



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

Leaning vs. Waving

The *Mishna* compares stringencies of waving and leaning:

Leaning: each member of a group offering a sacrifice must lean, while one can wave for all of them

Waving: applies to individual and communal sacrifices, and is done both on live and slaughtered sacrifices, and on animals and inanimate items (e.g. minchah), while leaning is only done on a slaughtered animal of an individual sacrifice.

The chart below details the differences:

Strict?	Leaning	Waving
Leaning	Each member of a group must lean	One can wave for the group
Waving	Only individual sacrifices	Individual and communal sacrifices
	Only on slaughtered animals	On live and slaughtered
	Only on animals	Done on animate and inanimate (e.g., <i>minchah</i>)

(93b – 94a)

Waving

The *braisa* says that the verse which states that “*he will lean his hand on the head of karbano – his sacrifice*”

teaches that all of the owners of a sacrifice must lean. The verse must teach us this, since we may have argued that only one need lean, since leaning is less severe than waving, as it is only done on a live animal individual sacrifice. If waving, which is also done on a slaughtered animal, need not be done by each partner, certainly leaning need not be. Therefore, the verse teaches us that all owners must lean.

The *braisa* then suggests that we instead learn from leaning that waving must be done by each owner, since it is logical that this requirement, which applies to the less severe act of leaning, should apply to the more severe act of waving.

The *braisa* says that it is impossible for all of the owners to wave the sacrifice. They may not wave simultaneously, as each one’s hands will be a separation for the others’ hand, and they may not wave sequentially, as the verse mandates only one *tenufah – waving*, not multiple ones.

The *Gemora* challenges the statement of the *Mishna* that waving is not done on slaughtered animals from another *Mishna*, which describes how a *Kohen Gadol* would offer portions of the sacrifice on the altar. The *Mishna* says that if the *Kohen Gadol* wants to offer them, he ascends to the top, and each portion of the sacrifice is brought to him by various *Kohanim*. For each portion, he leans on it and then throws it on the fire.

Abaye answers that this leaning is not mandated, but was instituted to enhance the prestige of the *Kohen Gadol*. (94a)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, SHTEI MIDDOS

Breads

The *Mishna* says that the two breads of *Shavuot* were kneaded and baked individually, while the show breads of the table were kneaded individually, but baked in pairs. The show breads were made with a mold, and when they were removed from the oven, they were also placed on a mold, to prevent them from being ruined.

The *braisa* says that the verse about the show breads which says that “two isaron will be the [each] one challah” teaches that they are kneaded one by one. The extra word *yih’ye* – will be includes the two breads in this requirement. The following verse, which says *v’samta osam* – and you will place them, teaches that they are not baked individually, as one loaf is not called “them”. Since the verse could have said, *v’samtam* – and you will place them, but instead used the longer phrase with the explicit word *osam* - them, this excludes the two breads from the requirement of baking in pairs.

The *braisa* says that the phrase *v’samta* – and you shall place teaches that they are placed on a mold. There were three molds:

1. one in which the dough was placed to take shape
2. one in which it was baked in the oven
3. one in which it was placed when baked, to prevent it from breaking

The *Gemora* explains that once it was baked, it could not be placed in the first mold, since it has now expanded beyond the original size. (94a)

Shape of the Show Breads

The *Gemora* cites a dispute about the exact shape of the show breads. Rabbi Chanina says they were shaped like an open box, while Rabbi Yochanan says they were shaped like a floating boat.

The *Gemora* discusses how each position can explain the various items used in supporting and storing the breads:

1. Spoons of *levonah* – This would make most sense if they were like an open box, as they would simply rest on the top breads. If they were like a boat, we must say that they made a slight cavity in the walls of the top breads for the spoons
2. Rods - They would make most sense if they were like an open box, as the three rods per each loaf would have a wide surface at all points of the bread. If they were like a boat, we must say that the breads had expanded corners at the bottom, in order to rest on the rods
3. Supports:
 1. They would make most sense if they were like an open box, as they would provide a flat support for the bottom of each loaf. If they were like a boat, we must say the supports curved up to support the whole bottom surface of the breads.
 2. The need for supports makes most sense if the breads were like a boat, since stacking the breads one on top of the other would collapse the unstable pile from the combined weight. The *Gemora* explains that even if they were like a box, they still could not be stacked, since the sheer weight of the breads would break them
 3. The location of the supports makes most sense if they were like a boat, as the supports can rest on the table, in the gap between the bottom of the loaves and the table.



The *Gemora* says that if they were like a box, the supports must have stood on the ground, outside of the table, supporting the breads from there.

The *Gemora* cites Rabbi Abba bar Mamal, who explicitly says that the placement of the supports depends on what position one takes on the shape of the breads.

The *Gemora* concludes with a *braisa*, in which Rabbi Yehudah says that the breads held up the supports, and the supports held up the bread. The *Gemora* explains that this follows the opinion that the breads were like a boat, and therefore the breads kept the supports from falling over, and the supports kept the bread from breaking from its weight.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, which says that, in the oven, the breads were on a type of square porous pan, implying the breads were like a box. The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that the *braisa* simply meant that the pan's opening was like a box, but its bottom was the shape of a boat.

The *Gemora* concludes with a *braisa* that explicitly says that they were like a boat. The *braisa* says there were four golden supports, with slits, which supported the bread, which was similar to a floating boat. (94a – 95a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

What is "inflated matzah"?

