



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**

The *korban todah* would be brought from five measures of a Yerushalayim *se’ah*, which equals six Wilderness *se’ahs* (for the Sages enlarged the *se’ah* by a sixth; in the Wilderness three *se’ahs* equaled an *eifah*, and therefore six *se’ahs* equaled two *eifahs*; later, in Yerushalayim, the *se’ah* was enlarged, so that there were five *se’ahs* in two *eifahs*), which equals two *eifahs*, and one *eifah* equals three Wilderness *se’ahs*, which were twenty *issarons* (tenths of an *eifah*). Ten *issarons* were used for the *chametz* loaves, and ten were used for the *matzah* loaves. The *matzah* loaves consisted of three varieties: *chalos* (unleavened loaves which had olive oil added to the dough), *rekikin* (wafers – baked without oil, and oil was added afterwards), and *revuchah* (boiled and then baked). [They made ten loaves of each variety, so that there were thirty unleavened loaves made from the ten *issarons*; the leavened loaves were only of one type, so that the ten leavened loaves were equal to the thirty unleavened loaves; each leavened loaf was, therefore, three times the size of an unleavened loaf.] It emerges that there were three and a third *issarons* for every type (for each of the ten *matzah* loaves), and three loaves per *issaron* (so that each loaf consisted of a third of an *issaron*; all this is according to the Wilderness measure). And according to the measures of Yerushalayim, there were thirty *kav* (for the forty loaves). Fifteen *kavin* were for the *chametz* loaves, and fifteen *kavin* were for the

*chametz*. It emerges that each loaf consisted of a *kav* and a half of flour. The *matzah* loaves consisted of three varieties: *chalos*, *rekikin*, and *revuchah*. It emerges that there were five *kavin* for each type of *matzah*, and one *kav* for every two loaves. (76b – 77a)

### **Measurements**

The *Mishna* had stated: The *korban todah* would be brought from five measures of a Yerushalayim *se’ah*.

Rav Chisda cites the source for this (that an *eifah* is three *se’ahs*): It is written: *The eifah (dry measure) and the bas (liquid measure) shall be of one measure*. Just as the *bas* is three *se’ahs*, so too the *eifah* is three *se’ahs*.

And it is derived that a *bas* is three *se’ahs* from the following verse: *And the bas is a measure of oil; a bas of oil shall be the tithe of the kor; ten bas are a chomer, for there are ten bas in a chomer*. [The *kor* was known to be thirty *se’ahs*, thus this verse teaches us that the *bas* was a tenth of a *kor*, which amounts to three *se’ahs*.]

Shmuel says: We do not increase measures by more than one sixth of their original value, nor do we do this when reestablishing the value of a coin. If someone buys wholesale and sells retail (of necessary commodities), he should not profit by more than a sixth.



The *Gemora* asks: Why can one not increase measures by more than one sixth of their original value? If it is because it will make the market price high (*for visiting merchants, learning of the increase in the weights and measures of this town, will immediately raise the prices of commodities, and taking advantage of this, they will raise them higher than what is warranted by the change in the measures*), one should not even add a sixth!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be because this will be a prohibition of *ona'ah* (*price fraud*) and will cause the sale to be invalid. [It is established that in any transaction, if an error is made which is more than a sixth of the value of the goods, the sale can be voided; if it is exactly a sixth, the transaction stands but the amount of error must be returned; if it is less than a sixth, the sale is valid and there is no redress. Now if weights and measures may be increased by more than a sixth, then visiting merchants, who were ignorant of the increase and who sell their goods in the present measures with the price of the old measures, would be defrauded by more than a sixth. This would cause that all their dealings would be declared void. In order to prevent this, the increase in weights and measures was limited to a sixth.]

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rava say that anything which is measured, weighed, or counted is considered *ona'ah* and the sale is invalid, even if the amount overcharged is less than one sixth? [Accordingly, the Rabbis should have outlawed all increases – even those that were less than a sixth!?!]

