



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Menachos Daf Samach Daled

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, maybe we can say that **R' Yishmael** of our Mishna (who holds that we must limit the melacha done for the Omer when it is brought on Shabbos, and cut only 3 se'ah of barley instead of the usual 5 se'ah needed to make fine flour) shares the opinion of **R' Chanina Sgan HaKohanim** in our Mishna, who said that when the barley for the Omer was cut on Shabbos it was done by one person, with one sickle, and one box, instead of 3 people, 3 sickles, and 3 boxes? **A:** It may be that **R' Yishmael** would agree with the **Rabanan** there and hold that 3 people should do it even on Shabbos, because it makes the matter more public. Or, it may be that **R' Chanina** would only hold that way regarding the cutting, since even with one person the job will be fully accomplished, but in the case of processing the flour, since 5 se'ah will result in better quality flour, he may agree that 5 se'ah is processed even on Shabbos.
- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, maybe **R' Yishmael** shares the opinion of **R' Yose** who says in a Mishna that if witnesses see the new moon when it is clearly visible, they should not be mechalel Shabbos to travel and give their testimony (we can assume that many others who are near Beis Din saw it as well), but if it was not clearly visible they can be mechalel Shabbos to travel to Beis Din. We see that he holds that we must minimize the chillul Shabbos! **A:** It may be that **R' Yishmael** would agree with the **Rabanan** there, who say that in either case they should travel so as not to cause them not to travel at future times when others may have not seen the new moon, and it is for that reason that the case is very different than the processing of additional flour. Or, it may be that **R' Yose** only holds that way there, because without their melacha the desired result takes place (someone will give testimony). However, since 5 se'ah of barley produce a more refined flour he would agree that 5 se'ah should be used.
- We have learned, if a person shechted two animals for the mussaf chatas of Shabbos, when only one is actually needed, **Rabbah or R' Ami** says he is chayuv (a chatas since it was done b'shogeg) for the shechita of the second animal, and is patur for the shechita of the first animal. This is so even if he ultimately uses the second animal for the korbos and even if the first animal is found to be a lean (low quality) animal.
  - **Q:** How could **Rabbah** have said this when he says elsewhere that if there are two animals that have been designated for a tzibbur's chatas (and only one is needed) – one which is lean and one that is more healthy – and on Shabbos a person first shechted the healthy one and then the lean one, he is chayuv for the second shechita. However, if he first shechted the lean one and then the healthy one, he is patur. Even more, if he shechted the lean one first we would tell him to go ahead and shecht the healthy one and bring that one instead!? **A:** Either we must remove mention of the lean animal from the first teaching, or we can say that the first teaching was said by **R' Ami** and not **Rabbah**.
    - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, what if the first animal was found to be lean only after the second shechita? Do we follow his intent, which was to do a shechita that was not allowed (since he did not know the first one was lean at that time) or do we only follow his action (and since it turns out that the first one was a lean animal, the shechita of the second animal was allowed to be done)? **A: R' Ashi** said, this would seem to be the subject of a machlokes between **Rava and Rabbah**. We have learned that if a person heard that there is a child drowning on Shabbos and he then spread out a net only with the intent to catch fish and he only caught fish, he is chayuv. If along with the fish he saved the child, **Rava** says he is chayuv and **Rabbah** says he is patur. Now, even **Rabbah** presumably only holds this way because we can assume that since he had heard about the child he must have intended to save the child as well. However, had he not

heard about the child, even **Rabbah** would say that he is chayuv! We see that they both hold that we follow the intent of the act, and not the actual act.

