

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Rami bar Chama's questions (cont.)

The Gemara rejects Rabbah's proof and the question of whether the two loaves permit new grain for use for korbanos remains unresolved.

Rami bar Chama inquires about the degree of development of fruit for the two loaves to permit them for use as bikkurim.

The Gemara clarifies the question and the matter is left unresolved.

Rava bar R' Chanan inquires about the status of kernels that were harvested, placed in the ground before the Omer was offered and then removed from the ground afterwards.

It is noted that this question is relevant concerning ona'ah and whether one would take an oath concerning these matters and the question is left unresolved.

Rami bar Chama inquires about the status of wheat kernels found in the droppings of animals.

After the Gemara clarifies the intent of the question it is left unresolved.

Rami bar Chama inquires about the status of a basket that was swallowed and then expelled by an elephant.

The question is clarified.

Two unsuccessful attempts to resolve this inquiry are presented and the matter is left unresolved.

R' Zeira inquires about the status of kernels that fell with the rain.

The matter is left unresolved.

### 2) Grain permitted by the Omer

R' Shimon ben Pazi inquires about the status of an ear of grain that was harvested before the Omer and then replanted after the Omer.

An unsuccessful attempt to resolve these questions is presented and the matter is left unresolved.

### 3) Ma'aser

Rabbah inquires whether in regard to ma'aser we follow the root. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is הנצה and what is חנטה?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What principle is derived from the verse הקריבהו נא לפחתך?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. May one use grain that fell from the sky for the two loaves?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Explain R' Shimon ben Pazi's inquiry as to whether we follow the root or its increase?  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

Using a commodity obtained through a miracle

חטין שירדו בעבים

R' Zeira asked whether wheat that falls from the clouds may be used in the Beis HaMikdash. Rashi explains that the case is where some clouds hovered over the ocean and as it absorbed moisture, it passed by a boat which was carrying a load of wheat, and these also became absorbed into the clouds. The wheat later fell over land in Eretz Yisroel. The question is whether these kernels of wheat qualify as wheat "from your encampments," which is required for the two loaves for Shavuot based upon the verse in Vayikra (23:21). Does the verse exclude only wheat from outside the land, but wheat from the clouds is acceptable because they are not considered to be from outside the land, or must the wheat be from the land itself, and the clouds are not part of the land of Eretz Yisroel?

Tosafos questions Rashi's explanation of the inquiry of R' Zeira. If the wheat was originally from outside the land, there is no reason to say that their lingering in the clouds should permit their being used. This would not avoid the wheat's having originated outside the land.

Rather, Tosafos explains that the case is where the wheat fell miraculously from a cloud, without its having originated outside Eretz Yisroel. The question, therefore, is whether it is permitted to use wheat which was obtained through a miracle. Is wheat allowed, even if it never grew from the ground, or must we use only naturally-grown products?

Kli Chemdah points out that Tosafos understands that the doubt is only whether wheat obtained through a miracle is considered to be from the land or not, but using wheat from the skies is not an issue. A minchah must be brought from wheat, and the Torah considers this miraculous product to be genuine wheat.

A similar situation is found in reference to the miracle of Chanukah. When the Beis HaMikdash was to be rededicated by the Chashmonaim, only found only one capsule of oil. They lit it, and it miraculously lasted for eight days. Tosafos HaRosh explains that they lit the entire bottle the first day, and after it burned, it miraculously refilled many times and

Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעילוי נשמת ר' שמואל נחמן בן ר' פנחס, ע"ה  
By the Okner family

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
In loving memory of our mother and grandmother  
מרת ח' גיטא בת ר' ברוך, ע"ה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Eating a kosher animal that ate non-kosher food

פיל שבלע כפיפה מצרית וכו'

An elephant that swallowed a "mitzris basket" etc.

Rami bar Chama inquired about the status of a basket that was tamei that was swallowed by an elephant and came out intact after going through the entire digestive system of the elephant. According to the Gemara's conclusion, if the basket had been even partially digested it is no longer tamei. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> notes that this seems inconsistent with a ruling in Bechoros (7b) that if a kosher fish swallows a non-kosher fish the non-kosher fish remains prohibited even if it was partially digested. Rav Hai Gaon differentiates between tum'ah and prohibited foods. Tosafos draws a distinction between what is found inside of the animal and that which has been expelled after travelling through the digestive system.

