



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf טו – Daf הו

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 טו---69-----

- **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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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**.

### -----Daf י'---70-----

- **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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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? **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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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' Yose 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' Yose** 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' Yose** 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.

-----Daf נ"ז---71-----

### MISHNA

- We may harvest the grains growing in irrigated fields in the valley (they are of inferior quality and therefore can't be used for the Omer, and are therefore not included in the prohibition of harvesting before the Omer), but the grain may not be piled before the Omer is brought.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The people of Yericho would harvest such grain before the Omer with the agreement of the **Chachomim**, and would even pile the grain but that was done against the will of the **Chachomim**, however the **Chachomim** did not protest their doing so.
- We may harvest “shachas” (unripe grain) for the purpose of using it as animal feed, before the cutting of the Omer. **R’ Yehuda** says this may only be done if the grain is harvested before it reaches one third of its eventual growth. **R’ Shimon** says this may be done even after it has reached one third of its eventual growth.
- We may harvest the grains that must be cut for the sake of trees (they grow near the trees and will ruin the trees or will create a kilayim problem) before the Omer. We may also harvest grains to clear a space needed for an Avel. We may also harvest grains to make place for people to learn Torah.
  - The stalks may not be made into bundles. Rather, they must be left untied.
- The mitzvah is for the Omer to be brought from standing grains. If there is none to be found (all grains have already been harvested), it can be brought from grain that was already cut.
- The mitzvah is for the Omer to be brought from moist, fresh kernels. If there is none to be found, it may be brought from dried kernels.
- The mitzvah is for the Omer to be cut at night (the night going into the 16<sup>th</sup> of Nisbon). If it was cut by day (on the 16<sup>th</sup>), it is valid.
  - The Omer overrides Shabbos.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R’ Binyamin** said, one pasuk says “ukitzartem es ketzira vahaveisem es Omer”, which suggests that harvesting may be done before the Omer, and another pasuk says “reishis ketzirchem ehl haKohen”, which suggests that the first harvest must be for the Omer. This teaches that in a place from which the Omer may be brought, nothing may be harvested before the Omer. In a place from which the Omer may not be brought, the grains may be harvested before the Omer.
  - **Q:** Maybe we should instead say that from a species from which the Omer may be brought the Omer must be the first harvest, but from a species from which the Omer may not be brought one may harvest the grains before the Omer? **A:** That can’t be correct, because we have learned a gezeira shava of **R’ Yochanan** which taught that all 5 grains are included in the issur of chadash.

### ANSHEI YERICHO KOTZRIN BIRTZON CHACHOMIM...

- The Mishna follows **R’ Yehuda**, who we find elsewhere discusses that there were instances where the **Chachomim** protested things done by the people of Yericho and instances where they did not.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** said, the people of Yericho had 6 practices: 3 that the Chachomim approved of, and 3 that they didn’t approve. The Chachomim approved of their practice of grafting palm trees the entire 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisbon, the practice of being “koreich” the shema, and the practice of cutting the grain before the Omer was brought. The Chachomim did not approve of their practice of piling the grain before the Omer was brought, the practice of making openings in their fences to allow the feeding of the fallen fruit to poor people on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and the practice of allowing the branches of hekdesch for personal use. **R’ Yehuda** said, if the Chachomim approved of the first 3, why didn’t everyone else do these things as well. Rather, the Chachomim disapproved of all 6, but they only protested 3 of them. They did not protest their practice of grafting palm trees the entire 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisbon, the practice of being “koreich” the shema, and the practice of cutting and piling the grain before the Omer was brought. They did protest their practice of allowing the branches of hekdesch for personal use, the practice of making openings in their fences to allow the feeding of the fallen fruit to poor people on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and the practice of giving pe’ah from vegetables. We see from the Braisa that **R’ Yehuda** holds that the harvesting was done *against* the wishes of the **Chachomim**, not like our Mishna that says it was done with their agreement!? **A:** If you count the number of items listed by **R’ Yehuda** in the Braisa, there are actually 7, not 6. We must remove mention of harvesting. Doing so will also resolve this contradiction.

