



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

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, even though he intended 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. (34a1)

Abaye bar Avin and Rav Chananya bar Avin studied Terumos at Rabbah's academy. Rabbah bar Masnah met them [and] asked them, What have you discussed in Terumos, at the Master's academy? — Said they to him, But what is your difficulty? He replied. We learned: Plants of terumah which were tamei, and he [their owner] replanted them, are tahor in that they do not render tamei [other eatables],¹ but they are forbidden to be eaten [as terumah].² But since they are tahor in that they do not render tamei, why are they forbidden to be eaten? — Said

they to him, Thus did Rabbah say: What is meant by 'forbidden'? They are forbidden to lay Israelites. Now what does he inform us? That that which grows of terumah is [itself] terumah! [But] we have [already] learned it [elsewhere]: That which grows of terumah is terumah?³ And should you answer: It refers to the second growth, and what does he inform us? [That this law holds good] in respect of that whose seed is not destroyed?⁴ But surely we learned this too: [In the case of] tevel, that which grows out of it is permitted in a species whose seed is destroyed,⁵ but in the case of a species whose seed is not destroyed, even its second growth is forbidden for eating!⁶ — They were silent. Said they to him, Have you heard anything about this? Thus did Rav Sheishes say, he answered, what does 'forbidden' mean? They are forbidden to Kohanim, since they became unfit [for eating] through [his] mental neglect.⁷ That is correct on the view that mental neglect is an intrinsic disqualification,⁸ then it is well. But on the view that

¹ Because the planting in the ground removes their tumah.

² It is now assumed that the prohibition refers to Kohanim, and they may not be eaten because they are tamei terumah.

³ Even in the case of a species whose original seed rots away in the earth.

⁴ E.g., an onion, the original stock of which remains when it is planted. Now its original leaves grow larger, and this is referred to as the growth. But in addition it sends out fresh shoots altogether, which never were terumah; these are referred to as the second growth, and we are informed that even these are terumah.

⁵ E.g., if tevel of wheat is sown the crop is not tevel. Before produce becomes tevel one may make a light meal of it through he has not yet rendered the ma'aser and terumah; but nothing whatsoever may be eaten of it when it reaches the stage of

tevel. Though that which grows from terumah remains terumah even if its seed is destroyed, that is merely a Rabbinical stringency, lest the Kohanic gifts are thus evaded. But that which grows of tevel is not tevel but ordinary produce of which a light meal may be enjoyed until it becomes tevel, which happens when it is heaped up in a stack.

⁶ Because it retains the same status as that of its parent stock. The same logically applies to terumah that is sown.

⁷ And not because it is tamei terumah. The Kohen must always keep the terumah in mind. - he must think of it. The terumah, having once become tamei, however, the Kohen would dismiss it from his mind, as he would abandon the hope of using it.

⁸ I.e., sacred food, even if proved not to have been tamei, becomes unfit thereby, because this neglect is in itself a disqualification.

mental neglect is a disqualification of tumah,⁹ what can be said?¹⁰ For it was stated, [As to] mental neglect: Rabbi Yochanan said, It is a disqualification of tumah; while Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said, It is an intrinsic disqualification. (34a1 – 34a2)

‘Rabbi Yochanan said, It is a disqualification of tumah’, for if Eliyahu should come and declare it tahor, we heed him.¹¹

‘Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said, It is an intrinsic disqualification’, for if Eliyahu should come and declare it tahor, we do not heed him.

Rabbi Yochanan raised an objection to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: There was a small passage between the stairway and the altar at the west of the stairway, where they used to throw disqualified bird chatas-offerings until [the flesh] became disfigured¹² and then they passed out to the place of burning.¹³ Now it is well if you say that [mental neglect] is a disqualification of tumah; therefore it requires disfigurement, lest Eliyahu may come and declare it tahor.¹⁴ But if you say that it is an intrinsic

⁹ I.e., it is not a disqualification in itself, but merely because while the Kohen was not thinking about it, it might have become tamei.

¹⁰ For it has now been established that even when it is certainly tamei it regains its taharah when replanted.

¹¹ Declaring the terumah fit to be eaten.

¹² I.e., by being kept overnight and thus becoming nossar.

¹³ The reference is to the offerings disqualified through mental neglect.

¹⁴ In which case it should not have been burnt. But when it is disfigured it must be burnt in any case.

¹⁵ E.g., if the blood was spilled before it could be sprinkled.

¹⁶ E.g., if he became tamei before the pesach offering could be eaten and there were no others available to eat it, as the pesach may be eaten only by those registered for it.

¹⁷ There the flesh itself is certainly disqualified.

