

When Potential is Enough - כל הרואו לבילה אין בילה מעכbat בו - Menachot 18b

This week's daf yomi introduces the ruling of R. Zera that a situation that allows for the flour and oil to be mixed in the korban mincha (e.g., a vessel that can hold enough for that mixing) is both necessary and sufficient even if that mixing is never done. This is a fascinating concept - namely that potential for a particular action is enough even if the action never happens - and it is applied to other realms of halakha as well. In this shiur we will examine this concept and what it teaches us about halakha.

Questions? Comments? Email dinanddraf@gmail.com

1. מנחות ית:

אמר רבי זירא: כל הרואו לבילה – אין בילה מעכbat בו, וכל שאין רואו לבילה – בילה מעכbat בו.

And Rabbi Zeira said the following explanation: For any measure of flour that is suitable for mixing with oil in a meal offering, the lack of mixing does not invalidate the meal offering. Even though there is a mitzva to mix the oil and the flour *ab initio*, the meal offering is fit for sacrifice even if the oil and the flour are not mixed. And for any measure of flour that is not suitable for mixing with oil in a meal offering, the lack of mixing invalidates the meal offering. This discussion demonstrates that when the mishna here says that the oil was not mixed into the meal offering, it means that it was not mixed at all. Therefore, the mishna's statement that the meal offering is fit even if the oil was not poured should be understood as referring to a case where the oil was never poured, and not, as the Gemara inferred, as referring to a case where a non-priest poured it.

2. מנחות קג:

מתני' מתנדב אדם מנחה של ששים עשרון, ומביा בכל'י אחד. (אם אמר "הרי עלי ששים עשרון" – מביा בכל'י אחד). אם אמר "הרי עלי ששים ואחד" – מביा ששים בכל'י אחד, ואחד בכל'י אחד, שכן האיבור מביा ביום טוב הראשון של חג שחל להיות בשבט ששים ואחד.

MISHNA: A person may pledge a meal offering of sixty tenths of an ephah of fine flour, and bring all sixty tenths in one vessel. If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring sixty tenths of an ephah, one brings it in one vessel. If he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring sixty-one tenths of an ephah, one brings sixty tenths in one vessel and one tenth in another vessel, as the greatest number of tenths of an ephah that the community brings as meal offerings in one day is on the first festival day of *Sukkot* when it occurs on Shabbat, when sixty-one tenths of an ephah of fine flour are brought.

דיין ליחיד שהוא פחות מן האיבור אחד.

It is sufficient for an individual that the maximum amount he can bring at once is one tenth of an ephah less than that of the community. When the first day of *Sukkot* occurs on Shabbat, thirteen bulls, two goats, and fourteen lambs are sacrificed as the additional offerings of *Sukkot*, two lambs are sacrificed as the daily offerings, and two lambs are sacrificed as the additional offering of Shabbat. Three tenths of an ephah are brought for each bull, two tenths for each goat, and a tenth for each lamb. Altogether, that is sixty-one tenths of an ephah.

אמר רבי שמעון: והלא אלו לפרים, ואלו לכברים, ואינם נבללים זה עם זה! אלא עד שישים יכולן ליבול.
Rabbi Shimon says: What is the relevance of the tenths of an ephah sacrificed on *Sukkot* that occurs on *Shabbat*? Aren't these meal offerings for bulls and those for lambs, and they are not mixed with each other (see 89a)? Rather, the reason that one may not bring more than sixty tenths of an ephah in one vessel is because up to sixty tenths of fine flour can be mixed with one *log* of oil.

אמרו לו: שישים נבללים, וששים ואחד אין נבללים? אמר להם: כל מדות חכמים כן – בארכעים פאה הוא טובל
ובארבעים פאה חסר קרטוב אינו יכול לטבול בך.
The Rabbis said to him: Is it so that sixty tenths of flour can be mixed with a *log* of oil, but sixty-one tenths cannot be mixed? Rabbi Shimon said to them: All the measures of the Sages are so: For example, in a ritual bath containing forty *se'a* of water, one immerses for purification, and in a ritual bath with forty *se'a* less the small measure of a *kortov*, one cannot immerse in it for purification.

