



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishna

Regarding the *komeitz* of a *minchah* offering, the smaller part is essential to the larger part. [No part of the *komeitz* may be missing.] Regarding the *issaron* (the tenth of an eifah of flour), the smaller part is essential to the larger part. Regarding the wine (for libations), the smaller part is essential to the larger part. Regarding the oil, the smaller part is essential to the larger part. The flour and the oil of a *minchah* offering are essential to each other. The *komeitz* and the *levonah* are essential to each other. (27a)

Scriptural Sources

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural sources that all these items are indispensable.

1. *Komeitz* - his full *komeitz* (twice)
2. *Issaron* – from its fine flour (extra)
3. Wine – like so (*kachah*)
4. Oil (libations) – like so
5. Oil (donated offerings) – and from its oil (extra)
6. Oil and flour – from its fine flour and oil, and, from its finely ground flour and oil (redundant)
7. *Komeitz* and *levonah* – in addition to its *levonah*, and, and all the *levonah* that is on the *minchah* (redundant)

The two goats of *Yom Kippur* are essential to each other. The two lambs of *Shavuos* are essential to each other. The two loaves (*sh'tei halachem*) are essential to each other. The two rows (*of the lechem hapanim*) are essential to each other. The two spoons (*of levonah*) are essential to each other. The

rows and the spoons are essential to each other. The two types (*of the breads*) of the *nazir*, the three (*elements*) of the red heifer, the four types (*of the breads*) of the *todah* offering, the four species of the *lulav*, the four (*elements*) of the *metzora* (which are used in his purification process) are essential to each other. The seven sprinklings of the red heifer are essential to each other, the seven sprinklings between the poles of the Holy Ark and on the *paroches* and on the golden altar are essential to each other.

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural sources that all these items are indispensable.

1. Two goats - *chukah* (decree – always essential)
2. Two lambs of *Shavuos* – being (must be done in this specific manner)
3. Two loaves – being
4. Two rows – *chukah*
5. Two spoons – *chukah*
6. The rows and spoons – *chukah*
7. The two types (*of the breads*) of the *nazir* – so shall he do (must be done in this specific manner)
8. The three (*elements*) of the red heifer – *chukah*
9. The four types (*of the breads*) of the *todah* offering – a *hekeish* (analogy) to *nazir*
10. The four (*elements*) of the *metzora* – this shall be the law of the *metzora*
11. The four species of the *lulav* – and you shall take; this indicates that it shall be a complete taking. (27a)

Bundling the Lulav

Rav Chanan bar Abba said: This was taught only in the case where he did not have them at all, but where he had them all, it is not essential (*for them all to be tied together*).

The *Gemora* asked on this from a *braisa*: Of the four species used for the *lulav*, two of them bear fruit (*the esrog and the lulav*) and two do not (*the hadas and the aravah*); those which bear fruits require those which bear no fruit, and those which do not bear fruit require those which bear fruit. And one does not fulfill his obligation unless they are tied together in one bundle. And so it is with Israel receiving appeasement (*by their prayers*); it is not achieved unless they are all in one group.

The *Gemora* answers: This is a matter of dispute amongst the *Tannaim*, for it was taught in a *braisa*: The *lulav* is valid whether it is bundled with the others or not; but Rabbi Yehudah says: If it is bundled with the others it is valid, and if it is not bundled, it is not valid.

What is Rabbi Yehudah's reason? He derives it through a *gezeirah shavah* by using the expression 'taking' used both here and also in connection with the bundle of the *eizov* (*hyssop; which was used by the Jews in Egypt during the pesach service*): just as there, it must be bound in one bundle, so too here, they must be bound in one bundle. The Rabbis, however, did not receive a tradition regarding this *gezeirah shavah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Whose opinion is reflected in the following *braisa*: It is a *mitzvah* to bind the *lulav* with the other species; nevertheless, if one did not bind it, it is valid! It cannot be Rabbi Yehudah's opinion, for then it would not be valid if it was not bundled. And it cannot agree with the view of the Rabbis, for they do not hold that there is a *mitzvah* to bundle it at all!?

