

7 Mar-Cheshvan 5779
Oct. 17, 2018



Menachos Daf 68

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Dealing with Chadash and Chametz

The *Mishna* had stated that Rabbi Yehudah was not concerned that if someone harvested the new crop before the *omer* was offered that he would come to eat it.

The *Gemora* challenged this from that which Rabbi Yehudah stated in a different *Mishna*: We search for chametz on the night of the fourteenth of Nissan, on the morning of the fourteenth, and at the time when the chametz is removed, which is during the sixth hour on the fourteenth. The *Chachamim*, however, maintain that if one did not search for chametz etc. (*on the night of the fourteenth, he should search even afterwards*). [*The Gemora there explains that Rabbi Yehudah maintains one can only search for chametz while chametz is permitted, but once chametz is prohibited, one cannot search for chametz, because if he were to find chametz, he may come to eat it. This would seemingly conflict with our Gemora!*]

Rabbah answers: Rabbi Yehudah is not concerned about the new crop, for since he is permitted to harvest the new crop only by plucking with his hand, he will remember (*that it is forbidden to eat from it*).

Abaye asks: It is understandable that people will realize when they harvest the grain that it is still forbidden (*as the new grain is prohibited for consumption until the omer is offered*); however, what is there to say regarding the

grinding and the sifting? [*What kind of change in behavior was present when they ground and sifted the flour?*]

The *Gemora* answers: This is not difficult. They had to grind with a hand mill (*instead of a water-powered mill*), and they were required to sift with the back of the sieve (*instead of using the sifter normally*).

The *Gemora* asks: What about the normal harvesting that was permitted in the irrigated fields (*in the valleys – even before the omer was offered*)? This is as the *Mishna* (71a) states: One is allowed to harvest (*new grain*) the irrigated fields in the valleys normally, but one cannot pile it up in the normal fashion. [*Rashi explains that if this grain was ripe and was not cut quickly, it would spoil.*] Where was the change in the method of harvest that made them realize that they were dealing with new crop?

Rather, Abaye stated: With regard to *chadash* (*the new crop*), a person is detached from the new grain (*because he has not yet eaten from the new grain, so there is no reason to suspect that by handling the new grain he will come to eat from it without thinking*). Regarding chametz, however, a person is accustomed to eating chametz throughout the year, so we are concerned that if he would find chametz after it is prohibited, he may come to eat it (*so Rabbi Yehudah decreed that one should not search for chametz on the fourteenth after chametz is prohibited*).

Rava stated: The contradiction in Rabbi Yehudah's position was difficult, but isn't the contradiction regarding the position of the Sages also difficult? [*This is only an answer for Rabbi Yehudah. How can we explain the fact that the Sages are worried that one who deals with new grain will come to eat it, but they are not worried that one who searches for chametz on Pesach will come to eat it?*]

Rather, Rabbah stated: The contradiction regarding Rabbi Yehudah's position was answered as stated above (by Abaye). The contradiction in the Sages can be answered by explaining that they are not worried that a person who is seeking chametz in order to destroy it will come to eat it (as opposed to the new grain which is being dealt with in order to eventually eat it).

Rav Ashi answers the contradiction in Rabbi Yehudah's position as follows. Our *Mishna* is dealing with the selling of regular flour and flour of toasted kernels (which is not fit to be eaten, and that is why Rabbi Yehudah does not mind that people are dealing with it before it is permitted).

The *Gemora* rejects this answer, and says it is mistaken. This answer is only effective for when it becomes unable to be eaten (after it is dried in the oven). When it is able to be eaten (which Rashi explains is right when it is harvested), there are no safeguards in place! If you will say that Rav Ashi combined his answer with that of Rabbah by saying that the harvesting must be done by hand instead of with a sickle, the question still arises (as it did earlier) regarding the leniency of cutting the grains from the irrigated fields of the valley normally. [*The Gemora above rejected Rabbah's approach due to this question.*] It therefore must be that Rav Ashi's answer is mistaken. (67b – 68a)

Mishna

Once the *omer* sacrifice was brought, new grain was immediately permitted to be eaten. The people who are far from Yerushalayim (and cannot immediately ascertain whether or not the *omer* had been brought) are permitted to eat new grain after midday (on the sixteenth of Nissan). When the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai instituted that it should be forbidden to eat from the new grain the entire Day of Waving (until after the entire day of the sixteenth of Nissan had passed). Rabbi Yehudah asked: Doesn't the Torah itself prohibit new grain on the sixteenth of Nissan, as the verse states, *until this very day*?