### KOTZER L’SHACHAS UMACHIL L’BEHEIMA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Mishna lists a number of things that act as a separation in a field for purposes of “peyah” (and would require that peyah be left from both sides of the separation). **R’ Meir** says that a row of harvested shachas acts as a separation as well (presumably because he holds this is not viewed as a true act of harvesting and is therefore not viewed as the beginning of the harvesting of this field). The **Chachomim** say that this would not act as a separation unless he then plowed this area as well (presumably because they hold this is viewed as a true act of harvesting and is therefore viewed as the beginning of the harvesting of this field).
  - **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, **R’ Meir** (of this Mishna) follows the reasoning of **R’ Shimon** (of our Mishna), who says that the cutting of shachas, even after it has grown to 1/3 of its potential size, is not considered to be a significant act of cutting.
    - **Q: Rava** repeated this teaching. **R’ Acha bar Huna** asked him, a Braisa says that if a row of produce was eaten by locusts or ants or was severed by the wind, all would agree that if he then plowed it, it would be viewed as a separation, but if he did not, it would not be viewed as a separation. Now, presumably the “all agree” comes to include **R’ Meir**. If we say that the Mishna quoted above is only discussing shachas that had not yet reached 1/3 of its growth, we can understand why over there **R’ Meir** says it is not a significant act and is not viewed as a true harvest, whereas the Braisa is discussing shachas that has reached 1/3 of its growth and that is why **R’ Meir** views it as a significant act of harvest. However, if even the Mishna is discussing shachas that has reached 1/3 of its growth, and even there when a person cut it **R’ Meir** holds it is not a significant act of harvest, then in the Braisa, where the cutting was not done by human hands, **R’ Meir** would certainly hold that it is not a significant act of harvest!? **A:** Rather, **R’ Meir** of the Mishna follows the reasoning of **R’ Yehuda** of our Mishna, and holds it is only an insignificant act when the shachas has not yet reached 1/3 of its potential growth.
      - **Q: R’ Yehuda** only held this way regarding shachas that is cut for animal feed, but with regard to shachas cut for human consumption he would say that it is always considered to be a significant act of harvest. However, **R’ Meir** seems to say that even when it is cut for human consumption it is not a significant act! **R’ Meir** cannot be following the reasoning of **R’ Yehuda**!? **A:** Rather, **R’ Dimi** said that **R’ Meir** follows the view of his rebbi, **R’ Akiva**, who is explained by **Shmuel** to say in a Mishna that cutting of shachas even for human consumption is not considered to be a significant act.
        - **Q: R’ Akiva** holds that way even when the harvested grain has grown to more than 1/3 of its size!? **A: R’ Meir** holds like **R’ Akiva** regarding one thing (cutting for human consumption before the grain reaches 1/3 of its growth) and disagrees with him regarding one thing (cutting for human consumption after the grain has reached 1/3 of its potential growth).

### -----Daf עב--72-----

#### KOTZRIN MIPNEI HANETI’OS...

- The reason why these cuttings are allowed is because the pasuk says “ketzirchem” (“your cutting”), which teaches that cutting for the sake of a mitzvah is allowed.

#### V’LO YAASEH KRICHOS AVAL MANICHAN TZIVASIM

- The reason they should not be made into bundles is that we try to deal with chadash as little as possible, so we rather not be involved with it to tie it into bundles.

#### MITZVAS HA’OMER L’HAVI MIN HAKAMAH

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’ihm takriv minchas bikkurim” and then repeats and says “takriv eis minchas bikurecha”. This teaches that the mitzvah is to bring the Omer from standing crop. The word “takriv” teaches that if there is no standing crop it may even be brought from crops that were already cut. Another thing that “takriv” teaches is that even though it is a mitzvah to bring the Omer from moist kernels, if there are no such kernels to be found, it may be brought from dry kernels. Another thing that “takriv” teaches is that even though it is a mitzvah to cut it on the night going into the 16<sup>th</sup> of Nissov, if it was cut on the day of the 16<sup>th</sup> it is still valid.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

The word “takriv” also teaches that the Omer overrides Shabbos. The drashos are as follows: “takriv” – whatever it is (even if it was already cut), from any place (even far from Yerushalayim), even on Shabbos, and even in a state of tumah.