גמרא:

... אמרו לו: "אמור אתה". אמר להם: הרי הוא אומר "וכל מנחה בלויה בשמן וחרבה", כבר אמרה תורה: הבא
מנחה שיכולה להיבול.
... The Sages said to him: You should state a reason why a meal offering of more than sixty tenths of an ephah must be brought in more than one vessel. Rabbi Shimon said to them: It says in the Torah: "And every meal offering, mixed with oil, or dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have, one as well as another" (Leviticus 7:10). The Torah has already stated here: Bring a meal offering that is capable of being mixed.

...

וכי אין נבללים,מאי hei? וזה תנן: אם לא בול – אפשר! אמר רבי זירא: כל הרואי לביולה – אין ביה מעכבה בו, וכל
שאין רואי לביולה – ביה מעכבת בו.
The Gemara asks: Even if sixty tenths do not mix with one *log* of oil, what of it? But didn't we learn in a mishna that although there is a mitzva to mix the oil with the flour in a meal offering, if he did not mix them, it is still valid? The Gemara answers that Rabbi Zeira says: For any measure of flour that is suitable for mixing with oil in a meal offering, the lack of mixing does not invalidate the meal offering. Although there is a mitzva to mix the oil and the flour *ab initio*, the meal offering is fit for sacrifice even if the oil and the flour are not mixed. And for any measure of flour that is not suitable for mixing with oil in a meal offering, the lack of mixing invalidates the meal offering.

Application to Mikveh

3. נדה סו:

אמר רבא: לעולם ילמד אדם בתוג' ביתו שתהא אשה מדיצה בית קמṭיה במים. מיתיבי: בית הקמṭים ובית
הסṭרים אין צריך לביאת מים!
And Rava says: A man should always teach in his house that a woman should rinse any place with creases, e.g., her undarms, in water before she immerses in a ritual bath, to ensure that

they are clean. The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: Places with creases and any concealed part of the body (e.g., inside the mouth) do not require immersion in water. In other words, the immersion is valid even if the water does not touch those parts of the body. If so, why must she rinse them before immersing?

גַּהֲיַ דְּבִיאַת מִים לֹא בְּעִינָן, מִקּוּם הַרְאָיו לְבִיאַת מִים בְּעִינָן, כְּדָרְבֵי זִירָא, דָּאָמַר רַבֵּי זִירָא: כָּל הַרְאָיו לְבִיאַת — אֵין בִּילָה מַעֲכַבָּת בָּו, וְשָׁאֵין רַאֲיוֹ לְבִיאַת — בִּילָה מַעֲכַבָּת בָּו.

The Gemara answers: Granted that they do not require immersion in water, but we require that they must be a place that is suitable for immersion in water. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Zeira, as Rabbi Zeira says: For any amount of flour suitable for mingling with oil in a meal offering, mingling is not indispensable for it, i.e., it is valid even if it is not mixed. But for any amount of flour not suitable for mingling, e.g., if the quantity of flour is so great that the ingredients cannot be properly mixed, mingling is indispensable for it, and such a meal offering is invalid. This teaches a halakhic principle: There are certain actions that prevent the fulfillment of a mitzva if they are impossible, even if the actual performance of those actions are not indispensable to the mitzva.

When 9 Av falls on Saturday Night: What about havdalah?

4. **תוֹסֶף פָּסָחִים קָז. ד"ה אֲמִירָה**

...ובתשעה באב שחל להיות בmonth ש' נמי רגילין להבדיל אחר התענית וכן בסדר דבר עמרם ...And when Tisha B'Av falls on Saturday night, we make *havdalah* after the fast (on Sunday night), and so it is in seder Rav Amram.

(Note: practically, we do make havdalah on Sunday night when 9 Av falls on Sat night, but without besamim or fire, which are reserved exclusively for Sat. night havdalah in general.)

