



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

Proof from Rabbi Shimon

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve the question (regarding the replanted *Shemitah* onion) from the following *Baraisa*: Rabbi Shimon said: Any forbidden item which can become permitted, such as *tevel* (untithed produce), *ma’aser sheini* (a tenth of one’s produce that he brings to *Yerushalayim* and eats there in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of the *Shemitah* cycle), *hekdesch*, or *chadash* (the new crop of grain, which cannot be eaten until the *korban omer* is brought on the second day of *Pesach*), the *Chachamim* did not give an amount (for when it can become nullified, for even the smallest amount will prohibit an entire mixture). However, regarding any item which cannot become permitted, such as *terumah*, *terumas ma’aser*, *chalah* (a portion of dough which is separated and then given to a *Kohen*; has *halachos* like *terumah*), *orlah* (the fruit that grows from a tree; the first three years of its life, they are forbidden for all benefit) and *kilayim* of the vineyard (the prohibition against planting together different species of vegetables, fruit or seeds; *kilayim* of a vineyard is forbidden for all benefit), the *Chachamim* did give an amount (that it will become nullified in a mixture).

They said to Rabbi Shimon: But the produce from *Shemitah*, which also does not become permitted, and nevertheless, the *Chachamim* did not give an amount (for when it can become nullified, for even the smallest

amount will prohibit an entire mixture). For we learned in a *Mishnah*: All produce of *Shemitah* will be prohibited in any amount, if it is mixed with its own kind. (*Ra”n*: Both in the case of a mixture of permitted fruits with those of *Shemitah* and in the case of growth, such as an onion of the sixth year that was replanted during *Shemitah*.)

Rabbi Shimon replied: That *Mishnah* is only referring to the *halachah* of *bi’ur* i.e. removing (the produce of *Shemitah* may be kept as long as that produce is still available in the fields for the animals; afterwards, it may no longer remain in the house). (*Ra”n*: Since it was possible to eat it before that time, it is regarded as something that can become permitted.) However, in respect to eating the produce of *Shemitah* after the “time of removal,” the mixture will only be prohibited if there is enough of the *Shemitah* produce to give flavor into the entire mixture. (It is evident from this *Mishnah* that growths do not become like the root, for otherwise, how could *Shemitah* render something forbidden by means of growth? Rather, growths are certainly not like the original part and therefore, they can nullify it!)

The *Gemora* rejects this proof, as it is possible that this was just regarding being stringent (however, in respect to our question, perhaps the new growths from the eighth year are regarded like the root, and therefore, the onion will be forbidden). (57b3 – 58a2)

Rained on Onions

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve the question (regarding the replanted *Shemitah* onion) from the following *Mishnah*: Onions that grew in the sixth year and rain caused them to grow during the seventh year the *halachah* is as follows: If their leaves are black, they are forbidden (because this indicates that they grew from the nutrients of the ground during *Shemitah*). However, if their leaves were yellow, they are permitted. Rabbi Chanania ben Antignos said: If the onions can be pulled out of the ground by their leaves, they are forbidden. If this corresponding situation would occur in the eighth year, the *halachah* is identical (if the leaves are black or strong enough to pull out the onion, the onions will be permitted). It is clearly evident that the growth does not become like the root, and it can nullify that which was forbidden (the root which grew during *Shemitah*).

The *Gemora* rejects this proof by saying that the *Mishnah* can be referring to crushed onions (and since they are inferior, the growth is not regarded like its root). (58a2 – 58a3)

Chasayos

Rather, let us resolve the question from the following *Baraisa*: One who weeds the *chasayos* (garlics and onions) together with a *Cuthean* (converts to Judaism after an outbreak of wild animals in Eretz Yisroel and their conversion was debated as to its validity; they observed some commandments, but not others). He may eat from that which he is weeding as a snack (like all *tevel*), but he is required to separate *ma'aser* as a certain obligation (since a *Cuthean* does not separate *ma'aser*). Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar says: If he is working

with a Jew who is suspected of transgressing the *halachos* of *Shemitah*, the leaves that grew in the eighth year are permitted (for their growth is certainly greater than the original forbidden part that is mixed in with them). It is clearly evident that the growth does not become like the root, and it can nullify that which was forbidden (the root which grew during *Shemitah*).

The *Gemora* attempts to reject the proof by saying that the *Baraisa* is referring to seeds that have decomposed (and the new growth is permitted, since the root which grew during *Shemitah* is not in existence).

The *Gemora* replies: Since we are referring to garlic and onions, this cannot be the case (for their roots do not decompose).

The *Gemora* attempts to reject the proof by saying that the *Baraisa* is referring to the growths of crushed onions (and since they are inferior, the growth is not regarded like its root).

The *Gemora* replies: The *Baraisa* stated that he was a Jew who we suspected of transgressing the *halachos* of *Shemitah* (only a person interested in upholding the *halachos* of *Shemitah* would crush them before planting them).

The *Gemora* attempts to reject the proof by saying that the *Baraisa* is referring to leaves that became intermingled with permitted ones (and that is why they are permitted).

