



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

Leavening with Apple Juice

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: One cannot leaven the *shteihalechem* (two breads brought on Shavuot) or breads of the *today* with apples (the juice from the apples; as its fermentation does not cause it to become full-fledged *chametz*). In the name of Rabbi Chanina ben Gamliel they said that it may be used. Rav Kahana taught that Rabbi Chanina ben Tradyon said that it may be used.

The *Gemora* asks: Who is the author of the following *Mishna*? If an apple of *terumah* was mashed up and placed into a dough of *chulin* (non-consecrated item) and it leavened it, the entire dough must be treated like *terumah*. This must be according to the opinion of Rabbi Chanina ben Gamliel, unlike the Rabbis (*Tanna Kamma*, who say that it cannot leaven it)!

The *Gemora* answers: This could even be according to the Rabbis, for they understand that while it cannot cause something to become full-fledged *chametz* (which is why it should not be used to make the breads into leaven), it can cause dough to become *nukshah* (imperfect *chametz*; which is why the mixture is deemed to have the status of *terumah*). (53b – 54a)

Sinner’s Minchah

Rabbi Ila stated: There is no more difficult *minchah* offering on which to perform *kemitzah* (taking the

scoopful from the flour) than the sinner’s *minchah* (as it is totally dry without oil, and when the Kohen attempts to brush off the extra flour which is protruding from his fingers, he will remove too much – causing the *komeitz* to become deficient).

Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi stated: One can mix the sinner’s *minchah* with water, and it is still valid (as the Torah only prohibits oil).

The *Gemora* suggests that the crux of their argument is as follows: Rav Yitzchak holds that the *komeitz* (the scoopful) is valid if the amount of a *komeitz* from the present *minchah* is taken (regardless of what the water did to the volume of the flour). Rabbi Ila understands that the *komeitz* is measured in terms of the flour before the water was added. [Being that the sinner’s *minchah* is only flour, the amount of the *komeitz* must be the volume of a *komeitz* of flour. If one mixes water in and it becomes thick, too much flour will be in the *komeitz*. Similarly, if he mixes in too much water, there could be less than a *komeitz* of flour. Either way, Rabbi Ila holds that this makes it invalid.]

The *Gemora* rejects this reasoning: Everyone agrees that the *minchah* is valid if the amount of a *komeitz* from the present *minchah* is taken. Their argument is regarding what the Torah states can be put in the *minchah*. Rav Yitzchak understands that when the Torah states it is dry, it means it is devoid of oil (but water may be mixed in).



Rabbi Ilai understands that *dry* means that nothing at all can be mixed with it. (54a)

“As it were,” or “As it is”?

The *Mishna* (*Uktzin* 2:8) states: If meat of a calf swelled (to size of the volume of an egg), or the meat of an older animal shrunk (to less than the volume of an egg), we measure it as it were. [The *Mishna* is referring to whether or not the meat now can convey tumah to others, which hinges on its size. Only foods whose volume is larger than an egg can convey tumah. Shrinking and swelling happen to meat due to cooking.] Rav, Rabbi Chiya, and Rabbi Yochanan state: The correct reading of the *Mishna* is “as they are now” (which means that the calf meat is cannot convey tumah as it is now less than an egg, whereas the meat from the old animal may convey tumah, as we measure based on its present size). Shmuel, Rabbi Shimon the son of Rebbe, and Rish Lakish state: The correct reading of the *Mishna* is “as they were” (and therefore the calf meat cannot convey tumah, for initially, it was less than the size of an egg; the meat from the old animal can convey tumah, for it was originally larger than the size of an egg).

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*, which states: If calf meat was less than the size of an egg and it swelled to become larger than the size of an egg, it is deemed *tahor* regarding the past, but is considered *tamei* from now on (after it swelled to the size of an egg). [This indicates that we measure based on its present size!]

The *Gemora* answers: This *braisa* is a Rabbinical stringency.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, what does the second part of the *braisa* mean when it says that this is also the law regarding *piggul* and *nossar*? If this is a Biblical law, it is understandable how it can apply to *piggul* and *nossar*. However, if it is Rabbinical, is there such a thing as Rabbinical *piggul* or *nossar* (that one can incur kares for eating it)?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* means that the same law applies to impurity of *piggul* and impurity of *nossar* (as one who touches *piggul* or *nossar*, his hands become tamei according to Rabbinic law). The *braisa* is teaching that one might think that being that the entire law of impurity regarding *piggul* and *nossar* is only Rabbinic in nature, it is possible they did not institute this Rabbinic stringency regarding their impurity. This is why the *braisa* had to state that it also applies to *piggul* and *nossar*.