5. **רַא"ש תְּעִנִית פִּיסְקָה מ'**

...וְאָלוּ דְבָרֵי הַרְמָבָן ז"ל...וְאַדְרָבָה אִפְּכָא מִסְתְּבָרָא דֵיכְיַא אֲסֹור לְמַיְלָל בְּאָפּוֹקִי שְׁבַתָּא וְלֹא חַזִּי לְאַבְדּוֹל בְּחַד בְּשַׁבָּא לְמַבְדֵּל בְּתַרְיִ בְּשַׁבָּא דֵיכְיַא לְחַזִּי בְּשַׁעַתְיִהְיָה לְאַבְדּוֹל וְטַפִּי (בְּטַפִּי) אִיכְא לְמַיְמָר דָּאֲפִילָו לְמַאֲן דָּאָמַר מַבְדֵּל וְהַולֵּר כָּל הַשְׁבָת כָּלָה הַנִּי מַילִּי הַיכָּא דְמַזְאָה שְׁבַת חַזִּיא לְאַבְדּוֹל אַבְלַ הַיכָּא דְמַזְאָה שְׁבַת לֹא חַזִּי לְיהָ לֹא מַבְדֵּל בְּלָא זְמָנִיה מְשׁוּם כָּל הַרְאָיו לְבִיאַת אֵין בִּילָה מַעֲכַבָּת בָּו... And these are the words of Ramban/Nachmanides: ...And the opposite makes sense, namely that because it is prohibited to eat on sat. night, and one therefore cannot recite havdalah on sunday, one should not required havdalah on Monday - as in its time, making havdalah was not viable. And one can say even further that even one who says that a person may make havdalah all week, that is only when making havdalah on Sat. night was viable, but if it was not viable on Sat. night, one does not make havdalah at a different time - based on the principle of "Only when mixing is viable is mixing not strictly required, but where it is not viable, mixing is strictly required..."

What is the logic?

6. תוספות מנוחות י"ח:

...ואם תאמר מנליה דלייבע ראיו לבילה מאחר דבילה לא מעכבא? ויש לומר סברא בעלמא הוא כיוון דכתב רחמנא בילה דנבעי לכל הפחות ראיו לבילה, וכן לגבי קריאה דחליצה דפ' מצות חלייצה (יבמות דף קד:) וגם קריאה דביבורים בפרק המוכר את הספינה (בבא בתרא דף פא:) ובמקות (דף יח:) דבכל הנהו מיתוי דרבי זירא...
...And if you ask: how does he know that even if mixing is not strictly necessary, having the conditions of viability to mix is necessary? We can answer: it is logical that given that Scripture states "mixing" that we at least require the conditions for mixing to be viable. And likewise regarding the declaration of *halitzah*, the declaration of first fruits, for in all of these it brings the words of R. Zeira...

7. רשב"ם בבא בתרא פא:

...מה שאי אפשר להבלל מעכבות בו דכיוון דכתב ויצק עלייה שמן וצוה לבול דכתב בלאה ש"מ שצוה הקב"ה להביא מנוחה שיכל לקיים בהן מצות בלילה וכשהוא מביא שישים ואחד מנוחה צו לא צוה להביא והרי הוא מביא מנוחה מן הקטניות דאיינה כלום שכל דבר שצוה הקב"ה להביא יש עיקוב בעיקר הובאות להביא באותו עניין שצוה הכתוב ולא בעניין אחר אבל מצות האמורות באותה מצוה כגון תנופה בקרבן בלילה במנחה יש שמעכביין אם גילה הכתוב לשנות עלייו ולעכוב ויש שאין מעכביין...

...The fact that it cannot be mixed undermines because, given that it is written "and he shall pour oil onto it" and it commanded to mix, as is written, "mixed," this teaches that God commanded to bring a *mincha* offering in which one can achieve the commandment of mixing/And when one brings 61 acronym, this is not what God commanded to bring. And it is as though one has brought a *mincha* of legumes (i.e., of the wrong material), which is nil. For everything that God commanded to bring, there is a basic requirement in bringing it to bring it with that which Scripture commanded, and not with something else. However, the subcommandments within that commandment - such as waving the offering, mixing the *mincha* - only some of those are strictly requirement if the Torah revealed it by repeating it to make it strictly required, and there are others that are not strictly required...

