



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 loaves that were brought with the *milu'im* sacrifices (when Aaron and his sons were inaugurated to serve in the Mishkan) were similar to the *matzah* loaves brought with a *todah* sacrifice, namely *chalos* (loaves), *rekikin* (wafers), and *revuchah* (scalded in water). The loaves that were brought with the sacrifice of a *nazir* were similar to two parts of the *matzah* loaves brought with a *todah* sacrifice, namely *chalos* and *rekikin*. No *revuchah* loaves were brought. Accordingly, only ten Yerushalayim *kavin* were brought with the sacrifice of the *nazir* (five for each type, as opposed to the fifteen *kav* brought with a regular *todah*), equaling six *issaron* and two thirds of an *issaron*. (78a)

Milu'im Loaves

The *Gemora* asked: How do we know that the *milu'im* sacrifice involved bringing all of these types of loaves?

Rav Chisda answered in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya: The verse states: *and from the basket of matzos that is before Hashem he took one chalah (loaf) of matzah and one chalah of oil and one wafer. A chalah seems to refer to a chalah, and a wafer refers to a wafer. What is the chalah of oil? It must be it is referring to revuchah loaves.*

Rav Avya asked him: Perhaps this verse is referring to a cake of oil?

Rather, Rav Nachman bar Rav Chisda taught in the name of Rabbi Tavra: *This is the sacrifice of Aaron and his sons that they will offer to Hashem on the day that he will be anointed. What law do we derive regarding the offering of Aaron's sons from the day of Aaron's anointment? Rather, the initial service of an ordinary Kohen is compared to the inaugural sacrifice (called anointing as a Kohen Gadol was anointed when he started*

servicing) of the Kohen Gadol. Just as the Kohen Gadol's inaugural sacrifice was a revuchah (the minchas chavitin of a Kohen Gadol), so too the ordinary Kohen's initial sacrifice is a revuchah. [This shows that any inaugural sacrifice is presumed to involve a revuchah, and therefore must be the intent of the Torah when it says a chalah of oil.]

Rav Chisda stated: The initial time a *Kohen Gadol* serves in the Beis HaMikdash, he requires two *issaron* offerings (for his *revuchah minchah*). One is required for his being anointed and one is required for his initiation. Mar bar Rav Ashi stated: He requires three *issaron* offerings.

The *Gemora* notes that he is not arguing with Rav Chisda, as Mar bar Rav Ashi is referring to a *Kohen* who never even served as an ordinary *Kohen*, whereas Rav Chisda is referring to a *Kohen* who already served as an ordinary *Kohen*. (78a)

Nazir's Loaves

The *Mishna* had stated that the loaves that were brought with the sacrifice of a *nazir* were similar to two parts of the *matzah* loaves brought with a *todah* sacrifice, namely *chalos* and *rekikin*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *His shelamim* includes the *shelamim* of a *nazir* to need ten Yerushalayim *kavin* and a quarter-log of oil (for its two types of *matzah* loaves). One might think that if we already compare *nazir* to *todah*, that we also include a *nazir* to bring *revuchah* as well. This is why the verse states: *matzos*.

The *Gemora* asked: How do we see this from the word *matzos*?

Rav Pappa stated: *Matzos* is only used to describe loaves and wafers, not *revuchah*. It therefore indicates that it excludes *revuchah*.

The Academy of Rabbi Yishmael taught a *braisa*: *Matzos* is a generalization, while *chalos* and *rekikin* are specifications. We should therefore use the rule of generalization - specification to teach that the general rule must be like the specific items mentioned. This means that only loaves and wafers are brought. (78a)

Mishna

If one slaughters a *todah* sacrifice inside the Courtyard when the accompanying bread is outside the wall, the bread is not sanctified. [*Ordinarily, the breads are sanctified with the slaughtering of the todah offering.*] If he slaughtered it before the outside of the bread became crusted in the oven, even if all the loaves were crusted besides one, all of the breads are not sanctified. (78b)

Sanctifying the Loaves

The *Gemora* asks: What is the meaning of “outside the wall?”

Rabbi Yochanan states: This refers to the wall of Beis Pagi (*the outer wall of Yerushalayim*). Rish Lakish states: This means outside the wall of the Courtyard.

