

4 Mar-Cheshvan 5779
Oct. 13, 2018



Menachos Daf 64

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

Rather, Rabbah said: Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Chanina the vice-Kohen Gadol both hold the same view. For we have learned in a Mishnah: Rabbi Chanina the vice-Kohen Gadol said: On the *Shabbos* it was harvested by one man with one sickle into one basket, and on a weekday, it was harvested by three men into three baskets and with three sickles. But the Sages said: Whether on the *Shabbos* or on a weekday, it was harvested by three men into three baskets and with three sickles. Now didn't Rabbi Chanina the vice-Kohen Gadol say there that where it is possible [to manage with one] we must not trouble [more to work on the *Shabbos*]? Here, too, since it is possible [to manage with less] we must not trouble [to do more on the *Shabbos*].

The Gemora counters: From where [do you know this]? Perhaps Rabbi Yishmael only said so here, since there is no opportunity for making the matter public,¹ but there, since there is an opportunity for making the matter public,² I would say that he is in agreement with the Rabbis.³ And, on the other hand, perhaps Rabbi Chanina the vice-Kohen Gadol

¹ For whether the Omer is obtained out of five or three se'ahs the people will learn nothing of importance thereby.

² The employment of more persons in the service of the 'Omer obviously gives the matter greater publicity and impresses immediately the mind of the people with the Rabbinic standpoint that the Omer must be offered on the second day of the Passover irrespective of the day of the week, thus creating stronger opposition to the Sadducees who held that the Omer must always be offered on a Sunday.

³ That although one person would be sufficient, three are to be employed to create greater publicity.

only said so there, for after all, whether one man or three are employed, the service to the Most High is performed according to its prescribed rites, but here, since the service to the Most High is not performed according to its prescribed rites,⁴ I would say that he is in agreement with the Sages!

Rather, said Rav Ashi, Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Yosi both hold the same view. For we have learned: Whether [the new moon] was clearly visible or not, they may desecrate the *Shabbos* because of it.⁵ But Rabbi Yosi says: If it was clearly visible they may not desecrate the *Shabbos* because of it.⁶

Now didn't Rabbi Yosi say there that wherever it is possible [to manage without them] we do not trouble [them to desecrate the *Shabbos*]? Here, too, since it is possible [to manage with less] we must not trouble [to do more on the *Shabbos*].

The Gemora asks: From where [do you know this]? Perhaps Rabbi Yishmael only said so here, since the reason 'it will result that you will prevent them from coming in the future'

⁴ For according to Rabbi Yishmael the Omer must be taken out of five se'ahs and not three in order to obtain the choicest flour.

⁵ Any who saw the new moon may transgress the *Shabbos* limits to go and give testimony before the court of the appearance of the new moon. As the calendar was not fixed the testimony was a matter of the greatest importance for the determination of the dates of the Festivals.

⁶ As it is most probable that the members of the court themselves had also seen the appearance of the new moon, so that it would be unnecessary for any to desecrate the *Shabbos* for this purpose.

does not apply, but there, since the reason 'it will result that you will prevent them from coming in the future'⁷ applies, I would say that he is in agreement with the Rabbis. And, on the other hand, perhaps Rabbi Yosi only said so there, since the matter in question is no service to the Most High, and moreover the Shabbos has not been overridden [by another service], but here, since it is a service to the Most High. and the Shabbos has already been overridden [by other acts of work], I would say that he is in agreement with the Rabbis.

It was stated: If a man slaughtered [on the Shabbos] two chatas offerings for the community when only one was necessary, Rabbah (others say R' Ammi) said: He is liable⁸ for the slaughtering of the second but not for the first, even though atonement was effected through the second offering,⁹ and even though the first proved to be a lean animal.¹⁰

The Gemora asks: But could Rabbah have really said so? Surely Rabbah has said: If a man had before him [on the Shabbos] two chatas offerings [for the community], one animal being fat and the other lean, and he first slaughtered the fat animal and then the lean one, he is liable; if he first slaughtered the lean animal and then the fat one, he is not liable; and not only that

⁷ For even when the new moon was not clearly visible to all, those who did see it might refrain from going to give their testimony, believing that they were not justified in desecrating the Shabbos on its account as others too might have seen the appearance of the new moon like themselves.

⁸ Since he acted in error, believing that he may slaughter any number of animals on the Shabbos for the community, he is liable to bring a chatas offering.

⁹ E.g., where the blood of the first animal was poured away after the second had been slaughtered, so that it was necessary in the end to use the blood of the second animal. In this case therefore it might be said that the slaughterer was not liable since in fact two animals were necessary. On the other hand, when he slaughtered the second animal he had no reason to believe that the first would be unfit.

but we even tell him [after he has slaughtered the lean one]: Go at once and fetch a fat one and slaughter it!¹¹

The Gemora answers: If you wish, you can say: Strike out the clause about the lean animal in the first statement; or if you prefer you may say that the first statement was taught by R' Ammi.

Ravina asked Rav Ashi: What is the law if the first animal was found [after the slaughtering of the second] to be lean internally?¹² Are we to decide the issue by his intention and this man certainly intended to do what was forbidden, or by his actual deed?

He replied: Is this not the case agreed upon by Rabbah and Rava? For it was stated: If a man heard that a child had fallen into the sea and he spread nets [on the Shabbos] to catch fish and he caught fish, he is liable. If he spread nets to catch fish and he caught fish and also the child, Rabbah says: He is not liable; but Rava says: He is liable. Now only in that case does Rabbah say that he is not liable, for since he heard [of this accident], we say that his intention was also concerning the child; but where he did not hear of it [Rabbah] would not [say that he was not liable].¹³

¹⁰ Before the slaughtering of the second animal. It is a meritorious act to offer a Rina animal for a sacrifice.