¹⁸ The partitions of the Temple corresponding to those of the Tabernacle. Thus ‘beyond the curtains’ means beyond the enclosures of the Temple Court. This refers to sacrifices of the higher sanctity, whose flesh might not be eaten beyond these enclosures.

disqualification, what is the need of disfigurement? Surely it was taught, This is the general rule: Wherever its disqualification is in itself, it must be burnt immediately; [if it is] in the blood¹⁵ or in its owner,¹⁶ [the flesh] must become disfigured and [then] it goes out to the place of burning. Said he to him: This Tanna is a Tanna [whose teaching was taught] in the School of Rabbah bar Avuha who maintained: Even piggul¹⁷ requires disfigurement.

He [Rabbi Yochanan] raised an objection to him: If the flesh became tamei or disqualified, or if it passed beyond the curtains,¹⁸ Rabbi Eliezer said: He [the Kohen] must sprinkle [the blood];¹⁹ Rabbi Yehoshua said: He must not sprinkle [the blood].²⁰ Yet Rabbi Yehoshua admits that if he does sprinkle [it], [the sacrifice] is accepted. Now, what does ‘disqualified’ mean? Is it not through mental neglect?²¹ Now, it is well if you say that it is a disqualification of tumah, then it is conceivable that the tzitz makes it accepted.²² But if you say that it is an intrinsic disqualification why is it accepted?²³ What does ‘disqualified’ mean? It was disqualified by a tevil yom.²⁴ If

¹⁹ He holds that the blood must be sprinkled even when there is no flesh.

²⁰ He holds that the blood is dependent on the flesh.

²¹ For there is no other disqualification, since tumah is stated separately. It cannot mean a disqualification through an illegitimate intention, e.g., if the officiating Kohen expressed his intention to eat the flesh beyond the boundaries or after the time allotted for its eating, for then the blood too is disqualified and can certainly not be sprinkled.

²² The headplate worn by the Kohen Gadol makes atonement in such a case, even if the flesh is definitely tamei. Nevertheless, Rabbi Yehoshua rules that the blood must not be sprinkled at the outset, for he holds that the acceptability conferred by the headplate is only if it was sprinkled, but it may not be sprinkled in the first place in reliance on the headplate.

²³ For the headplate cannot make atonement for such a disqualification.

²⁴ His touch disqualifies it, as he is not really tahor until evening falls.

so, it is identical with 'tamei?' There are two kinds of tumah.

When Ravin went up, he reported this teaching with reference to the terumah plants before Rabbi Yirmiyah, whereupon he observed: The Babylonians are fools. Because they dwell in a land of darkness they engage in dark [obscure] discussions.²⁵ Have you not heard this [dictum] of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish in Rabbi Oshaya's name: If the water of the Festival²⁶ was tamei and he brought it into contact [with a mikvah] and then sanctified it, it is tahor; if he sanctified it and then brought it into contact [with a mikvah], it is tamei.²⁷ Now consider: this is 'sowing';²⁸ what does it matter whether he brought into contact and then sanctified it or he sanctified it and then brought into contact? This proves that 'sowing' has no effect upon hekdesch;²⁹ so here too sowing has no effect upon terumah.³⁰

Rav Dimi sat and reported this teaching. Said Abaye to him, Does he Rabbi Oshaya mean [that] he sanctified it in a vessel, but if [merely] verbally the Rabbis did not set a higher standard; or perhaps for verbal [sanctification]³¹ too the Rabbis set a higher standard? — I have not heard

²⁵ I.e., they discuss laws without knowing their true meanings.

²⁶ 'Festival' without a further determination always means Sukkos. The 'water of the Festival' is that used for libations each day which was drawn the previous evening with great ceremony and joy. Here the reference is to the water for the Shabbos libation; fresh water could not be brought on the Shabbos, and therefore this water had to be made tahor.

²⁷ Tamei water can be purified by placing it in a vessel and immersing the vessel in a mikvah (ritual bath) until the water in the vessel is level with and just touches the water of the mikvah. This is called hashshakah (lit. 'kissing') and the tamei water thereby becomes one with the mikvah, which of course is tahor. The water libation was sanctified by formal dedication, or by being poured into a sacred service vessel.

²⁸ The process of bringing into contact is regarded as 'sowing', as though the water were sown in the mikvah, just as tamei produce becomes tahor if it is resown in the earth.

this, he replied, [but] I have heard something similar to it. For Rabbi Avahu said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If grapes were tamei and he trod them and then sanctified them,³² they are tahor; if he sanctified them and then trod them, they are tamei. Now grapes are [a case of] verbal sanctification, yet even so the Rabbis set a higher standard!³³ — Said Rav Yosef: You speak of grapes! We treat here of grapes of terumah,³⁴ their verbal sanctification is being tantamount to the sanctification of a vessel.³⁵ But those that require a vessel [for sanctification,³⁶ where they are sanctified] verbally [maybe] the Rabbis did not set a higher standard.

