



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf כו – Daf לו

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כו---62-----

USHTEI HALECHEM USHNEI KIVSEI ATZERES...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’heinif haKohen osam ahl lechem habikkurim”. We would think that the lambs should be put on top of the breads. The pasuk therefore says “ahl shnei kevasim”, which suggests that the breads go on top. Now that we have the pasuk seemingly equating the two, we look to see what is done elsewhere. We find that elsewhere the bread is put on top, so we do that here as well. [Q: Where is the elsewhere that we find that the bread is put on top? A: **R’ Pappa** said we see this by the Milu’im.] **R’ Yose ben Hameshulam** says the lambs go on top, and the pasuk of “ahl shnei kevasim” is there to teach to exclude the 7 olah lambs from being part of the tenufa. **Chanina ben Chachinai** says that the breads are put in between the thighs of the lambs and the tenufa is then done, with the result being that the bread is on top of the lambs and under the lambs. **Rebbi** said we would not serve bread in such an undignified manner even to a human king, so certainly we would not do so for Hashem! Rather, we put the breads next to the lambs and we do the tenufa like that.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says “ahl”, so how can **Rebbi** say that they are put side by side? **A: R’ Chisda** said to **R’ Hamnuna**, **Rebbi** is following his view elsewhere where he says that the word “ahl” can be interpreted as meaning “next to”.

MOLICH UMEIVI MAALEH UMORID...

- **R’ Chiya bar Abba in the name of R’ Yochanan** explains, they are waved out and in to symbolize that it is being done for Hashem, Who owns all four corners of the Earth. They are waved up and down to symbolize that it is being done for Hashem, Who owns the Heavens and the Earth. In Eretz Yisrael they said in the name of **R’ Chama bar Ukva in the name of R’ Yose the son of R’ Chanina**, it is waived in and out to ward off bad winds. It is then waived up and down to ward off bad dew.
 - **R’ Yose bar Avin** said, we see from here that even the non-essential parts of a mitzvah hold off punishment, because the waving is not essential and yet it wards off bad winds and bad dew.
 - **Rava** said, the same waving process is done to the lulav as well.
 - **R’ Acha bar Yaakov** would waive the lulav out and in, and would say, “this is an arrow in the eye of the Satan”.
 - The Gemara says, one should not say this, because it will incite the Satan to cause him to do aveiros.
- A Braisa says, the Shavuot shelamim lambs require tenufa after their shechita. **Rebbi** says the entire animal is used for the tenufa, whereas the **Rabanan** say that only the chazeh and shok are used.
 - **R’ Chisda** explained the machlokes to **R’ Hamnuna** as follows. The **Rabanan** say that we learn the requirement for tenufa after shechita from an individual’s shelamim, and therefore also learn from there that just as there it is only done with the chazeh v’shok the same is regarding the Shavuot shelamim. **Rebbi** holds that although we learn the tenufa requirement from there, the tenufa must be done with the whole animal, which is how the tenufa of the Shavuot shelamim before the shechita is done.
 - **R’ Pappa** explained that **Rebbi** holds that we do learn it all from the individual’s shelamim, but he learns that just as there the part that is given to the Kohen is the part that has the tenufa done to it (only the chazeh and shok are given to the Kohen), so too here, the part that is given to the Kohen has the tenufa done to it (here the *entire* animal is eaten by the Kohen).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Ravina** explained that the **Rabanan** darshen the word “shalmeyhem” (written in the plural regarding the individual’s shelamim) to teach that even the tzibbur’s shelamim only uses the chazeh and shok for the tenufa.

R’ SHIMON OMER SHLOSHA MININ TE’UNIN SHALOSH MITZVOS...

