



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

### Menachos Daf Samach Zayin

- **Q: Rava** asked, if dough was mixed by a goy when it was owned by the goy and a Yid then bought it, would he be chayuv to take challah? A Mishna clearly teaches that if a dough was mixed by a goy who then became a ger, he would not be chayuv to separate challah. However, whose view does that Mishna follow? Is it a universally accepted view, and even **R' Meir and R' Yehuda**, who hold that produce smoothed by a goy is subject to maaser, would agree that the dough made by a goy would be patur from challah? The reason for the distinction would be that regarding maaser there are two extra words of "degancha", which is an exclusionary term, but when a "mi'ut" follows a "mi'ut" it comes to *include*, and therefore comes to include even the case where a goy smoothed out the grain. Regarding challah the Torah twice says "arisoseichem" – one is needed to teach the minimum size which is chayuv in challah and the other would teach that the dough of Hekdesh or of a goy would be patur. Or maybe the Mishna only follows the view of **R' Yose and R' Shimon**, who hold that the grain smoothed by a goy is patur from maaser and would therefore also hold that a goy's dough is patur from challah. However, **R' Meir and R' Yehuda**, who hold that the grain smoothed by a goy would be chayuv in maaser, would learn from a gezeira shava on the word "reishis" to the case of challah, that the dough mixed by a goy is also chayuv in challah? **A: Rava** davened that he be answered from Heaven in a dream. Then he thought further and said that whoever holds that the grain smoothed by a goy would be chayuv would also hold that the dough mixed by a goy would be chayuv, and whoever holds the grain would be patur would also hold that the dough is patur.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says that if a goy separated a sheep to redeem a firstborn donkey (a "peter chamor") or he separated challah from his dough, and the goy then became a ger, we let him know that he is really patur from those things and therefore the challah may be eaten by anyone (it doesn't have the status of challah) and the donkey may be worked with. Now, the Braisa implies that if he had separated terumah as a goy, that terumah would remain assur to be eaten by anyone but Kohanim. That means that the Tanna of this Braisa holds that grain smoothed by a goy is chayuv in terumah, yet he holds that the dough mixed by a goy is patur from challah. We see that the two halachos do not necessarily come out the same!? **Q2: Ravina** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says that if a goy separated challah, even from flour that came from grains grown in EY, or terumah separated by a goy from produce of chutz laaretz, we let him know that the challah and terumah don't have the status of challah and terumah. This implies that if he separated terumah from grain grown in EY it *would* have the status of terumah. We see that this Tanna holds that grain smoothed by a goy is chayuv in terumah, yet he holds that the dough mixed by a goy is patur from challah. We see that the two halachos do not necessarily come out the same!? **A:** The Braisos mean that the terumah has the status of terumah only D'Rabanan, which was done as a gezeira to prevent people from making all their produce patur by temporarily transferring ownership to a goy for the smoothing process.
    - **Q:** If this is true, the **Rabanan** should have made a similar gezeira in the case of challah as well!? **A:** In one wants to make his dough patur from challah he can do so by making less than the minimum amount of flour that would make the dough chayuv in challah. Since he can make himself patur in other ways, there was no reason for the **Rabanan** to make a gezeira regarding the challah of a goy.
      - **Q:** Regarding terumah as well, one can make his produce patur without giving it to a goy, by following the ruling of **R' Hoshaya**, who said that if one brings his produce into his house while the chaff is still on it, it remains patur from maaser. Also, if one brings the produce into the

house through the roof or the back chatzer, rather than through the front door, it is also patur from maaser. If so, why did the **Rabanan** make the gezeira regarding the terumah of a goy? **A:** These methods of one making his produce patur is something that will be seen by other people, and the person is therefore embarrassed to use these methods. The method of making one's challah patur (by using a smaller amount) is not done in public view and therefore something that someone would do if he wants to make his dough patur.

#### MISHNA

- [On the morning after the barley for the Omer was cut, they would begin to prepare the Omer to be brought.] He would go to the issaron of flour. He would put its oil and its levonah into a keili and put the flour on top of the oil, would then pour more oil on top of the flour, and then mix the oil with the flour. He would then do tenufah and hagasha, and would then take a kometz and burn it on the Mizbe'ach. The remaining flour would be eaten by the Kohanim.
- As soon as the Korbon Omer was brought (permitting the new grain), the markets of Yerushalayim were full of flour and grain dried in an oven from the new crop. (This means the produce was cut, ground and dried before Yom Tov began, when eating from this produce was assur). **R' Meir** says this was done against the will of the **Chachomim**. **R' Yehuda** says, the **Chachomim** did not have a problem with this.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Was **R' Yehuda** not goizer that people may come to eat from the new grain before the Omer was brought? A Mishna says, **R' Yehuda** says one must do a bedika on the night going into the 14<sup>th</sup>, the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>, and at the time that he destroys the chametz. He does not allow for a bedika after that time out of concern that one would eat the chametz he finds. Why was he only goizer there and not in the case of the chadash (the new grain)? **A:** **Rabbah** said, since before the bringing of the Korbon Omer one may only detach the new produce from the ground by pulling it out of the ground by hand, that unusual method will remind him that he may not eat from it.
  - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, that would help during the time that he is pulling it out of the ground, but why was **R' Yehuda** not goizer against grinding and sifting of the flour!? **A:** These processes were also done in an unusual manner (the grinding was done with a hand grinder and the sifting was done on an upside-down sifter) which act as a reminder for him not to eat from the new produce.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that one may cut produce from irrigated fields and fields in the valley in the usual manner (although it is assur to eat that produce before the bringing of the Omer), although he may not pile the produce, and the Gemara there establishes that the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**. We see that he is not goizer that they may come to eat from the produce that they are handling in a normal manner!? **A:** **Abaye** explained that people separate themselves from eating chadash and will therefore not come to eat from it. However, people are accustomed to eating chametz all year long and we must therefore be concerned that one will eat from the chametz.
  - **Q:** **Rava** asked, the Gemara says that the **Rabanan** allow a bedika to be done after the issur chametz has begun and we are not concerned that he will come to eat from it. Yet, the **Rabanan** (the shita of **R' Meir**) did not allow the handling of the new produce out of concern that one would come to eat from it!? **A:** The **Rabanan** say, with regard to chametz, the person is searching for it to destroy it! He will therefore not come to eat from it.
    - **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the reason **R' Yehuda** is not goizer in the case of flour and dried grain of the new produce is because those are not fit to be eaten, so there is no reason to be goizer.
      - The Gemara says that this is a mistaken answer, because the raw produce (before it is ground or dried) is fit to be eaten.