¹¹ Thus contradicting Rabbah's previous statement that he is liable for slaughtering the fat animal after the lean one.

¹² When slaughtering the second animal he had no knowledge that the entrails of the first animal were lean and not fit to be offered, consequently the slaughtering of the second animal was undoubtedly a forbidden act. On the other hand, it might be said that he is not liable, since it was proved in the end that it was right to have slaughtered the second animal.

¹³ And, therefore, in the case stated by Ravina, since he did not know of the unfitness of the first animal when he slaughtered the second, he is certainly liable according to all views.

Others say that he answered him as follows: This is a matter of dispute between Rabbah and Rava. For It was stated: If a man had not heard that a child had fallen into the sea and he spread a net [on the Shabbos] to catch fish and he caught fish, he is liable. If he spread the net to catch fish and he caught fish and also the child, Rabbah says: He is not liable; but Rava says: He is liable. 'Rabbah says: He is not liable' because we decide the matter by his actual deed. 'Rava says: He is liable' because we decide the matter by his intention.

Rabbah said: If one fig was prescribed for a sick person¹⁴ and ten men ran and returned together bringing ten figs,¹⁵ they are all not liable, and [it is the same] even if they brought them one after the other, and even if the sick person had recovered after he had taken the first one.

Rava raised this question: If two figs were prescribed for a sick person and there happened to be two figs on two stalks¹⁶ and also three figs on one stalk, which are we to bring? Should we bring the two figs as they only are required, or the three, for then there is less plucking?

The Gemora answers: Surely it is obvious that we should bring the three figs [on the one stalk], for even Rabbi Yishmael only said so in that case, since the less one uses the less one reaps, but in this case, where the less one uses the more one has to pluck, we should certainly bring the three [figs].

MISHNAH. The mitzvah of the omer is that it should be brought from [what grows] nearby. If [the crop] near Jerusalem was not yet ripe, it could be brought from any place. It once happened that the omer was

¹⁴ For a sick person not only is it permitted to desecrate the Shabbos but it is even a meritorious act to do so.

¹⁵ And desecrated the Shabbos by plucking the figs.

brought from Gaggos Tzerifin and the two loaves from the valley of Ein Socher.

GEMARA. Why is this so? If you wish. I may say, because it is written: plump kernels [shall you bring]; or if you wish, I may say: Because of the rule 'One must not pass over [the first occasion for performing] the mitzvah'.

The Mishnah had stated: It once happened that the omer was brought from Gaggos Tzerifin.

Our Rabbis taught: Two Hasmonean kings (*two brothers; Hyrkanos and Aristobolus*) fought each other. Aristobolus was inside Yerushalayim and Hyrkanos laid siege to it. Each day, the besieged would lower *dinars* in a basket over the wall, and the besiegers would send up lambs for the daily offerings. There was, however, an elderly man there, who was well versed with Greek wisdom, who told them (*in a certain type of gesture-code*) that as long as the defenders engage in the sacrificial service, they will not be conquered. On the following day, they lowered the *dinars* once again to them in a bag, but this time, the besiegers sent up a pig, and when the pig reached halfway up the wall, it stuck its hoofs into the wall, and *Eretz Yisroel* shook over an area of four hundred *parsahs*. At that time they declared: Cursed be the man who rears pigs, and cursed be the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom.

The *braisa* concludes: Concerning that year we learned that the *omer* was supplied from Gaggos Tzerifim and the two loaves from the valley of Ein Socher.

The Gemora explains: For when the time for the omer arrived they did not know from where they could take it. They at

¹⁶ The stalks in either case were attached to the tree so that in any event it was necessary to transgress the Shabbos by breaking off the stalks from the tree. In the one case, however, two stalks would have to be broken off, while in the other case only one.



once proclaimed the matter, whereupon a deaf-mute came forward and pointed with one hand to the roof and with the other to a cone-shaped hut. Then Mordechai (who lived in the time of Achashverosh) spoke, "Is there anywhere a place by name Gaggos Zerifin or Zerifin Gaggos?" Thereupon they searched and found the place.

When they should have brought the Two Loaves they did not know from where they could take it. They at once proclaimed the matter, whereupon a deaf-mute came forward and put one hand on his eye and the other hand on the socket of the bolt. Then Mordechai spoke, "Is there anywhere a place by name Ein Socher or Socher Ein?" Thereupon they searched and found the place.

Once three women brought three pairs of doves to the Temple. One said, "It is for my zivah"; the other said, "It is for my yammah"; and the third said, "It is for my onah." Now they [the Kohanim] thought that by zivah, [the woman] actually meant her flow, by yammah - her my sea (discharge of a zavah which flows like the sea), and by onah - her period, and therefore of each pair of doves, one bird was to be offered for a chatas offering and the other for an olah offering. Then Mordechai spoke, "Perhaps the one had been in danger by reason of her flow, the other had been in danger by reason of a sea journey, and the third had been in danger by an infection of the eye, and therefore all the doves were to be offered for olah offerings!" Thereupon they enquired into the matter and found that it was so.

This is indeed what we have learnt: Pesachyah was over the bird-offerings. This same Pesachyah was Mordechai; why was his name called Pesachyah? Because he was able to open matters and interpret them, and he knew seventy languages.

The Gemora asks: But didn't every member of the Sanhedrin know seventy languages? For Rabbi Yochanan said: None are to be appointed members of the Sanhedrin but men of wisdom, of good appearance, of fine stature, of mature age. men with a knowledge of sorcery and who know seventy

languages, in order that the court should have no need of an interpreter!

The Gemora answers: Say, rather, that he used to mix together expressions and explain them; and on that account it is written of Mordechai 'Bilshan'.