This disagreement has practical application in regard to the question of whether one may eat a kosher animal that was fed non-kosher food. Rema<sup>2</sup> rules that an animal that was fed non-kosher food is permitted but if it was only fed non-kosher food it is prohibited. Shach<sup>3</sup> disagrees and permits the consumption of an animal that was fed only non-kosher food with the rationale that once it was fully digested by the kosher animal the non-kosher food no longer exists and does not prohibit the kosher animal that consumed it.

Pri Megadim<sup>4</sup> cites Knesses Hagedolah who writes about a

(Insight...continued from page 1)

lasted another seven days. The oil which appeared each subsequent day was not oil which came from olives. Yet the mitzvah is to light olive oil, not a miraculous substance which did not come from olives. Nevertheless, we see that oil obtained by means of a miracle is still considered to be oil. Due to this question, R' Chaim of Brisk understands that the original capsule of oil only burned one-eighth of its volume each day, and the miracle was its qualitative ability to burn longer, not in its quantitative increase in more oil each day. ■

certain type of bird that was fed non-kosher food and ruled that as long as it was in the possession of a Jew for twenty-four hours before it was slaughtered the bird is permitted for consumption. Be'er Heitev<sup>5</sup> quotes Beis Yaakov who also rules that an animal that ate non-kosher food should not be slaughtered for twenty-four hours. Rav Moshe Feinstein<sup>6</sup> explained that whatever an animal digests no longer poses a kashrus problem and that is why the Poskim are not concerned about what the animal was fed. However, food that is not digested remains prohibited. Since it is not known how long it takes an animal to digest its food these Poskim adopted the period of twenty-four as an amount of time about which one could be certain that the non-kosher food was already digested. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה דבלע.
2. רמ"א יו"ד סי' ס' סע' א'.
3. ש"ך שם סק"ה.
4. פמ"ג שם שפ"ד סק"ה.
5. בה"ט שם סק"ג.
6. שו"ת אג"מ או"ח ח"א סי' קמ"ז. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## A Corruption of Judgment

"כל דבר שבמדה ושבמשקל ושבמנין..."

On today's daf Rashi explains that if dishonest weights or measures are used, a sale is annulled even if the amount that the customer was overcharged was less than a sixth over the total value of the item, but if dishonest weights or measures were not used, small overcharges need not be refunded. Rambam disagrees with this interpretation, however, and maintains that any amount that was charged beyond the true value of the item must be returned to the customer. In his view, the halachah does not countenance cheating, no matter how small the difference.

The author of the Sefer HaChinuch

explains that the reasoning behind this mitzvah should be obvious to any thinking person. "The root of not cheating another in business is self-evident; every person understands this from his intellect. Even if this halachah had not been recorded, everyone would understand that it is fitting to write it. It is obvious that it is improper to use deceit to deprive our fellow human beings of their property. Everyone must earn money by working with whatever skills and opportunities God sends his way—honestly and with integrity."

He continues, "Everyone benefits if people don't cheat. Just as one can cheat, he can also be cheated. Although a certain person may be exceptionally adept at deception, it is still not worthwhile to engage in the practice. He may be a

skilled swindler but perhaps his children will be less skilled and will be robbed. Clearly this mitzvah is for the public good and is essential for the maintenance of civilized society. God, blessed is He, created the world so that it would be a settled and civilized place."<sup>1</sup>

The Panim Yafos, ז"ל, offers food for thought for the person who does cheat others. "The verse states, 'לא תעשו עול במשפט'—Do not do corruption in judgment.' This prohibition is also directed at a person who falsifies his weights and measures. Every person who weighs or measures merchandise is like a judge, since he must fairly calibrate how much he dispenses to his customers. Failing to give the exact amount even slightly is also a corruption of judgment."<sup>2</sup> ■

1. ספר החינוך, מצוה של"ז
2. פנים יפות, ויקרא, י"ט: ל"ה. ■