'If he trod them' — [does that mean] even in great quantity? But did Rabbi Yochanan say thus? Surely Rabbi Yochanan said: if grapes are tamei, he may tread them out less than an egg in quantity at a time? — If you wish I can say that here too [it means] less than an egg at a time. Alternatively, I can answer: There the case is that they [the grapes] had come into contact with a first degree [of tumah], so that they [the grapes] are a second. But here they come into contact with a second degree, so that they are a third.³⁷

²⁹ Lit., 'there is no sowing for hekdesch' — to make it tahor. The reason is because a higher standard of purity is required in the case of hekdesch.

³⁰ Hence the plants remain tamei in so far that they are forbidden to be eaten.

³¹ And in such a case 'bringing into contact' is considered effective.

³² For its wine to be used for libations.

³³ In declaring the expressed juice tamei, whereas it would be tahor if it were not sanctified.

³⁴ The sanctification referred to is not as previously assumed for libations but for purposes of terumah.

³⁵ Since terumah can only be verbally sanctified, there being no sacred vessels to sanctify them.

³⁶ Such as wine for libations.

³⁷ When the grapes are tamei in the second degree they render the juice tamei in the first degree, it being a general rule that whatever disqualifies terumah, i.e., eatables tamei in the second degree, defiles liquids in the first degree. But when they

Rava said:³⁸ We too learned [thus]:³⁹ And he shall put [upon the ashes] running [living] water in a vessel; [this teaches] that its running must be [directly] into a vessel.⁴⁰ 'And he shall put' — this proves that it is detached, but surely this is attached!⁴¹ Rather, it is a higher standard; so here too it is a higher standard.

Rav Shimi bar Ashi said, We too learned thus: When he [a tamei person] immerses in a mikvah, he may eat ma'aser; when the sun sets, he may eat terumah. [Thus] only terumah, but not sacred food. Yet why so? He is tahor? But [you must say] it is a higher standard; so here too it is a higher standard.

Rav Ashi said, we too learned [thus]: And the flesh; this is to include fuel and frankincense. Are then fuel and frankincense capable of being tamei?⁴² But [you must say] it is a higher standard; so here too it is a higher standard.⁴³ (34a2 – 35a1)

DAILY MASHAL

Remaining Quiet

Rabbi Yirmiyah rebuked Rabin by saying: "Silly Babylonians! Just because you live in a dark land you say dark things!" Rashi explains that this means that just

are tamei in the third degree they cannot render liquids tamei. Hence if he first trod them, even in great quantity, they remain tahor. But if he first sanctified them, the expressed juice is tamei, because the Rabbis set a higher standard for terumah.

³⁸ The Torah tells us that the *parah adumah* (red heifer) should be burned, and its ashes mixed together with spring water in order to be sprinkled on people who had become impure by coming in contact with the dead. This would make them pure again (if done in the way the Torah commands in Bamidbar ch. 19).

³⁹ Viz., that the Rabbis set a higher standard for sacred objects, even when they were verbally sanctified.

⁴⁰ In which it is sanctified with the ashes of the red heifer, but it must not be collected in another vessel and then poured over into this.

because one does not know a reason for something does not mean he should make something up which does not make sense.

At a recent Siyum Hashas, Rav Mattisyahu Solomon, the Lakewood Mashgiach, brought a similar proof to this concept: It is preferable to remain with a solid question than to always attempt to supply an answer which may often be erroneous. This can be evidenced, he said, from the fact that our *Gemora* often concludes with the statement "Teiku," which stands for "Tishbi Yashiv Kushyos v'Ibayos" – "Eliyahu (who is also known as Tishbi) will answer the question and inquiries (that we cannot answer)." The *Gemora* was comfortable with the answer that we do not always have the answer. It is of utmost importance that we do not try to give answers that clash with the Torah we do know, in order to answer that which we do not know.

⁴¹ The passage is rather difficult. 'And he shall put' implies that Scripture refers to detached water, i.e., water which does not form part of a stream but has been detached and collected in a vessel, from where it is poured into a second vessel containing the ashes. But when the Mishnah states that the running must be direct into the vessel, it insists on attached water, i.e., water forming part of the stream. This must be because the Rabbis set a higher standard.

⁴² Surely not, as they are not eatables!

⁴³ Though fuel and frankincense cannot usually become tamei, a higher standard is set when they are to be used in the sacred service.