Reish Lakish holds this way because the verse states *al*, indicating the bread has to be in close proximity to the sacrifice when it is slaughtered. Rabbi Yochanan does not understand that this is the intent of the verse.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't they already have a similar argument (*and therefore this argument is unnecessary to be stated*)? The *Mishna* had stated: If one slaughters a *pesach* sacrifice while having *chametz* in his possession, he transgresses a negative prohibition. Rabbi Yehudah states: This is also true regarding the afternoon *tamid* sacrifice (*on Erev Pesach*). And Rish Lakish said: One is only liable if either the one who slaughtered the sacrifice, sprinkled the blood, or one of the people who is a part owner of the sacrifice has *chametz* with him in the Courtyard. Rabbi Yochanan states: Even if they do not have it in the Courtyard, they are still liable. [*Here, as well, the argument seems to hinge on the verse “al” stated regarding having chametz while offering a pesach sacrifice.*]

The *Gemora* answers: Both arguments had to be stated. If the only argument stated would be regarding the *pesach* sacrifice, one might have thought that Rabbi Yochanan held that wherever the *chametz* is, it is in its prohibitive state (*and therefore one transgresses this prohibition as well*); however, regarding the sanctification of the *todah* breads, perhaps he would agree with Rish Lakish that they are only sanctified if they are in the Courtyard while the *todah* is being slaughtered. And if the only argument stated was regarding the *todah*, perhaps we would think Rish Lakish would agree to Rabbi Yochanan regarding the *pesach* sacrifice. This is why both arguments were necessary to be stated.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which supports Rabbi Yochanan. If one slaughters a *todah* sacrifice inside the Courtyard when the accompanying bread is outside the wall of Beis Pagi, the breads are not sanctified.

The *Mishna* had stated that if he slaughtered it before the outside of the bread became crusted in the oven, even if all the loaves were crusted besides one, all of the breads are not sanctified.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know this?

The *Gemora* answers from a *braisa* which states: *With loaves of leavened bread he should bring his offering, with his todah sacrifice*. This teaches that the bread is not sanctified unless the outside of the bread became crusted in the oven (*before the slaughter*). *He should bring his offering, with his todah sacrifice* teaches that the bread only becomes sanctified when the sacrifice is slaughtered. His *todah – shelamim sacrifice* teaches us that if he slaughtered it not for its own sake, the bread is not sanctified.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: One fulfills the *mitzvah* of eating *matzah* on *Pesach* with *matzah* that is partially baked and *matzah* made in a pan.

The *Gemora* asks: What is partially baked *matzah*?

Rav Yehudah states in the name of Shmuel: It is any *matzah* that when broken apart, and strands of dough do not come away from it.

Rava says: This also applies to the breads of the *todah*.

The *Gemora* asks: This is obvious, as both are described by the Torah as *bread*!?

The *Gemora* answers: Being that the verse states “one” regarding the loaves of the *todah*, teaching us that they must be whole, one might think that this (*partially baked matzah*) is regarded as if it is not whole and therefore cannot be used. This is why Rava states that it may be used for the *todah* as well.

It was taught: If a *korban todah* was slaughtered together with eighty loaves, Chizkiyah said: Forty of them are consecrated. Rabbi Yochanan said: None at all are consecrated.

Rabbi Zeira explains: If he said, “Forty of the eighty loaves should become consecrated,” everyone would agree that forty of them are consecrated. If he said, “Forty should not become consecrated unless all eighty become consecrated,” everyone would agree that none of them become consecrated. They only argue in a case where he did not specify anything (*he just brought eighty*). Chizkiyah holds that he intended that the other forty should be used as substitutes (*if the first forty were to become lost*). Rabbi Yochanan, however, maintains that he intended that this should be a large offering of eighty loaves (*and since this is impossible, none of them become consecrated*).

Abaye says: They agree that he intended that this should be a large offering of eighty loaves (*and since this is impossible, they should not become consecrated*). Their argument is whether or not a service vessel may consecrate without intent. Chizkiyah says that they do (*and therefore forty are sanctified*), and Rabbi Yochanan says that they do not (*being that the intent of the owner was for eighty and eighty cannot be sanctified, none of them are consecrated*).

Rav Pappa says: Everyone agrees that an ordinary service vessel may sanctify without intent. The argument here is regarding whether or not the slaughtering knife functions like any other service vessel. Chizkiyah says that it does, and therefore the slaughtering of the sacrifice with the knife consecrates the forty breads, whereas Rabbi Yochanan maintains that it does not, being that it has no interior (*leaving the sanctification up to the intent of the owner who intended that all eighty should be holy and therefore none of them are sanctified*).

Some say Rav Pappa said as follows: Everyone agrees that a service vessel requires intent to sanctify. The argument here is regarding whether or not the knife functions like a service vessel. Chizkiyah holds that it is superior than a service vessel, as it even works like a service vessel despite the fact it does not have an inside. [*Accordingly, it only sanctifies what is meant to be sanctified, causing exactly forty breads to become consecrated.*] Rabbi Yochanan maintains that it is not better than an ordinary service vessel (*leaving the holiness up to the intent of the owner who intended that all eighty should be holy and therefore none of them are sanctified*). (78a - 78b)

Mishna

If one slaughtered the *todah* with intent that he would eat it beyond its allotted time or outside of its prescribed area, the bread is sanctified. [*This is in accordance with the principle that if the offering first became invalid in the Holy at the time of the slaughtering, the bread is sanctified.*] If he slaughtered it and it was discovered to be a *tereifah*, the bread is not sanctified. If he slaughtered it and it was discovered to be blemished, Rabbi Eliezer says that the breads are sanctified, while the Sages say that the breads are not sanctified. If he slaughtered it not for its own sake, and similarly if one slaughtered the ram of the *milu'im* offering or the two lambs of *Shavuot* not for their own sake, the bread is not sanctified. (78b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