- **Q:** We should say that an individual’s shelamim should require tenufa while it is alive, based on a kal v’chomer – if the tzibbur’s shelamim, which doesn’t need semicha when alive, needs tenufa when alive, then the individual’s shelamim, which needs semicha when alive, should surely need tenufa when alive!? **A:** The pasuk regarding the tzibbur’s shelamim says “osam”, which comes to exclude the individual’s shelamim from the tenufa while alive.
- **Q:** We should say that the tzibbur’s shelamim requires semicha based on a kal v’chomer – if the individual’s shelamim, which does not need tenufa when alive, still needs semicha, then the tzibbur’s shelamim, which does need tenufa when it is alive, certainly needs semicha!? **A:** **Ravina** said, we have a kabbalah that there are not more than 2 tzibbur korbanos that need semicha.
- **Q:** We should say that a metzora’s asham needs tenufa after shechita based on a kal v’chomer – if the individual’s shelamim, which does not need tenufa when alive, still needs tenufa after shechita, then the metzora’s asham, which does need tenufa when it is alive, certainly needs tenufa after shechita!? **A:** The pasuk regarding the individual’s shelamim says “oso”, which comes to exclude the metzora’s asham from the requirement of tenufa after shechita.
- A Braisa says, if 5 people jointly bring a korbon, one person does the tenufa on behalf of all the rest of them. When a woman brings a korbon, the Kohen does the tenufa on her behalf. Similarly, one who sends a korbon from overseas, the Kohen does the tenufa on the owner’s behalf.

-----Daf 10---63-----

MISHNA

- If someone promises to bring a “machavas”, he may not instead bring a “marcheshes”, and visa-versa.
- What is the difference between a machavas and a marcheshes? **R’ Yose Haglili** says, the difference is that a marcheshes has a cover and a machavas does not. **R’ Chanina ben Gamliel** says, a marcheshes is made in a deep pan and it “shakes” (because of the fluffy nature) whereas a machavas is shallow and is hard.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the reason for **R’ Yose’s** view? It can’t be based on similar uses of these words that can suggest marcheshes as referring to something that is covered and machavas as referring to something that is uncovered, because we find other uses of these words with the opposite references!? **A:** Rather, he had a kabbalah that this is what each one means.

R’ CHANINA BEN GAMLIEL OMER...

- The reason for his view is that the pasuk says “**bam**marcheshes”, which means “in” rather than “on”, which means that it refers to something that is deep. Regarding machavas the pasuk says “ahl”, which suggests that it is something that is shallow.
- A Braisa says, **B”S** say, if someone promises to bring a marcheshes (rather than making a promise to bring “in a marcheshes”), he must wait until Eliyahu comes to tell him what to do. [**B”S** is uncertain whether “marcheshes” refers to the keili or to the actual mincha.] **B”H** say, there was a keili in the Mikdash called a marcheshes [**B”H** hold it is called marcheshes because of the keili].

MISHNA

- If one promises to bring a mincha that was baked in a tanur oven, he may not fulfil this promise with something that was baked in a kupach oven, or on a re’afim oven (heated tiles), or in the Arabian pots that were used for baking. **R’ Yehuda** says he can bring a mincha baked in a kupach oven.
- If one promises to bring a baked mincha, he may not bring half as challos and half as rekikin. **R’ Shimon** says that he may, because both types are under the title of a baked mincha.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “maafei tanur” which teaches that it may not be baked in a kupach, on re’afin, or in Arabian pots. **R’ Yehuda** says, the word “tanur” is written twice, which comes to allow the mincha baked in a kupach. **R’ Shimon** says, the two words of tanur are used to teach that they must be baked in a tanur, and that they become kadosh in the tanur.
 - **Q:** We find that **R’ Shimon** allows the baking of the Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim in the Beis Pagi (which was outside the Azarah). Now, if it becomes kadosh in the oven, they would become passul for being outside the Azarah!? **A:** **Rava** said, **R’ Shimon** means that a person should say that he is making the flour kadosh for the sake of being baked in an oven.

