



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. The amount of ashes needed for *terumas hadshen* is learned from the amount meal offering burnt on the Altar.

The Korban Minchah (meal offering) was eaten by the Kohanim. A fist full however, was burnt on the Altar. This was called *kemitza* (a fist full). The *Gemora* learns the minimum requirement of the *terumas hadshen* though a common word which appears both in the parshah of *terumas hadshen* and *kemitza*. Therefore the *Gemora* concludes that a minimum of a fist full of ashes must be taken.

2. There is a disagreement whether a non-Kohen who does *terumas hadshen* is liable for the death penalty.

A non-Kohen who performs the Temple service commits a sin which is punishable by death from heaven. The services for which one is liable for such a penalty include throwing the

blood on the Altar, burning the limbs of the sacrifices, and wine and water libations. There is a disagreement whether or not this severe penalty is extended to a non-Kohen who does *terumas hadshen*. Rav says only the four services listed are ones punishable by death, while Levi includes also, *terumas hadshen*.

3. According to Rav any service which is a removal from the Altar or a service which is only a preparation for another service is not liable for the death penalty.

Rav derives from the psukim that services which involve giving to the Altar can obligate a non-Kohen in death. *Terumas hadshen*, however is a service which involves removal and not giving. Consequently, it is not included in the services which can incur such a penalty. Rav also derives an exemption for services which prepare for other services. For example, the catching of the blood is a service which is preparation for the throwing of the blood, and, therefore, a non-



Kohen who performed the catching of the blood would also be exempt.

4. Four lotteries were cast in order generate excitement in Temple.

The *Gemora* asks why four separate lots were cast when all the assignments could have been designated with just one. The *Gemora* answers by quoting the pasuk, "I will go to the house of Hashem with excitement." In order to generate more excitement the Rabbis instituted more lotteries.

5. There is a disagreement to whether the Kohanim wore their sanctified clothes or their mundane clothes during the lottery.

The *Gemora* records two opinion as to which clothes the Kohanim wore during the lottery. Rav Nachman says they wore their mundane clothes in order to prevent one who didn't win from unfairly stealing the right to perform the service. If all the Kohanim were already in their sacred clothes, one could be in the position to use force and perform the service

even though he was not delegated to do so. Rav Sheishes, on the other hand, says they wore their sanctified clothes. This was to prevent a situation where the winner of the lottery in his excitement would forget to change his clothes and thereby, ruin the service.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Kohen's Clothing

Our *Gemora* brings one opinion that the Kohanim wore the holy garments during the lottery. The mefarshim are bothered how this is permitted. The Avnet, the belt which the Kohanim wore, was made from shatnez. The Torah allows for the Kohanim to wear them during Temple service during which the prohibition of shatnez is suspended. What about when the Kohanim are not engaged in the Avodah? There is a disagreement between the Rambam and the Raavad in regards to this. The Rambam states that the Kohanim who wore their belts when they weren't engaged in actual service violates the prohibition of shatnez. The Raavad disagrees and says the Kohanim are allowed to wear the belts as long as they are in the Mikdash.

According to the Raavad our *Gemora* makes sense. There is no prohibition of shatnez in the Temple. Consequently, the Kohanim may wear their holy garments for the lottery. According to the Rambam, however, this would be a violation of the prohibition of shantez. The problem is

compounded by the fact that the Rambam holds like the opinion that the Kohanim indeed wore their sanctified clothes during the lottery. This seems to be a contradiction within the Rambam.

Rav Eliashiv suggests an answer to this problem. He says the Kohanim would wear all of their clothes except for the belts. The *Gemora* says the Kohanim would wear their sanctified clothes because if they would wear their mundane clothes they might inadvertently do the service without changing clothes. Rav Eliashiv says that this might happen when the Kohen was wearing their non-sanctified clothes. If, however, the Kohen was wearing his sanctified clothes without the belt he would not make such a mistake. He would be constantly aware that his clothes were loose and this would remind him to put on the belt to do the service. This answer is difficult, however, because it should have been explicitly mentioned in the Rambam that the Kohanim do not wear the belt during the lottery.

DAILY MASHAL

KINDLING THE MENORAH AND LESSON FOR CHANUKAH

By: Rabbi Tzvi Akiva Fleisher

"B'haalos'cho es ha'neiros" - Rashi (Medrash Tanchumo #5) says that this parsha is juxtaposed to that of the heads of the tribes bringing their

offerings for the dedication of the Mishkon at the end of parshas Nasso, to tell us that Aharon was pained by not taking part in the dedication ceremony. Hashem consoled him by telling him that he would have the mitzvoh of kindling the menorah. Although kindling the menorah is a most wonderful act, nevertheless, how did it compensate for an act of DEDICATION?

