



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mar the son of Ravina said, This is what he means: No: if you say thus of other mitzvos — where the unintentional is not treated as intentional, for if he intended cutting what was detached but cut what is attached, he is not culpable;<sup>1</sup> will you say [the same] in the case of me’ilah, where if he intended to warm himself with wool shearings of chullin but warmed himself with the wool shearings of an olah-offering he is liable to a me’ilah-offering? (33a1 – 33a2)

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: He means this: If you say thus in the case of other mitzvos, that is because he who is not preoccupied [with another action] is not declared culpable like he who is preoccupied,<sup>2</sup> for if he intended to pick up that which was detached but he plucked that which is attached [instead], he is not culpable;<sup>3</sup> will you say [the same] of me’ilah, where if he stretched out his hand to take a vessel and [incidentally] anointed his hand with holy oil,<sup>4</sup> he is liable for me’ilah? (33a2)

The Master said: ‘When is this said? When he separates terumah and it became chametz. But if he separates

terumah of chametz on Pesach, all agree that it is not holy.’ From where do we know this? — Said Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak, Scripture said, [The first of your gathered fruits, of your wine, and of your oil ...] shall you give to him; but not for its light.<sup>5</sup>

Rav Huna son of Rav Yehoshua objected: One must not separate terumah from tamei [produce] for tahor; yet if he separates [thus] unwittingly, his terumah is valid. Yet why? Let us say, ‘for him, but not for his light’? — There is no difficulty: There it enjoyed a time of fitness,<sup>6</sup> whereas here<sup>7</sup> it did not enjoy a time of fitness.<sup>8</sup> And how is it conceivable that it had no time of fitness? E.g. if it became chametz while attached [to the soil].<sup>9</sup> But if it became chametz when detached,<sup>10</sup> would it indeed be holy?<sup>11</sup> — Yes, he replied: ‘the sentence is by the decree of the watchers, and the matter by the word of the holy ones’; and thus do they rule in the academy in accordance with my view.

When Rav Huna son of Rav Yehoshua came, he said, Scripture said: The first [of your gathered fruits etc.],

in which it cannot be eaten, as here, it does not become terumah.

<sup>6</sup> Before it became tamei it was fit to be separated as terumah.

<sup>7</sup> In the case of the chametz terumah.

<sup>8</sup> It was not fit to be terumah before Pesach as it goes on explaining.

<sup>9</sup> While before it is harvested it cannot be declared terumah.

<sup>10</sup> I.e., before Pesach, so that it was fit to be terumah before the Festival.

<sup>11</sup> If separated as terumah during Pesach.

<sup>1</sup> This refers to the Shabbos, when one must not cut or pluck produce growing in the soil (‘attached’). In the present case he is not liable to a sin-offering, which is only due when a man sins in ignorance, i.e., where he intended to do what he did, but did not know that it was forbidden.

<sup>2</sup> But rather, he is culpable for transgressing only while he is not preoccupied with another action.

<sup>3</sup> Here he was not engaged in plucking or cutting at all.

<sup>4</sup> There too he was not engaged in anointing at all.

<sup>5</sup> I.e., the Kohen must be able to consume it himself and not have to burn it for its heat or light. Hence if it is separated in a state

[implying] that its remains are distinct [in that it becomes permitted] to the Israelite,<sup>12</sup> [thus] this<sup>13</sup> is excluded, since its remains are not [so] distinct.<sup>14</sup> (33a3 – 33b1)

Rav Acha bar Rav Avya sat before Rav Chisda and he sat and said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If grapes became tamei, one may tread them out less than an egg in quantity at a time, and their wine is fit for libations.<sup>15</sup> This proves that he holds that the juice is indeed stored up,<sup>16</sup> [consequently] when is it [the juice] tamei? When he expresses it; [but] when he expresses it, its standard quantity [for rendering tamei] is absent. If so, [he can tread] as much as an egg too, for we learned: If a man became tamei through a corpse squeezes out olives or grapes exactly as much as an egg in quantity, they are tahor?<sup>17</sup> — There it is [thus] if he did it,<sup>18</sup> here it is in the first instance [when he must not tread as much as an egg] for fear lest he come to tread more than an egg.<sup>19</sup>

Said Rav Chisda to him, Who needs you and Rabbi Yochanan your teacher: where then has their tumah gone? This proves that he holds that the juice is indeed absorbed,<sup>20</sup> and since the [solid] eatable is tamei, the juice

<sup>12</sup> I.e., by giving the terumah to the Kohen, the remains become permitted to the Israelite.

<sup>13</sup> Chametz separated as terumah during Pesach.

<sup>14</sup> The remains, being chametz, remain forbidden to the Israelite.

<sup>15</sup> On the altar. Tamei food less than an egg in quantity cannot make other eatables tamei. Hence when he treads out the grapes in such small quantities, there is never enough to make the exuded juice tamei, and the wine manufactured from them is tahor, and consequently fit for libations on the altar, for which, of course, only tahor wine is valid.

<sup>16</sup> It is not joined, as it were, to the outer skin and part of it, but like a liquid that is kept in a vessel. For if it were held to be absorbed and part of the skin, it would become tamei simultaneously with the skin.

