



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

Minchah in doubt

Rav Kahana asked Rav Ashi: But why does the doubt (*of the Mishna’s case, where he specified a minchah, but he does not recall which*) include also the *minchas nesachim* (*flour, oil and wine*)? For Rava has said: A man can donate a *minchah* offering of libations every day (*even without being accompanied by an animal sacrifice*).

The *Gemora* answers: The doubt includes only that *minchah* offering (*mnemonic: individual, on account of, frankincense, log, komeitz*) which ...

1. ...is brought by an individual, but not that which also comes for the community.
2. ...is brought by itself, but not that which is brought to accompany an animal offering.
3. ...requires frankincense, but not that which does not require frankincense.
4. ...requires but one *log* of oil, but not that which requires three *lugin*.
5. ...a *kemitzah* is performed with it, but not that which does not have a *kemitzah* performed with it.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If one said, “I specified a *minchah* offering of a certain amount of *issarons*, and I established them to be in one vessel, but I do not

recall the number which I specified,” he must bring a *minchah* offering of sixty *issarons*; these are the words of the Sages. Rebbe, however, says: He must bring *minchah* offerings of every number of *issarons* from one to sixty; that is, one thousand eight hundred and thirty *issarons*.

If he said, “I specified a *minchah* offering of a certain amount of *issarons* (*and I established them to be in one vessel*), but I do not recall which type I specified, nor do I recall the number which I specified,” he must bring the five types of *minchah* offerings each consisting of sixty *issarons*; that is, three hundred *issarons*; these are the words of the Sages. Rebbe, however, says: He must bring the five types of *minchah* offerings, and from each type he must bring a *minchah* consisting of every number of *issarons* from one to sixty; that is, nine thousand one hundred and fifty *issarons*.

The *Gemora* explains the point of issue between them: Rav Chisda said: They differ as to whether or not it is permitted to bring unconsecrated items into the Courtyard. [*They both agree, however, that it is forbidden to mix together the minchah offering that is brought as an obligation with the minchah that is brought as a donated offering.*] Rebbe holds that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated items into the



Courtyard, whereas the Sages hold that it is permitted. [According to Rebbe, he cannot bring sixty issarons in one vessel and declare that the quantity corresponding to the amount he specified shall be in fulfillment of his vow and the rest shall remain unconsecrated, since it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated items into the Courtyard; neither can he say that the rest shall be a donated offering, since it is forbidden to mix the offering of obligation with a donated one. The only option is to bring in sixty vessels minchah offerings of every number of issarons from one to sixty, and declare that the vessel which contains the quantity he specified shall be in fulfillment of his vow and all that which is in the other vessels shall be donated offerings.]

Rabbah said: They all agree that it is forbidden to bring unconsecrated items into the Courtyard, but they differ as to whether or not it is permitted to mix the offering of an obligation with a donated one. The Sages hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of an obligation with a donated one, whereas Rebbe holds that it is forbidden.

Abaye asked Rabbah: According to the Sages who hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of an obligation with a donated one, should not two handfuls be taken from there?

He replied: First one *komeitz* is taken and then another.

The *Gemora* asks: But he would be taking the *komeitz* from the offering of obligation for the donated one,

and from the donated offering for the one of obligation!?

The *Gemora* answers: He leaves it up to the intent of the *Kohen*, and says, "Whatever the *Kohen's* hand scoops up the first time shall be the *komeitz* for the offering of obligation, and whatever he scoops up the second time shall be for the donated offering.

The *Gemora* asks: But how are the handfuls to be burned? If he burns the *komeitz* of the donated offering first, then how may he afterwards burn the *komeitz* of the offering of obligation; perhaps the entire *minchah* was his offering of obligation, and consequently the remainder of the *minchah* will be found to be lacking, and a master has stated that if the remainder had diminished between the *kemitzah* and the burning, and the law is that you may then not burn the *komeitz* on its account!?! And if he burns the *komeitz* of the offering of obligation first, then how may he afterwards burn the *komeitz* of the donated offering; perhaps the entire *minchah* was his offering of obligation, and any offering - a portion of which had been placed on the Altar fire is subject to the prohibition of 'you shall not burn'?

Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said: It is burned for the sake of firewood (*as if it was fuel for the fire*), in accordance with a ruling of Rabbi Eliezer, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer said: For a pleasing aroma you may not offer upon the altar (*something that may be eaten*); but you may offer up for the sake of wood.

Rava explains the dispute as follows: All hold that it is permitted to mix the offering of obligation with the donated one, and all accept Rabbi Eliezer's ruling, but they differ regarding the same matter which is disputed by Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov and the Rabbis. For we have learned in a *Mishna*: Even a *minchah* offering of sixty *issarons* of flour required sixty *lugin* of oil. Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov said: Even a *minchah* offering of sixty *issarons* of flour required only one *log* of oil, for it is written: *for a minchah, and a log of oil*. The Sages hold like the Rabbis, who maintain that sixty *lugin* are required for sixty *issarons*, one *log* for each *issaron*, whereas Rebbe holds like Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, who says that only one *log* is required, and therefore we do not know whether to regard the sixty *issarons* as one *minchah* offering for which one *log* is sufficient, or as two *minchah* offerings for which two *lugin* are necessary.

Rav Ashi said: They differ in the case of one who vowed to bring a small *minchah* offering and brought a large one. The Sages hold that one who vowed to bring a small offering and brought a large one has fulfilled his obligation, whereas Rebbe holds that he has not fulfilled his obligation. (106a – 106b)

DAILY MASHAL

Rav Elyashiv – Maintaining The Lechem Hapanim

The *lechem hapanim* must be on the Shulchan, "tamid" - always. What does always mean? The *Mishna* says that the *Chachamim* hold that the new

bread must be held up against the old bread and in one motion the old bread was removed as the new bread took its place. This way there was never even a split second that where the Shulchan was empty. Rabbi Yosi says you may remove the old bread and then set down the new bread, and this is also called *tamid*.

The *Gemora* brings a *braisa* that says that according to Rabbi Yosi you may even remove the old bread in the morning and bring then new bread in the afternoon. From here Rabbi Ammi learns that if you learn one perek in the morning and one perek in the evening you have fulfilled the *mitzvah of: this book of the Torah shall not depart from your mouth*. We see that it is also considered *tamid* if you are consistent and never miss your scheduled learning.

Rav Elyashiv points out that according to the *Chachamim* who we hold like, regarding *lechem hapanim*, we can make the same inference. From the *Chachamim* we learn that it is not considered *tamid* unless your learning is unabated even for a moment, just like the careful and meticulous process of maintaining a constant presence of the *lechem hapanim*.