

20 Tammuz 5783
July 9, 2023



Gittin Daf 54

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

Rabbi Meir’s Viewpoint

[The Gemora above had stated that Rabbi Meir imposed a penalty on one who inadvertently violated a Rabbinical transgression.] The Gemora asks on this from the following Baraisa: If a non-Kohen inadvertently ate *terumah* which was *tamei*, he must repay the Kohen with *chullin* (unconsecrated) produce that is *tahor*. (That which he compensates the Kohen with replaces the *terumah* and acquires *terumah* sanctity; this is why he pays him with produce that is *tahor*.) If he paid the Kohen with *chullin* that is *tamei*, Sumchos says in the name of Rabbi Meir: If he used *tamei* produce inadvertently, the repayment is valid (this *tamei* produce now becomes *terumah*, and he has no further obligation). If he used *tamei* produce intentionally, the repayment is invalid (the Rabbi penalized him; the *tamei* produce is returned to him and he must repay the Kohen with *tahor* produce). The Chachamim say: Whether he did so inadvertently or willingly, the repayment is valid, and he must repay again with *tahor* produce (this second repayment does not acquire *terumah* sanctity).

The Gemora had asked on Rabbi Meir: Rabbi Meir ruled that if a non-Kohen inadvertently ate *terumah* which was *tamei*, and he deliberately paid the Kohen with *chullin* that is *tamei*, he is penalized, and the repayment is invalid. Why should that be the case? On the contrary, let him be blessed for doing such a noble thing! He ate something that was unfit for the Kohen to eat while he was *tamei* (for a Kohen is always forbidden from eating *terumah tamei*), and he is repaying him with something

(that he thinks) is fit for the Kohen to eat while he is *tamei* (in truth, the Kohen will not be able to eat this because the *tamei chullin* produce becomes *terumah tamei*).

And Rava, or some had said that it was Kedi, answered: It is as if the Baraisa was missing some words, and this is what the Baraisa is teaching us: If a non-Kohen inadvertently ate *terumah* which was *tamei*, he repays the Kohen with anything (even with *chullin* produce that is *tamei*). If he ate *terumah* which was *tahor*, he must repay the Kohen with *chullin* (unconsecrated) produce that is *tahor*. If he paid the Kohen with *chullin* that is *tamei*, Sumchos says in the name of Rabbi Meir: If he used *tamei* produce inadvertently, the repayment is valid (this *tamei* produce now becomes *terumah*, and he has no further obligation). If he used *tamei* produce intentionally, the repayment is invalid (the Rabbi penalized him; the *tamei* produce is returned to him and he must repay the Kohen with *tahor* produce). The Chachamim say: Whether he did so inadvertently or willingly, the repayment is valid, and he must repay again with *tahor* produce (this second repayment does not acquire *terumah* sanctity).

The Gemora presents its proof: And Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika said: The argument here is whether the Rabbi penalized an inadvertent action on account of a deliberate one. Rabbi Meir holds that we do not penalize such an action, whereas the Chachamim maintain that we do. [This would contradict our conclusion above regarding Rabbi Meir’s viewpoint!?!]

The *Gemora* answers: This case is not comparable to ours, for in this case, the man is intending to pay! Should we get up and penalize him?! [*Certainly not! However, in our case, although it was not deliberate, he did contaminate his fellow's produce, or he did mix terumah into his fellow's produce!*]

The *Gemora* asks from another *Baraisa*: If the blood of a sacrifice became *tamei* and a *Kohen* nonetheless threw the blood against the *mizbeiach* (Altar), the *halachah* is as follows: If he did so inadvertently, the offering is accepted, but if he did so intentionally, the offering is not accepted. [*Evidently, the penalty is imposed upon someone who violated a Rabbinical prohibition inadvertently!?*]

Rabbi Meir could answer to you: This case is not comparable to ours, for in this case, the *Kohen* is intending to atone for the owner of the *korban*! Should we get up and penalize him?! [*Certainly not! However, in our case, although it was not deliberate, he did contaminate his fellow's produce, or he did mix terumah into his fellow's produce!*]

The *Gemora* cites a proof from the following *Mishnah*: If a man separates *ma'aser* on *Shabbos* if inadvertently, the food may be eaten, but if deliberately, it may not be eaten.? — Is there any comparison? There the man is trying to do his duty, and shall we get up and penalize him?