HAREI ALAI MINCHAS MAAFEH LO YAVI MECHTZA...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the mincha baked in an oven says “v’chi sakriv”, which refers to a voluntary korbbon mincha, “korbbon mincha” – **R’ Yehuda** says this teaches that the entire korbbon must be brought of one kind (either challos or rekikin). **R’ Shimon** said to him, the pasuk says “korbbon” once, but also says it is challos and rekikin, which teaches that it may be brought of either type or of both types, which would then be mixed together and one kometz would be taken from the mixture, and even if the kometz is of only one of them he would still be yotzeh. **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** says, the pasuk of the baked mincha is followed by the pasuk of the marcheshes and the machavas. Just as the second pasuk refers to a korbbon brought exclusively of one type, the pasuk regarding the baked mincha does as well.
 - **R’ Yehuda** disagrees with what was said to him by **R’ Shimon**, because he says the pasuk does say “bashemen” twice, which is functionally the same as if the pasuk had said the word korbbon twice. **R’ Shimon** says that the double mention of bashemen is needed to teach that the korbbon may be brought exclusively of either of the two types, and need not be brought of a mixture of the two.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between the opinions of **R’ Yehuda** and his son **R’ Yose**? **A:** According to **R’ Yehuda**, if one brought a mixture of the two it would be valid b’dieved. According to **R’ Yose** it would be passul.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAMENACHOS!!!

PEREK R’ YISHMAEL -- PEREK SHISHI

MISHNA

- **R’ Yishmael** says, when the Omer was brought on Shabbos it was processed from 3 se’ah of barley (which was then ground and refined to produce one issaron of fine flour). If it was brought during the week it was processed from 5 se’ah of barley. The **Chachomim** say that in both cases it was processed from 3 se’ah.
- **R’ Chanina Sgan HaKohanim** said, on Shabbos the barley for the Omer was cut by one person, with one sickle, and put into to one box. During the week it was done with 3 people, put into 3 boxes, and used 3 sickles. The **Chachomim** say, that in both cases it was cut with 3 people, using 3 boxes, and 3 sickles.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The view of the **Rabanan** is understandable, because they hold that 3 se’ah of barley is what is needed to produce one issaron of fine flour, and that is why the same amount of barley is used whether the Omer is brought on Shabbos or a weekday. However, what does **R’ Yishmael** hold? If 5 se’ah is needed to produce that amount of fine flour, then that amount should even be used on Shabbos. If only 3 se’ah is needed, then that amount should even be used on a weekday!? **A:** **Rava** said, **R’ Yishmael** holds that an issaron of fine flour can be processed without much effort from 5 se’ah, but can also be processed with effort from 3 se’ah. During the week we use the 5 to yield the better result. On Shabbos, we rather that one do more sieving than cutting.
 - **Q:** **Rabbah** said, maybe we can say that **R’ Yishmael** and **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yochanan ben Broka** share the same view. A Braisa says that **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yochanan ben Broka** says that when the Korbbon Pesach is brought on Shabbos, the animal may only be skinned from its hind legs until its

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

chest (which gives one the ability to easily remove the parts of the animal that must be offered on the Mizbeach). The **Chachomim** say that the animal may be fully skinned (like any other year). Presumably, the view of **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka** is based on the same idea that on Shabbos we may not do more melacha than is absolutely necessary? **A:** The Gemara says, it may be that **R' Yishmael** only holds that way in our Mishna, because there is no disgracing of kodashim involved. However, regarding the skinning of a korbon, where less than a full skinning is disgraceful for the animal, maybe he would agree with the **Chachomim**. **A2:** We can also say that **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka** only holds that way there, because the full purpose is accomplished with this limited melacha. However, in the case of the Omer, 5 se'ah would produce a better flour, and therefore he may agree that we may do the extra melacha associated with using 5 se'ah of flour.

