



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

### Combining Terumah

*Terumah*<sup>1</sup>, *terumas ma'aser*<sup>2</sup>, *terumas ma'aser* separated from *demai*<sup>3</sup>, *challah*<sup>4</sup> and *bikkurim*<sup>5</sup> can combine with one another to render other things forbidden (e.g., if small amounts of yeast from these five items fall into a dough and leaven it, even though each one of them could not have leavened it by itself, the dough is prohibited to all non-Kohanim), and to be liable to the payment of a fifth (if a non-Kohen has eaten unwittingly the amount of an olive, one is liable to the payment of an additional fifth). All kinds of *piggul* can combine with one another, and all kinds of *nossar* can combine with one another.

The *Gemora* notes that they combine with each other, for they are called by the term '*terumah*.' (15b)

### Combining Neveilah and Sheratzim

All kinds of *neveilah*<sup>6</sup> can combine with one another (to make up the required legal size of an olive), and all kinds of *sheratzim*<sup>7</sup> can combine with one another.

Rav said: This has been taught only with reference to *tumah*, but with regard to eating, (the *neveilos* – carcasses of) kosher animals form one group for themselves and nonkosher animals another. [This is because

a nonkosher animal cannot possess the prohibition of *neveilah* – even when it wasn't slaughtered, because of the principle that one prohibition (*neveilah*) cannot take effect upon an existing prohibition (*nonkosher*).]

Levi said: Also in regard to eating do they all combine with one another. [Levi maintains that this case is an exception, and one prohibition (*neveilah*) can take effect upon an existing prohibition (*nonkosher*).]

And Rav Assi said: Kosher animals for themselves and nonkosher animals for themselves.

There are some that say that Rav Assi differs from Rav (and he maintains that they do not combine even for *tumah*), while others say that he does not disagree with him.

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Assi from the following *braisa*: [The meat of] a dead cow (which was not slaughtered properly) and [the meat severed off] a living camel combine with one another (if there was half an olive's volume of each; they combine together to render one liable to lashes for eating it). This would imply that if both, however, were dead, their meat would combine (although a camel is a nonkosher animal). Does this not create a difficulty for Rav Assi?

The *Gemora* deflects the challenge by saying that the implication meant is that if both animals were alive they could combine; and this would be in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah's view who holds that the

<sup>1</sup> the separation of a certain amount of produce which is then given to a Kohen

<sup>2</sup> the Levite takes one tenth of his *ma'aser* received, and gives it to the Kohen; it has the sanctity of *terumah*

<sup>3</sup> produce purchased from an *am ha'aretz*; since we are uncertain if *ma'aser* was separated, one is obligated to separate *ma'aser rishon* from it, but he is not required to give it to the Levi because that would be a monetary question (since there are no prohibitions regarding its consumption), and those issues are decided by using the principle of "the one attempting to extract payment from the other bears the burden of proof" – however, he is obligated to separate the *terumas ma'aser* from the *ma'aser rishon*, for otherwise, it will be prohibited for consumption

<sup>4</sup> a portion of dough which is separated and then given to a Kohen; has halachos like *terumah*

<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>6</sup> carcass of an animal that was not slaughtered properly; this is with respect of *tumah* and consumption

<sup>7</sup> the Torah enumerates eight creeping creatures whose carcasses transmit *tumah* through contact; they are also forbidden for consumption

prohibition to eat a limb from a living animal applies also to nonkosher animals.

The *Gemora* asks: But what then would be the law if they both were dead? Presumably, they would not combine! If so, why did the *braisa* rush to state the case of the meat of a dead cow and the meat of a living camel? Surely even if both were dead they would not combine!?

The *Gemora* continues: And furthermore, we have learned in another *braisa*: Half an olive size (*of the meat*) of a living cow and half an olive-size of that of a dead camel cannot combine with one another, but half an olive size of the meat of a cow and half an olive size of that of a camel can combine with one another, whether both are alive or both are dead. There, seemingly, would be a contradiction between the opening clause and the concluding one (*for here it is saying that the meat from a living cow would combine with the meat of a dead camel, and the opening clause rules exactly the opposite*)!? You must therefore come to the conclusion that (*the concluding clause is only teaching us that*) in the case of both animals being dead, they can combine with one another! [*Does this not create a difficulty for Rav Assi?*]

The *Gemora* answers that Rav Assi would reply that the *Tanna* of this *braisa* holds that a prohibition can take effect upon something that has been prohibited already by reason of another prohibition (*while his ruling is following the view that such a prohibition cannot take effect*).

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: As to the eating of *sheratzim*, one is liable to the penalty of lashes only when one has consumed an olive-size (*unlike the law of tumah, which applies even with the size of a lentil*). Why is this? It is because the expression ‘eating’ is used in that connection (*and we have a tradition that “eating” mentioned in the Torah connotes an olive-size*).

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi, the son of Rabbi Chanina recited before Rabbi Yochanan: It is written: *You shall separate between the kosher animal and the nonkosher one, and between the nonkosher bird and the kosher one, and you shall not defile your souls by (eating) such animals and birds, or by anything that creeps upon the ground, which I have set apart for you to render tamei*. The Torah speaks at the beginning of eating and ends with *tumah*, in order to indicate that as with reference to *tumah* - the lentil is the standard size, so also with regard to eating. Rabbi Yochanan (*upon hearing this*) praised him. Does this not create a difficulty for Rav?

Rav Yosef answers: There is no difficulty, for the *braisa* deals with *sheratzim* while they are dead (*where one is liable to lashes even through a lentil-size*), whereas Rav is referring to *sheratzim* while they are alive.

Abaye said to him: But doesn’t Rav refer his statement to the *Mishna*, and our *Mishna* speaks of ‘all *sheratzim*’ - even though they are dead?

Rav Yosef replied: That is your assumption. The fact is that Rav made an independent statement.

The *Gemora* asks: And Rabbi Yochanan praised him!? But we learned as follows: There is no minimum size for limbs (*of a neveilah or sheretz; if it is whole*) it transmits *tumah* – even if it is smaller than an olive or lentil. And Rabbi Yochanan remarked: The penalty of lashes, however, is incurred only for an olive-size!

Rava answers: The Torah speaks only of those that are separated (*from others; this refers to sheratzim, for it is only the eight species of rodents mentioned in the Torah that transmit tumah; this is in contrast to dead animals, where the carcass of all animals transmit tumah*). [*R’ Yochanan praised R’ Yosi in his interpretation of the verse, was referring specifically to sheratzim, which were ‘separated’ from other rodents. Although limbs from those sheratzim transmit tumah – even by the smallest size, one incurs lashes for eating them only if they are an olive-size. When R’ Yochanan ruled that the size of an olive is required, he was referring to the limbs of animals.*]

Rav Adda the son of Ahavah said to Raba: If so, why not draw a distinction also with reference to animals between those that are separated (*entire limbs*) and those that are not separated? [*We should say that just as regarding tumah, an entire limb from a dead animal transmits tumah – even when it is less than an olive-size, so too, one should incur lashes for eating such a limb - even when it is less than an olive-size!?*]

Rava replied to him: The Torah compares them with reference to the prohibition of ‘*you shall not defile,*’ but not with regard to their minimum sizes. (15b – 17a)