



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

Oil for the Chavitin

Rava says that the source that the preparation for the *chavitin* (daily minchah offering of the Kohen Gadol) of the Kohen Gadol overrides Shabbos is derived from the following verse: *on a griddle*. This teaches us that a sacred service vessel is required. Now, if it would be baked from the night before, it would become invalidated by it being left overnight. [*The invalidation of being left overnight – linah – only occurs if it was sanctified first in a service vessel.*]

The Gemora cites a *braisa* which supports Rava: The expression ‘*on a griddle*’ implies that it requires the use of a service vessel. ‘*With oil*’ signifies that it must have more oil (*than the usual log*); yet, I do not know how much. Therefore I derive as follows: here it is written *oil*, and there in connection with the *minchah* of libations accompanying the lambs of the *tamid* offering, it is also written *oil*. Just as there it has three *logs* of oil to the *isaron* of flour, so too here it must have three *logs* to the *isaron*. Or perhaps I should derive as follows: here it is written *oil*, and there in connection with the voluntary *minchah* offering, it is also written *oil*. Just as there it has only one *log*, so too here it should have only one *log*.

Let us then see to which of the two is this case more similar to. We may derive a *minchah* offering (*the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol*) which is characterized by

the mnemonic *TaShaT* from another *minchah* offering (*the minchah of libations accompanying the lambs of the tamid offering*) which is also characterized by the mnemonic *TaShaT* — they are offered constantly; and they override the *Shabbos*; and they overrides *tumah*, but we may not derive a *minchah* offering which is characterized by the mnemonic *TaShaT* from another (*a voluntary minchah*) which is not characterized by the mnemonic *TaShaT*. Or perhaps I should derive as follows: We may derive a *minchah* offering (*the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol*) which is characterized by the mnemonic *YaGeL* from another *minchah* offering (*a voluntary minchah*) which is also characterized by the mnemonic *YaGeL* —they are offerings of an individual; they are brought on their own account (*and not to accompany something else*); and they require frankincense, but we may not derive a *minchah* offering which is characterized by the mnemonic *YaGeL* from another (*the minchah of libations accompanying the lambs of the tamid offering*) which is not characterized by the mnemonic *YaGeL*.

Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: It is written: *fine flour for a minchah offering daily*; it should be comparable to the *minchah* offering which accompanies the *tamid* offering: Just as there it has three *logs* of oil to the *isaron* of flour, so too here it must have three *logs* to the *isaron*.

Rabbi Shimon says: Here (*by the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol*), additional oil is required, and there also in connection with the *minchah* offering accompanying the lambs of the *tamid* offering, additional oil is required: Just as there it has three *logs* of oil to the *isaron* of flour, so too here it must have three *logs* to the *isaron*. Or perhaps I should derive as follows: here, additional oil is required, and there also in connection with the *minchah* offering accompanying the offering of the bulls and rams, additional oil is required: Just as there it has two *logs* of oil to the *isaron* of flour, so too here it must have two *logs* to the *isaron*.

Let us then see to which of the two is this case more similar to. We may derive a *minchah* offering consisting of one *isaron* (*the chavitin of the Kohen Gadol*) from another *minchah* offering also consisting of one *isaron* (*the minchah of libations accompanying the lambs of the tamid offering*), but we may not derive a *minchah* offering consisting of one *isaron* from a *minchah* offering consisting of two or three *isaron*s (*the minchah offering accompanying the offering of the bulls and rams*).

The *Gemora* asks: Is the above *braisa* not self-contradictory? It states at first, '*With oil*' signifies that it must have more oil (*than the usual log*); and then it states: here it is written *oil*, and there in connection with the voluntary *minchah* offering, it is also written *oil* (*which teaches us that just as there it has only one log, so too here it should have only one log*)!?

Abaye answered: The *Tanna* of the *braisa* who understands that the expression '*with oil*' signifies that it must have an increase in oil, is Rabbi Shimon, whereas

the one who argues otherwise through the comparison to the voluntary *minchah* offering is Rabbi Yishmael.

Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said: The entire first part of the *braisa* is authored by Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah, and he argues as follows: '*with oil*' signifies that it must have additional oil, for to establish merely that it requires oil (*the usual amount*), no verse would be necessary, since the expression '*on a griddle*' indicates that it should be like any *minchah* offering made on a griddle. Or perhaps it is not so, and the expression '*with oil*' signifies merely that it requires oil, for had the Torah not stated '*with oil*,' I might have thought that it should be like the sinner's *minchah* offering (*and there shouldn't be any oil at all*). And then he said: Even if it would be so that '*with oil*' signifies merely that it requires oil, surely it can still be argued through an inference (*that more than one log is required*). He then attempted to prove this through a comparison (*to the minchah of libations accompanying the lambs of the tamid offering*), but it was refuted (*for perhaps it could be compared to the voluntary minchah offering*). He therefore concluded that the verse - *fine flour for a minchah offering daily* – was necessary (*to teach us that it should be comparable to the minchah offering which accompanies the tamid offering: just as there it has three logs of oil to the isaron of flour, so too here it must have three logs to the isaron*), as Rabbi Yishmael concluded his words.