-----Daf 70--64-----

- **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 korbon 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 for 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

Daf 70--65

MISHNA

- How would they cut the barley for the Omer? The sheluchim of Beis Din would go out on Erev Pesach and tie the barley into bundles that were still attached to the ground, so that it would be easier to cut. At the night going into the second day of Pesach (which is when the barley was cut), all the people of the cities nearby would gather near the field so that the barley be cut with a lot of fanfare. The person who would be cutting the barley would ask the people, “Has the sun set?” The people would say “yes”. He would then repeat the question and they would repeat their answer. He would then ask, “Should I cut with this sickle?” They would say “yes”. He would then repeat the question and they would repeat the answer. He would then ask, “Should I use this box?” The people would say “yes”. He would then repeat the question and they would repeat the answer. If it was Shabbos he would ask them, “Should I cut even though it is Shabbos?” The people would say “yes”. He would then repeat the question and they would repeat the answer. He would then ask, “Should I now cut?” The people would say “yes”. He would then repeat the question and they would repeat the answer. Each question and answer was actually repeated three times.
 - Why did they have to do all this (all these questions)? It was because of the Baisusim, who would say that the Omer should not be done until the first Motzei Shabbos after the first day of Pesach. We therefore want to make it known that we are not following their view.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, these are the days that one may not fast, and some of them one may also not make a hesped: from Rosh Chodesh Nisnon until the 8th, because the Korbon Tamid was correctly established during that time and therefore one may not even make a hesped. From the 8th until after Pesach one may not make a hesped, because the Yom Tov of Shavuot was firmly established. From Rosh Chodesh until the 8th the Tamid was established in that the Tzedukim darshened the pesukim to allow private donation of the Korbon Tamid, and the **Rabanan** bested them and established that it must come from the tzibbur’s fund. From the 8th until after Pesach it is also considered a Yom Tov, because the **Rabanan** bested the Baisusim regarding the Halacha of when to begin counting the Omer which results in the arriving at the proper time for Shavuot. The Baisusim said it begins on the Motzei Shabbos following the first day of Pesach. **R’ Yochanan ben Zakai** said to them, “What is your basis for saying this!?” One elder said to him, Moshe Rabbeinu loved the Yidden, so he set up Shavuot to always fall on a Sunday so that it should always follow Shabbos and the Yidden can have two festive days in a row. **R’ Yochanan** said to him, if you are correct that Moshe went against Hashem’s will because of his love for the Yidden, why did he keep the Yidden in the Midbar for 40 years when he could have traveled and entered EY in just 11 days!? The elder said, is that really how you will dismiss my claim? **R’ Yochanan** said, the real reason is based on the pesukim – one pasuk says that we count the Omer for 50 days, which suggests that it may start on any day of the week (not just a Sunday), and another pasuk says that we count for “7 complete weeks”, which

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

suggests that we begin counting on a Sunday. We must understand this contradiction by saying that the first pasuk discusses a year in which Pesach fell out at some point during the week and the second pasuk discusses a year in which Pesach fell out on a Shabbos.

- The Braisa continues, **R' Eliezer** said that we don't need **R' Yochanan's** proof to refute the Baisusim. The pasuk regarding counting the Omer says "tispar lach", which teaches that the counting is up to the decision of Beis Din, based on when they decide to make the new month. The words "mimacharas hashabbos" must therefore mean the day after Yom Tov, because the day after Shabbos is not something that is determined by Beis Din. It is Yom Tov that is determined by Beis Din through their deciding when Rosh Chodesh should be.
- The Braisa continues, **R' Yehoshua** says, the pasuk says to count days and make holy the Rosh Chodesh. The pasuk similarly says to count the Omer and make holy the day of Shavuos. Just as we know when we begin counting the new month, the beginning of the counting of the Omer must be at an easily identifiable time – which is the 16th of Nisson, not the Sunday after the Yom Tov (since that can fall out on a number of different dates, depending on the year).
- The Braisa continues, **R' Yishmael** says, there is a requirement to bring the Omer on Pesach and to bring the Shte Halechem on Shavuos. Just as the Shte Halechem is brought at the beginning of Shavuos, so too the Omer must always be brought at the beginning of Pesach.
- The Braisa continues, **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** says, the pasuk regarding the Omer says "Shabbos" and the pasuk regarding the Shte Halechem says "Shabbos". This teaches that just as Shavuos falls out immediately after the last week of the counting of the Omer, so too Pesach must be immediately preceding the starting of the counting of the Omer.