The *Mishna* asks: Why are those who are far from Yerushalayim able to eat at midday on the sixteenth? This is because by that time they can be certain the *omer* had already been brought. (68a)

When does the Omer Permit?

Rav and Shmuel both agree that when the Beis Hamikdash is extant, the bringing of the *omer* permits the new grain. When the Beis Hamikdash is not extant, sunrise of the sixteenth of Nissan permits it. How do they know this? This is based on two verses. One verse states: *until the day that you bring (indicating the omer permits the new grain)*. Another verse states: *until this very day (indicating the day permits the new grain)*. How can we reconcile these two verses? It must be that when the Beis Hamikdash is extant, the bringing of the *omer* permits the new grain. When the Beis Hamikdash is not extant, sunrise of the sixteenth of Nissan permits it.

Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish both agree that even when the Beis Hamikdash is extant, the sunrise of the sixteenth of Nissan permits the new grain.



The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the verse state, *until the day that you bring (indicating the omer permits the new grain)?*

The *Gemora* answers: They hold this is a *mitzvah*, but not required.

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the *Mishna* say that when the *omer* is brought, the new grain becomes immediately permitted (*indicating it is dependent upon the bringing of the omer*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is saying that it is a *mitzvah (but not obligatory)* to wait to eat the new grain until after the bringing of the *omer*.

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the *Mishna* state that the *omer* permitted the new grain in the provinces, and the *shteihalechem (the two breads offered on Shavuot)* rendered the new grain permitted in the Beis Hamikdash (*to be brought as minchah offerings*)?

The *Gemora* answers: This (*too means it*) is a *mitzvah (but not obligatory)*.

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't the *Mishna* say that when the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai instituted that it should be forbidden to eat new grain until after the entire day of the sixteenth of *Nissan* had passed? What was his reasoning? It must be that the Beis Hamikdash will be rebuilt speedily, and people will say that last year we ate the new grain starting from sunrise on the sixteenth. This year we can also do so! They will not realize that being that last year there was no *omer* offering, sunrise indeed permitted them to eat the new grain. Now that an *omer* will be offered, the *omer* permits the new grain. If it is only a *mitzvah* that one should wait for the *omer*, do you think Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai

would have made this decree due to a (*non-obligatory*) *mitzvah*?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answered: Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai follows the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah who says that the entire day of the sixteenth is forbidden according to Torah law, as the verse states, *until this very day*. This means the day itself is forbidden, as he holds that the word 'until' means 'until and including' (*so that the grain remains forbidden until the end of the sixteenth; this is why it is forbidden the entire day during the time after the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash*).

The *Gemora* asks: Does Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai follow the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah? Don't they argue? This is as the *Mishna* states: When the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai instituted that it should be forbidden to eat new grain until after the entire day of the sixteenth of *Nissan* had passed. Rabbi Yehudah asked: Doesn't the Torah itself prohibit new grain on the sixteenth of *Nissan*, as the verse states, *until this very day*?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yehudah misunderstood Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai. He thought Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai was saying that it was a Rabbinic prohibition, when in fact he was saying it is a Torah prohibition.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai "institute?" (*This means it was not a Torah prohibition!*)

The *Gemora* answers: What does it mean that he "instituted?" It means that he derived this from the verse and instituted its practice.

Rav Pappa and Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua ate new grain from the night of the seventeenth of *Nissan*, meaning immediately after the sixteenth of *Nissan*. This is because they held that the prohibition against eating new

grain outside of *Eretz Yisroel* is only Rabbinic, and they therefore were not concerned with a doubt. [And since doubts – in matters of Rabbinic law – are treated leniently, they did not suspect that the Court had added a day to Adar, causing the seventeenth of Nissan to actually be the sixteenth of Nissan.] The Rabbis in the Academy of Rav Ashi would only eat new grain on the morning of the seventeenth of Nissan. They held that the nature of the prohibition against eating new grains outside of *Eretz Yisroel* is a Torah prohibition. [They therefore suspected that *Beis Din* added an extra day to Adar, and did not eat until after the morning of the seventeenth. Even if it would really be the sixteenth, after the morning of the sixteenth the new grain is permitted according to Torah law.] However, Rabbi Yochanan's institution (that the entire sixteenth should be prohibited) was only that people should not eat new grain on the sixteenth of Nissan, not that they should be stringent on the seventeenth as perhaps there was an extra day added to Adar.