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, it is due to the loss that will be incurred by visiting merchants. [A merchant is allowed to make a profit of one sixth on a transaction.

*By limiting the increase of measures to a sixth, a visiting dealer, who sells his goods ignorant of the increase will at most lose his profit, but will not suffer any loss.]*

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps they will not have a loss, but don't they also need to make a profit? If someone buys and sells for the same price, is he called a merchant!?

Rather, Rav Chisda says: Shmuel found a verse from which he derived this law. The verse states: *And the shekel is twenty geira, twenty shekel, twenty five shekel, fifteen shekel is a mana for you. Is a manah sixty shekel (adding up the numbers of shekel in the verse) which equals two hundred and forty dinar? [Isn't a manah equal to one hundred dinar?]* Rather it must be that we derive three things from here. One thing is that the *manah* of the Torah was twice as large as our *manah*. [Two hundred instead of one hundred, plus the extra sixth (of forty).] We also see that when we add on the measures, one can only add up to a sixth (*the forty was added*). We also see that a sixth is measured based on the sum total (*the outside*), not excluding the sixth itself.

Ravina said: This (*that the sixth was added from the outside*) may be proven from our *Mishna* which states: The *korban todah* would be brought from five measures of a Yerushalayim *se'ah*, which equals six Wilderness *se'ahs*. This indeed is a proof. (77a)

### **Mishna**

From each type (*of todah breads*) the *Kohen* would take one out of ten as *terumah*, as it is written: *and from it he shall offer one of each offering as terumah to Hashem*. The Torah stated: *one*, indicating that he may not take a loaf which is broken. *Of each offering teaches*

us that each type of offering shall be equal (*in the amount of loaves*), and that he must not take the *terumah* from one kind for the other. To the *Kohen* that throws the blood of the *shelamim* – (*the four loaves are given to the Kohen as terumah*) the rest of the bread offering was eaten by the owner. (77a – 77b)

### **Todah Breads**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *and from it he shall offer* — from those that are attached (*meaning that they shall all be placed in one vessel before the terumah is taken from them*). *One* indicates that he may not take a loaf which is broken. *Of each offering* teaches us that each type of offering shall be equal (*in the amount of loaves*), and that he must not take the *terumah* from one kind for the other. *As terumah to Hashem* - but I do not know how much it should be. [*We are uncertain as to how many loaves should go to the Kohen.*] I can derive as follows: It is written here ‘*terumah*,’ and it is written there in connection with *terumas ma’aser* ‘*terumah*’ (*the Levite takes one tenth of his ma’aser received, and gives it to the Kohen; it has the sanctity of terumah*); just as there it is one-tenth, so too here it is one-tenth. Or perhaps it shall be argued as follows: it is written here ‘*terumah*,’ and it is written there in connection with *bikkurim* ‘*terumah*’ (*the first ripe fruits of any of the seven species with which the Torah praises Eretz Yisroel, which had to be brought to the Beis Hamikdash in Yerushalayim*); just as by *bikkurim* there is no fixed amount, so too here there is no fixed measure.

Let us then see to which of the two is this case most similar. It is logical to derive the *terumah* which is not followed by any other *terumah* (*after the loaves are separated for the Kohen, no further separation is*

*necessary*) from that *terumah* which is not followed by any other *terumah* (*for after the terumas ma’aser is taken, nothing else needs to be separated*); but let us not derive from *bikkurim*, for they are followed by another *terumah* (*for terumah and ma’aser must be separated from the bikkurim*). Or perhaps we can argue this way: It is logical to derive the *terumah* which must be eaten in a holy place from that *terumah* which must also be eaten in a holy place (*the loaves of the todah offering and bikkurim must be eaten in Yerushalaim*); but let us not derive from *terumas ma’aser* seeing that it may be eaten in any place. The verse therefore states here: *from it... as terumah to Hashem*, and it also states there regarding *terumas ma’aser*: *from it, the terumah of Hashem*. These are written for the purpose of a *gezeirah shavah*. [*Just as there it is one-tenth, so too here it is one-tenth.*]