-----Daf 10---66-----

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "usfartem lachem" teaches that the counting must be done by every person. The words "mimacharas haPesach" refer to the day after Yom Tov. Maybe it means the day after Shabbos (i.e. Sunday)?
 - **R' Yose bar Yehuda** said, the pasuk says "tispiru chamishim yom", which means there must be 50 days of counting – not more. Now, if we begin counting on Sunday, some years it will be 50 days from Pesach, some years it will be 51, some 52, 53, 54, 55, and even 56 days!
 - **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** said, "tispar lach" teaches that the count begins on a day that is determined by Beis Din (which is Yom Tov, based on the fact that they determine when Rosh Chodesh is), and Shabbos is not determined by Beis Din.
 - **R' Yose** said, "mimacharas hashabbos" must refer to Yom Tov. If it refers to a regular Shabbos, how do we even know which Shabbos of the year this refers to? Rather, it must refer to the Yom Tov. Also, the pasuk regarding the Omer says "Shabbos" and the pasuk regarding the Shte Halechem says "Shabbos". This teaches, that just as the Shabbos of the Shte Halechem means it is close to the Yom Tov and at the beginning of the Yom Tov, so too the Omer must be near the Yom Tov of Pesach and at the beginning of the Yom Tov of Pesach.
 - **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, one pasuk says matzah should be eaten for 6 days and one pasuk says it should be eaten for 7 days. We can explain this by saying that there is matzah that may only be eaten for 6 days of Pesach. This refers to matzah made from the new grains, which may only be eaten beginning on the second day of Pesach.
- The Braisa continues, the pasuk says "miyom havi'achem...tispiru", which can mean that the barley should be cut and the Omer should be brought on the second day of Pesach, but the counting can even begin at a later date. The pasuk therefore says "meihacheil chermeish bakamah tacheil lispor", which teaches that the count begins when the barley is cut, even before the Omer is brought. If we only had this second pasuk we would think that the barley is cut and the count begins on the second day of Pesach, but the Omer could be offered even at a later date. The first pasuk teaches that the count does not begin until the day that the Omer is brought. If we only had the pasuk of "miyom havi'achem" we would think that the cutting, the counting and the offering of the Omer must all be done during the daytime. The pasuk therefore says "shevah shabbasos temimos tihiyena",

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

which means that the counting must begin at night, because that is the only way that we can achieve 7 full weeks (and the cutting must also be done at night, because the cutting must be done before the counting begins). We would think that the Omer should also be brought at night. The pasuk therefore says “miyom havi’achem”. From all the pesukim together we learn that the cutting and counting are done at night and the Omer is offered during the daytime.

- **Rava** said, all the proofs that were brought to prove the correctness of our view over that of the Baisusim can be refuted, except for the proofs brought by the last two Tanna'im of the first Braisa and of the second Braisa which cannot be refuted. He explains: **R' Yochanan Ben Zakai's** proof (based on the pasuk's mentioning days and weeks) can be explained as **Abaye** said, that this teaches that there is a mitzvah to count the days and a mitzvah to count the weeks; **R' Eliezer's** and **R' Yehoshua's** proofs, each of which said that the counting must begin on a fixed day of the month, can be refuted by saying that maybe it refers to the last day of Yom Tov (and not the second day). However, the proofs of **R' Yishmael** and **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** can't be refuted (because they prove that it must be referring to the beginning of the Yom Tov). **Rava** continues with the second Braisa: **R' Yose bar Yehuda's** proof which was based on the fact that the count must be for exactly 50 days can be refuted by saying that this refers to 50 days without the additional days (as explained in the Braisa); **R' Yehuda ben Beseira's** proof is the same as the proof of **R' Eliezer** of the first Braisa, and can therefore be refuted in the same way. In fact, **R' Yose** himself realized this flaw in his proof and therefore gave an additional proof, which is like that of **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** of the first Braisa and can also not be refuted.
 - We mentioned that **Abaye** says that there is a mitzvah to count the days and to count the weeks. The Gemara says, the **Rabanan** of **R' Ashi's** yeshiva would count the days and the weeks. **Ameimar** would only count days and not weeks. He explained that counting today (after the Churban) is only done as a remembrance for the Mikdash, and therefore it suffices to count days.