### NIKTZAR BAYOM KASHER

- **Q:** A Mishna says, the entire night is valid for: cutting the barley for the Omer and for burning the fats and limbs of a korbon. The general rule is, any mitzvah that must be done by day, may be done the entire day. Any mitzvah which must be done at night, may be done the entire night. Presumably, this is teaching that just as something that must be done during the day can't be done at night, so too a mitzvah that must be done at night may not be done during the day!? **A: Rabbah** said, our Mishna follows **Rebbi** (who allows the Omer to be cut during the day of the 16<sup>th</sup>) and this other Mishna is the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** (who says it may not be cut on the day of the 16<sup>th</sup>), as we see this view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** in a Braisa, where he argues on **Rebbi**.
  - **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** is following the view of his father's rebbi, **R' Akiva**, that with regard to a mitzvah overriding Shabbos, anything that can be done before Shabbos will not override Shabbos. He also follows the view of **R' Yishmael**, who holds that the cutting of the Omer is a mitzvah that overrides Shabbos. Therefore, he holds that if the Omer is valid b'dieved even if it was not harvested in the ideal way, the cutting of the Omer would not override Shabbos, since it could be cut on Friday and be valid b'dieved. From the fact that we know that it does override Shabbos proves that if it is not cut in the ideal way, it is passul.
    - **Q: Rebbi** was also a talmid of **R' Shimon** (as can be seen from a Braisa), which should mean that he also follows **R' Akiva's** view. If so, why does he hold that it is not essential that the Omer be cut that night? **A:** He holds like another ruling of **R' Shimon** which says that although the limbs and cheilev of a korbon may be offered at night, for a korbon that is brought on Shabbos we may still offer these parts during the day (although they are valid if offered at night), because we rather override Shabbos so that they are brought in the more ideal time. The same would be with the Omer – although it can be cut at another time, we would cut it on Shabbos, since that is the ideal time to have it cut.
      - **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** disagrees with this. He says this case is different, because once we override Shabbos for the shechita of the korbon, it may be overridden for the offering of the parts as well.
      - **Q: Rebbi** should make this differentiation as well!? **A: Rebbi** actually holds that the cutting of the Omer does *not* override Shabbos.
        - **Q:** There are a few places where the Mishnayos say that it does override Shabbos!? **A:** The Mishnayos do not follow **Rebbi**.
        - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if it is cut on the day of the 16<sup>th</sup> it is valid, and the Omer overrides Shabbos. Now, **Rebbi** is the one who holds that cutting on the day of the 16<sup>th</sup> is valid, so the Mishna is following his view, and the Mishna then says that the Omer overrides Shabbos. Presumably, this refers to the cutting of the Omer!? **A:** It refers to the offering of the Omer, which even **Rebbi** holds overrides Shabbos.
        - **Q:** A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says, we would only know that Tamid and Pesach override Shabbos and tumah, because the pasuk says “moed” regarding them. The pasuk regarding the mussafim of Yom Tov therefore ends off “eileh ta'asu LaShem b'moadeichem”, to teach that they too override Shabbos and tumah. We still don't know that the Omer and its accompanying items, and the Shte Halechem and their accompanying items (which are not written in the parsha with the mussafim) override Shabbos and tumah, therefore the pasuk says “vayidaber Moshe ess moadei Hashem” (written at the end of the parsha that discusses these korbanos as well as the mussafim of Yom Tov). Now, the Omer and the Shte Halechem are grouped together. The Shte Halechem is not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

offered on the Mizbe'ach, so the overriding of Shabbos refers to the grinding and sifting. Similarly, the overriding of Shabbos by the Omer must refer not to its offering, but rather to its cutting!? We see that **Rebbi** holds that even the cutting overrides Shabbos!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the offering of the Omer and to the baking of the Shte Halechem. **Rebbi** holds that the baking makes it kadosh and therefore if it is baked before Shabbos it would become passul with linah.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **Rebbi** holds the Shte Halechem become kadosh through the proper shechita and zrika of the Shavuot lambs!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa means that the breads become set and established as accompanying these lambs when the shechita and zrika are done properly. It is not referring to it becoming kadosh, because that happens when it is baked in the oven.

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK R' YISHMAEL!!!

### PEREK EILU MENACHOS NIKMATZOS -- PEREK SHEVI'I

#### MISHNA

- The following menachos have a kemitza taken off and the shirayim are then given to the Kohanim: a minchas soles, a machavas, a marcheshes, challos, rekikin, a mincha of a goy, a mincha of a woman, the Omer, a chatas mincha, and a sotah's mincha. **R' Shimon** says, the chatas mincha of a Kohen has a kemitza taken, the kemitza is burned on the Mizbe'ach, and the shirayim is then burned separately on the Mizbe'ach.

