



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

Servicing his own Minchah

The *Gemora* asks: And is the *halachah* that a *Kohen* who offers a *minchah* for a sin can perform the service derived from that verse (*v’haysa lakohen kaminchah – and it will be for the Kohen like the minchah*)? Was it not taught from a different verse, as we learned in the following *braisa*: From where can we learn that a *Kohen* is entitled to come and sacrifice his offerings at any time and on any occasion he prefers? It is written: *And the Kohen shall come whenever his soul desire ... and shall minister.*

The *Gemora* answers: if we would only have that verse, I would have thought that he may perform the service (*on his offering*) only when it does not come for a sin; however, on an offering that comes for a sin, perhaps he cannot perform the service.

The *Gemora* asks: But is that *halachah* derived from here? Was it not taught from a different verse, as we learned in the following *braisa*: *And the Kohen shall atone for the person who errs, when he sins through error*? This (*the redundant expression at the end of the verse*) teaches us that the *Kohen* can provide atonement for himself by his own service!?

The *Gemora* answers: From this latter teaching I would have said that the *halachah* applied only to such offerings that are brought for a sin committed inadvertently, but

not for an offering which is brought for a sin committed deliberately (*such as a false oath*); we are therefore taught that it applies there as well. An example of an offering which is brought for a sin committed deliberately is one who took a false oath. (74a)

The Kohen’s Minchah

The *Gemora* cites a different *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon says: Regarding the sinner’s *minchah* offering brought by a *Kohen* – the *komeitz* is taken, and it is offered by itself and so also the remainder is offered by itself. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon understands that the *komeitz* is offered by itself, while the rest of it is simply placed on the *beis hadeshen* (*the ash-heap*).

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan pondered over this: Which ash-heap did Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon mean? If he meant that which is on top (*of the altar; the place which is referred to as “tapu’ach”*), then his view is identical with that of his father (*who also stated that it is offered on the altar*); and if he was referring to that which is below (*on the floor of the Courtyard*), then it can be asked: Is there anything that is ever offered below? Rabbi Abba suggested: Perhaps it should go to waste (*and not be burned at all*). They laughed at him (*saying*): Is there anything whose formal procedure is that it shall go to waste?

The Gemora answers: Rabbi Avin's father taught as follows: *Every minchah offering of the Kohen shall be entirely burned - it shall not be eaten. They (the sinner's minchah of a Kohen to his donated offering) are compared only in respect of eating, but in no other respect. [His voluntary minchah is offered on the altar, but his minchah brought for a sin is scattered on the beis hadeshen below.]*

The Gemora asks: *What is he saying (for since the verse states that it shall be entirely burned, it would seem to indicate that his minchah brought for a sin should not have a kemitzah as well)?*

Abaye answers: The following is the meaning of the verse: *Every minchah offering of the Kohen... it shall not be eaten* – this is referring to his obligatory *minchah* offering (*brought for a sin; it shall not be eaten, but a kemitzah shall be performed on it*); *shall be entirely burned* - this is referring to his voluntary *minchah* offering (*where it does not even have a kemitzah*).

Rava asked him: A sharp knife is dissecting the verse!? *[Can you expound the verse in such a manner – using the words out of sequence?]*

Rather, said Rava, it means as follows: *Every minchah offering of the Kohen shall be entirely burned* - this is referring to his voluntary *minchah* offering (*where it does not even have a kemitzah*); *it shall not be eaten* – this is referring to his obligatory *minchah* offering (*brought for a sin; it shall not be eaten, but a kemitzah shall be performed on it*).

The Gemora asks: Perhaps it should be expounded in the reverse manner (*that his sin offering is completely burned, and his voluntary one has a kemitzah done to it*)?

The Gemora answers: It is more logical to include his voluntary *minchah* (*to be entirely burned*), since (*like the Kohen Gadol's minchah offering*) it is frequent (*for it can be donated every day*); it is not brought on account of sin, and it has a sweet aroma (*for it has oil mixed into it*).

The Gemora counters: On the contrary! It is more logical to include his obligatory *minchah*, since [*like the Kohen Gadol's minchah offering*] its amount of one-tenth (*flour*) is an obligation (*whereas a voluntary minchah can consist of much more*)!?

The Gemora answers: Those (the voluntary *minchah* to the Kohen Gadol's *minchah*) are more in number (*than his obligatory minchah to the Kohen Gadol's minchah*).

The Gemora asks: To what purpose do the Rabbis (*who disagree with Rabbi Shimon and his son*) apply the verse of '*Every minchah offering of the Kohen shall be entirely burned - it shall not be eaten*'?

The Gemora answers: They require it for that which was taught in the following *braisa*: I only know that the one mentioned above (*the Kohen Gadol's minchah*) must be entirely burned (*but one does not transgress a prohibition if he eats it*), and the one below (*the minchah offerings brought by ordinary Kohanim*) shall not be eaten (*that a prohibition is violated if it is eaten, but it does not say that it is entirely burned*); from where do I know to apply what is stated by one to the other and vice versa? The verse therefore stated '*kalil*' (*entirely burned*), '*kalil*' for the purpose of a *gezeirah shavah* (*one of the thirteen principles of Biblical hermeneutics; it links two similar words from dissimilar verses in the Torah*). It says in the former passage '*kalil*' and in the latter also '*kalil*'; just as in the former (*by the Kohen Gadol's minchah*) it should be entirely burned, so too in the latter (*by the minchah offerings brought by ordinary Kohanim*) it should be

entirely burned. And just as in the latter passage the eating of the *minchah* is expressly forbidden by a prohibition, so too in the former the eating is forbidden by a prohibition.