MISHNA

- They would cut the barley and put it into boxes. They would bring it to the Azarah and would toast it over a fire to fulfil the mitzvah of “kali” (the pasuk says it should be toasted). This is the view of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** say that they would first hit the barley reeds and stems to remove the kernels of barley from the stalks. They used soft things like reeds, so that they not crush the kernels. They would then take these threshed kernels and put them into a copper pipe which was full of holes to allow the fire to reach all over and toast the kernels. They would then spread them out in the Azarah to allow the wind to blow on them. They would then put it in a mill made to grind beans (which did not make a fine flour) and would extract an issaron of fine flour from it after it had been through 13 sifters. Whatever was left over was redeemed and could be eaten by anyone. The redeemed flour is chayuv in challah but is patur from maaser. **R' Akiva** said it is chayuv in challah and maaser.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Omer says “aviv”, which refers to the first produce to be cut. The pasuk says “kaluy ba'aish” – **R' Meir** says this teaches that the Yidden would toast it over fire to fulfil the mitzvah of “kaluy”, and the **Chachomim** said “kaluy” does not refer to roasting directly on fire, rather it refers to roasting with some other medium in between, or **Others** said that the **Chachomim** said that “kaluy” refers to something shiny (the copper pipe that is used in this process). How was it done? There was a copper pipe with holes like a sifter that was used to toast the barley. The pasuk says “aviv kaluy...geres”. We wouldn't know if it should be toasted when “aviv” (when still whole) or when “geres” (when ground). The word “ba'aish” creates a separation in the pasuk and therefore teaches that it must be toasted before it is ground. The pasuk says “karmel”, which teaches that the barley should be “rach” and “mal” – soft and easily crushed. The Gemara brings other instances where we interpret a word as being a contraction of words. The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** darshened “karmel” to mean “kar” and “malei”, meaning “a full pillow” (the kernels should be plump and fully ripe).

V'R' AKIVA MECHAYUV B'CHALLAH UBIMAASROS

- **R' Kahana** said, **R' Akiva** would say that when grain is smoothed while it belonged to Hekdesh, it does not make it patur from maaser.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, a Braisa brings the machlokes between the **Rabanan and R' Akiva** of our Mishna, and then says further that the **Rabanan** said to **R' Akiva**, your view can be refuted from the case of the person who buys regular grain (not of the Omer) from Hekdesh, which is chayuv in challah and is patur from maaser. Now, according to **R' Kahana**, what are the **Rabanan** asking **R' Akiva**? **R' Akiva** would say in that case as well that it is chayuv in maaser!? Rather, it must be that **R' Akiva** holds that only the redeemed grain of the Omer is chayuv in maaser, but not other grains redeemed from Hekdesh! **Q2: R' Kahana bar Tachlifa** asked, a Braisa says that the reason why **R' Akiva** holds the redeemed grain is chayuv in challah and maaser is because the grain that ended up not being needed never became Hekdesh in the first place. **A:** Rather, **R' Yochanan** said, the reason of **R' Akiva** is not like **R' Kahana** explained, but is rather that he holds that the redeemed grain is chayuv in challah and maaser because the grain that ended up not being needed never became Hekdesh in the first place.
 - **Rava** said, it is obvious that grain smoothed while belonging to Hekdesh is patur from maaser. And, even **R' Akiva** holds this way and holds differently regarding the leftover flour of the Omer only because the grain that ended up not being needed never became Hekdesh in the first place. Whether grain that was smoothed while belonging to a goy is patur from maaser is subject to a machlokes Tanna'im in a Braisa. We also see from a Mishna that the mixing of a dough that took place while it belonged to Hekdesh makes it patur from challah.