Ravina stated: My mother told me that my father did not eat new grain until the night of the eighteenth after the entire seventeenth had passed. This is because he held like Rabbi Yehudah (that the entire sixteenth was prohibited according to Torah law), and suspected that a day was added on to Adar. (68a – 68b)

Mishna

The *omer* offering permitted new grain to be eaten in the provinces, and the *shtei halechem* permitted grain to be used in the Temple. One cannot bring an offering of *bikkurim* (new fruits) or the flour offering accompanying animal sacrifices until the *omer* is brought. If one does so, the sacrifice is invalid. He should not bring it before the *shtei halechem* is brought. If he does (bring it between the date of the *omer* and the *shtei halechem*), it is valid. (68b)

Omer and Shtei Halechem

Rabbi Tarfon was sitting, and asked the following question. What is the difference between before the *omer* and before the *shtei halechem*? [Rashi explains Rabbi Tarfon's question: He did not understand why *menachos* offered before the *omer* are invalid, even *b'dieved* (after the fact), while *menachos* brought before the bringing of the *shtei halechem* are valid *b'dieved*.]

Yehudah bar Nechemyah replied: No! [The two cases are not similar.] Before the offering of the *omer*, even common people are not released from the general rule (and cannot eat from the new grain; this is why a *minchah* offered then would be invalid). However, before the bringing of the *shtei halechem* (after the *omer* has already been offered), common people have been released from the general rule (and are permitted to eat from the new crop; a *minchah* offered at that time would therefore be valid).

Rabbi Tarfon remained silent. Yehudah ben Nechemyah's face lit up (apparently from the pleasure that he had due to besting a great scholar). Rabbi Akiva said to him: Yehudah, your face has lit up because you refuted an elderly sage! I would be surprised if you live a long life!

Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Ilai said: This happened two weeks before *Pesach*. When I went up to Yerushalayim for *Shavuot*, I asked people, "Where is Yehudah ben Nechemyah?" They told me that he had passed away.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak stated: According to Yehudah ben Nechemyah (who maintains that anything which is permitted to be eaten by a common person is valid – if offered, it is valid), libations from grapes that matured

before the bringing of the *omer*, and were offered before the bringing of the *omer*, are valid.

The *Gemora* asks: This is obvious! [After all, only grains are included in this prohibition, not grapes!]

The *Gemora* answers: One might think that *minchah* offerings brought before the offering of the *shteihalechem* are valid because common people are released from the general rule. However, libations, where common people were not released from the general rule (for there was never any prohibition against drinking wine before the offering of the *omer*), perhaps the libations should not be valid. This is why Rav Nachman said they were permitted. [There is an argument among the commentaries regarding how to explain why one would think the libations should be forbidden, and how the *Gemora* answers this question. One approach is that of the *Yad Binyamin*. He explains that the *Gemora* entertains that the reason that before the bringing of the *omer* one cannot bring sacrifices from new grains is not because the grains cannot be eaten, and therefore cannot be brought as a sacrifice (due to the teaching from the verse *mi'mashkei Yisroel*, which teaches that one may only bring sacrifices from things that one is permitted to eat). Rather, it is because there is a special law that any new grains brought as a sacrifice before the *omer* is brought is invalid, even *b'dieved*. Accordingly, the *Gemora* entertains that this might apply to grapes as well. If it applies to grapes, one should say that libations before the bringing of the *omer* should be invalid, as we never see any leniency regarding grapes like we do regarding grain before the *shteihalechem*. Being that this is so, if we say sacrifices from new grain before the *omer* are even invalid *b'dieved*, certainly libations from new grapes should not have any leniency before the bringing of the *omer*! Rav Nachman therefore teaches us that the law that before the bringing of the *omer* one cannot bring sacrifices from new grains is not specifically because the grains cannot be

eaten, and therefore having nothing to do with grapes which are not included in the prohibition against new grain.]

Rami bar Chama inquired: Do the *shteihalechem* permit when it is brought out of order (the *omer* did not encounter the new grain)? [In order for the new crop to be used in the Temple, the *omer* and the *shteihalechem* must be offered.]