<sup>17</sup> This person defiles food, and the food in turn, if not less than an egg in quantity, defiles liquids. Here the man does not touch the expressed juice. Now after the first drop issues the remains are less than the necessary minimum and therefore it does not defile the liquid that follows.

too is tamei. And do you not hold that the juice is stored up? he replied. Surely we learned: If he who is tamei through a corpse squeezes out olives and grapes exactly as much as an egg in quantity, they are tahor. Now it is well if you say that the liquid is stored up; for that reason it is tahor. But if you say [that] it is absorbed, why is it tahor? — Said he to him: We discuss here grapes which were not made fit;<sup>21</sup> when [then] do they become fit? when he squeezes them;<sup>22</sup> but when he squeezes them the standard quantity [for tumah] is diminished.<sup>23</sup> For if you should not say thus, [them] when it was taught, 'To what is this like? To terumah of mulberries and grapes which were tamei, which is not permitted to him either for eating or for burning.' — But surely it may be eaten too, for if he wishes, he can tread them out less than an egg at a time?<sup>24</sup> — Said Rava: It is a preventive measure,<sup>25</sup> lest he come to a stumbling-block through them.<sup>26</sup>

Abaye said to him, Yet do we fear a stumbling-block? Surely it was taught: One may light [a fire] with bread or oil of terumah which was tamei!<sup>27</sup> — The bread he casts among the wood, he replied, and the oil of terumah he pours into a repulsive vessel.<sup>28</sup> (33b1 – 33b4)

<sup>18</sup> If he squeezes as much as an egg, it is tahor.

<sup>19</sup> If he comes to ask what to do, he is told to tread it less than an egg at a time. For if he is permitted to tread out exactly as much as an egg, he may exceed it, thus rendering the whole tamei.

<sup>20</sup> As part of the grape, and does not stand separate.

<sup>21</sup> To become tamei. Before an eatable can become tamei it must have had moisture upon it.

<sup>22</sup> I.e., the first drop which exudes and touches the outer skin makes the grapes fit to become tamei.

<sup>23</sup> For after the first drop has oozed out, less than an egg in quantity is left.

<sup>24</sup> If we assume that the liquid is merely stored up. Hence it follows that the liquid is absorbed and is tamei simultaneously with the outer skins of the mulberries and grapes.

<sup>25</sup> Sc. thus denying him the right to squeeze them out in such small quantities.

<sup>26</sup> He may eat them while treading them.

<sup>27</sup> And we do not fear that he may come to eat it.

<sup>28</sup> So that in both cases he is not likely to eat it.

[It was stated in] the text: ‘One may light [a fire] with bread or oil of terumah which was tamei’. Abaye said in Chizkiyah's name, and Rava said in the name of the school of Rabbi Yitzchak bar Marta, who said in Rav Huna's name: They learned this of bread only, but not of wheat, lest he come to a stumbling-block through it.<sup>29</sup> But Rabbi Yochanan said: Even wheat. But why? Let us fear lest he come to a stumbling-block through it? — As Rav Ashi said [elsewhere]. It refers to boiled [grains], so that they are repulsive; so here too it refers to boiled [grains], which are repulsive. And where was Rav Ashi's [explanation] stated? In reference to what Rabbi Avin son of Rav Acha said in Rabbi Yitzchak's name: Abba Shaul was the baker in Rebbe's house, and they used to heat him hot water with wheat of tamei terumah, in order to knead dough in purity. But why? Let us fear lest he come to a stumbling-block through it? — Said Rav Ashi: It refers to boiled [grains], which are repulsive. (33b4 – 34a1)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Mis'asek*

In our *Gemora*, Mar the son of Ravina explains the *braisa* as stating that *me'ilah* is more stringent than other *mitzvos*. In other *mitzvos*, such as *Shabbos*, “*mis'asek*” is exempt. This means that one needs to have intended to do the exact act of desecrating *Shabbos* in order to be obligated to bring a *korban* (*he simply forgot it was Shabbos, or that the work was prohibited on Shabbos*). However, regarding *me'ilah*, if a person had two pieces of wool and intended to pick up the one that was not *hekdesh* to warm himself and he instead picked up and warmed himself with the one that was *hekdesh*, he is obligated to bring a *korban*.

<sup>29</sup> Even if wheat is thrown among wood it does not become repulsive.

The Pnei Yehoshua asks that the *Gemora* seems to be focusing on *Shabbos* as representing “all other *mitzvos*.” It would seem that besides for *Shabbos*, in all other *mitzvos* we have a rule that if someone was *mis'asek* in forbidden relations or eating forbidden fats, he is obligated to bring a *korban* (see Kerisus 19b). The rule is that *mis'asek* is generally obligated because of the benefit the person derived from being *mis'asek* (*i.e. he still enjoyed the forbidden fats*). Why did our *Gemora* think *me'ilah* should better be compared to *Shabbos* than these prohibitions?

The Pnei Yehoshua answers that in our case the person did *not* benefit from using the *hekdesh* wool. This is because he could have been warmed with permitted wool, and it made no difference to him that he was warmed with forbidden wool. The wool is the exact same material; just it had happened to be declared *hekdesh*. On the other hand, the case of forbidden fats and relations is where the person derives benefit from something he would never be allowed to benefit from, namely a type of forbidden fat or having relations with a person he would never be permitted to have relations with. In such a case the benefit means that even a *mis'asek* must bring a *korban* (*see Sfas Emes who argues with the Pnei Yehoshua and gives a different answer*).

## DAILY MASHAL

### Like Angels

Once the Chasam Sofer discussed the greatness of his rebbe, R' Nosson Adler *zt"l*. Someone commented, “Yes, R' Nosson Adler was like a *malach*.” When the Chasam Sofer heard this he took great offense. “A *malach*? You have no idea what a *malach* is and you have no idea who R' Nosson Adler was. My rebbe was far greater than the *malachim*.”