

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

1 Nissan 5772

Kerisus Daf 5

March 24, 2012

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
HaRav Refoel Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel 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.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.
Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler
To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Three Types of Chadash

Rabbi Yitzchak says that one who eats bread, roasted kernels, and raw kernels of *chadash* - new grain (before the omer offering is brought), is liable for three sets of lashes, as the verse delineates each of these types individually in the prohibition.

The *Gemora* asks why each one is considered a separate prohibition, as the verse only has one statement for all of them, making them all fall under one general prohibition.

The *Gemora* answers that the items listed are not all necessary, and therefore their enumeration indicates separate prohibitions.

The *Gemora* explains that although bread and raw kernels must be enumerated, roasted kernels can be inferred from them. Although bread is the only item from which challah must be taken, and raw kernels are in their natural form, since these characteristics are different, the listing of these two would already imply roasted kernels. Although only the roasted kernels is extra, since it is in the middle of the list, we learn that all three items are compared to it, each one being considered a separate prohibition. (5a)

Importance of Gezeirah Shavah

Rabbi Yannai says that one should not take lightly the *gezeirah shavah* method of equating two verses that have similar words, as the essential fact of the punishment for *piggul* - a sacrifice offered with the wrong intentions is only learned by *gezeirah shavah*.

Rabbi Yannai cites Rabbi Yochanan who quoted a braisa of Zavda bar Levi who said the source is the common phrase "he will carry his sin," which is used in the context of *nossar* - leftover sacrifice meat and *piggul*. Just as one who eats *nossar* is punished with *kares*, so also is one who eats *piggul*.

Rabbi Sima'i says we can see the importance of *gezeirah shavah* from the verse about *nossar* itself. The way we know that the verse is referring to *nossar* is the use of the word "*kodesh*," which is the same word used in the verse which says that "you must burn the *nossar*, since it is *kodesh*."

Abaye says we can see the importance of *gezeirah shavah* from the fact that the essential prohibition and punishment of having relations with one's biological daughter is only learned from two *gezeirah shavah*'s. He cites Rava, who quoted Rabbi Yitzchak bar Avdimi saying that the prohibition of having relations with one's biological daughter, born out of wedlock, is learned from the same word *heinnah* - they are used in the verse about a biological daughter and the verse about one's wife's offspring. Just as the verse about a wife's offspring explicitly enumerates a daughter along with a granddaughter, so the verse about a biological granddaughter includes a daughter. We then learn that both of these cases are punishable by burning, from the same word *zimah* - immorality used in the verse about a wife's offspring and in the verse about a wife's mother. Just as the verse about a wife's mother explicitly states that he is punished by burning, so we learn that all the other cases associated with this word are punished by burning.

Rav Ashi says that we can see the importance of *gezeirah shavah* from the fact that we learn the punishment of stoning for many prohibitions from the use of the phrase *demaitem bam* - their

blood is on them [i.e., their responsibility]. Since this phrase is used in the context of one who conjures up the dead, who is executed by stoning, we learn that all prohibitions which use the same phrase are also punishable by stoning. (5a)

The Anointing Oil

The *Mishna* listed one who fashions oil like the anointing oil in the list of *kares* offenses.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* about this prohibition. The *braisa* says that if one makes the oil to learn how to do it correctly, or to give it to the community for use as anointing oil, he is exempt from *kares*. If he made it to anoint himself with it, he is liable, while if someone did anoint with the oil he made, that person is exempt, as *kares* is only for making the oil, or for anointing someone with the original oil made by Moshe.

The *Gemora* says that we learn that one is only liable for making the oil for personal use due to the same word *maskones* – *formula* used in the context of the oil and the context of the prohibition of making *ketores*. Just as the verse prohibits making the *ketores* “for you,” so the prohibition of making the oil is only for your personal use. Although this common word equates them, they have different rules about when one is liable.

Rava explains that we still learn that one is only liable for making a full measure of the oil, but one is liable for less than a full measure of *ketores*, due to differences in the way the verse states the prohibitions. The verse about the oil states that “*in its formula, you should not make like it,*” limiting the prohibition to making it like the real oil, i.e., in the full measure. However, the verse about the *ketores* says, “*and the ketores that you will make, in its formula you should not make for you,*” including any making of the *ketores* that would be usable, even less than the full measure.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* listing the spices for the anointing oil:

1. 500 shekel of *mar deror*
2. 500 shekel of *kidah*
3. 500 shekel of *kinman besem*
4. 250 shekel of *kenai bosem*

This makes a total of 1750 shekel of spice.

The *Gemora* asks why the *braisa* needs to give a tally at the end, and answers that we may have thought that the verse which lists *kenai bosem* as 250 shekel, is stating half of the full measure, making the full weight 2000 shekel. Since the verse does not say “*kinman besem and kenai bosem, half is 250 shekel,*” but rather, “*kinman besem, half is 250 shekel, and kenai bosem, 250 shekel,*”

we learn that the 250 stated about *kinman besem* is half its full weight, but the 250 stated about *kenai bosem* is the full weight.