The *Gemora* explains the inquiry: The case is where grains were planted between the bringing of the *omer* and the bringing of the *shteihalechem*. The *shteihalechem* (of this year) passed over it, and then the *omer* (of the next year) passed over it. Can one bring these grains as a sacrifice (before the next *shteihalechem* is brought)? Do we say that the *omer* and *shteihalechem* permits new grain only in this order? Or do we say that the new grain is permitted even if they were offered out of order?

Rabbah answers from a *braisa* which states: *If you will offer a minchah from the first grain*. This refers to the *minchas omer*. From what is it brought? It comes from barley. One might suggest that it comes from wheat. Rabbi Eliezer explains: *Aviv (ripe)* was stated regarding (the plague of hail in) Egypt and for (the *omer* for) future generations. Just as *aviv* stated by Egypt referred to barley, so too the *aviv* used here refers to barley. Rabbi Akiva states: We find that an individual brings some *minchah* obligations from wheat and some from barley (by a *sotah*). So too, the public sacrifices, which are brought from wheat, must also be brought from barley. And if you say the *omer* is brought from wheat, there will be no public sacrifices brought from barley. Another teaching is that if you will say that the *omer* is brought from wheat, the *shteihalechem* cannot rightfully be called (as they are by the verse) *first fruits*.

Rabbah continues: Now if you will say that the *shteí halechem* and *omer* permit the grain in the Temple even when they are brought out of order, one could refute this last claim (*and the shteí halechem can be the first offering*), for the *omer* could be brought from wheat that took root before the *shteí halechem* but after last year's *omer*, while the *shteí halechem* could be brought from new wheat that took root before the *omer* of this year and after last year's *shteí halechem* of last year! [*This way they are both brought from wheat, and yet, the shteí halechem is still the "first fruit"!*]

The *Gemora* deflects the proof: The verse does not mean that the *shteí halechem* should be the "first fruit" with regard to the produce that it is permitting; rather, it means that it is the "first fruit" offered on the altar, and in this case, the altar has already "eaten" from this year's produce. (68b – 69a)

DAILY MASHAL

BUILDING THE GATES

Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai instituted that one is not permitted to eat from the new grain the entire day of the sixteenth of Nissan. In the times of the Beis Hamikdash, the new grain could only be eaten after the omer offering was brought on the sixteenth of Nissan. Subsequent to the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash, one was biblically permitted to eat the new grain on the sixteenth of Nissan in the morning. Rabban Yochanan Ben Zakkai was concerned, however, that the Beis Hamikdash may be built the following year on the night of the sixteenth of Nissan and there would not be enough time to prepare the omer offering. People might then say that the new grain will be permitted in the morning just as it was the previous year. This assumption would be erroneous, because the previous year there was no Beis Hamikdash, thus there

was no possibility of offering the omer, and for that reason the new grain was permitted in the morning. During the present year, however, there is a Beis Hamikdash and one must wait for the offering of the omer or one must wait until the end of the day. Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai therefore instituted that one was prohibited from eating the new grain the entire day of the sixteenth of Nissan.

Rashi wonders how the Beis Hamikdash could be built on the night of the sixteenth of Nissan, as the *Gemora* in *Shevuos* 15b states that the Beis Hamikdash cannot be built at night. Rashi answers that it is only regarding a Beis Hamikdash built by humans that there is a restriction of building it at night. The third Beis Hamikdash, however, will descend from Heaven miraculously, thus there are no restrictions regarding the building of the third Beis Hamikdash.

The Maharil Diskin is troubled by this answer, as the Jewish People have an obligation to build the Beis Hamikdash, so why would Hashem prevent us from performing this mitzvah?

The Maharil Diskin answers based on a *Medrash* in *Eichah* that states that when the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, the gates of the Beis Hamikdash sank into the ground and in the future, the Jewish People will excavate the gates and affix them to the Beis Hamikdash. The *Gemora* in *Bava Basra* rules that one who secures the gates in an ownerless field is deemed to be the one who acquires the field. Thus, we will fulfill the mitzvah of building the Beis Hamikdash when we secure the gates of the Beis Hamikdash. This can also be the explanation of the words that we recite in the *Shemone Esrei* of *Mussaf* on the festivals, show us its rebuilding and gladden us in its perfection. The word for perfection is *tikkuno*, which can allude to the securing of the Beis Hamikdash gates.