Come and hear from the following *Mishnah*: If a man immerses vessels on *Shabbos*, if inadvertently they may be used, but if deliberately they may not be used.? — Is there any comparison? There the man is desirous of purifying his vessels, and shall we get up and penalize him? (54a1 – 54a3)

Rabbi Yehudah's Viewpoint

[*The Gemora above had stated that Rabbi Meir imposed a penalty on one who inadvertently violated a Rabbinical transgression.*] The *Gemora* notes a contradiction between the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah (mentioned above) and the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah (in the following *Baraisa*) regarding a Rabbinic prohibition, for it was taught in a *Baraisa*: If *orlah* (*the fruit that grows from a tree; the first three years of its life, they are forbidden for all benefit*) nuts fell among others (*it cannot be nullified even though it fell into a mixture which was two hundred times the amount of the forbidden nuts; this is because these particular nuts are significant, and significant items cannot be nullified even in a mixture of a thousand*) and were then smashed (*and now they may become nullified, for they lost their significance*), whether they were smashed inadvertently or deliberately, they are not nullified in the mixture. These are the words of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Yosi and Rabbi Shimon, however, say that if it was smashed inadvertently, they are nullified, but if it was done deliberately, they are not. Now, this is most certainly only a Rabbinical matter, for Biblically speaking, all items may be nullified if they are a minority. Nevertheless, Rabbi Yehudah holds that we penalize the inadvertent “smasher” on account of the deliberate one!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yehudah's reason there is because without this penalty, the “smasher” may act cunningly (*and say that he smashed them inadvertently*). (54a3 – 54b1)

A contradiction was also pointed out between two statements of Rabbi Yosi. For we have learned: If a sapling of *orlah* or of the mixed plants of the vineyard becomes mixed up with other saplings, its fruit should not be gathered, but if gathered it becomes nullified in two hundred and one times the quantity [of permitted fruit], provided, however, that the gathering was not done with

that purpose in view. Rabbi Yosi says: Even if it was gathered deliberately, it is nullified in two hundred and one times [its own quantity!] — [This is no difficulty] since with reference to this it has been recorded: Rava said: The presumption is that a man does not make his whole vineyard forbidden for the sake of a single sapling. So too when Ravin came [from Eretz Yisroel] he said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The presumption is that a man will not make his whole vineyard forbidden for the sake of a single sapling. (54b1 – 54b2)

Mishnah

Kohanim who purposely make a *korban piggul* (a *korban* whose *avodah* was done with the intention that it would be eaten after its designated time) must pay the owner for the damage (a new animal). (54b2)

Believing One Witness

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If a man is helping another to prepare *tahor* things, and he says to him, “The *tahor* things that I have prepared with you have become *tamei*,” or if a *Kohen* is helping another with sacrifices, and he says to him, “The sacrifices with which I have been helping you have been rendered *piggul*,” he is believed. If, however, he says, “The *tahor* things, which I was preparing for you on such-and-such a day, have become *tamei*,” or the sacrifices with which I was assisting you on such-and-such a day have been rendered *piggul*,” he is not believed.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is the rule different in the first case from that of the second?

Abaye answers: So long as it is in his power to effect now that which he said he has done, he is believed. [The *Baraisa* is speaking of a case where he says this while he is still helping the other; he is then believed because he can still render the *korban piggul*.]

Rava answers: We do not believe him if for instance, he came across him but said nothing to him, and then, when he came across him again, he told him.

The *Gemora* cites an incident: A certain man said to another, “The *tahor* things, which I was preparing for you on such-and-such a day, have become *tamei*.” He presented the case to Rabbi Ami, who said to him: According to the strict letter of the law, he is not believed.

Rav Assi asked him: My teacher, is this really what you say? But Rabbi Yochanan has distinctly said in the name of Rabbi Yosi: What can I do, seeing that the Torah has believed him (the Torah trusts one witness even after some time, when it is not in his power any longer)!?

The *Gemora* asks: Where do we find that the Torah believes one witness?

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Bisna replied: The proof is from the *Kohen Gadol* on *Yom Kippur*, since if he says that the sacrifice (the bull or the goat, which was sprinkled in the Holy of Holies) is *piggul*, we believe him. Now, how do we know that it is *piggul*, seeing that it is written: *And there shall be no man in the Tent of Meeting (at the time when the Kohen Gadol enters the Kodesh)*? Rather, it must therefore be that he is believed.

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps this is because we heard him make it *piggul*?

The *Gemora* answers: If he were not believed, we could not believe him, even if we heard him, since he might have said this after concluding the service.

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps he was seen through the doorway?

The *Gemora* concludes: This is indeed a difficulty.

The *Gemora* cites another incident: A certain scribe came before Rabbi Ami and said to him, “In a Torah scroll which I have written for So-and-so, I did not write the names of Hashem with proper intention.” He asked him: Who has the scroll now? He replied: The purchaser. Whereupon, Rabbi Ami said to him: Your word is good to deprive you of your wages, but it is not good to ruin a Torah scroll.