Rav Pappa asked Abaye whether the weighing of the spices was done with an extra measure to account for error tolerance, or if it was done with a precision balance.

Abaye answered that it was definitely done with a precision balance, as the verse states *bad b'vad* – *one by one*, indicating precision.

The *Gemora* rejects this from Rav Yehudah’s statement that Hashem knows the extra added for tolerance, indicating that extra was added.

The *Gemora* cites Rav Yehudah who says that the verse specified that half of *kinman besem* is 250, and not that it is 500 in total, to mandate that we take two units of 250, each with its own extra for tolerance, indicating that extra was added.

Ravina explains that the verse which states that it be taken “one by one” teaches that one must not weigh one spice on the balance against a weight, but not another spice.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which discusses how the anointing oil was made. Rabbi Yehudah says that the spices were cooked in the olive oil. Rabbi Yosi challenges this, as there wasn’t enough oil to even cover the spices, let alone to cook them in it. Rather, the spices were soaked in water, and then oil was poured over them to absorb the spices’ smell. The oil was then captured and used for anointing. Rabbi Yehudah responds that many other miracles were involved in this oil, as the limited amount of 12 log was used to anoint the *Mishkan* and its vessels, to anoint Aharon and his sons during the seven days of initiation, and to anoint all *Kohanim Gedolim* and kings. Furthermore, the full amount still remains forever, as the verse about the oil says that “*anointing oil will zeh – this be, for all your generations,*” and the word *zeh* has the numerical value of 12, indicating that the full 12 log always remains. Therefore, we can say that the capacity of this oil to hold the spices was also miraculous.

The *Gemora* cites another *braisa* about the anointing oil. Rabbi Yehudah lists the miracles involved with this oil, as it began as 12 log, some of which was absorbed by the pot and by the spices, and some of which boiled off. This oil was used for all anointing in history, including the *Mishkan* and its vessels, Aharon and his sons during the initiation, and all *Kohanim Gedolim* and kings throughout history. A *Kohen Gadol* the son of a *Kohen Gadol* is anointed, but a king who is the son of a king is not. The *braisa* explains the exceptions:

1. Shlomo was anointed to counter the challenge of Adonia, who aspired to rule.
2. Yehoash was anointed to counter the challenge of Asalya
3. Yehoachaz was anointed since he was anointed even though his brother Yehoyakim was two years older than him

The *Gemora* explains that a *Kohen Gadol* must be anointed, even if his father was a *Kohen Gadol*, as the verse refers to the *Kohen* “who is anointed, in place of him, from his sons,” indicating that even a *Kohen Gadol* who is “from his [*Kohen Gado*’s] sons” must be anointed.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov explains that a king’s son need not be anointed, as the verse says “in order that his [*king*’s] days will extend over his kingdom, he and his sons,” indicating that the monarchy passes directly to his children, with no need for anointing.

Rav Pappa explains that this is only true when there is no dissent, as the verse concludes “... in the midst of all *Yisrael*.” Therefore, in the case of any dissent, the king was anointed, as the *braisa* details.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that Yehu was also anointed, to counter the challenge of Yoram, the son of Achav.

The *Gemora* challenges this reason, as Yehu the start of a dynasty, and therefore would have to be anointed even without dissent.

The *Gemora* therefore amends the *braisa* to say that kings of the Israel kingdom did not need to be anointed, but Yehu was still anointed, due to the challenge of Yoram.

The *Gemora* explains that the verse in which Hashem tells Shmuel to anoint Dovid says “anoint him, because this is it,” limiting the oil to this, i.e., a king from Dovid.

The *Gemora* asks, if it is limited to kings from Dovid, how was it misused simply to counter the challenge?

Rav Pappa answers that the real oil was not used, but rather pure persimmon oil.

The *Gemora* challenges the *braisa*’s statement that Yehoyakim was older from the verse, which lists the sons of Yoshayahu as:

1. The oldest, Yochanan
2. The second, Yehoyakim
3. The third, Tzidkiyahu

4. The fourth, Shalum

Rabbi Yochanan explains that Yochanan is actually Yehoachaz, and Shalum is Tzidkiyahu, making Yehoachaz the oldest.

The *Gemora* answers that although he was younger than Yehoyakim, the verse refers to him as the first, since he ruled first.

The *Gemora* asks why he was appointed first, as the oldest is generally chosen to succeed. We see an example of this with Yehoram, who was chosen by his father Yehoshafat to succeed him, since he was the oldest.

The *Gemora* answers that Yehoram was a righteous substitute for his father. However, Yehoyakim was not as righteous, and therefore Yehoachaz was appointed first.

The *Gemora* asks why Tzidkiyahu is listed both as third and fourth, and answers that he was the third son, but the fourth to rule. First ruled Yehoachaz, then Yehoyakim, then his son Yechanya, and finally Tzidkiyahu ruled.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that Shalum is Tzidkiyahu, and he was called Shalum because:

1. He was *shalem* – complete in his deeds
2. In his reign, the kingdom of Dovid was completed

His real name was Matanya, and Nevuchadnetzar named him Tzidkiyahu, to say that Hashem will *yatzdik* - *adjudicate* against him if he rebels against him.