The *Gemora* answers: Indeed it reflects the opinion of the Rabbis, and it is a *mitzvah* to bundle it based upon the

principle of that which is written: *This is my God and I shall glorify him.* (27a)

Sprinklings

The *Gemora* continues citing the Scriptural sources that the items mentioned in the *Mishna* are indispensable.

1. The seven sprinklings of the red heifer – *chukah*
2. The seven sprinklings between the poles of the Holy Ark: regarding *Yom Kippur* – *chukah*; the bull of the Anointed *Kohen*, the communal error bull, the goats brought for the sin of idolatry – taught in the following *braisa*: *He shall do (with the communal bull for a chatas) as he did (with the Kohen Gadol's bull). Why is this stated (for all of this bull's halachos are explicitly mentioned)? It is as a repetition of the law of sprinkling, which teaches us that if he omitted one of the applications, he has done nothing. [Rashi seems to have had the following version in our Gemora: I know this only regarding the seven applications (on the Paroches), which are indispensable in all cases; how do we know this regarding the four applications (of the Inner Altar)? It is from the verse: So shall he do. With the bull refers to the bull of Yom Kippur. As he did with the bull refers to the bull of the anointed Kohen (that all of its blood applications are essential). The chatas refers to the goats of idolatry (that it requires sprinkling on the Paroches, and its blood is applied on the Inner Altar, and that its meat is burned outside of the three Camps – all like the communal-error bull).*

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Regarding the seven sprinklings of the blood of the Red heifer – if they were done not for their own sake, or they were not directed correctly (*towards the entrance of the Sanctuary*), they are invalid; but regarding the sprinklings which are performed inside, or the sprinklings (*of the oil*) in the purification process of a *metzora*, if they done not for their own sake, they are invalid, but if they were not directed correctly, they are valid.

The *Gemora* notes a contradiction from the following *braisa*: Regarding the seven sprinklings of the blood of the red heifer – if they done not for their own sake, they are invalid, but if they were not directed correctly, they are valid.

Rav Chisda answers: There is no difficulty, for the first *braisa* reflects the view of Rabbi Yehudah, and the other that of the Rabbis, for it was taught in a *braisa*: If a *mechusar kippurim* (*one who was tamei, but has immersed himself in a mikvah, and has waited until nightfall; he is just lacking atonement until he brings his offerings the next day*) entered the Courtyard inadvertently, he is liable to bring a *chatas*, but if he entered deliberately, he is punished with *kares*; and it is not necessary to say that this is so by a *tevul yom* (*one who was tamei, but has immersed himself in a mikvah; he is considered a tevul yom until nightfall*) and any other *tamei* person. If a *tahor* person (*a Yisroel or a Kohen when he is not performing the service*) overstepped his boundary and entered the Sanctuary, he will be liable to forty lashes, and if he entered within the curtain (*into the Holy of Holies*) or towards the front of the Ark (*even further in*), he will be punished by death (*at the hands of Heaven*). Rabbi Yehudah says: If he entered into the Sanctuary or within the curtain, he will be liable to forty lashes, and if he entered towards the front of the Ark, he will be punished by death.

They argue in the interpretation of the following verse: And Hashem said to Moshe: *Speak to Aaron your brother that he shall not come at all times into the Sanctuary, within the curtain, towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark, so that he should not die.* The Rabbis hold that “*into the Sanctuary*” is a negative prohibition of “*he shall not come,*” and “*within the curtain, towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark*” is subject to the warning “*that he should not die.*” Rabbi Yehudah maintains that “*into the Sanctuary*” and “*within the curtain*” is a negative prohibition of “*he shall not come,*” and “*towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark*” is subject to the warning “*that he should not die.*”

The *Gemora* explains the reason of the Rabbis: If it is as Rabbi Yehudah maintains (*that entering the Holy of Holies without approaching the front of the Ark is subject to lashes and not to death*), the Torah should only have stated “*into the Sanctuary*” and “*towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark,*” and it would not be necessary to state “*within the curtain,*” for I would have argued as follows: If for entering the Sanctuary one incurs lashes, is it necessary to state that he incurs lashes for entering within the curtain! Why then did the Torah also state “*within the curtain*”? It must be to infer that there is the punishment of death for it.