Rabbah said: The entire *braisa* is following Rabbi Shimon's point of view, and he argues as follows: [*When the braisa said that we might have thought that we should compare the chavitin to a voluntary minchah offering, and only one log of oil should be required, this is what it meant:*] '*With oil*' signifies that it must have an

increase in oil, for to establish merely that it requires oil, no verse would be necessary, since the expression 'on a griddle' indicates that it should be like any *minchah* offering made on a griddle. But even without the expression 'with oil,' I could derive that more than the usual amount of oil is necessary. He then attempted to prove this through a comparison (to the *minchah* of libations accompanying the lambs of the *tamid* offering), but it was refuted (for perhaps it could be compared to the voluntary *minchah* offering). He therefore concluded that the verse – *with oil* – was necessary. [Rabbi Shimon] then said: Let it be compared with the *minchah* offering accompanying the offering of the bulls and rams (and two logs of oil should be required), but he refuted this by saying: We may derive a *minchah* offering consisting of one *isaron* (the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol* - from another *minchah* offering also consisting of one *isaron* (the *minchah* of libations accompanying the lambs of the *tamid* offering). (51a – 51b)

Mishna

If they did not appoint another *Kohen* in place of the *Kohen Gadol* who died, at whose expense was the *chavitin* offered? Rabbi Shimon says: at the expense of the public; but Rabbi Yehudah says: at the expense of the heirs. And it was offered whole (a full *isaron*; not halved). (51b)

Chavitin of the Successor

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If the *Kohen Gadol* died and they had not appointed another in his place, from where do we know that his *minchah* offering must be offered at the expense of his heirs? It is because it is

written: *And if the anointed Kohen dies, in his stead, from among his sons shall offer it.* I might think that they offer it in halves, the Torah therefore states 'it,' implying that the whole *isaron* (is offered) but not half; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Shimon says: *It is a statute forever.* This implies that it is offered at the expense of the public. *It shall be completely burned.* This means that the whole of it shall be burned (like all *minchah* offerings of a *Kohen*; there is no *kemitzah* and no remainder).

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa* which uses the same verse to teach us that all *Kohanim Gedolim* – in future generations, are also obligated to bring the *chavitin*!?

The *Gemora* answers that the words 'from his sons' are extra, and therefore, we can derive both laws from the same verse.

The *Gemora* notes that Rabbi Shimon uses this verse to teach us that If the *Kohen Gadol* died and they appointed another in his stead, the successor may not bring a half an *isaron* from his house, nor may he use the remaining half *isaron* of the first *Kohen Gadol*.

The *Gemora* notes further that Rabbi Yehudah uses the expression 'it shall be completely burned' for a *gezeirah shavah* between the *minchah* offering of the *Kohen Gadol* and that of an ordinary *Kohen*. Both offerings are completely burned on the altar, and both have a prohibition against it being eaten.

The *Gemora* asks: And does Rabbi Shimon indeed maintain that it is a Biblical obligation (as he derives it from a Scriptural; verse) for the expenses for the *chavitin* to come from the public funds? But it was



taught in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Shimon said that the court ordained seven things and this was one of them: if an idolater sent his *olah* offering from overseas and he also sent with it the (*money to purchase the*) libations, they then are to be offered from his own; but if he did not send the money, they are to be offered at the expense of the public.

Similarly, if a convert died and left animal offerings, the law is as follows: if he also left libations, they are offered from his own; but if he did not, they are to be offered at the expense of the public.

It was also a condition laid down by the court that if the *Kohen Gadol* died and they had not appointed another in his place, his *minchah* offering shall be offered at the expense of the public!?

Rabbi Avahu said: There were two ordinances. By Biblical law, it should be offered at the expense of the public; but when they saw that the funds of the Temple Treasury were being depleted, they ordained that it should come from the heirs. When, however, they saw that the heirs were negligent regarding it, they reverted to the Biblical law. (51b)

GLOSSARY

chavitin (daily *minchah* offering of the *Kohen Gadol*)

log – a measurement of oil used for a *minchah* offering

tamid – daily offering; one lamb is offered in the morning and one in the afternoon

isaron – an amount of flour used in a *minchah* offering

DAILY MASHAL

The Purpose of the Minchas Chavitin

Chazal said (Bava Basra 162b) that there are sins “from which a person is not saved every day”, such as *lashon hara* etc. HaGaon Rav Y. Engel imagines that this is the purpose of the *Kohen Gadol's chavitin*, so that he may be atoned, “that due to his high level, his slight transgressions are considered severe”. We thus understand why the Gemara (further on, 51a) tends to liken the *minchas chavitin* to a sinner's *minchah*. A *minchas chavitin* serves to atone and they thought well to compare it to a sinner's *minchah* (Gilyonei HaShas, Bava Basra 164b).