



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

### **Mishna**

All *minchah* offerings require rubbing (*they would rub the grains of wheat with their hands in order that the husk be the more easily removed, or to enhance the appearance of the dough*) three hundred times, and pounding (*with their fists or feet on the grains*) five hundred times. The rubbing and the pounding apply to the grains of wheat. Rabbi Yosi says: It was done to the dough.

All *minchah* offerings consist of ten (*loaves or wafers*) each, except the *lechem hapanim* and the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, which consist of twelve each; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. But Rabbi Meir says: They all consist of twelve each, except for the loaves of the *todah* and the *nazir* offering, which consist of ten each. (76a)

### **Rubbing and Pounding**

A *Tanna* taught: He must rub it once and pound it twice, then rub twice and pound it three times (*and continue this process until it is rubbed three hundred times and pounded five hundred times*).

Rabbi Yirmiyah inquired: Is the moving of the hand to and fro counted as one rubbing or as two? The *Gemora* leaves this unresolved.

The *Mishna* had stated: The rubbing and the pounding apply to the grains of wheat. Rabbi Yosi says: It was done to the dough.

They inquired: Does Rabbi Yosi mean to the dough and not to the grains of wheat, or does he mean to the dough as well?

The *Gemora* resolves this from the following *braisa*: The rubbing and the pounding apply to the grains of wheat. Rabbi Yosi says: The rubbing and the pounding apply to the dough. [*From the extra expression, “the rubbing and the beating,” it would seem to indicate that Rabbi Yosi holds that it was only done with the dough.*] (76a)

### **Amount of Loaves**

The *Mishna* had stated: All *minchah* offerings consist of ten each, except the *lechem hapanim* and the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, which consist of twelve each.

The *Gemora* notes that with respect to the *lechem hapanim*, this is expressly stated (*that it requires twelve loaves*). With regard to the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, this is derived through a *gezeirah shavah* using the word ‘*chukah*’ -- ‘statute’ stated both here and in connection with the *lechem hapanim*.

The *Gemora* asks: But where do we know that all other *minchah* offerings must consist of ten each?

The *Gemora* answers: It is derived from the breads of the *todah* offering; just as they consist of ten loaves, so too all *minchah* offerings consist of ten loaves.



The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps it should be derived from the *lechem hapanim*, as this consists of twelve loaves, so too all *minchah* offerings should consist of twelve loaves!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is more logical to derive this *halachah* from the breads of the *todah* offering, since they (*other minchah offerings and the todah breads*) are the offerings of an individual, are voluntary offerings, require oil, are rendered invalid if left overnight, and may not be offered on *Shabbos*, and they cannot be offered in a state of *tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary! It is more logical to derive this *halachah* from the *lechem hapanim*, for they (*other minchah offerings and the lechem hapanim*) are most holy (*for they are classified as kodshei kodashim, whereas the breads of the todah are classified as kodashim kalim*), require frankincense, are baked as *matzah*, and are brought on their own account (*not to accompany a different offering*).

The *Gemora* answers: Those (*the comparisons to the breads of the todah*) are more in number.

The *Gemora* asks: But if we hold that that which is derived by a *gezeirah shavah* may then teach another law through a *binyan av (analogy)*, should we not then derive (*the other minchah offerings*) from the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol* (*as they were derived from the lechem hapanim*), and say that just as they consist of twelve loaves, so too all the *minchah* offerings should consist of twelve loaves?

The *Gemora* answers: It is more logical to derive this *halachah* from the breads of the *todah* offering, since they (*other minchah offerings and the todah breads*) are the offerings of an individual, are voluntary offerings, are not offered in halves, are subject to the law of *piggul*, and may not be offered on *Shabbos*, and they cannot be offered in a state of *tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary! It is more logical to derive this *halachah* from the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, for they

(*other minchah offerings and the chavitin*) contain one-tenth of flour, are sanctified by a vessel, are most holy, require frankincense, are baked as *matzah*, are brought on their own account (*not to accompany a different offering*), require bringing near (*the altar*), and offered on the altar fire, and these similarities are more in number (*than the similarities with the breads of the todah*)!

The *Gemora* answers: It is preferable to derive an offering of an ordinary person (*other minchah offerings*) from an offering of an ordinary person (*the breads of the todah; and not from the chavitin, which is brought by the Kohen Gadol*).

Rabbi Meir in the *Mishna* had stated: They all consist of twelve each.

The *Gemora* asks: What does he hold? If he holds that that which is derived by a *gezeirah shavah* may then teach another law through a *binyan av (analogy)*, then he could derive (*the other minchah offerings*) from the *chavitin* of the *Kohen Gadol* (*as they were derived from the lechem hapanim*), for these (*similarities*) are more in number. And if he holds that that which is derived by a *gezeirah shavah* may not teach another law through a *binyan av*, then he could derive (*the other minchah offerings*) from the *lechem hapanim*, for he prefers to derive the most holy from the most holy (*for the other minchah offerings and the lechem hapanim are classified as kodshei kodashim, whereas the breads of the todah are classified as kodashim kalim*).

Rabbi Meir in the *Mishna* continued: except for the loaves of the *todah* and the *nazir* offering, which consist of ten each.

The *Gemora* notes that this is written explicitly by the breads of the *todah*, and the breads of a *nazir* are derived from that which the master had stated in a *braisa*: *His shelamim* includes the *shelamim* of a *nazir*.