Rabbi Yehudah counters: If the Torah would have only stated “*into the Sanctuary*” and not “*within the curtain,*” I might have thought that by the expression “*into the Kodesh (Sanctuary),*” only within the curtain was meant, but with respect to entering into the Sanctuary, there is not even a prohibition!

The Rabbis disagree with this: You could not have possibly said like that, for the entire Sanctuary is referred to as *Kodesh*.

The *Gemora* now explains the reason of Rabbi Yehudah: If it is as the Rabbis maintain (*that entering the Holy of Holies without approaching the front of the Ark is subject to death*), the Torah should only have stated “*into the Sanctuary within the curtain,*” and it would not be necessary to state “*towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark,*” for I would have argued the following: If for entering within the curtain one is punished by death, is it necessary to state that he is punished by death for approaching the front of the Ark! Why then did the Torah also state “*towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark*”? It must be to infer that one is punished by death for approaching the front of the Ark, but there is a mere prohibition for entering within the curtain.

The Rabbis counter: Indeed, it was unnecessary to state, but the reason why the Torah stated “*towards the front of the Cover which is upon the Ark*” was in order to exclude from

this prohibition someone who enters in an unusual manner (such as tunneling underneath the wall). As it was taught by a *Tanna* in the academy of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov: The Torah writes (regarding the sprinkling of the *Kohen Gadol*): upon the front of the Ark-Cover, on the east. This establishes the principle that wherever the Torah says “the front,” it means the east side. [This teaches us that one will be punished by death only upon entering the Holy of Holies from the east, but not if he tunnels in from any other direction.]

Rabbi Yehudah responds that if the verse would only be teaching us that, it should then have only stated “*pnei*” -- “the front”; why does it also state “*e*” -- “to”? [It must be to teach that only one who approaches the Ark is liable to death.]

It emerges that “*e*” must be interpreted with exactness (according to Rabbi Yehudah); and according to the Rabbis “*e*” need not be interpreted precisely.

The *Gemora* now answers the original contradiction: According to Rabbi Yehudah – just as “*e*” regarding the front of the Cover is interpreted precisely, so too “*e*” is interpreted precisely regarding the sprinkling of the red heifer “toward” the opening of the Tent of Meeting (and it is invalid if it was sprinkled in the wrong direction). The Rabbis, however, maintain that just as there it is not precise, here it is not precise as well.

Rav Yosef asked: Then according to Rabbi Yehudah, if “*e*” must be interpreted precisely, would “*a*” also be interpreted exactly? And it would emerge that during the second Temple, when there was neither Ark nor Cover, no sprinklings were to be made (by the *Kohen Gadol* on *Yom Kippur*, for it is written: he shall sprinkle ... “*a*” the front of the Ark-cover)!?

Rabbah bar Ulla answered: It is written: *And he shall make atonement for the Holy of Holies*. This indicates that the sprinkling may be done in the place that is sanctified for Holiness.

Rava answers the contradiction as follows: Both *braisos* are reflecting the view of the Rabbis; the second *braisa* refers to a case where the *Kohen*, at the time of sprinkling, was standing with his back to the east and he was facing the west (and therefore it is valid, for he was facing the Sanctuary and he was sprinkling in that direction). The first *braisa* was referring to a case where he was standing to the north and south (and therefore, it is ruled to be invalid). (27a – 28a)

DAILY MASHAL

The *Gemora* states that Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one is required to bundle the *lulav* with the other species, and he derives this ruling from a *gezeirah shavah* of taking, taking, from the case of the bundle of *eizov*, hyssop, that the Jews took prior to departing from Egypt. That verse states and you shall take a bundle of *eizov*. We can interpret the verse homiletically to mean that if one desires to be a part of the bundle, i.e. the group, he should humble himself like the hyssop, which is a low branch.