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked him: Granted that he has lost his wages for the Names, but why should he lose it for the entire scroll? He replied: Yes, because a scroll in which the Names of Hashem have not been written with the proper intention is not worth anything.

The *Gemora* asks: But can’t he go over them with a pen and so sanctify them? Will you say that Rabbi Ami does not hold of Rabbi Yehudah’s viewpoint? For we have learned in a *Baraisa*: A scribe was supposed to write the Name of Hashem in a Torah scroll, and instead, intended to write the name Yehudah. [*The name Yehudah is similar to the letters in the Name of Hashem, except that the word Yehudah has a letter “dalet” between the “vav” and the “hey.”*] He forgot to insert the “dalet” and ended up writing the Name of Hashem but without the required intention necessary to write the Holy Name. Rabbi Yehudah posits that the scribe can pass his quill over the Name of Hashem and have the proper intention of writing the Name. The *Chachamim* disagree, claiming that this is not the best way to write the Name of Hashem, and the Sefer Torah is subsequently invalid.

The *Gemora* notes: You may even say that he is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah. For Rabbi Yehudah would allow this only in the case of one mention of Hashem’s Name, but not throughout a whole scroll, because the Torah would appear spotted.

The *Gemora* cites another incident: A certain scribe came before Rav Avahu saying, “In a Torah scroll which I have written for So-and-so, I did not prepare the parchments

for their sake.” He asked him: Who has the scroll now? He replied: The purchaser. Whereupon, Rav Avahu said to him: Since your word is good to deprive you of your wages, it is also good to ruin a Torah scroll.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the difference between this case and that of Rabbi Ami?

The *Gemora* answers: In that case it might be argued that the scribe mistakenly adopted the view of Rabbi Yirmiyah (*that he would lose only his wages regarding the Names of Hashem*), but here, since he is losing his entire wages and yet comes and tells us (*that the parchments were not tanned correctly*), we presume that he is telling the truth. (54b2 – 55a1)

DAILY MASHAL

Rabbi Yoel Gold shared the following story: Mordechai Fishman was the *gabbay* for a *minyán* on Simchas Torah. While dancing, he bumped into another man and the Torah fell to the floor. The man who dropped it turned white and raced out of the room, embarrassed. Everyone was shocked and didn’t know what to do.

Mordechai tried to change the mood, “We can’t allow this mistake to ruin the atmosphere of Simchas Torah. We have to get everyone back into it.” However, no one was interested in celebrating anymore. They dragged their feet and hardly clapped. The man who dropped the Torah was distraught outside the sanctuary and refused to return.

Someone had the idea to honor the Torah that fell by utilizing it to begin Bereshis. After reciting the brachah, the *baal koreh* hesitated, starting at the fallen scroll open in front of him. People began to grow uncomfortable and say, “There was a brachah, you need to start right away.”

The man motioned for the congregants to approach and look at what he saw. The words *bereshis bara* were

missing from the scroll. Because of this, the Torah that fell wasn't ever completed. They rolled it up and left the room to show the man who dropped it.

When they showed him, he breathed a sigh of relief. They located the owner of the Torah and told him about the missing words. He was shocked at first. Then he remembered, "The *sofer* explained a custom of leaving a couple of words at the beginning and end for people to write in before the *hachnasas Sefer Torah*, and suggested we do the same." But they had forgotten all about this when it came time to dedicate the Torah.

Initially, the man who dropped the Torah was devastated. Then he realized that because he dropped it, the Torah actually became complete. So too in our own lives, we are all incomplete. Every time we fall, it is an opportunity for growth. Our imperfections can actually help us to soar.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM YESTERDAY'S DAF

to refresh your memory

Q: Is compensation for an unrecognizable damage Biblically mandated, or is it only Rabbinical? Why is he exempt if he did it inadvertently, but he is liable when done deliberately?

A: Chizkiyah says that he is Biblically liable. He is exempt from paying when he did it inadvertently so that he will confess and notify us regarding it. R'Yochanan holds that he is Biblically exempt from paying. The reason why he is liable for a deliberate damage is because of a penalty so that people don't cause such damages.

Q: According to R' Meir, is one liable for accidentally making someone's wine Yayin Neshech? Why?

A: He is liable. Although he holds that one is exempt when he inadvertently violates a Rabbinical prohibition,

nevertheless, since Avodah Zara is very strict, here he is liable.

Q: Why according to R' Meir do we penalize one who planted a tree during *shemita*, but not if he planted one on *Shabbos*?

A: It is because everyone knows that he planted on *shemita* and if we don't tell him to uproot it, people will think that it is permitted to plant during *shemita*. Also because we are concerned that people will violate *shemita*, but not *Shabbos*.