



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

Shabbos – first day of Pesach

The *braisa* lists more proofs that when the verse’s reference to “the *Shabbos*” refers to the first day (*Yom Tov*) of *Pesach*, mandating that the omer be brought on the next day. As the *Gemora* described earlier, the heterodox *baitosim* claimed that the verse refers to a literal *Shabbos*.

1. Rabbi Yossi bar Yehudah says that the verse which says that we must count 50 days teaches that there are always 50 days from the start of *Pesach*. If the verse means to count from the first Sunday of *Pesach*, there can be anywhere from 50 to 56 days from the first of *Pesach*.
2. Rabbi Yehudah ben Besairah says that “seven weeks you shall count *to you*,” teaching that the count depends on “you”, i.e., the court. If it starts from Sunday, it is independent of the court. However, if it starts from the second day of *Pesach*, it depends on when the court established *Rosh Chodesh*.
3. Rabbi Yossi says that if the verse refers to a literal *Shabbos*, since it does not say, “*Shabbos of Pesach*,” there’s no way to know *which Shabbos*, as the verse does not specify as one occurs every week of the year. Therefore, the verse must be referring to the *Yom Tov*, which is a definite day of the year. In addition, the verse later refers to the day after the seventh “*Shabbos*,” on which *Shavuot* occurs. Just as the later reference is the start of a holiday, so the first reference is the start of a holiday (i.e., *Pesach*).
4. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar notes that one verse says that you shall eat matzah for six days, while one says that you shall eat matzah for seven days. The resolution to this seeming contradiction is that the

verse referring to six days teaches that we may eat *matzah* from the new grain only the last six days of *Pesach*. This proves that the omer is always offered on the second day of *Pesach*, leaving six days when the new grain is permitted. (65b – 66a)

What is done when?

The *braisa* continues to discuss the sequence of events on the second day of *Pesach*. One verse states that “you shall count from the day after *Shabbos*, from the day you bring the omer, seven complete weeks,” while another verse states that “from the start of harvesting, you shall start to count.”

- From the first section of the first verse (“from the day you bring the omer), we could have thought that we may counting any time after offering the omer, even on a later day. The second verse teaches that one must start counting at the same time that we start the harvest, i.e., the second day of *Pesach*.
- From the second verse alone, we could have thought that we may bring the omer any time after harvesting and counting, but the first verse teaches that we may only count *after* the omer is brought.
- We still could have thought that all the actions – harvesting, counting, and offering – are done in the daytime. Therefore, the verse mandates that the seven weeks counted be complete. The count can only be complete if it starts at the night.
- We still could have thought that we offer the omer at night. Therefore, the verse refers to the *day* of

offering the omer, mandating that it be offered in the daytime.

Therefore, the conclusion from all these verses is that harvesting and counting occur at night, while the offering is done in the day. (66a)

Challenges to proofs

Rava says that all of the proofs offered in the *braisos* above can be challenged, except for the last two of each *braisa*.

Rava explains the challenges to each of the proofs:

1. Rabbi Yochanan Zakkai proved it from the seeming contradiction between the verse referring to seven weeks and the verse referring to fifty days. We could challenge this by resolving the contradiction like Abaye, who says that the verse referring to seven weeks is teaching that we must count the weeks of *sefirah*, and is not referring to seven standard *Shabbos* weeks.
2. Rabbi Eliezer said the verse which refers to counting “for you” proves that it must depend on the court’s determination of *Rosh Chodesh*. Rabbi Yehoshua proved it from the parallel to the sequence of a month, which is apparent when it arrives. We can challenge both of these by suggesting that the verse is referring to the *last* day of *Pesach*, which would still be consistent with both of these statements.
3. Rabbi Yossi bar Yehudah said that the verse which says that if we count from after *Shabbos*, it won’t be a consistent 50 days. We can challenge this by saying that 50 days is the consistent minimum for each year.
4. Rabbi Yehudah ben Besairah offered the same proof as Rabbi Eliezer, and we can challenge him in the same way as above.
5. Rabbi Yossi himself offered an alternate proof, since he knew his first one could be challenged. Rabbi Yossi’s first proof was that if the verse refers to *Shabbos*, we wouldn’t know which one. We can challenge this by saying that it refers to the last day of *Yom Tov*.

The only proofs that cannot be challenged are:

1. The last two of the first *braisa*
 - a. Rabbi Yishmael proved it by saying that the omer is parallel to the two breads offered on *Shavuos*.
 - b. Rabbi Yehudah ben Besairah proved it from the parallel between the *Shabbos* mentioned in relation to the omer and the *Shabbos* mentioned in relation to *Shavuos*.
2. The last two of the second *braisa*
 - a. Rabbi Yossi’s second proof, which is like Rabbi Yehudah ben Besairah’s in the first *braisa*.
 - b. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar proved it from the verse which mandates eating *matzah* for six days. (66a)

Days and weeks?