#### GEMARA

- **R' Pappa** said, wherever we have a list of menachos (like in our Mishna), it is always a list of ten. This comes to exclude the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that when a person promises to bring a baked mincha he may bring half of the required mincha as challos and half as rekikin. According to this view the Mishna should list an 11<sup>th</sup> case – where a person brings this mixed mincha. **R' Pappa** teaches that one may not bring a mixed mincha.

#### V'SHIREYHEN LAKOHANIM

- **Q:** How do we know that the shirayim are eaten by the Kohanim?
  - **Q:** From where is it known? Regarding some it is written explicitly, and regarding the others we have a general pasuk regarding menachos – “v'zos toras hamincha...” which says that the leftovers are eaten by the Kohanim!? **A:** That is regarding a mincha brought of wheat. We are asking regarding a mincha brought of barley.
    - **Q:** Even if it is brought of barley, once we know that a kemitza is taken we know that the shirayim are eaten, because if it is also burned why would we take off a kemitza!? **A:** We are asking according to **R' Shimon** who says that a kemitza is taken even where the shirayim are not eaten. According to him we are looking for a source that the shirayim of a mincha of barley is eaten.
  - **A: Chizkiya** said, the pasuk says “v'chol mincha b'lula bashemen vachareiva l'chol Bnei Aharon tihyeh”. This pasuk is not needed to teach regarding a mincha of wheat, and therefore it teaches that even a mincha of barley – whether it is of the type that is mixed with oil or not – has its shirayim eaten by the Kohanim.

### -----Daf ל"ג---73-----

- **Q:** The Gemara just said that **Chizkiya** said that the pasuk of “v'chol mincha b'lula bashemen vachareiva l'chol Bnei Aharon tihyeh” teaches that the shirayim of a barley mincha is also eaten by the Kohanim. The Gemara now asks, that pasuk is used by a Braisa to teach that one Kohen may not exchange his rights to a portion of one

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

mincha for a larger portion of another mincha and is therefore not available to teach this!? **A:** The Braisa's drasha is based on the word "v'chol", whereas **Chizkiya** uses the other words of the pasuk.

- **Q:** We used this pasuk earlier for the drasha of **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** that a baked mincha may not be brought of a combination of challos and rekikin!? **A:** **R' Yose** darshens the "vuv", whereas the Braisa darshens the word "chol".
- **Ravina** said that the source for the halacha that the shirayim of a barley mincha is eaten by the Kohanim is in a Braisa taught by **Levi**. The Braisa darshens a pasuk as follows:
  - The Braisa says, among the things given to Kohanim the pasuk says "kol korbanan", which comes to include the log of oil of a metzora. The Gemara says, we would think the pasuk of "min ha'aish" excludes the oil, since it is not put on the Mizbe'ach.
  - The Braisa says, "l'chol minchasam" includes the mincha of the Omer and the mincha of a sotah. We would think based on the pasuk that the Kohen only gets to eat from korbanos that are brought for a kapparah, and these are not brought for a kapparah. (These menachos are brought of barley, and this is therefore the source to teach that the shirayim of a barley mincha are eaten by the Kohanim).
  - The Braisa says, "ulichol chatasam" includes the chatas bird. We would think that this is not included, because it is a neveilah.
  - The Braisa says, "l'chol ashmam" includes the ashmam of a nazir and of a metzora. We would think he does not get these, because these are brought to make these people valid, not for a kapparah.
    - **Q:** The pasuk specifically says that the Kohen eats from the ashmam of a metzora!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk comes to include the ashmam of a nazir.
  - The Braisa says, "asher yashivu" includes the property stolen from a ger who then died.
  - The Braisa says, "lecha hu" comes to teach that it belongs to the Kohen to the extent that he can even be mekadesh a woman with it.
- **R' Huna** said, the Korbon shelamim of a goy is treated like an Olah (it is burned in its entirety on the Mizbe'ach, and the same would be true for a mincha that is brought by a goy). This can be based on logic, because a goy brings a korbon with the expectation and intention that the entire animal will be offered to Hashem. This can also be based on the pasuk from which we learn that a goy may bring a korbon, which says "asher yakrivu laHashem l'olah" – which we understand to mean that any korbon that they bring should be treated as an Olah.
  - **Q: R' Chama bar Gurya** asked, a Braisa says that the shelamim of a goy is eaten by a Yid!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa means that if the goy gives a shelamim for the sake of a Yid who is obligated to bring a shelamim, the shelamim is eaten by the Yid. However, if a goy brings a shelamim for himself, the entire animal would be burned on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q: R' Shizbi** asked, our Mishna says that the Kohanim eat the shirayim of a mincha brought by a goy. We see that they could bring a korbon that is eaten!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna follows **R' Yose Haglili** of a Braisa and **R' Huna** follows **R' Akiva** of a Braisa, where **R' Yose Haglili** darshens a pasuk to teach that a goy can bring any type of korbon other than that of a nazir, and **R' Akiva** says that a goy may only bring a Korbon Olah.
    - **Q:** We learn that a goy cannot become a nazir from a different pasuk, not the one cited by **R' Yose** in the Braisa!? **A:** If we only had the pasuk of **R' Yose** we would think that a goy can become a nazir, but can't bring the korbanos. The other pasuk is needed to teach that a goy cannot even become a nazir.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says, that if a goy sends a korbon along with money for the wine for nesachim, we use the money to buy the wine. If he did not send money, we take wine from the tzibbur. Shall we say that the Mishna only follows **R' Yose** and not **R' Akiva** (who says that a goy may only bring an olah)? **A:** It can even follow **R' Akiva**, because he allows a goy to bring an olah and all the things that need to accompany it (including the nesachim that must be brought with it).
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding nesachim says "ezrach", which teaches that only Yidden bring nesachim, not goyim. However, the pasuk says "kacha" which teaches that their korbanos must have nesachim (they either give the money and we buy the nesachim, or we bring nesachim from the communal fund). This seems not to follow **R' Yose**, because he says that a

