



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

### Menachos Daf Ayin

- **Q: Rava** asked, do we follow the root with regard to maaser? The Gemara explains, the case in question is where one gave maaser on produce based on estimation before it was threshed, then replanted them and they became bigger. The question is, if we say that we don't follow the root and the increased amount therefore needs to have maaser taken from it, does the root need maaser taken again as well?
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, why is this different than any case of wheat or barley that is replanted after taking maaser from them, where he must give maaser from the entire new crop (and he doesn't subtract the amount used as the seeds)? The same should be in this case!? **A: Rava** said, seeds decompose before they grow, and therefore it is certainly all considered to be a new crop. The question is when replanting things that do not decompose.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from **R' Yitzchok in the name of R' Yochanan** who said that when onions for which maaser was given are then replanted and grew, maaser must then be taken for the entire onion again. This is so even though the root remains and does not decompose, and therefore answers **Rava's** question. **A:** The Gemara says the case of onions is different, because that is the normal way of planting onions. However, it is not normal to replant ears of grain and therefore that case may be different.
  - **R' Chanina bar Minyumei** asked **Abaye**, what is the halacha regarding taking maaser from produce grown in a flowerpot without a hole for produce grown in another flowerpot without a hole? **Abaye** asked, if both flowerpots have no hole why would we not be able to take maaser from one for the other (they are both only chayuv D'Rabanan)? Maybe your question is where it began growing without a hole in the pot and a hole was then made in the pot, with more growth taking place after the hole was made, and your question is really whether maaser can be taken from within this pot for the whole pot? Although this seems to be the same question that **Rava** asked, it is actually different. In the case of making the hole in the flowerpot, there is only one planting, and it therefore makes sense to view the entire plant as one item. However, when something was picked and then replanted it can be looked at as separate entities, and that is why **Rava** asked whether it is looked at as part of the increased produce or not.
  - **Q: R' Avahu** asked, if an ear of grain was cut off the ground and smoothed into a pile, and was then replanted and declared to be terumah while it was still attached to the ground, is it terumah or not? Do we say that since it was smoothed into a pile it became chayuv in terumah and can therefore become terumah, or do we say that since it was replanted it is no longer chayuv in terumah and therefore cannot become terumah? **A:** The **Rabanan** said to **Abaye**, if it does become terumah we would have a case of terumah that is still attached to the ground, and a Mishna says that there is no such thing as terumah that is still attached to the ground. **Abaye** said, that Mishna is not a proof, because that Mishna is only talking about whether a non-Kohen would be chayuv for eating terumah that is still attached to the ground, because eating something that is still attached to the ground is not considered to be an act of eating. It does not mean that it would not have the status of terumah in all respects.
    - **Q:** The Gemara asks, we find that **Ilfa** says that if one eats an egg from inside the neveila of a kosher bird, it will make him tamei like the bird itself. Now, eating in that manner is also not the normal way of eating and yet it is considered to be an act of eating!? **A:** That is a more normal way of eating than eating something that is still attached to the ground.

- **R' Tavyumei bar Kisma in the name of Shmuel** said, planting kilayim in a flowerpot without a hole is assur D'Rabanan.
  - **Abaye** said, if he would say that the person who plants this would get malkus D'Rabanan, I can understand the novelty of his statement. If he is simply saying that the planting in a flowerpot without a hole is considered to be a planting D'Rabanan, that is something that we already know from a Mishna. Therefore, it must be that he is telling us that the planter would get malkus D'Rabanan.

#### MISHNA

- Wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye are the grains that are chayuv in challah, and they combine with each other to create the chiyuv. They are also assur as chadash before the bringing of the Omer and are assur to be harvested before Pesach. If they took root before the Omer, the Omer makes them permitted. If they did not, they are assur until the bringing of the Omer of the following year.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says that spelt is in the wheat family, whereas oats and rye are in the barley family (with regard to terumah one must give terumah for produce of the same family).
- **Q:** How do we know that only these 5 grains are chayuv in challah, but rice and “dochan” are not? **A: Reish Lakish** said, we have a gezeira shava on the word “lechem” from matzah, which teaches that just as matzah must be made from one of these 5 grains, challah is only a chiyuv of these 5 grains.
  - **Q:** How do we know that one must use matzah only of these 5 grains? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk places the issur of chametz next to the mitzvah of matzah to teach that only something which can become chametz may be used for the matzah obligation.