8. אור שמח על הרמב"ם הלכות י"בום וחליצה ד"ח

כתב הרב המגיד, אבל בדייעבד שרשה שהרי אין רקייה מעכבות כמו שיתבר, והמשנה למלך תמה ע"ז דהא רקייה עדיפה מקריאה ואפ"ה באלים ואלמת אם חלצו חלייצתן פסולת מפני שאין ראיון לקריאה והוא כמו שאין ראיו לבילה, כ"כ כאן שaina ראייה לראייה בפניו דהוי חלייצה פסולת דהוי כמו שאין ראייה לבילה עכ"ל.
The Maggid Mishnah wrote: but post facto it is kosher, for spitting is not strictly required, as will be explained. And the Mishneh leMelech questioned this - for spitting is more important than declaring, and yet regarding a mute male and female, even post facto if they performed the *halitzah* it is invalid because they are unable to make the declaration. And it is similar to the case of the *mincha* in which mixing is not viable; all the more so here when it is not viable for her to spit in his face (i.e., that he would see it), that the *halitzah* should be invalid, as it is similar to the case of the *mincha* in which mixing is not viable - end quote...

...

אולם באמת כאשר תעין בכל התלמוד לא תמצא הר דכל שאין ראיו לבילה אין בילה מעכבות בו אלא דוקא היכי שהדבר ראוי להעשות עי להיות טרם גמר הדבר המעכבות, כמו בילה גבי מנוחה שהבלילה נעשית במנחה טרם הקטרת קומץ המתירה, וכן בכיסוי הדם שכיסוי העפר שיתן למטה צירק שיתן אותו טרם שושופך הדם שמכסין

א"כ מלמעלה, וכן גבי ביכורים בפרק הספינה, דהקריה הוא קודם קודם ההנחתה שמניחן ע"ג המזבח שאוותה ההנחתה היא המותרת והיא המعقבת, וכן גבי הפרת נדרים דהشمיעה עלי שתהיה קודם ההפירה, וכן גבי טבילה ובכולחו, אבל כאן שהרתקיקה סדרה הוא אחריו החליצה עפ"י שהסדר אינו מעכ卜 אמן הסדר כך הוא, א"כ בעת החליצה הרי לא חסר דבר רק שאינו ראוי לתקיקה שא"כ זה לא מעכבא,

However, when you search in all of the Talmud you will only find this principle of viability being determinant where that which is viable to be done must be done before the essential thing is done - like the mixing of the *mincha*, for the mixing is done before the burning of the *kometz* which permits it (to be eaten); and likewise regarding covering the blood - where covering the ground with dirt under the blood must be done before spilling the blood that will afterwards be covered above. And likewise regarding first fruits, where the declaration precedes placing the fruits on the altar - and that placement is what causes permission and what is strictly necessary. And likewise regarding invalidating an oath, where the hearing of the oath must precede the invalidating, and likewise regarding immersion, and so in all of them. Here, however, where the spitting comes after the *halitzah* (=removal of the shoe), though the order is not strictly required, this is the general order. If so, at the time of the removal of the shoe nothing is missing - but it is only that he is not viable for the spitting afterwards - this does not undermine.

וטעמא ברירא, דבכולחו הרי בעת העשות גמר הדבר המעכ卜 לא נעשה כהלכתו, שאם הוא אלם הרי חסר הקריה שלפני החליצה, וכן חסר הנtinyת עפר למטה, וכן חסר הקריה של בכורים והشمיעה שקדם ההפירה, רק שאינו מעכ卜, ע"ז אמרין כיון שלא היה יכול להיות שפир מעכ卜, אבל כאן בעת החליצה עדיין אינו חסר דבר ונעשה כהלכתו רק שלא יכול להיות דבר שצרכה להיות א"כ, מנא לן דמעכבא ולא שייך ע"ז כלל שאינו ראוי לbijlah:

And the reason is clear, for in all of them at the time when it was done, the essential/strictly required actively was not done properly - for if he was mute, there was no declaration before *halitzah*, and likewise there was no placement of dust below, and likewise there was no declaration of first fruits or hearing before invalidating a vow - only that these things are not usually strictly required - in these cases we say that the viability can be undermining. Here, however, at the time of the removal of the shoe, nothing is missing, and it was done according to the rules - just that the thing that is supposed to happen next cannot happen - why would we say that undermines? The ruling of viability does not apply.