A Double-Edged Question

A *Kohen* who starts to serve in the Temple first offers a *minchas chinuch*, inaugurating him for his holy position, which is a special *minchah* different from other *menachos* in that the *Kohen* must offer it personally. According to Rambam (*Hilchos Klei HaMikdash* 5:16), failing to offer the *minchas chinuch* does not

disqualify any other services performed by the *Kohen*. However, *Toras Kohanim* (*parshas Tzav*, ch. 3) states that the services of a *Kohen* who didn't offer a *minchas chinuch* are disqualified (see *Mishneh Lemelech*, *ibid*, and *Sefer HaMaftaiach*, *ibid*).

The kohanim who will rise at the Resurrection: Before addressing our major topic, we cite the Malbim (*Yechezkel* 44:27), who says that the *kohanim* who will rise at the Resurrection will be regarded as new *kohanim* as their obligation to serve in the Temple will apply to them anew. Thus all the past *kohanim* will offer a *minchas chinuch*. Indeed, the Malbim writes that *kohanim* who served in the First Temple before its destruction and witnessed the erection of the Second also offered a *minchas chinuch* again as "since the Temple was destroyed, it is as though they start their service anew" (see *Torah Shleimah*, II, *miluim*, 9).

The question whose answer escapes us either way: Our *Gemora* teaches us about a rare case of a *Kohen* who never served in the Temple and was appointed directly as the *Kohen Gadol*. This *Kohen* must bring two *minchos chinuch*: one as a *minchas chinuch* for a simple *Kohen* (*Kohen hedyot*) and the other as a *minchas chinuch* which a *Kohen Gadol* offers when he is appointed to his position.

As soon as the *Kohen Gadol* is appointed, he dons eight garments, even before he is inaugurated for his position by offering the *minchas chavitin* (*Tosfos*, *Yoma* 12b, s.v. *Kohen Gadol mishum eivah*). In other words, as soon as he is announced *Kohen Gadol*, he becomes the *Kohen Gadol* and must wear the eight garments.

Which minchah should the Kohen offer first? Now, according to *Toras Kohanim*, we must ask how the above *Kohen* should behave. Which *minchah* should he offer first? If he wants to offer the *minchah* of the *Kohen Gadol*, he is not allowed as he has not yet offered a *minchas chinuch* as a *Kohen hedyot* and all his service is disqualified. But if he chooses to first offer the *minchas chinuch* of a *Kohen hedyot*, this *minchah* will be regarded as though offered by a *Kohen Gadol* since he is already wearing the eight garments and it turns out that he began to

serve in his capacity as *Kohen Gadol* before he offered the *minchah* which inaugurates a *Kohen Gadol*.

He offers them simultaneously: *Mikdash David* (30, S.K. 1) suggests a solution: he should offer both *menachos* together and it then turns out that he is inaugurated as a *Kohen hedyot* and a *Kohen Gadol* simultaneously. It is interesting to note that Rambam (*ibid*, *halachah* 17) writes "he brings a tenth of an *eifah*...like any inauguration of a *Kohen hedyot* and afterwards offers another tenth of an *eifah*, which is the inauguration of a *Kohen Gadol*" as, in Rambam's opinion, not offering the *minchos chinuch* does not disqualify his other services and this *Kohen* requires no creative solution. However, HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Zev of Brisk zt"l remarked that we should investigate if *Toras Kohanim's* statement includes the *minchas chinuch* of a *Kohen Gadol*. It could be that the inauguration of the *Kohen Gadol* is a *mitzvah* but, unlike the *minchah* of a *Kohen hedyot*, its absence does not disqualify the services performed by the *Kohen Gadol*.

The position of the Kohen Gadol: We should mention that we clearly learn from our *Gemora* about the essence of the *kehunah gedolah*. From the fact that he must bring two *menachos* and that it doesn't suffice for him to be directly inaugurated as a *Kohen Gadol* without being inaugurated as a *Kohen hedyot*, we learn that the position of a *Kohen Gadol* is not entirely different from that of a *hedyot* but it is the position of a *hedyot* with the addition of being a *Kohen Gadol*. Therefore, as the *Kohen Gadol* serves in the same position as his companions with increased sanctity, he must be appointed as a *hedyot*, to be one of the *kohanim* serving in the Temple and then be further sanctified (see *Beer Miryam* on the Torah, *parshas Tzav*, in the name of HaGaon Rav Y.M. Feinstein zt"l).

DAILY MASHAL Sanctifying the Bread

If a person feels that he must bring a *todah* sacrifice for miracles that occurred to him but doesn't have a similar feeling about the food he gets daily from Hashem, he has "not sanctified his bread" (livelihood) with complete faith (*Meorah shel Torah*, *Vayikra* 7:12).