

(c)Dr Russell Jay Hendel; Jun 2026

VERSES: Lv02-01f, Lv02-02a

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: [NOTE: We combine Rashi comments Lv02-01f and Lv02-02a since they form one parallelism] Table Lv02-01f presents the parallel structure of Lv02-01:02

Subject - Verb in Lv02-01:02	Actions
When one of the masses	offers a minchah...
	He will pour on it oil
	He will place on it frankincense
	He will bring it to the Priests
He [the priests]	will take fistful of its oil and flour
	and offer it on the altar

Table Lv02-01f2: Sequence of actions with the doers of the action (column 1)

Rashi is simple and straightforward enough.

- The pouring and placing can be done by the offeror (one of the masses even though he is not a priest)
- But the acts of taking a fistful and the following acts must be done by a Priest.

Despite this simplicity Ramban demurs. Ramban uses the parallel construction of Lv01-08:09 presented in Table Lv02-01f2

Subject in Verb Lv02-08:09	Actions
The (offeror)	brings any of the above [five] Minchahs to God
	He brings it near to the Priest
He [the priest]	Brings it [the Minchah] near to the altar
	He raises the its remembrance from the Minchah

	And offers it on the altar
--	----------------------------

Lv02-01f2: Sequence of actions with the doers of the action (column 1). Cf. to table Lv02-01f1

Based on Lv02-01f, Ramban cogently argues that bringing near to the altar is also done by the priest (and cannot be done by one of the masses). But if so, Rashi's statement "the priest starts activities from taking the fistful and thereafter" is incorrect as the priest starts activities from "bringing near to the altar."

Ramban therefore emends Rashi: Rashi' statement that the priests responsibility is from the act of taking the fistful should be emended to read the priests responsibility in this paragraph Lv02-01:03 is from the act of taking the fistful. Using this emendation of Ramban, Rashi is no longer contradicting the inferences from verse 8.

In passing I point out that many of my readings of Rashi are based on emendations similar to the Ramban's; that is, I frequently, based on examination of other verses point out that the scope of a Rashi statement must be limited to certain verses. I hope that this example of Ramban shows that this is really quite common and should create any problems about deviating from the Rashi text.

As already pointed out, we combined the two Rashi comments (Lv02-01f and Lv02-02a) since they are part of the same parallelism.