The MESHECH CHOCHMOH brings our *Gemora* which states that the kindling of the menorah is not considered a service in the Mikdash that requires a Kohein. In the commentary Tosfos Y'shonim, Rabbi Yoseif asks, "If the kindling is not a service requiring a Kohein why does our verse say 'Da'beir el Aharon b'haalos'cho es ha'neiros?'" The MESHECH CHOCHMOH answers that Hashem gave him the mitzvoh of lighting the menorah for the very first time, an act of dedication. This was to be done with the evening lighting, as per the mishnah in M'nochos 49a, that the menorah is to be inaugurated only by lighting all seven lamps and with the evening lighting. He was consoled by being given a mitzvoh that was also an act of dedication. Regarding the menorah for all later times and generations the verse says "yaaroch oso Aharon u'vonov." Only the preparation and cleaning of the lamps requires a Kohein, but not the kindling except for the inaugural lighting which Hashem said that specifically Aharon should light. The next verse says "Va'yaas kein Aharon kaa'sher tzivoh Hashem es Moshe." This refers

only to his lighting the menorah as an inauguration and not for the rest of his life, as we have no indication that he lit it always. (It should be noted that the Ramban says that this verse tells us that Aharon always lit the menorah even though he was not required to do so.)

It is quite possible that this insight of the MESHECH CHOCHMOH is encapsulated in a few words that Rashi (Medrash Tanchumo #5) says, "shelcho g'doloh mishelo'hem she'atoh MADLIK U'MEITIV es ha'neiros." The order of lighting is always cleaning out the residue of the previous lighting, "hatovoh," before lighting. However, at the time of the first lighting, the dedication of the menorah, Aharon would first light and then afterwards clean. This would also explain why "hatovoh" is mentioned at all. The verse does not mention it, so why does Rashi? The answer is that he wants to point out that Hashem appeared Aharon with the inaugural lighting, hence lighting before cleaning.

Perhaps this gives us a new insight into "L'hagid shvocho shel Aharon shelo shinoh" (Rashi on 8:3 - Sifri 8:5). Since we are discussing specifically the dedication according to the MESHECH CHOCHMOH, the Sifri stresses that the same enthusiasm that Aharon had when he dedicated the menorah was present even 40 years later, even though he had lit it thousands of times. To answer the original question of how the lighting of the menorah is a compensation for missing out on taking part in the dedication, perhaps another

answer can be offered. At the beginning of parshas Trumoh the verses list the materials to be brought for the building of the Mishkon. In 25:6 the verse says to bring "shemen lamo'ore," - oil for lighting. The Daas Z'keinim asks that oil for lighting is not a material for building the Mishkon, but rather, an object that is offered in the daily service of kindling of the menorah. They answer that just as a king who has a palace built for himself has it well lit, so too, the oil of the menorah when lit will light up the Mishkon. This is considered part and parcel of the building of the Mishkon. The Baa'lei Tosfos likewise use this concept to explain the listing of incense among the building materials. It is now simply understood that the daily lighting of the menorah is not a service done in the Mikdosh, but rather, a daily completion of the Mishkon, a daily rededication. This would also explain why the lighting of the menorah may be done by a non-Kohein, as it is not a service, but rather, building the Mikdosh.

This would also explain why during Chanukah a miracle was needed for eight days so that only pure oil was used. Even though commentators say that for a dedication we do not want to use or may not use the rule of "tumoh hutroh b'tzibur," - defiled objects may be used when pure ones are not available for the services of the Mikdosh that are communal (which in reality means that they have a set time), nevertheless, this only explains why pure oil was needed for the first lighting, but why did the next seven days

require pure oil? According to the above it is well understood, as lighting every day was a new dedication of the Mikdosh, as it is considered a completion of BUILDING the Mikdosh. (See the Ramban for another answer connected to Chanukah).

Ch. 11, v. 4: "Hisavu taavoh" - Literally, this means "they lusted to have a lust." The M.R. Bmidbar 15:24 and Tanchumoh Bmidbar #16 say in the name of Rabbi Shimon that the people did not actually lust for meat, as the literal words of the verses indicate, but rather they lusted physical relations with relatives now forbidden to them, as is indicated by a verse in T'hilim 77:27. It says "Va'yamteir a'leihem ke'ofor SH'EIR." Sh'eir refers to incest as is written in Vayikroh 18:6, "Ish ish el kol SH'EIR b'soro lo sik'r'vu l'galos ervoh."

The Shaarei Aharon says in the name of the Eitz Yosef, Eshed Hancholim, and MESHECH CHOCHMOH that the words "hisavu taavoh" give us the insight into understanding the literal and the Medrashic interpretations as one. The experience of spiritual exposure and the acceptance of the Torah at Har Sinai had a spiritual uplifting and purifying effect on the bnei Yisroel. The eating of manna, a very spiritual food sent from heaven, likewise added to the positive effect on the bnei Yisroel. The "Asafsuf," the multitudes of "eiruv-rav," wanted to continue having relations with their relatives, as was permitted before the giving of the Torah. They

knew that their lust was weakened by eating the spiritually fortified manna. They therefore requested meat, which would bring them back to their former selves, which would nurture a lust for things physical, particularly relations with their relatives. The lust for meat was a lust to bring on the lust for physical relations with their relatives.

Moshe responded with (11:13), "Mei'ayin li bosor." Ever since Moshe received the Torah at Har Sinai he had been on an even higher plane than before. He had no further relations with his own wife (gemara Y'vomos 62a). He said that he could not be a conduit for something so physical as meat, which could bring to a lust for incest.

At this point Hashem responded with (11:16), "Esfoh li shivim ish." The seventy new prophets who were not as removed from this world as Moshe was, would become the conduit to bring quail (slov) to the people who desired it.