-----Daf 70-----67-----

- **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 “ariseichem” – 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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 14th, the morning of the 14th, 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**)

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

-----Daf פ"ו-----68-----

MISHNA

- When the Korbon Omer is brought (on the second day of Pesach), the new grains may be eaten immediately. One who is not at the Beis Hamikdash to know when the korbon is brought may begin eating the new grains from chatzos on that day (at midday). When the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** instituted that the new produce ("chadash") should not be eaten the entire day of the 16th of Nisson. **R' Yehuda** asked, it is not **R' Yochanan** who was goizer this! It is assur that entire day D'Oraisa, based on the pasuk of "ahd etzem hayom hazeh"!
 - Why is it that the people who are not near the Beis Hamikdash may begin eating the chadash at chatzos? It is because they know that Beis Din will not delay in the bringing of the Omer.

GEMARA

- **Rav and Shmuel** both say, when the Beis Hamikdash is standing it is the Omer that is matir the new grains, and when the Beis Hamikdash is not standing it is the start of the morning of the 16th of Nisson that is matir the new grains. This is based on two seemingly contradictory pesukim. One pasuk says "ahd havi'achem" and another says "ahd etzem hayom hazeh". We must say that the pasuk that refers to the bringing of the Omer refers to when the Beis Hamikdash is standing, and the pasuk that refers to the morning of the 16th refers to when the Beis Hamikdash is no longer standing. **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** say that even when the Beis Hamikdash is standing it is the start of the morning on the 16th that is matir the new grains.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says "ahd havi'achem", which suggests that it is assur until the Omer is brought!? **A:** They say that this pasuk is teaching a mitzvah, but the issur is removed at the start of the day.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that the chadash becomes mutar immediately after the Omer is brought!? **A:** The Mishna is teaching a mitzvah.
 - **Q:** Another Mishna says that the Omer would be matir the new grains for consumption outside the Beis Hamikdash!? **A:** The Mishna is teaching a mitzvah.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that when the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** instituted that the new produce ("chadash") should not be eaten the entire day of the 16th of Nisson. What is his reason for this gezeira? The concern is, that when the Beis Hamikdash is rebuilt and one will need to wait for the bringing of the Omer to begin eating the chadash, he will not wait. He will think, that since the year before (when there was no Beis Hamikdash) he was allowed to eat the chadash on the morning of the 16th, there should be no change this year (he will not realize the significant difference between the years). By requiring one to wait until after the day of the 16th, he assured that no one will eat the chadash before the bringing of the Omer. Now, if the only reason for waiting for the Omer is a mitzvah, we would not be goizer for a mitzvah!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, that reason for the view of **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** is that he holds like **R' Yehuda**, that eating chadash on the 16th is actually assur D'Oraisa (based on the pasuk of "ahd etzem hayom hazeh").
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** and **R' Yehuda** argue about this in our Mishna, so how can we say that they shared the same view? **A: R' Yehuda** was mistaken into thinking that **R' Yochanan** meant that the prohibition of eating chadash on the 16th was only D'Rabanan, which is why he argued. However, in truth, **R' Yochanan** held that it is assur D'Oraisa.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna said that **R' Yochanan instituted**, which means that it is not D'Oraisa!? **A:** The Mishna means that he darshened the pasuk and instituted that the people should follow the Halacha that he felt was a D'Oraisa.
- **R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** would not eat the new grains until the night *after* the 16th of Nisnon (they did not wait an additional day for the “sfeika deyoma” even though they were in Bavel). They held that chadash is assur in chutz laaretz only D'Rabanan and we therefore don't need to be concerned for a safek. The **Rabanan of R' Ashi's** yeshiva would eat the chadash on the morning of the 17th of Nisnon. They held that chadash in chutz laaretz is assur D'Oraisa and therefore they waited for the morning of the 17th as a sfeika deyoma in case it was really the 16th (and they held that the chadash became mutar on the morning of the 16th). They held that **R' Yochanan ben Zakai's** halacha (of waiting until the end of the 16th day) is only D'Rabanan, and this was never enacted for a case of safek. **Ravina** said, my mother told me that my father would not eat the chadash until the night following the 17th of Nisnon, because he held like **R' Yehuda** that the chadash is assur D'Oraisa the entire 16th, and he was concerned for sfeika deyoma, so he waited until the end of the 17th day.