We have learned that the *terumah* must be one-tenth of the total, but I do not know of what measure shall each loaf be made from. I can derive it from the following: it is written here ‘*bread*,’ and it is written there in connection with the *shteih halechem* ‘*bread*’; just as there it was an *issaron* of flour for each loaf, so too here it should be an *issaron* for each loaf. Or perhaps it shall be argued as follows: it is written here ‘*bread*,’ and it is written there in connection with the *lechem hapanim* ‘*bread*’; just as there it was two *issarons* for each loaf, so too here it should be two *issarons* for each loaf.

Let us then see to which of the two is this case most similar. It is logical to derive a *minchah* offering which is *chametz* and offered together with an animal offering (*the bread of the todah*) from another *minchah* offering which is *chametz* and is offered together with an animal



offering (*the shteï halechem*); but let us not derive from the *lechem hapanim*, for they are neither *chametz* nor offered with an animal offering. Or perhaps we can argue this way: It is logical to derive a *minchah* offering which may be offered from produce of the Land of Israel or of produce that grown outside of it, from the new produce or the old from that *minchah* offering which also may be offered from the produce of the Land or of that grown outside of it, from the new produce or the old; but let us not derive from the *shteï halechem* seeing that it must be offered from the new produce and of that which was grown in the Land. The verse therefore states here (*regarding the shteï halechem*): *From your dwelling places you shall bring bread for waving, two loaves*. Now why did the verse state *you shall bring* (*seeing that it was written in the verse prior to this one*)? It is to teach us that every other offering (*of chametz*) that you make of a similar kind (*the chametz breads of the todah*) shall be like this (*the shteï halechem*); just as there it was an *issaron* of flour for each loaf, so too here it should be an *issaron* for each loaf.

We have learned that ten *issarons* of flour were required for the *chametz* loaves, but where do we know that ten *issarons* were required for the *matzah* loaves? It is therefore written: *With loaves of chametz bread*. This teaches us that one must bring (*the flour in the*) *matzah* loaves in the same measure as the *chametz* loaves. It emerges that there were twenty *issarons* for the breads of the *todah* offering, ten for the *chametz* breads and ten for the *matzah* breads.

I might have thought that the ten *issarons* for the *matzah* breads should be all of one type; the verse therefore states: *If he offers it for a todah, then he shall offer with the todah offering matzah loaves mixed with*

*oil, and matzah wafers smeared with oil, and scalded fine flour*. [Evidently, there are three different types of *matzah* loaves.] It emerges that there were three and a third *issarons* for each type, three loaves per every *issaron*. In total there were forty loaves for the *todah* offering. He takes four loaves and gives them to the *Kohanim*, and the rest was eaten by the owner.

The *Gemora* notes that just as we derived from the verse that the *terumah* should be separated for the *Kohen* while it was “attached” to the other loaves (*in the same vessel*), so too regarding the fats of the *chatas* offering, for Rav Chisda said in the name of Avimi: One must not cut up the meat before removing the parts that were burned on the altar. (77b)

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***The Fishermen Are Also Forbidden to Eat Fish***

In the days of Rabbi Yechezkel Feivel, the Vilna *magid*, the local fishermen united and raised the price of the fish excessively. Rabbi Feivel warned them that he would forbid buying fish but they didn't give in. He immediately commanded to announce in all the synagogues that everyone was forbidden to eat fish on Shabbos or a weekday till further notice. Two weeks later the fishermen pleaded to him that he should repeal the prohibition but he refused, lest the event be repeated. Before they left, he said, “As long as the prohibition is in force, it applies also to you: you and your children are forbidden to eat fish” (*Hizaharu Bemamon Chavreichem*, 286).