The *Gemora* replies: The *Baraisa* states that we are discussing one who is weeding (he is eating as they were being picked). (The *Gemora* concludes from here that the growth from the eighth year will indeed nullify

the forbidden part which grew during Shemitah.) (58a3 – 58b1)

Prohibition from the Ground

(The Gemora concluded that the growth from the eighth year will indeed nullify the forbidden part which grew during Shemitah.)

The Gemora asks: Shouldn't the Baraisa (cited above) be a refutation of Rabbi Yochanan (who held that if a young tree (whose fruits were still forbidden due to orlah, the Torah prohibition against eating the fruits of tree that has not yet reached three years old) is cut and mixed with an old tree, even if its (the young tree's) fruits (that existed before it was cut down) grew one two hundredth more (after the grafting) the fruits are forbidden) and Rabbi Yonasan (who held that if an onion was planted in a vineyard and the vineyard was later uprooted, the onion (and its growths) is prohibited)? (They both maintain that the growth retains the halachic status of the roots!)

Rabbi Yitzchak answers: *Shemitah* is different because its prohibition is on account of the ground; it stands to reason that its nullification can come about because of the ground. (The mitzvah of *Shemitah* is to rest the ground, and the ground during *Shemitah* gives kedusha to the produce. So too, in the eighth year, the ground can provide the produce with a non-kedusha status. This is in contrast to *orlah* and *kilayim* of the vineyard, where the prohibition is not on account of the ground, but rather, due to exterior factors, such as lack of time or because of a mixture).

The Gemora asks: But *ma'aser*, whose prohibition does come about because of the ground, and nevertheless, its nullification, does not come because of the ground?

The Gemora provides support to its question from the following Baraisa: If there was a *litra* of untithed *ma'aser* (the *ma'aser rishon* was separated from it, but the *terumas ma'aser* was not yet taken from it) that was planted in the ground (prior to *Shemitah*) and it improved during *Shemitah* and it is now ten *litra*, the *halacha* is as follows: He must separate *terumas ma'aser* from it and it has the sanctity of *Shemitah*. (Ra"n: He separates *terumas ma'aser* from the original *litra* and the entire crop has kedushas *Shemitah*; it must be eaten before the time of removal.) The *terumas ma'aser* that he takes off for the original *litra* must be from somewhere else (because the other nine *litra* are not obligated in *terumas ma'aser*, for it grew during *Shemitah*, and *Shemitah* produce is ownerless; all ownerless produce is exempt from *ma'aser*), according to the amount of untithed *ma'aser* that was here before. (Shouldn't we say that the ground, which caused the obligation for *ma'aser*, should also nullify the *ma'aser*, and therefore, the ground during *Shemitah* should be able to nullify the *ma'aser* obligation that was on the root from before *Shemitah*?)

The Gemora answers: There is no obligation for *ma'aser* until the grain is piled (and therefore, the ground cannot nullify any *ma'aser* obligation). (58b2 – 59a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Something that will become Permitted

Rabbi Shimon said: That *Mishnah* is only referring to the *halachah* of *bi'ur* i.e. removing (the produce of *Shemitah* may be kept as long as that produce is still available in the fields for the animals; afterwards, it may no longer remain in the house).



The Ra"n explains: Since it was possible to eat it before that time, it is regarded as something that can become permitted.

The Sha'ar Hamelech and the Noda B'Yehudah ask: According to this logic, why is it only not nullified if it becomes intermingled with its type? The *halachah* should be that it should not become nullified even if it becomes mixed up in something that is not its type? For the Ra"n above (52a) explained at great length in the name of the Ri"ף that something which is permitted presently to be consumed will not be nullified, even with a mixture of things that aren't its type?

The Sha'ar Hamelech answers: The Ra"n only said that rule in respect of things that will be permitted forever, such as meat, which will always be permitted to be eaten with other meat or foods that are not from milk. However, here, the *Shemita* produce will become forbidden forever, i.e. after the "time of removal." It is therefore compared to something that will become permitted, where it will not become nullified only in a mixture of things that aren't its type.

DAILY MASHAL

Open miracles

Hashem does not shortchange anyone. He promises in the Torah to bless those who observe the *Shemita* laws. As it says (Vayikra 25:21) "And I will command My blessing upon you in the sixth year. And it will yield a crop for three years." However, we live in a time when Hashem hides Himself behind the laws of nature, and there is no guarantee that we will experience such open miracles. Nevertheless, there is an abundance of amazing stories how individual *Shemita* observers have experienced miraculous events.

One of the most famous stories goes back to the *Shemita* year 5719 (1958/59) in the village of Komemiyut. They had some crop in the fields left from the sixth year. It was meant for animal feed and was permissible to harvest during *Shemita*. One fine Friday a huge hoard of locusts swarmed all over the area and descended upon the neighboring, non-*Shemita* observant, villages. The farmers of Komemiyut came running to their rabbi in panic, as this was the only permissible feed for their animals available. While the locusts were coming closer and closer the Rabbi tried to calm his congregants. Just as the locusts reached the border of the fields of the little village they made a sudden u-turn and flew away without touching any of the crops of these valiant farmers.