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

goy can bring nesachim even without bringing an accompanying korban, and it seems to also not follow **R' Akiva**, because he says that a goy may only bring an olah and not nesachim!? **A:** We can say it follows **R' Yose**, and must amend the earlier Braisa to say that **R' Yose** does not allow a goy to bring nesachim on its own. We can also say that it follows **R' Akiva**, because he allows a goy to bring an olah and all the things that need to accompany it.

### -----Daf 74-----

R' SHIMON OMER MINCHAS CHOTEI SHEL KOHANIM...

- **Q:** What is the reasoning of **R' Shimon**? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of “v’huysa laKohen kamincha” teaches that if a Kohen must bring a chatas mincha, he may do the Avodah for himself. The Braisa asks, maybe the pasuk teaches that the chatas of a mincha may be eaten by the Kohen, and the other pasuk that says that the mincha of a Kohen is not eaten refers only to the minchas nedavah of a Kohen? The pasuk of “v’huysa laKohen kamincha” creates a hekesh of his obligatory mincha to his minchas nedavah, which teaches that just as his nedavah is not eaten, his obligatory mincha is not eaten either. **R' Shimon** said, the pasuk doesn’t say that it should be to the Kohen “kaminchaso” (“his mincha”), rather it says “kamincha”, which creates a hekesh between the chatas mincha of a Kohen and the chatas mincha of a Yisrael, and teaches that the chatas mincha of a Kohen also requires a kemitza. However, the pasuk says “laKohen kamincha”, which teaches that the Kohen’s chatas mincha is only like a Yisrael’s mincha with respect to the Avodah that must be done by a Kohen – i.e. the kemitza, but is not the same with regard to it being eaten by a Kohen. Rather, the chatas mincha of a Kohen must have a kemitza removed and offered, and then the shirayim are also offered onto the Mizbe’ach afterwards as well.
  - **Q:** The fact that a Kohen may do the Avodah of his own korban is learned in another Braisa from the pasuk of “uvah b’chol avas nafsho...v’sheireis”!? **A:** From that pasuk we would not know that this is even true for a korban which brings him a kapparah (e.g. his chatas).
    - **Q:** Another Braisa learns from the pasuk of “v’chiper haKohen ahl hanefesh hashogeges b’chetah bishgaga” that a Kohen may even do the Avodah for his own chatas!? **A:** From that pasuk we would only know that he can do the Avodah for a korban that brings a kapparah for an aveirah that he did b’shogeg. We would not know that this is even true for something he did b’meizid, like where he swore falsely denying the knowledge of testimony.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says, the chatas mincha of a Kohen must have a kemitza removed. The kometz is then burned on the Mizbe’ach and the shirayim are then burned separately on the Mizbe’ach. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, the kometz is offered on the Mizbe’ach and the shirayim are spread over the Beis Hadeshen.
  - **R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yochanan** asked which “Beis Hadeshen” this refers to – if it refers to the one on the Mizbe’ach, then **R' Elazar** is saying the same thing as his father, and if it refers to the one off the Mizbe’ach, how can he say it is placed there and that is considered to be “offered”? We don’t find anything that is “offered” off the Mizbe’ach!? **R' Abba** said, maybe **R' Elazar** means that the shirayim of a Kohen’s mincha is destroyed. Other talmidim laughed at that and said, if it is destroyed it cannot be considered to have been offered!?
