



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

### ***Omer from Eretz Yisroel***

The *Gemora* states that the *Tannaim* only disagree regarding the new produce, but as to the Land (*that the grain used for the omer and shteí halechem must come from Eretz Yisroel*), they do not differ at all, for they all maintain that the *omer* and the *shteí halechem* must be brought from the produce grown in the Land and not from that which was grown outside the Land.

The *Gemora* notes that this view is not in accordance with that of the following *Tanna*, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah said: The *omer* offering may be brought from that which is grown outside the Land. How then am I to interpret the expression ‘*When you come into the Land*’? It is to teach us that they were not obligated to bring the *omer* offering before they entered the Land.

The *Gemora* explains his reasoning: He is of the opinion that the prohibition against eating of the new grain outside *Eretz Yisroel* is Biblical, for it is written: *your dwelling places*. This implies that it applies wherever you may be dwelling; and when the verse states: *When you come into the Land*, this teaches us that the prohibition comes into effect only at the time when you come into the Land. Now, since the prohibition of the new grain outside *Eretz Yisroel* is Biblical, we may surely bring the *omer* offering from there as well. (83b – 84a)

### ***Fresh Kernels***

We have learned in a *Mishna* elsewhere: Those who kept guard over the *sefichin* (aftergrowths) in the *Shemittah* year (*which ensured that there will be barley available for the omer offering*) received their pay out of the treasury chamber.

Rami bar Chama asked the following contradiction to Rav Chisda: We have learned in the *Mishna*: Those who kept guard over the *sefichin* in the *Shemittah* year received their pay out of the treasury chamber. However, it was taught in a *braisa*: ‘*For food*’ (*the shemittah produce may be used for*), but it may not be burned. [So how could they use it for the *omer offering*, when the *omer* is completely burned on the altar?]

He replied: The Torah says: *for your generations (the omer should be offered)*, and you are suggesting that it should be cancelled (*when it is shemittah*)!?

Rami bar Chama retorted: Am I suggesting that it should be cancelled? I say that it can be offered using last year’s barley.

Rav Chisda replied: It must be ‘*fresh kernels*,’ and it is not so in that case.

But perhaps, Rami bar Chama persisted, it can be offered by using the fresh kernels of last year’s produce!



Rav Chisda answered: It is written: *fresh kernels you shall offer*. It needs to be fresh kernels at the time that it is being offered.

It was stated: Rabbi Yochanan said: It is written: *fresh kernels you shall offer*. [It needs to be fresh kernels at the time that it is being offered.] Rabbi Elozar said: It is written: *the first of your harvest*. This implies that it should not come from the end of your harvest (*last year's produce*).

Rabbah asked from the following *braisa*: *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 *shtei halechem* cannot rightfully be called (*as they are by the verse*) *first fruits*. Evidently, the reason (*that the shtei halechem comes from wheat*) is because it is called "first fruits" (*and it therefore must be from the first-cutting of the wheat; so too the omer, it is called "first-fruits," so it must be from the first cutting of the barley*); this indeed is a refutation (*of Rabbi Yochanan, for the exposition is expounded like Rabbi Elozar*)! (84a)

## **Bikkurim**

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna*: *Bikkurim (the first ripe fruits of any of the seven species with which the Torah praises Eretz Yisroel, which had to be brought to the Beis Hamikdash in Yerushalayim)* may be brought only from the seven species.

And they are not brought from the dates in the mountains (*which are inferior due to its sweetness*) nor from the produce in the valleys (*which rot due to the water that collects there*).

Ulla said: If one brought any of these, they are not consecrated at all.

Rabbah was once sitting and reciting Ulla's ruling when Rav Acha bar Abba asked Rabbah from the following *braisa*: It is written (*regarding the shtei halechem*): *An offering of first-fruit*. This indicates that it should be the first (*from the new produce*) of all *minchah* offerings; and so too, it says: *when you offer a new minchah to Hashem in your festival of weeks*. I know now that it should be the first before any other *minchah* offering of the new wheat; from where do I know that it should be the first before any *minchah* offering of the new barley? It is because the Torah repeats the word 'new'; and as this word is not necessary to teach us that it (*the shtei halechem*) should be the first before any other *minchah* offering of the new wheat, you may use it to teach us that it should be the first before any *minchah* offering of the new barley. And from where do I know that it shall be offered before *bikkurim*? It is because the Torah states: *And you shall make for yourself the festival of weeks; the first-fruits of the wheat harvest*. I know now that it shall be offered before the *bikkurim* of the wheat harvest; but from where do I know that it shall be offered before the *bikkurim* of the barley harvest? It is because the Torah states: *And the festival of the harvest of the first-fruits of your labor which you sow in the field*. I know now that it shall be before the harvest which you sow; from where do I know that it shall be before that which grew by itself? It is because the Torah states: *in the field*. I know now that it shall be before that which grew in the field; but from where do I know that it shall also be before that which grew on the roof, or in a ruin, or in a flowerpot, or in a ship? It is because the Torah states: *the first-fruits of all that is in their land*. And from where do I know that it shall be before the libations (*of the new wine*) and the new fruits (*for bikkurim*) of the tree? It is because it is written here: *the first-*

fruits of your labor, and it says there (regarding the festival of Sukkos): when you gather in your labor out of the field. Just as there it includes the libations (of the new wine) and the new fruits (for bikkurim) of the tree (for by the time the Festival of Sukkos arrives, all new produce has been gathered), so here it includes the libations and the fruits of the tree.