Rav Tovi bar Kisna said in the name of Shmuel: If for the loaves of the *todah* offering one baked only four loaves (*instead of forty*), he has discharged his obligation.

The *Gemora* asks: But aren't forty necessary?

The *Gemora* answers: That is only the correct procedure (*but baking only four is also valid*).

The *Gemora* asks: But one must separate *terumah* from them? [*Ordinarily, one loaf is separated from each type (one out of ten); so how can terumah be taken here, when each type of bread has only one loaf?*] And should you say that a piece is taken from each loaf as *terumah*, but the Torah explicitly said: *one*, indicating that he may not take a loaf which is broken!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *terumah* was separated during the kneading process. [*During the kneading of each type, one loaf was separated from ten loaves as terumah and the other nine were baked into a single loaf.*]

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: All *minchah* offerings which were made into too many loaves (*more than ten*) or too few loaves (*less than ten*) are valid, except for the *lechem hapanim*, the *chavtin* of the *Kohen Gadol*, the breads of the *todah* offering and the breads of the *nazir* offering!?

The *Gemora* answers: Shmuel is following the view of the following *Tanna*, for it was taught in a *braisa*: All *minchah* offerings which were made into too many loaves (*more than ten*) or too few loaves (*less than ten*) are valid, except for the *lechem hapanim*, the *chavtin* of the *Kohen Gadol*. Others say: The breads of the *todah* offering and the breads of the *nazir* offering are also excluded.

Rav Huna said: If for the *minchah* offering baked in the oven one baked it as only one loaf (*instead of ten*), he has discharged his obligation. This is because the word '*matzos*' is written deficiently (*without a 'vav'*).

Rav Pappa asked: Is this indeed the reason? But with regard to the breads of the *todah* offering, the word '*matzos*' is not written deficiently, and nevertheless Rav Tovi bar Kisna said in the name of Shmuel that if one baked only four loaves (*instead of forty*), he has discharged his obligation!?

The *Gemora* answers: That ruling disagrees with this one. (76a – 76b)

### **Mishna**

The *omer* consisted of an *isaron* (*one-tenth of an eifah of flour*) sifted from three *se'ahs* (*of flour*). The *shte halechem* (*two loaves*) consisted of two *isarons* sifted from three *se'ahs*; and the *lechem hapanim* consisted of twenty-four *isarons* sifted from twenty-four *se'ahs*. (76b)

### **Fine Flour**

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason for this? [What was the necessity to take one *isaron* from such a large amount – three *se'ahs*?]

The *Gemora* answers: Since the *omer* was from the new produce and of barley, an *isaron* of the finest flour could only be obtained out of three *se'ahs*. [*There is more chaff in the new crop than in the old one, and so too there is more chaff in barley than in wheat.*]

The *Mishna* had stated: The *shte halechem* consisted of two *isarons* sifted from three *se'ahs*.

The *Gemora* explains: Since it was from wheat, even though it was from the new produce, two *isarons* of the finest flour could be obtained out of three *se'ahs*.

The *Mishna* had stated: The *lechem hapanim* consisted of twenty-four *isarons* sifted from twenty-four *se'ahs*.

The *Gemora* explains the reason for this: Since it was from wheat and from the old produce, an *isaron* of the finest flour could be obtained out of one *se'ah*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: In all *minchah* offerings - if the number of *isarons* were increased or diminished, it is invalid; if the number of *se'ahs* were increased or diminished, it is valid. (76b)

### **Mishna**

The *omer* was sifted through thirteen sieves; the *shteihalechem* was sifted through twelve, and the *lechem hapanim* through eleven. Rabbi Shimon says: There was no prescribed number for them, but they brought sifted flour and sifted it as much as was necessary, as it is written: *and you shall buy fine flour and you shall bake it*. It may be purchased as long as it has been sifted as much as necessary. (76b)

### **Sieves**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: It was sifted through a fine sieve and then a coarse one, and again through a fine sieve and then a coarse one. [See *Rashi and Rabbeinu Gershom for their explanation*.]

Rabbi Shimon the son of Elozar said: There were thirteen sieves in the Temple, one on top of the other (*the sieve below being of finer texture and of smaller meshes than the one above it*). The uppermost sieve collected the bran and the lowest one collected the fine flour.

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon says: There was no prescribed number for them.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* (*regarding the lechem hapanim*): *You shall buy fine flour and you shall bake it*. This teaches us that fine flour was to be purchased. And by the fact that the Torah says '*you shall buy*,' that teaches us that even wheat

may be bought (*and then sifted*). This dispensation is only here, having regard to sparing expense (*but by a private minchah, one must purchase fine flour that has already been sifted*).

Rabbi Elozar explains: The Torah has compassion on *Klal Yisroel's* money (*and since the lechem hapanim was brought every week, and since it involved twenty-four isarons, it would be very expensive to purchase fine flour that had been sifted already*).

This is hinted at from the verse: And you shall give drink to the congregation and their animals. [*The miracle of providing water from the rock for the Jews in the Wilderness was performed for the cattle as well; this demonstrates Hashem's concern for their property*.] (76b)

### **WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, EILU MENACHOS NIKMATZOS**

### **DAILY MASHAL Modim Derabanan**

People say that during the repetition of the *Shemoneh Esreh* everyone listens to the *chazan* except for during *Modim*, when each person says it individually as each person must give thanks personally and not that one person should give thanks for all.