    - **R' Avin’s** father taught a Braisa that darshens the pasuk “v’chol minchas Kohen kalil tihyeh lo sei’acheil” to teach that the chatas mincha of a Kohen is compared to the minchas chavitin only in regard to eating (it teaches that the chatas is not eaten) but not in regard to the Avodah (the chavitin is offered on the Mizbe’ach, whereas the shirayim of the chatas would be sent to the Beis Hadeshen). **Abaye** explained the drasha that “kol minchas Kohen...lo sei’acheil” refers to the Kohen’s chatas mincha, and “kalil tihyeh” refers to his minchas nedavah. The requirement that it be entirely burned on the Mizbe’ach therefore does not apply to his chatas mincha. **Rava** said, we can’t cut up a pasuk in this way. Rather, he learns the same thing as **Abaye**, but instead darshens the pasuk as follows: “kol minchas Kohen kalil tihyeh” refers to his minchas nedavah, and “lo sei’acheil” refers to his chatas.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe the drasha should be reversed and should instead teach that the shirayim of his nedavah should be thrown onto the Beis Hadeshen whereas his chatas should be offered entirely on the Mizbe'ach? **A:** It makes more sense to say that his nedavah should be offered like the chavitin, because it is tadir, it is not brought for an aveirah, and it has a pleasant smell (it has oil and levonah) like a chavitin.
  - **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to treat the chatas like the chavitin, because they are both brought from an issaron of flour and are both obligatory? **A:** The chavitin is similar in more ways to the nedavah than it is to the chatas.
- **Q:** The **Rabanan**, who hold that the Kohen's chatas mincha does not get a kemitza, what do they learn from the pasuk of "v'chol minchas Kohen kalil tihyeh lo sei'acheil"? **A:** They use it for the drasha of a Braisa, which uses this pasuk for a gezeira shava to teach that all menachos of a Kohen are offered entirely on the Mizbe'ach and all are subject to a lav against eating the mincha.
- **Q:** **Ravina** asked, what is the halacha if a Kohen ate the eimurim of a korbon? It is clear that he is oiver the lav of "kol zar lo yochal kodesh", because he is considered to be a "zar" with regard to eimurim. The question is whether he is oiver on the lav of "kalil tihyeh" as well. Does this only apply to menachos or does it apply to all parts that are supposed to be offered on the Mizbe'ach? **A:** **R' Aharon** said to **Ravina**, a Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** said, the pasuk of "kalil tihyeh" serves to place a lav for the eating of anything that is supposed to be burned on the Mizbe'ach. Therefore, there would be a lav for eating the eimurim as well.

### MISHNA

- The mincha of a Kohen, the mincha of the Kohen Gadol, and the minchas nesachim are offered on the Mizbe'ach in their entirety and are not given to the Kohanim. With regard to these korbanos, the rights of the Mizbe'ach are stronger than the rights of the Kohanim.
- The Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim are eaten entirely by the Kohanim and are not offered at all on the Mizbe'ach. With regard to these korbanos, the rights of the Kohanim are stronger than the rights of the Mizbe'ach.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The first part of the Mishna implies that only those korbanos are offered in their entirety on the Mizbe'ach. This is not accurate, since we know that an olah is offered in its entirety as well!? **A:** The olah has the skins that are given to the Kohanim.
  - **Q:** The bird olah is offered in its entirety!? **A:** The crop and feathers of the bird olah are not offered on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** The wine of nesachim are offered entirely on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** They are poured into the "shisin", and are not burned on the Mizbe'ach.
  - The Mishna is teaching to exclude the ruling of **Shmuel**, who says that nesachim are sprinkled onto the fire of the Mizbe'ach. The Mishna teaches that it is only these korbanos that are offered in their entirety, and the nesachim are poured into the shisin. The Mishna also supports another ruling of **Shmuel** where he said that when one brings a korbon of oil, a kemitza is taken and the shirayim are eaten (and we would not burn it entirely on the Mizbe'ach).