#### UMITZ'TARFIN ZEH IHM ZEH

- A Braisa says that unprocessed kernels of grain, flour, and dough combine with each other.
  - **Q:** With regard to what halacha is this referring? **A: R' Kahana** said, it refers to chadash. **R' Yosef** said, it refers to chametz on Pesach. **R' Pappa** said, it refers to one who eats this of maaser sheini outside Yerushalayim and would get malkus. **Rava** said, it refers to food tumah and teaches that the shells of the barley grain and the bran in the flour do not count towards the size needed for food tumah.
    - A Braisa supports **Rava** with regard to the shells of the barley.
    - **Q:** A Braisa of **R' Yishmael** says that the barley shell *is* included!? **A:** This Braisa is referring to moist shells. The earlier Braisa is referring to dry shells.

#### VA'ASURIN B'CHADASH MILIFNEI HA'OMER

- **Q:** How do we know that chadash only applies to these 5 grains? **A: Reish Lakish** said, we learn this from a gezeira shava on the word “lechem” from matzah.

#### V'LIKTZOR LIFNEI HAPESACH

- **Q:** How do we know that this applies to these 5 grains? **A: R' Yochanan** said, this is learned from a gezeira shava on the word “reishis” from challah.
- **Q:** Until what point in the Omer process is chadash assur to be eaten? **A: R' Yonah** said, it is only before the Omer is harvested. **R' Yosef bar Zavda** said, it is assur until the Omer is actually brought.
  - **Q:** The Mishna made two statements – these grains are assur as chadash is assur before the Omer, and these grains may not be harvested before Pesach. Now, according to **R' Yosef** it makes sense that these statements couldn't be combined. However, according to **R' Yonah**, why didn't the Mishna say that they are assur as chadash and may not be harvested before Pesach? **A:** Rather, the machlokes must have been regarding the end of the Mishna, where it said that if the grains took root before the Omer, the Omer is matir them. Regarding that statement the question was, at what point in the Omer process must it have already taken root? **R' Yonah** said before the Omer is brought and **R' Yosef** said before the Omer is harvested.
- **R' Elazar** asked **R' Yoshiya** of his generation, how do we know that the Omer is only matir grains that have already taken root? **R' Yoshiya** said, the pasuk says “aviv” – the Omer must come from ripe grain – which means that there is grain that is not considered ripe and will still become mutar with the Omer. This must refer to grain that has taken root.

- **Q:** Maybe this refers to grain that is not yet ripe but that has grown to at least a third of its growth? **A:** Rather, **Shmuel** said, the pasuk of “meihacheil chermeish” teaches that the Omer must come from grain that is fit to be cut by a sickle, which would seem to say that the Omer is matir even grain that cannot be cut with a sickle – which would seem to include grain that has only taken root.
  - **Q:** Maybe this refers to grain that has grown at least enough to be animal feed, but if it only took root the Omer would not be matir it? **A:** **R’ Yitzchak** said, the pasuk of “kamah” teaches that the Omer must come from grain that is already standing, which would seem to say that the Omer is matir even grain that cannot stand – which would seem to include grain that has only taken root.
    - **Q:** Maybe this refers to grain that has grown somewhat, but that is still soft and bendable and does not stand? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the pasuk says that the Omer is matir the grain “asher tizrah” – which teaches that it is matir grain that has been planted.
      - **Q:** **R’ Pappa** asked, if so, it should even be matir grain that has not yet taken root!? **A:** **Rava** said, the pasuk says “basadeh”, which means that the grain is already “part of the field”, which means that it must have already taken root.