The proof, the rejection and the decision

A halachic *chidush*, not ignored by any important *posek*, was ruled by the Maharil and the Remo (*Shulchan 'Aruch*, O.C. 461:5): "A *matzah* inflated in the middle is forbidden" (see *Chok Ya'akov*, S.K. 9). Many *poskim* did

not agree with this *chidush*. The *Taz* testified that his father-in-law and mentor, the *Bach*, discussed this *halachah* at length but "never forbade it" (see *Magen Avraham*, *ibid*, S.K. 13). The sages of Venice also never understood why inflated *matzah* should be forbidden (*Chok Ya'akov*, *ibid*; note that real *chametz* is left to rise before baking).

The showbread, which was *matzah*, also expanded: One of the questions concerning this *halachah* is indicated in our *sugya*. Our *Gemora* explains that when the showbread was taken out of the oven in the Temple, it was not returned to the container used to form the dough as during the baking the volume of the dough increased. "As soon as it was baked, it expanded" – and had to be put in a bigger container. We thus see that the showbread, which wasn't *chametz* but *matzah*, expanded during the baking and there was no defect therein. Rabbi Moshe ben Zechus, the Ramaz, also mentioned this question (*Responsa*, 52) and disagreed with this *halachah*, saying "and another clear proof, as we learn in Menachos: „as soon as it was baked, it expanded" – if so, we see that the showbread was inflated." He therefore ruled that inflated *matzah* is kosher.

Two possibilities of raised *matzah*: One of the *poskim* who tried to reconcile the Maharil's opinion was Rabbi Shmuel Abuhav, who deals with the question in his *Responsa Dvar Shmuel* (234, 374). We should know that raised *matzah* can come about in two ways. Sometimes the dough divides in half during baking and a hollow appears between the halves and sometimes the entire dough expands uniformly (see *Bach* and *Mishnah Berurah*, S.K. 33). Therefore, says Rabbi Abuhav, our *Gemora* concerns the showbread *matzah* which expanded but didn't become divided in half and this *matzah* is allowed. However, the Maharil forbade *matzah* divided in half because it might have become *chametz*.

A third possibility for raised *matzah*: Indeed, this is also the opinion of the Maharam of Lublin, that raised *matzah* is permitted and *matzah* divided in half is forbidden. The *Taz* (*Magen Avraham*, S.K. 13) maintains the opposite: *matzah* with a hollow is allowed and *matzah* that expanded is also allowed and only *matzah* which rose like a mountain, risen unevenly, is forbidden because of the suspicion that it became *chametz* where it rose but uniform expanding is a natural phenomenon that doesn't arouse a suspicion of *chametz* (see *Pri Megadim* in *Mishbetzos Zahav*, S.K. 6, and *Sha'arei Teshuvah* at the end of the *siman*). According to this opinion, our *Gemora* concerns *matzah* which expanded naturally and evenly whereas the Maharil related to *matzah* which rose only partially.

Members of our *beis midrash* discussed this idea at length and encountered a great difficulty: the question on the Maharil is based on our *Gemora*, which recounts that the showbread expanded so why did the Maharil disqualify inflated *matzah*. But how do we know that the *Gemora* means that the *matzah* expanded upwards? Maybe it means that it expanded to the sides. It is even logical that that is its meaning as the *Gemora* says that after baking, the bread could not be returned to its original container as it expanded. If it expanded upwards, why is it so hard to return it to the same container? We must say that the *Gemora* means that it expanded to the sides and therefore there is no question on the Maharil.

Indeed, *Sha'arei Teshuvah* (S.K. 5) discusses this question at length but concludes that Rabbi Abuhav understood the *Gemora* to mean that the *matzah* expanded in all directions. The Ramaz (*ibid*) helps us to understand the matter. He indicates that the showbread expanded upwards so much that there was a need to put it in

containers with higher sides as it was soft and without proper support, its unique form could be ruined.

In practice, the custom for many generations is to forbid all sorts of inflated *matzah*, both *matzah* which expanded uniformly and *matzah* divided lengthwise (*Magen Avraham* and *Chok Ya'akov*, *ibid*; *Mishnah Berurah*, S.K. 33). Still, some wanted to maintain this custom with *matzos* common in the Oriental lands, which were very thick, but not with thin *matzos* (*Responsa Dvar Shmuel*, *ibid*; *Sha'arei Teshuvah*, S.K. 6; *Mishnah Berurah*, S.K. 35).

Perforating *matzos*: Indeed, *'Aroch HaShulchan* (461:12) testifies: "we never forbade inflated *matzah*. Thin *matzos* that become inflated are known to usually be because of insufficient perforation or the strength of the fire" (*Mishnah Berurah* cites this opinion in the name of "some Acharonim" but didn't decide the issue; see *Piskei Teshuvos*, here). Indeed, the reason we perforate the dough before baking is also because of these suspicions.

An inflated *matzah* that became mixed in a pack of *matzos*: Another question is if an inflated *matzah* becomes mixed in a pack of *matzos*. Does it forbid the whole package or hot utensils that it touches? *Mishnah Berurah* (*ibid*) writes: "It seems that, at any rate, we should behave leniently if the inflated *matzah* is mixed in a majority of 60, especially with thin *matzos* such as ours; even if one wants to behave strictly, at any rate one shouldn't be strict concerning mixtures."