The *Gemora* asks how Yehoachaz was anointed with the anointing oil, as the *braisa* states that when the Ark was hidden, his father Yoshaya also hid:

1. The container of man from the times of the desert
2. The container of the anointing oil
3. The staff of Aharon, which blossomed with almonds
4. The chest of gifts sent by the Pelishtim when they returned the Ark, which was kept next to the Ark

Rabbi Elozar explains that the word *sham* – *there* is used in reference to the Ark and to the container of man, the phrase “your generations,” used in reference to the container of man, and the container of anointing oil, and the phrase “a guarding”, used in reference to the container of man and to Aharon’s staff, teaches that all of these items followed the Ark into hiding.

Rav Pappa answers that persimmon oil was used instead for Yehoachaz.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which discusses how the anointing was done. A king was anointed with oil around his head, like a crown, while a *Kohen Gadol* was anointed with a shape like the Greek letter chi (x). One *braisa* says that first the oil was placed on his head, then between his eyes, and then the two deposits of oil were connected through the forehead, while another *braisa* says that first it was placed between his eyes, and then on his head.

The *Gemora* explains that these two dispute whether the main act is anointing (*done between the eyes*), or pouring (done on the head). The source for the first *braisa* is the verse which states that Moshe “poured from the anointing oil on Aharon’s head, and he anointed him,” indicating that pouring is the primary action. The source for second *braisa* is the fact that the vessels were anointed, indicating that that is the primary action. The second *braisa* would explain the verse about Moshe anointing to mean that he poured the oil, *because he already* anointed him.

The *braisa* explains that the verse which refers to the “good oil that falls on the head” refers to two drops of the anointing oil that hung like pearls on Aharon’s beard.

Rav Kahana cites a *braisa* saying that when he would speak, the drops would jump to the root of his beard. Moshe was concerned that he did *me’ilah* - misuse by pouring too much oil, until a heavenly voice continued the verse, saying that the drops are like “the dew of Chermom that falls on the mountains of Tzion.” Just as there is no *me’ilah* with dew, so the oil was not misused. (5a – 5b)

Omens

The *braisa* says that kings are anointed next to a spring, as a sign that their kingdom should flow continuously like the spring. As a source, the *braisa* cites the verse in which Dovid told his men to take Shlomo to the Gichon spring, and anoint him there as king.

Rav Ami lists signs that one can use to determine what will happen.

If one wants to know if he will live out his year, he should take a candle during the days between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, and place it in a house with no wind. If the flame burns through all the fuel, this is a sign that he will survive the year.

If one wants to know if he will be successful in his business, he should raise a hen. If it grows fat and healthy, this is a sign that the business will do well.

If one who is going on a trip wants to know if he will return peacefully home, he should go to a dark house. If he sees a shadow of his shadow, this is a sign he will return in peace.

The *Gemora* concludes that one should not try these tests, as the concern he will have if he sees a negative result may itself cause him misfortune. (5b – 6a)

DAILY MASHAL

A Negative Miracle

HaGaon Rav E.M. Shach zt”l was asked: Our *sugya* treats the prohibition to concoct the oil of anointment. How is it possible if the concoction cannot be accomplished without Heavenly miracles? He answered, “Hashem created both possibilities (of evil opposing good). It could be that He would help this evildoer to transgress the prohibition” (*Kol HaTorah*, Nisan 5762, p. 76).

The Power of Unity

HaGaon Rav C. Shmuelevitz zt”l would become excited about the *Shitah Mekubetzes* here (*os* 25), who cites the Midrash: “Because it was on Aharon’s beard, it was as though on Moshe’s.” How wonderful this is: because of their great brotherhood, Moshe felt as though he were himself anointed! (*Sichos Musar*)

Kingship Stems from Above

A hundred and ten years ago, on 5 Iyar 5654, Nikolai Alexandrovitch was crowned as the Czar of Russia and the Rabbis were obligated to speak in honor of the event. None of them could imagine daring to avoid it... HaGaon Rabbi Ben Tziyon Sternfeld zt”l, author of Responsa *Sha’arei Tziyon* and one of those who wrote a letter of approbation for *Mishnah Berurah*, also spoke, and thus he said: “Why is a king anointed especially by a spring? If it is to serve as a sign that his kingship should last long, it would be more fitting to anoint him next to a long and wide river! But this anointment serves to teach us that this kingship flows from a pure source like a spring, from Hashem, even though in our eyes it seems that such and such ministers crowned him.”

A Chupah on a Spring

There was a custom in Frankfurt that on the day of a wedding they would hold a ceremony outdoors called the “Maine *Chupah*” (for the river Maine). HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Weiss suggests (Responsa *Minchas Yitzchak*, V, 30) that the ceremony was so called because of the spring mentioned in our Gemara as a source for a good sign at auspicious times. At first the ceremony was called *Chupah Ma’yan* (“a *chupah* by a spring”) but eventually it was distorted to be called *Chupah Main*.

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi