



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

***Kohanim get the Remainder***

The *Gemora* said that the source, according to Rabbi Shimon, that even the remainder of a barley *minchah* is eaten by *Kohanim* is the verse which states that any *minchah*, with or without oil, is given to the *Kohanim*.

The *Gemora* challenges this from a *braisa* which learns other rules from this same verse. The *braisa* learns that sacrifices are not divided between *Kohanim*. There are two verses listing *minchah* offerings, which conclude with the statement that “they should be to the *Kohanim*,” teaching that all *Kohanim* have a share in each one, and we cannot give one *Kohen* part of one in exchange for part of another one.

The *braisa* learns the following from each part of the verses:

Verse	Splitting which for which?	Why we may have thought it is split
<i>V’chol haminchah asher tai’afeh batanur – and all minchah offerings that are baked in an oven</i>	<i>Minchah/animal sacrifices</i>	
<i>V’chol na’asa vamarcheshes – and all minchah offerings made in a deep pan</i>	<i>Minchah/bird offerings</i>	A <i>minchah</i> substitutes directly for a bird when one is too poor for a bird

<i>V’al machavas – and [a minchah offering made on] a shallow pan</i>	Birds/animals	Both have blood offered on the altar
<i>V’chol minchah belula bashemen – and all minchah offerings mixed with oil</i>	<i>minchah</i> offerings	Both are performed the same way (while birds are killed by finger, and animals are killed by knife, which is a vessel)
<i>Vachareva – and a dry [minchah offering]</i>	<i>Minchah</i> offerings of the same type (e.g., deep pan)	Both are offered and performed identically

The *braisa* concludes by saying that the second verse is followed by the section about the *todah* and *shelamim*, which are *kodashim kalim* – less severe sacrifices. This teaches that even these sacrifices cannot be divided one against the other. The *braisa* concludes by saying that the word *ish – man*, used to describe who receives the sacrifices, teaches that any adult *Kohen*, even with a blemish, receives a portion. The second verse in this *braisa* is the verse cited earlier as a source for Rabbi Shimon.

The *Gemora* answers that the *braisa* is learning from the extra words *kol* – all, while from the listing of the two types of *minchah* offerings themselves is the source cited earlier.

The *Gemora* then challenges that we've already used the word *kol* as the source for Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah, who says that a *minchah* must be uniform – either all crackers or all loaves.

The *Gemora* answers that this is learned from the extra “v’ – and”, since the verse could have just said “all”, instead of “and all.”

Ravina says that the source that the remainder of all *minchah* offerings, even of barley, is given to the *Kohanim* is a *braisa* of Levi. Levi explains the verse that lists all the gifts given to the *Kohanim*, as follows:

Verse	Gift	Why it's needed?
<i>Kol karbanam – all their sacrifices</i>	The oil of a <i>metzora</i>	The verse says the <i>Kohanim</i> get <i>min ha'aish – from the fire</i> , but the oil is not offered on the fire
<i>L'chol minchahsam – to all of their minchah offerings</i>	<i>Omer</i> and <i>sotah minchah</i> (from barley)	The verse says <i>Kohanim</i> eat from an offering that atones on others, while these don't atone, since the <i>omer</i> permits new grain, and the <i>sotah</i> clarifies a wife's status

<i>L'chol chatasam – to all of their chatas offerings</i>	Bird <i>chatas</i>	It isn't slaughtered normally, but killed by the <i>Kohen's</i> nail, which would ordinarily be a prohibited <i>neveilah – carcass</i>
<i>L'chol ashamam – to all their guilt offerings</i>	The <i>asham</i> of a <i>nazir</i> , just like the <i>asham</i> of <i>metzora</i>	It doesn't atone, but rather to enable the <i>nazir</i> to shave and become impure
<i>Asher yashivu – that they return</i>	Money paid in return for stealing from a convert	

The concluding phrase of the verse, *lecha hee ul'vanecha – it will be for you and your sons*, teaches that these gifts are true property of the *Kohanim*, and they can even use them to marry a woman. (72b – 73a)

### **A Non-Jew's Sacrifice**

Rav Huna says that a *shelamim* offering donated by a non-Jew is offered as an *olah – burnt offering*.

The *Gemora* offers both a logical or textual reason:

1. A non-Jew donating a sacrifice is doing it for pure reasons, and therefore we can presume he wants to offer as much as possible to the altar.
2. The verse which teaches that a non-Jew can offer a sacrifice refers to one who offers a sacrifice to Hashem *l'olah – for an olah*. This concluding phrase teaches that whatever a non-Jew offers, it automatically becomes an *olah*.

Rav Chama bar Guria challenges Rav Huna with a *braisa*, which states that if a non-Jew donated a *shelamim*, and then gave it to a Jew, the Jew eats it, implying that it is offered as a *shelamim*.

Rava deflects this, saying that the *braisa* is a case where the non-Jew donated the *shelamim* for the purpose of the Jew's atonement, in which case it is considered the Jew's sacrifice.

Rav Shizvi challenges Rav Huna from our *Mishna*, which lists a non-Jew's *minchah* as one whose remainders are eaten by *Kohanim*, like a standard *minchah*. This would imply that a non-Jew's *shelamim* would also be offered like a standard *shelamim*. T

The *Gemora* answers that the *Mishna* is following Rabbi Yossi Haglili, while Rav Huna is following Rabbi Akiva.

The *Gemora* cites the *braisa* in which Rabbi Yosi Hagelili says that the extra phrases in the verse include other sacrifices (*besides olah*) that a non-Jew can offer. The word *nidraihem* – *their vows* includes *shelamim*, the word *nidvosam* – *their donations* includes *todah*, and the extra words *l'chol* – *for all* preceding both of these words include birds, wine, *levonah* spice, and wood. The end of the verse which seems to limit their sacrifices, by specifying *olah*, excludes sacrifices of a *nazir*. Rabbi Akiva says that this phrase limits a non-Jew's sacrifice to only an *olah*. The *Gemora* clarifies that this verse only teaches that a non-Jew cannot offer the sacrifices of a *nazir*, while the verse about a *nazir*, which specifies that only a Jew can become a *nazir*, teaches that a non-Jew cannot become a *nazir* at all.

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* in which Rabbi Shimon lists seven enactments of the Sages. One of them is that if a non-Jew sent a sacrifice from abroad, if he sent along the libations, those are used, but if he did not, the community provides them.

The *Gemora* suggests that this *Mishna* follows Rabbi Yossi Hagelili, as it allows the non-Jew to offer libations, which are a form of wine sacrifice, but rejects this, as Rabbi Akiva agrees that the non-Jew who offers an *olah* can offer all that comes along with it, including libations.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, and asks whose opinion it follows. The *braisa* says that the verse about libations which refers to *ezrach* – *a citizen* excludes non-Jews, but the verse which refers to the libations as *kachah* – *like this* mandates that *all* sacrifices be brought with libations. Therefore, a non-Jew cannot offer a libation on its own, but must include a libation on any sacrifice he offers.

The *Gemora* says that this *braisa* doesn't seem consistent with either opinion. The *braisa's* statement that a non-Jew may not offer a libation on its own is inconsistent with Rabbi Yosi Hagelili, who says that a non-Jew may offer a wine sacrifice, while the *braisa's* statement that a non-Jew offers libations with his sacrifice is inconsistent with Rabbi Akiva, who says that a non-Jew may only offer an *olah*. The *Gemora* says that it may follow Rabbi Yosi Hagelili or Rabbi Akiva: Rabbi Yosi Hagelili - we can amend the original *braisa*, to remove wine from the list of sacrifices that a non-Jew may offer, as even Rabbi Yosi Hagelili agrees that he may not offer a libation on its own.

Rabbi Akiva – when Rabbi Akiva says he may bring an *olah*, this includes everything that comes along with it, including libations. (73a - 73b)

### **A Kohen's Sin Minchah**

The *Gemora* cited the dispute between the Sages and Rabbi Shimon about the *minchah* offered by a *Kohen* for a sin. The Sages said that this *minchah* is also completely offered on the altar, like a *Kohen's* donated *minchah*, while Rabbi Shimon said that a *komeitz* is separated, and it and the remainder are offered on the altar.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, which explains the source for both positions. The verse about a *minchah* offered for a sin says, *v'haysa lakohen kaminchah – and it will be for the Kohen like the minchah*. The Sages say that the verse teaches that **3**. *Kohen* who offers a *minchah* for a sin can perform the service. The Sages question whether we should instead learn from the verse that this *minchah* is eaten like a non-*Kohen's minchah*, but then conclude that the verse states that this *minchah* will be for the like *the minchah*, i.e., his voluntary *minchah*, which is not eaten. Rabbi Shimon notes that the verse says that this *minchah* will be for the *Kohen* like *the minchah*, but not like *his minchah*. Therefore, the verse is teaching that this *minchah* should be like a non-*Kohen's minchah*, i.e., that a *komeitz* is taken. Since the verse equates these two *minchah* offerings only *lakohen – for the Kohen*, it teaches that the only similarity is vis a vis the *Kohen's* actions (i.e., *komeitz*), but not vis a vis the altar (i.e., *what is offered*). Therefore, it teaches that a *komeitz* is taken, but both it and the remainder are separately offered on the altar. (73b–74a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Division of Sacrifices*

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, which enumerates the various ways that sacrifices may not be split between different *Kohanim*. It concludes by saying that any adult, even with a blemish, may split the sacrifices, but children may not.

Tosfos (73a Ish) questions what the *braisa* means when it concludes that the adults “split” the sacrifices, if the *braisa* began by listing the ways in which sacrifices are *not* split.

Tosfos offers the following answers:

1. The conclusion of the *braisa* is not being exact when it refers to the *Kohanim* splitting the sacrifices, and it simply means that he amicably takes a portion along with the other *Kohanim*.

To make peace among all the *Kohanim*, the Sages instituted a more formal division of the sacrifice, but the Torah itself does not give a *Kohen* the *right* to split.

The *Kohanim* do divide the sacrifices, but the beginning of the *braisa* only means that the portion they receive is not considered their property, and therefore they cannot marry a woman by giving it to her.

The beginning of the *braisa* only teaches that *Kohanim* may not divide a portion of one sacrifice in exchange for a portion in another one, but the end of the *braisa* refers to dividing portions within one sacrifice.

### *Offering Wine*

The *Gemora* discusses whether a non-Jew can bring a sacrifice of wine. In one *braisa*, Rabbi Yosi Hagelili lists wine among the items a non-Jew can sacrifice, but the second *braisa* says that although his animal sacrifice requires a libation, he may not offer wine. The *Gemora's* first answer is to amend the *braisa*, by removing wine.

Rashi explains that the *Gemora* means to remove wine from Rabbi Yosi Hagelili's list. The conclusion would therefore be that, even according to Rabbi Yosi Hagelili, a non-Jew can only offer wine as libation for an animal sacrifice.

The Shitah Mekubetzes (6) offers another explanation, which amends the second *braisa*. Instead of understanding the second *braisa*, which says that a non-Jew does not offer libations, to mean that he *may not* offer a sacrifice of wine alone, we can understand it to mean that he *need* not offer libation. The *braisa* is stating that his sacrifice must come with libation, but the non-Jew is not obligated to provide it. He may provide it, but otherwise the community does. This is different than a Jew, who *must* provide libations for his sacrifices. According to this explanation, the first *braisa* remains intact, and Rabbi Yosi Hagelili does allow a non-Jew to offer a sacrifice of wine.