- **Others** said that **R' Ashi** said that the question is actually the point of machlokes between **Rava and Rabbah** – with **Rava** holding that we follow the intent and **Rabbah** saying he is patur because we follow the actual act.
- **Rabbah** said, if there was a sick person who needed to eat a dried fig on Shabbos, and 10 people ran and each brought him a dried fig (they were each mechalel Shabbos, either by picking it off the tree, carrying it in the reshus harabim, etc.) they are all patur. This is true even if they did not all bring it at the same time, and even if the sick person had already recovered, because he ate a dried fig from someone who brought it to him earlier.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what if there was a sick person that needed to eat 2 dried figs on Shabbos and we can either pick two figs off the tree, each on its own stem (so there would be two distinct acts of cutting) or we can cut off a different stem that has 3 figs on it (which would mean that we are cutting off more figs than he needs). Which one should we do? **A:** It is obvious that we would cut off the stem with the 3 figs on it. Even **R' Yishmael** says to use less barley only because doing so will result in less melacha being done. In this case, taking the extra fig actually causes less melacha to be done, and he would therefore agree that the one stem with the 3 figs should be cut.

#### MISHNA

- The mitzvah of the Omer is to bring barley from a place closest to Yerushalayim. If the barley closest to Yerushalayim is not fully ripened, it may be brought from any place. It once happened that the barley for the Omer was brought from Gagos Tzerifin and the wheat for the Shte Halechem was from for the valley of Ein Socher.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why should it be brought from near Yerushalayim? **A:** Either because the pasuk says “karmel”, which teaches that it should be soft, and if it is brought from a distance it will harden as it travels, or because of the rule of “ein mavirin ahl hamitzvos” (we don’t pass over an opportunity to do a mitzvah).

#### MAASEH SHEBAH HA’OMER MIGAGOS TZERIFIN

- A Braisa explains that when the Chashmenai kings were fighting each other, those inside Yerushalayim would send out money every day to those besieging on the outside, and in return they would send a basket over the wall with an animal to use for the Korbon Tamid. There was one elderly man inside who used to learn Greek wisdom, and he told the people on the outside that if they stopped sending animals for the Korbon Tamid they would be able to conquer those on the inside. The next day the people on the outside sent up a pig in the basket. Halfway up the wall the pig dug its nails into the wall preventing it from going up any further, and all of Eretz Yisrael shook. It was at that time that the Rabanan said, “Cursed is the person who raises pigs, and cursed is the person who teaches his son Greek wisdom”. It was regarding that year that we learned that it once happened that the barley for the Omer was brought from Gagos Tzerifin and the wheat for the Shte Halechem was from for the valley of Ein Socher.
  - When it came time for the Omer they did not know where to go for the barley (because the army on the outside had destroyed all the surrounding crops). They announced that whoever knows where there is barley growing should come and tell them. A mute person came and symbolized to them. Mordechai was able to determine that he was trying to tell them that barley can be found in Gagos Tzerifin. When it came time to bring the Shte Halechem they again didn’t know where to find wheat. A mute man came and symbolized to them. Mordechai was able to determine that he was trying to tell them that wheat can be found in Ein Socher.
    - There were once 3 women who each brought a pair of birds as korbanos. One said her pair was for her “zivah”, the second said her pair was for her “yamma” and the third said her pair was for her “onah”. Those present thought that each woman was bringing the birds for having been a zavah (zivah referring to zavah, yammah referring to the sea to symbolize a flow of blood, and onah referring to

her time), which would mean that one bird in each pair was for a chatas and one was for an olah. Mordechai said, “zivah” may mean that she was bleeding so much that she was in danger of dying and is bringing a korbon to thank Hashem, “yammah” may refer to her having been in danger in the sea, and “onah” may refer to her having been in danger due to her eye, in which case all the birds are being brought as korbon olos. They researched the matter and found it to be exactly as Mordechai had said. This story illustrates what is taught in a Mishna that says that Pesachya, who was Mordechai, was in charge of the pairs of birds. He was called by the name of Pesachya, because he opened and explained many difficult topics, and spoke 70 languages.

- **Q:** All of the Sanhedrin knew 70 languages, so why is that considered to have made Mordechai special? **A:** He knew how to combine languages and explain them.