Now, Rav Acha concludes his challenge to Ulla, it stated above regarding things which grew on the roof, or in a ruin, or in a flowerpot, or in a ship (are valid bikkurim; certainly then, the fruits that grew in the mountains or valleys should be valid bikkurim)!?

The Gemora answers: That is referring only to minchah offerings.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah asked: But if so, why does it say in that same verse that every tahor person in your house may eat of it; if it is in reference to minchah offerings, then only male Kohanim may eat from it!?

Rav Mesharsheya replied that the verse is split in two; it is referring to minchah offerings and bikkurim.

Rav Ashi answers that although the entire verse is referring to minchah offerings, the latter part is referring to the breads of the todah (that are given to the Kohen; those can be eaten by his entire family).

The Gemora notes that Ulla's ruling is actually a matter of dispute amongst other Amoraim: Rabbi Yochanan said: If one brought these fruits (dates in the mountains or produce in the valleys), they are not consecrated as bikkurim. Rish Lakish said: If he brought them, they are consecrated as bikkurim, for they are regarded like a lean animal among offerings (for although, one should offer a choice animal for a korban, a lean animal is nevertheless valid).

The Gemora asks: What is the explanation for Rabbi Yochanan's view?

Rabbi Elozar replied: I saw Rabbi Yochanan in a dream, so I am confident that I will say a good thing. It is written: "from" the first, which implies - but not all the first fruits. It is also written: from your land, which implies - but not from every part of your land.

Rish Lakish uses these verses for that which was taught in the following braisa: Rabban Gamliel the son of Rebbe said: The word 'land' through a gezeirah shavah teaches us that bikkurim applies to the "seven species" – the fruits which are the praise of Eretz Yisroel.

The Gemora notes a contradiction between two braisos: It was taught in one braisa: A man may bring the produce grown on a roof, or in a ruin, or in a flowerpot, or in a ship as bikkurim, and also recite the Biblical verses (that is said by all other bikkurim). However, another braisa taught: He may bring it, but he does not recite the verses.

Now, according to Rish Lakish, there is no contradiction, for each braisa is referring to something else:

First braisa	Second braisa
Bring and Recite	Bring but do not Recite
Roof of a cave	Roof of a house
Ruin that is cultivated	Ruin that is not cultivated
Perforated flowerpot	Nonperforated flowerpot
Wooden ship	Earthenware ship

The Gemora concludes that according to Rabbi Yochanan, we must say that it is a matter of Tannaic dispute. (84a – 85a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***The mitzvah of the first fruits, Chanukah and kodshim***

The mitzvah of *bikurim*, by which we were commanded to bring the first fruits from the seven choice species of Eretz Yisrael to the Temple, lasts from Shavuot till Chanukah. As we have no Babylonian Talmud on tractate Bikurim, we shall try to address this important mitzvah in those places where it is mentioned in the Gemara. This week we treat the identification of *bikurim* as *kodshim*.

Rambam (*Hilchos Bikurim* 2:6) rules that fruit which became ripe after Chanukah is regarded as the *bikurim* of the next year and should be left till after Shavuot. He indicates that fruit separated before Shavuot is also brought as *bikurim*. However, the Raavad disagrees and maintains that fruit which was not separated between Shavuot and Chanukah is not sanctified at all, in the light of the Yerushalmi, which states "If he separated them after Chanukah, they do not become sanctified."

HaGaon Rabbi Aryeh Pomeranchik zt"l explains this difference of opinions in his *Toras Zera'im* (Bikurim 1:6). "There is *dichuy* (rejection) in *kodshim*." In other words, a sacrifice that became unfit for its mitzvah is rejected and can no longer be ever offered on the altar (Zevachim 59a). However, there are various opinions about a sacrifice "rejected from its start" – i.e., a sacrifice that was never fit to be offered. Some maintain that when its defect disappears, it may be offered as it was never "rejected", since a rejected entity is that which stood near and was pushed away whereas this animal never reached the level to be fit to be offered as a sacrifice.

As the halachah of *bikurim* is like that of *kodshim* regarding things that prevent offering *kodshim* and which disqualify them (such as an *esnan* and "that which is fit to be eaten by Jews"), the halachah of *dichuy* also applies to *bikurim*. Therefore, it could be that the Yerushalmi holds of the opinion that something which is "rejected from its start" is regarded as rejected and can never serve as *kodshim*. Therefore, if *bikurim* are separated after Chanukah, when they cannot be brought, they are rejected entirely from bringing to the Temple even after Shavuot. However, Rambam (*Hilchos Ma'aseh HaKorbanos* 15:4) holds that rejection from the start is not rejection forever. Therefore, *bikurim* separated after Chanukah became sanctified and should be brought after Shavuot (see *ibid* for another explanation and see *Turei Even*, Megillah 20b, s.v. *Vecheiteima*, and *Chazon Ish*, Zera'im, *Likutim*, 8).