



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

### Menachos Daf Samach Tes

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, does the Shte Halechem permit produce that is even only at the stage of "hanatza" (an earlier stage in development) or only produce that is already at the stage of "chanatah" (a later stage in development)? The Gemara explains that this doesn't refer to these stages in development of the produce itself, because we have learned that even if it takes root it become mutar with the Shte Halechem. Rather, the question is where the leaves that precede the fruit were at these stages, would the Shte Halechem be matir them? **TEIKU**.
  - **Q: Rava bar R' Chanan** asked, is the Omer matir wheat kernels that were planted in the ground? The Gemara explains that the question can't be regarding what grows from the kernels, because a Mishna clearly says that if something took root before the Omer the Omer is matir it, and if it did not, the Omer is not matir it. Rather, the question is regarding the kernels themselves – where he put them into the ground to plant them before the Omer and they had not yet taken root before the Omer, and after the Omer he changed his mind and decided to eat the kernels and not have them grow. The question is, do we view the kernels as having simply been placed into a "keili" and the Omer is therefore matir them, or do we say that they became batel to the ground by having been planted and the Omer is therefore not matir them?
    - **Q2:** Are these kernels subject to ona'ah (which only applies to moveable property) or not? The question is, do we view the kernels as having simply been placed into a "keili" and ona'ah therefore applies to them, or do we say that they became batel to the ground by having been planted and therefore ona'ah does not apply?
    - **Q3:** Would a person swear regarding these kernels or not? The question is, do we view the kernels as having simply been placed into a "keili" and a person would therefore swear regarding them, or do we say that they became batel to the ground by having been planted and therefore no oath is taken regarding them?
    - With regard to all these questions the Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, what is the status of kernels of wheat or barley that are found in animal waste?
  - **Q:** Status regarding what? It can't be whether it can become tamei as food, because a Braisa clearly says that it would only have the status as food for tumah if it was taken from the waste with intent to eat. It can't be whether these kernels can be used for a korbon mincha, because that is clear that that would not be proper! **A:** The question is if these kernels are then planted and he wants to bring a mincha from the grains that grow from these kernels, is that allowed? Are the kernels themselves not fit for a korbon because they are disgusting, but the produce that grows from them is not disgusting and should therefore be ok, or are the kernels not fit because they are of low quality (having gone through the digestive system of the animal) and the produce that grows from them is also of low quality and therefore also not fit?
  - The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, what is the halacha if an elephant swallowed a basket made of the fibers of a palm tree and the basket then exited with the wastes of the animal?
  - **Q:** Status regarding what? The question can't be whether it loses its tumah status, because a Mishna says that a keili only loses its tumah status when there is a physical change to the keili! **A:** Rather, the question is where the elephant swallowed the fibers which then came out with its wastes, and the person then used those fibers to make a basket. The question is, do we say that since it has gone through the digestive system it

has the status of wastes and therefore the basket has the status of keilim made of wastes, which are not mikabel tumah, or do we say that it is a keili made of fibers, which can be mekabel tumah?

- **A:** We can answer from **Ulla in the name of R' Shimon bar Yehotzadak**, who said that it once happened that wolves swallowed two babies and the bodies then came out with the wastes of the animals. The **Chachomim** said that the flesh was tahor. We see that anything that goes through the digestive system gets the status of wastes.
  - The Gemara says this is not a proof, because flesh is soft and that may be why it gets the status of wastes, but palm fibers are harder and maybe therefore doesn't get that status.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the next part of that ruling which said that the **Chachomim** said that the bones of the children were tamei. We see that since they are harder they do not get the status of wastes, and the same should be true for palm fibers!? **A:** It may be that bones are extremely hard and therefore don't get the status, but palm fibers, which are softer than bones, may get the status of wastes.
- **Q: R' Zeira** asked, what is the halacha with regard to wheat that came down from the clouds?
  - **Q:** The halacha with regard to what? It can't be whether or not this wheat can be used for a mincha, because there is no reason that it shouldn't be able to be used for that!? **A:** Rather, the question is whether this wheat can be used for the Shte Halechem. The pasuk says "mimoshvoseichem", which comes to exclude wheat from chutz laaretz, but would not exclude wheat that comes down from the clouds, or do we say that it comes to exclude wheat from the clouds as well?
    - **Q:** Can there even be such a case that we should even concern ourselves with that question? **A:** There can be, as in fact it once happened for Bar Adi the Arab.
- **Q: R' Shimon ben Pazi** asked, if grain grew to one third of its eventual size before the Omer was offered and it was uprooted before the Omer, and it was then replanted after the Omer and grew more, can it be eaten before the next Omer? Do we follow the root, and that was made mutar with the Omer that has already been offered, or do we follow the growth and must wait until the following year's Omer? **A:** We can answer from the following. We have the statement of **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan**, who said that fruits of orlah that are grafted onto an old tree and grew there, even 200 times the old growth, remain assur as orlah. We see that we follow the original root of the fruit. We also have the statement of **R' Shmuel bar R' Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason**, that an onion that grew as kilayim in a vineyard, and then grew more after the vineyard was removed, remains assur. Again, we see that we follow the original root of the onion.
  - **Q:** The Gemara says that the question was whether we are certain that we follow the root, or is it that we are unsure and therefore only follow the root l'chumra, not l'kula? Based on this, these statements would not answer the question.
    - The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.