### SHTEI HALECHEM V'LECHEM HAPANIM

- **Q:** Are there no other korbanos that are eaten entirely by the Kohanim? There is the case of the chatas bird!? **A:** The blood of the bird is offered on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** There is the case of the lug of oil of a metzora!? **A:** Part of the oil is thrown to the paroches and part is put onto the metzora. The Kohen then gets the remaining oil.
  - The Mishna is teaching to exclude the view that holds that if the Shte Halechem are brought without the accompanying korbanos, they are burned on the Mizbe'ach. The Mishna teaches that even if they are brought on their own they are eaten by the Kohanim.

### MISHNA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- All menachos that are made in a kli shareis require 3 placings of oil – pouring (which is done after the mixing), mixing (added to the flour to mix it), and putting oil into the kli before the mincha is made.
  - **Rebbi** says, oil is mixed into the mincha after they have been made into challos. The **Chachomim** say it is done while it is still flour.
  - With regard to baked menachos, if they are made as challos it is required to be mixed with oil. If they are made as rekikin, the oil is smeared onto them. How is it smeared? In the shape of a “chi”.
    - The remaining oil is eaten by the Kohanim.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What type of mincha does the Mishna mean to exclude by referring only to menachos made in a kli shareis? **A: R' Pappa** said it comes to exclude a baked mincha.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “soles bashemen te'aseh” written regarding a marcheshes teaches that there must be oil put into the keili before the flour is put in. The word “korbanecha” creates a gezeira shava between marcheshes and machavas, which teaches that a machavas also requires that oil be put into the keili before the flour is put in. The gezeira shava also teaches that just as a machavas requires pouring of oil after the mixing and oil for the mixing, a marcheshes requires oil at those points as well.

### -----Daf 75-----

#### CHALLOS BOLILAN DIVREI REBBI V'CHACHOMIM OMRIM SOLES

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “soles bilula”, which teaches that it should be mixed with oil when it is still flour. **Rebbi** says, the pasuk says “challos...bilulos”, which teaches that they are mixed after having been made into challos. The **Rabanan** said to him, the pasuk regarding the Todah breads also says “challos...bilulos” and yet it is impossible to mix them with oil when they are already challos, rather they must be mixed when they are flour! The Braisa continues, how are the menachos prepared? He puts oil into the keili and then puts the flour on top of the oil. He then puts more oil onto it and mixes it and kneads it and fries it. He then breaks it into pieces, pours the rest of the oil onto it, and the kemitza is then done. **Rebbi** says they are mixed when they are challos, based on the pasuk of “challos...bilulos bashemen”. How is this done? He first puts oil into a keili, then puts the flour onto the oil, kneads it and fries it. He then breaks it into pieces and puts more oil onto it and mixes it. He then puts the rest of the oil onto it and does the kemitza.
  - **Q:** What did the **Rabanan** mean that it is impossible to mix the Todah challos with oil? **A: R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said, it is because there is only a revi'is of oil for 20 challos. It is impossible to mix so many baked challos with that small amount of oil. Therefore, it must be that the oil is mixed when it is still flour.

#### HACHALLOS TE'UNOS BELILAH UREKIKIN MISHICHAH

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “challos...bilulos”, which teaches that rekikin are not mixed with oil. We would think to say that if challos, which are not smeared with oil, must be mixed with oil, then rekikin, which must be smeared with oil, must surely be mixed with oil! The pasuk therefore teaches that this is not so. The pasuk says that rekikin are smeared with oil, which teaches that challos are not smeared with oil. We would have thought to say that if rekikin, which are not mixed with oil, are smeared with oil, then challos, which must be mixed with oil, must surely be smeared with oil! The pasuk therefore teaches that this is not so.
  - **Q:** Why can't we say that the procedure is written by each but should be applied to the other as well? **A: Rava** said, if that were true, there would have been one pasuk that would have mentioned smearing for challos and mixing for rekikin.