Ravina inquired: What is the law if a *Kohen* ate of the sacrificial portions of an offering (*which should have been burned*)? As regards to the prohibition concerning non-*Kohanim* (*for them to eat kodashim*), it is not a question to me (for they have certainly violated that – for with respect to the sacrificial parts, they are regarded as non-*Kohanim*); my inquiry is regarding the prohibition of ‘*it shall be entirely burned.*’ [*Does it apply only to minchah offerings, or perhaps it applies to anything which is meant to be burned on the altar?*]

Rav Aharon said to Ravina: This can be resolved from the following *braisa*: Regarding anything that is included in the verse, “*it shall be entirely burned,*” the Torah comes to establish a negative prohibition against eating from it. (74a – 74b)

Mishna

The *minchah* offering of the *Kohanim*, the *minchah* offering of the Anointed *Kohen Gadol*, and the *minchah* offering that is offered with the libations are (*entirely*) for the altar, and the *Kohanim* have no portion in them; with these the altar is more privileged than the *Kohanim*. The *shtei halechem* (*two loaves*) and the *lechem hapanim* (*showbread*) are eaten by the *Kohanim* and the altar has no share in them; with these the *Kohanim* are more privileged than the altar. (74b)

Other Cases

The *Gemora* asks: Are there no other cases (*where everything is offered to the altar and the Kohanim have no portion in them*)? But what about an *olah*?

The *Gemora* answers: There is the hide which belongs to the *Kohanim*.

The *Gemora* asks: And what about the bird *olah*?

The *Gemora* answers: There is the crop and the feathers from it (*which are not offered on the altar, but rather, they are cast on the side of the altar*).

The *Gemora* asks: And what about the libations?

The *Gemora* answers: They flow down into the pits (*under the altar; it is therefore not included in the listing of offerings that go on the altar*).

The *Gemora* asks: And what then does the *Mishna* signify with the expression ‘with these’?

The *Gemora* answers: it is to exclude Shmuel’s ruling, for Shmuel said: When one donates wine, he brings it and the *Kohen* sprinkles it on the fires; our *Mishna* therefore teaches us (*otherwise*) that it is poured into the pits. Our *Mishna*, however, supports a different ruling of Shmuel, for Shmuel said: If someone donates oil by itself, he separates a *komeitz* from it (*burns it on the altar*), and its remainder is eaten. [*It is offered on the altar and it goes to the Kohanim; this is in contrast to minchah offerings, which are offered on the altar but do not go to the Kohanim.*]

The *Mishna* had stated that the *shtei halechem* (*two loaves*) and the *lechem hapanim* (*showbread*) are eaten by the *Kohanim* and the altar has no share in them.

The *Gemora* asks: Are there no other cases (*where kodashim is eaten by the Kohanim and the altar has no share in them*)? But what about a bird *chatas*?

The Gemora answers: There is its blood (*which was sprinkled upon the side of the altar*).

this was done) and the remainder of the oil was consumed by the Kohanim. (74b)

The Gemora asks: And what about the log of oil of the metzora?

DAILY MASHAL

The Gemora answers: There are the sprinklings (*from that oil which go on the metzora and the paroches; it emerges that the entire log does not belong to the Kohanim*).

The Real Price

The Gemora asks: And what then does the Mishna signify with the expression 'with these'?

A person once entered the shop of Rabbi Eliezer Keiser, a pupil of the Tiferes Aharon of Mattersdorf, and asked the price of a pair of shoes. Rabbi Keiser told him the price and he paid immediately. When Rabbi Keiser saw that the purchaser wasn't bargaining, he gave him back a certain amount. To his wonderment, he explained, "I thought you would bargain, like most people, and then I'd reduce the official price and in my heart I decided to sell you for the reduced price. But you didn't bargain so I have to give you back the difference to be "speaking truth in his heart" (*Hizaharu Bemamon Chavreichem*, 372).

The Gemora answers: It is to exclude the view of the one who says that the *shtei halechem* - if brought alone, must be burned; our Mishna therefore teaches us that with these the Kohanim are always privileged (*and they eat the shtei halechem even when they are brought alone*). (74b)

Mishna

All *minchah* offerings that are prepared in a vessel require three applications of oil. They are: pouring, mixing and placing oil in the vessel before they were prepared. [*First oil is poured into the vessel; then the flour is placed inside. They then knead it with lukewarm water. They pour oil in it and mix them together. At the end, more oil is poured onto the dough.*] The loaves (*that were baked or fried, were crumbled after they were made into loaves, and then oil was placed on them*) were then mixed; these are the words of Rebbe. But the Sages say: (*oil was poured on them and it was mixed together while they were still*) fine flour. [*Minchah offerings which were baked could either be brought as loaves or as wafers.*] The loaves required mixing (*where the process was disputed above*), and the wafers required anointing (*while they were whole*). How were they anointed? In the form of (*the Greek letter*) 'ki' (which there are various explanations as to how precisely