The *Gemora* returns to discuss Abaye’s statement that one must count both days and weeks. The students in Rav Ashi’s *Beis Medrash* counted both days and weeks. Ameimar only counted days, as he said that now we are only counting to remember the Bais Hamikdash, and we therefore need not count the weeks. (66a)

Omer process

The *Mishna* continues describing the process of the *omer*. They harvested the barley, placed it in sacks, and brought it to the courtyard of the Bais Hamikdash. Rabbi Meir says that they then roasted it over fire, to fulfill the verse which calls it *kalui* – roasted. The Sages say that to thresh the moist *omer* stalks, they struck them with soft reeds and vegetable stalks to avoid crushing them. They then placed the kernels in a metal pan over a fire. To ensure the fire fully affected all the kernels, the pan had holes. They then laid the kernels out in the courtyard to allow the wind to dry them off. They placed the kernels in a coarse mill, and then extracted one isaron after sifting with thirteen sifters. The remaining flour is redeemed, and then can be eaten by anyone. *Challah* must

be taken from the remaining flour, but *ma'aser* need not be taken. Rabbi Akiva says that *ma'aser* also must be taken.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which learns the details of processing the *omer* barley from the verse. The verse calls the *omer* offering *aviv kalui ba'esh geres karmel* – first, roasted in the fire, ground, moist. The word *aviv* – first teaches that it must be from the first harvest. Rabbi Meir says that the phrase *kalui ba'esh* means that it is roasted on the fire, while the Sages say that the word *kalui* connotes the use of a medium that is *kalil* – light, i.e., a porous metal pan, which allows the fire to fully affect all of the kernels. The *braisa* continues to explain that if the verse would have said *aviv kalui geres* – first, roasted, ground, we would not know whether to roast it when it is just harvested (*aviv*) or when it is already ground (*geres*). Since the verse inserted the word *ba'esh* – in the fire after the word *kalui* – roasted, it teaches that it is first roasted, and only then ground.

The *braisa* concludes with a discussion of the word *karmel* – moist. This word, of the four letters *kaf raish mem* and *lamed*, means two words, made of the same letters: *rach* (*raish chaf*) – soft and *mal* (*mem lamed*) – soft and easily rolled. The *braisa* cites other instances of verses that have words that are each references to other words:

1. The verse says a man was coming to Elisha new bread, twenty loaves of barley, and moist bread *b'tziklono*, and he told him to give it to the people so they can eat. The *braisa* says that the word *b'tziklono* is an acronym, meaning:

Ba – he came

Vayatzeq lanu – and he poured for us

V'achalnu – and we ate (using a vav, like the **o**)

v'naveh haya – and it was pleasant (using a vav, like the final **o**)

2. The verse refers to the adulteress, who says to the adulterer, *nisalsa* in love. The word *nisalsa* means:

Nisa v'nitain – let us exchange (with the tav like the soft sav)

V'na'aleh – and we will go up [on a bed]

V'nismach – and we will be happy

V'nischateh – and we will stroll (with the ches similar to the final heh)

3. The verse refers to the wing of the wild bird *ne'elasa*. The word *ne'elasa* means:

Noseh – carrying [its egg]

Oleh – goes up

V'nischateh – and it goes down (with the ches similar to the final heh)

4. The verse says that the angel told bilam that the path he was on *yarat* opposite me. The word *yarat* means:

Yarasa – she [the donkey] was afraid [of the angel]

Ra'asa – she saw [the angel]

Nat'esa – she veered

The *Gemora* cites the *braisa* of Rabbi Yishmael's *bais midrash*, which says that *karmel* is a contraction of the words *kar* – a pillow (i.e, soft) and *maleih* – full (i.e., fully ripe). (66a – 66b)

Obligated in *ma'aser*?

The *Gemora* discusses the dispute between Rabbi Akiva and the Sages about the obligation to take *ma'aser* from the remaining flour. Rav Kahana says that Rabbi Akiva says it is obligated in *ma'aser* since he says that the smoothing of the pile of grain (which is the point at which it is obligated in *ma'aser*) done by the *hekdesh* – property of the *Bais Hamikdash* does not remove the obligation for *ma'aser*. The *Gemora* challenges this:

1. The *braisa* says that the Sages challenged Rabbi Akiva, saying that it should be just like grain that was smoothed out by the administrator of *hekdesh*, which is obligated in *challah*, but not obligated in *ma'aser*. If Rav Kahana is correct, this is no proof, since Rabbi Akiva says that in both cases, it isn't obligated in *ma'aser*. (Rav Sheishes)
2. The *braisa* says that Rabbi Akiva explicitly says the remaining flour is obligated in *challah*, but not in *ma'aser*, since *hekdesh* only acquired the final required measure of flour, so the rest was never the property of *hekdesh*. (Rav Kahana bar Tachlifa)



The *Gemora* therefore concludes (as Rabbi Yochanan says) that Rabbi Akiva says that it is obligated in *ma'aser* since *hekdesh* only acquired the amount of flour needed, and not the remainder.

Rava enumerates the impact of various owners of produce and dough on the obligations of *ma'aser* and *challah*:

- All agree that smoothing done by *hekdesh* removes the obligation for *ma'aser*.
- The *Tannaim* debate whether the smoothing done by a non-Jew removes the obligation.