MISHNA

- The Omer would be matir the new grains for outside of the Mikdash and the Shte Halechem would be matir using the new grains for inside the Mikdash.
 - We do not bring menachos, bikkurim, or the mincha of an animal korban from the new grains before the Omer is offered. If it was brought before the Omer these korbanos are passul. These korbanos should also not be brought before the offering of the Shte Halechem, but if they were brought before, they are valid.

GEMARA

- **R' Tarfon** asked, why is it that if the korbanos are brought before the Omer they are passul, but if they are brought before the Shte Halechem they are valid? **Yehuda bar Nechemya** said, before the Omer the chadash is completely assur to all, but before the Shte Halechem the chadash is at least mutar outside the Mikdash, and therefore the korbanos will be mutar b'dieved. **R' Tarfon** remained quiet, which caused **Yehuda ben Nechemya's** face to shine. **R' Akiva** asked him, “Is your face shining because you bested an elder? I wonder if you will live long!” **R' Yehuda b'R' Illai** said, this exchange took place 2 weeks before Pesach, and when I went there for Shavuot and asked, I was told that **Yehuda ben Nechemya** had already passed away.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, according to **Yehuda ben Nechemya**, nesachim and bikkurim that were brought before the Omer was offered will be valid (since they are mutar to be eaten then).
 - **Q:** This is obvious!? **A:** We would think to say that the issur on new grain becomes weaker with the offering of the Omer, since it now becomes mutar for people to eat, and that is why even if it is offered on the Mizbe'ach after the Omer, it is valid. However, wine was never assur for people to drink, it was only assur to be brought on the Mizbe'ach. Therefore, we would think to say that since the issur was never weakened it should be passul. He therefore teaches, that the fact that it was never assur is even more reason to say that it is valid b'dieved.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, will the Shte Halechem be matir the new grains for use in the Mikdash if the Shte Halechem was brought from the new grains before the Omer? The case would be where grain was planted between the bringing of the Omer and the Shte Halechem, so the Shte Halechem was brought when they were in existence and the Omer of the following year would be brought when they were in existence. Since the korbanos are out of order for this grain, will the Shte Halechem still be matir or not? **A: Rabbah** said, a Braisa says that **R' Akiva** says it must be that the Omer is brought from barley, because the pasuk refers to the Shte Halechem as being the “first offering”, and if the Omer is brought from wheat the Shte Halechem (which is brought from wheat) would not be the first wheat offering! Now, if we say that the Shte Halechem can be matir the new grain to be offered in the Mikdash even if it is out of order, we can find a way for both the Omer and the Shte Halechem to be of wheat and yet have the Shte Halechem be considered the “first offering”. The case

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would be where the Omer is offered from wheat that took root before the Shteit Halechem but after the Omer of last year, and the Shteit Halechem is offered from wheat that took root before this year's Omer but after the Shteit Halechem of last year. Since **R' Akiva** gives this proof, it must be that the Shteit Halechem does not permit grains for the Mikdash when it is out of order.

- The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. When we say that the Shteit Halechem must be the "first offering" we don't mean that in regard to the grains that it comes to be matir. Rather, we say that it must be so in regard to the Mizbe'ach, and in this case the Mizbe'ach would have already had a korban from this year's grain by the time the Shteit Halechem is offered.