#### KEITZAD MOSHCAN K'MIN KI V'HASHAR NECHAL...

- **R' Kahana** explained, this means it is smeared in the shape of the Greek letter “ki”.
- A Braisa says, if a mincha is brought of half challos and half rekikin, one brings a lug of oil and splits it between the two types. For the challos he mixes the oil in, and for the rekikin he smears the oil on them. He smears the entire top of the rekikin and any leftover oil is given over to the challos. **R' Shimon ben Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon** says, he smears the oil in the shape of the “ki” and the remaining oil is eaten by the Kohanim.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if rekikin are brought by themselves, one brings a lug of oil and smears the rekikin again and again until all of the oil is used up. **R' Shimon ben Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon** says, he smears the oil in the shape of the “ki” and the remaining oil is eaten by the Kohanim.

### MISHNA

- All menachos that are made in a kli shareis must be broken into pieces.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What type of mincha does the Mishna mean to exclude? **A: R' Pappa** said it comes to exclude the Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “pasos osah pitim...mincha”. This extra word “mincha” teaches that all menachos must be broken into pieces. The word “osah” comes to exclude the Shte Halechem and the Lechem Hapanim. The pasuk then says “v'yatzakta...shemen mincha”. This extra word “mincha” teaches that all menachos are included in the requirement of “pouring”. The word “aleha” comes to exclude the challos of a baked mincha from this requirement, and the word “hee” comes to exclude rekikin from this requirement.
  - **Q:** How do we know to exclude the baked mincha from this requirement? Maybe we should instead exclude a Kohen's mincha? **A: Rabbah** said, there are two exclusionary words in the pasuk, and the baked mincha is the one that has two types and therefore needs the two exclusionary words to be excluded.

### MISHNA

- When breaking up a mincha of a Yisrael, he first folds it into two, then folds the two into four, and breaks it into the 4 pieces. When breaking the mincha of a Kohen, he first folds it into two, then folds the two into four, but does not then break it into the 4 pieces. The mincha of the Kohen Gadol is not folded. **R' Shimon** says that the mincha of a Kohen and of the Kohen Gadol are not broken into pieces because they do not require a kemitza, and any mincha that does not require a kemitza is not broken into pieces. All of them that are broken must be broken into smaller pieces, the size of an olive.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “pasos”. We would think it should be broken into only 2 pieces. The pasuk therefore then says “pitim”, which teaches to break it into 4 pieces. If we only had the word “pitim” we would think that it should be crumbled into crumbs. The pasuk therefore says “osah”, which teaches that the mincha should be broken into pieces, but the pieces should not then be broken down further into smaller pieces. How is this done? The mincha of a Yisrael is folded into two, then folded into four, and then separated into four pieces. The mincha of Kohanim and of the Kohen Gadol would be folded (but not broken).
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that the mincha of the Kohen Gadol is not folded!? **A: Rabbah** said, the Mishna means that it is not folded into four, but it is folded into two.

### R' SHIMON OMER MINCHAS KOHANIM...

- **Rav Yosef** said, “chavitzta” – a cooked mixture with kezayis size pieces of bread requires that a hamotzi be made before eating it. If the pieces are smaller than a kezayis, it requires a mezonos. **R' Yosef** brings a proof from a Braisa that says that a Kohen makes a hamotzi on a korban mincha, and we learned in our Mishna that the broken pieces are at least the size of a kezayis.
  - **Q: Abaye** asks, if that's true, then according to **R' Yishmael** who says that the mincha is broken down to flour one should not make a hamotzi. However, this can't be, because a Braisa says that one may use the mincha for his matza on pesach!? This means it is bread and needs a hamotzi, not like **R' Yosef** said!?  
**A:** It can be used for matzah only if it is kneaded back together to a kezayis sized piece.
    - **Q:** The verbiage of the Braisa suggests that it can be used for matzah even in its broken state, without kneading it back together?! **A:** One can be yotzeh with smaller pieces if they are broken from a piece that is larger than a kezayis piece which is still intact at the time of the bracha.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How do we come out l'halacha regarding a chavitza? **A: R' Sheishes** said, even if it is made with crumbs that are smaller than a kezayis, a hamotzi is made.
  - **Rava** said, this is only if the pieces still have the appearance of bread.