The *braisa* says that Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah say that one may take *ma'aser* from any produce on any other produce, whether any of the produce is from a Jew, a non-Jew, or a Cuthean. This indicates that they consider all produce, whether of a Jew or non-Jew, to be obligated in *ma'aser*. Rabbi Yossi and Rabbi Shimon say that one may not take *ma'aser* from a Jew's produce on a Cuthean's or non-Jew's, nor vice versa, indicating that they do not consider a non-Jew's produce to be fully obligated in *ma'aser*.

- Dough which was owned by *hekdesh* at the point of mixing flour with water (at which point the obligation of *challah* takes effect) is not obligated in *challah*.

This is indicated from the *Mishna*, which says that if a woman sanctified dough before adding the water or after adding the water, and then redeemed it, she must take *challah*. However, if she sanctified it before adding the water, then the administrator of *hekdesh* mixed in the water, and she then redeemed it, she need not take *challah*, since it owned by *hekdesh* at the point the obligation of *challah* would take effect. (66b – 67a)

The *Gemora* discusses the parameters of counting *sefirah*. Abaye says that one is obligated to count both days and weeks, and the students of Rav Ashi would count days and weeks. AmEimar only counted days, as he said that the counting nowadays is only Rabbinic, in memory of the Bais Hamikdash.

The Tur (OH 489) rules like Abaye, requiring a count of days and weeks, but cites various opinions about what that means:

1. Every night, starting from the seventh, one must count the full days, as well as the number of weeks, and the days in the current week. This is our practice.
2. When one reaches a full week, he counts the days and weeks (e.g., 7 days, which are one week). For other days, he counts the number of weeks and the days in the current week. He need not count the full days (e.g., 8) as he already counted the number of days in each of the full weeks.[Avi Haezri]
3. One only mentions the week when it is completed. Otherwise, one just counts the full days. The Tur says this is the correct explanation.

The Rishonim debate whether we rule that the counting is Rabbinic or Torah mandated nowadays. Tosfos (66a zecher) rules that counting the *omer* nowadays is Rabbinic. Therefore, one may count during *bein hashmashos* – between sunset and dusk. Although that period is only possibly night, one may treat it as night for the Rabbinic commandment.

Tosfos suggests that one should *preferably* count during that time, in order to fulfill the commandment of *temimos* – full days, as the earlier in the day one counts, the more complete the count will be, but Tosfos reject this.

The Rambam (Temidin umusafim 7:24) and the Rif (end of *Pesachim*) say that it is from the Torah nowadays, as illustrated from our practice to count days and weeks.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Sefirahs Haomer

Rabbi Ovadia Yosef (Chazon Ovadia Yom Tov Hilchos *Sefirah* 1) says that since the Shulchan Aruch rules that it is Rabbinic, one should not treat it as a Torah commandment. Therefore, if one says the introductory *I'shem yichud*, he should omit any reference to the verses about the counting of the *omer*, since that would look like he is blurring the lines between Torah and Rabbinic commandments, which is a form of *bal tosif* – adding on the *mitzvos*.

Tosfos further cites the Behag, who says that if one did not count at night, he may count in the day. The Behag cites the *Mishna* (71a) which says that if they did not harvest the grain for the *omer* at night, they may do so in the daytime, and states that the same should be true for the counting, which begins at the same time as harvesting.

Rabbeinu Tam disagrees, and notes that the *Mishna* is only one opinion, while Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon says that it must be cut at night. In fact, the more authoritative anonymous *Mishna* in Megillah (20b) says that any commandment which is for the night can be done the whole night, and cites the harvesting of the *omer* as an example. The *Mishna* implies that only during the night can it be fulfilled, and not in the day. Therefore, counting the *omer* similarly can only be done during the night.

Furthermore, Tosfos (Megilla 20b kol) quotes Rabbeinu Tam saying that even if one may harvest the *omer* in the day, one may not count in the day, as the verse mandates that the days be *temimos* – complete.

The Behag also says that the requirement of *temimos* – complete requires that one count *all* of the 49 days. Therefore, if one missed a full day, he may not continue counting, as he has not fulfilled the *mitzvah*.

Tosfos disagrees, and says that each day is its own *mitzvah*.

The Tur cites the position of Rav Sa'adia Gaon, who says that one may continue counting even if he skipped a day, as long as he did not skip the first day.

Remainder of the omer flour

Rabbi Akiva says that the remainder of the *omer* flour is obligated in *challah* and *ma'aser*. The *Gemora* concludes that this is because Rabbi Akiva says that only the amount ultimately needed was sanctified, so the remainder was not considered the property of *hekdesh*.

Tosfos (66b shelo) notes that according to Rabbi Akiva, there is no sanctity in the remainder, so it should not have to be redeemed. Yet, the *Mishna* states that the remainder was redeemed. Tosfos offers two answers:

1. The statement that the remainder was redeemed is made by the Sages, but Rabbi Akiva says that it need not be redeemed.
2. Even Rabbi Akiva agrees that Rabbinically it must be redeemed, to avoid people thinking that something consecrated can be used without being redeemed.