The *Gemora* asks from another *braisa*: If meat of an older animal was the size of an egg and it shrunk to become less than the size of an egg, it is deemed *tamei* regarding the past, but is considered *tahor* from now on (after it shrunk to less than the size of an egg). [This indicates that we measure based on its present size – even for a lenient ruling!]

Rabbah said: Whenever the item originally had the necessary amount (to convey tumah) but after it shrank it has less than the necessary measure, it presently does not have that amount (and it is not even *tamei* according to Rabbinic law). If it originally did not have the necessary amount (to convey tumah) and after it swelled it does have that amount, it is *tamei* according to Rabbinic law. The argument (amongst the *Amoraim*) is regarding a case where it originally had the necessary amount; it then shrank and then swelled back to the necessary measure. Shmuel and others hold that regarding prohibitions it is rejected (although when it swells again it is forbidden).

according to Rabbinic law). Rav and others understand that its status is not rejected (and it may therefore convey tumah once again even according to Biblical law).

The Gemora asks: Is there indeed an opinion that regarding matters that affect prohibitions we apply the principle of rejection? But it was taught in a Mishna: An amount of *tamei* food the size of an egg that was placed in the sun and then shrank, and also: flesh the size of an olive from a corpse, an olive's volume of *neveilah* (carcass of an animal that was not slaughtered properly), a lentil's volume of a *sheretz* (the Torah enumerates eight creeping creatures whose carcasses transmit tumah through contact), an olive's volume of *piggul*, an olive's volume of *nossar*, an olive's volume of forbidden fat (that shrinks after being placed in the sun) is considered *tahor*, and one is not liable to be punished for eating the *piggul*, *nossar* or forbidden fat. If these items were then left in the rain and swelled back to the minimum amount, they are *tamei*, and one is liable to be punished for eating the *piggul*, *nossar* or forbidden fat. This refutes those who say that the principle of rejection applies to prohibitions!

The Gemora challenges Rabbah from the following *braisa*: One may separate *terumah* (i.e. *ma'aser*, according to the present understanding of the Gemora) from moist figs on dried figs by the numbers (as opposed to by volume). [In other words, one takes ten moist figs as *ma'aser* to exempt ninety dried figs.] This is understandable if one looks at the dried figs (after shrinking) as they were (initially; for then the number of moist figs being taken for *ma'aser* is equal to ten percent of the initial volume of the dried figs). However, if one looks at the dried figs as they are, he is taking far too many figs as *ma'aser*! [The volume of a moist fig is almost double to that of a dried fig!] And it was taught in a *braisa* that if one separates too much *ma'aser* (more than the required "tenth"), his remaining produce may be eaten, but his *ma'aser* is partially ruined (as the

excess '*ma'aser*' is not regarded as *ma'aser*, and is therefore considered untithed). [It must be the *braisa* holds that we view the figs as they were, not as they are.]

The Gemora counters: Let us consider the second part of the *braisa*: One may separate *ma'aser* from dried figs on moist figs based on volume. This indicates that we look at the present state of the figs, not how they were, for otherwise, one would be separating too much *ma'aser*! [How can we reconcile the beginning and end of the *braisa*?]

Rather, the Gemora answers: The *braisa* must be referring to *terumah* (not *ma'aser*), and both cases must be talking about someone who wants to separate a large amount of *terumah* (which can be done, as opposed to *ma'aser* which needs to be exact).

The Gemora asks: The end of this *braisa* states that Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Yosi states that his father would take ten dried figs from the (dried) fig cake to exempt ninety that were in the basket. How can this be referring to *terumah* (where even a large amount is one out of forty, not one in ten)?

Rather, the Gemora answers: It must be referring to *terumas ma'aser*, and is based on the opinion of Abba Elozar ben Gomel. This is as the *braisa* states: It is written: And your *terumah* shall be reckoned to you. This verse refers to two types of *terumah*, one which is *terumah gedolah* (that which is separated from the produce) and one which is *terumas ma'aser* (that which is separated from the *ma'aser*). Just like one can separate *terumah gedolah* by estimating and with his thought (i.e. he does not need to physically or verbally separate the *terumah*), so too, one can estimate in separating *terumas ma'aser* and he can separate it by thought. And just as the owner has the right to separate *terumah gedolah* in a generous



manner, so too, he has the right to separate the *terumas ma'aser* in a generous manner. (54a – 55a)

DAILY MASHAL

Holy Thoughts

The *Gemora* states that one can separate both *terumah gedolah* and *terumas ma'aser* with a thought and one does not need to physically or orally designate the *terumah*.

There are certain *mitzvos* which require one to contemplate the *mitzvah*, such as loving HaShem, fearing HaShem and other such *mitzvos*. There is even a situation where if one sought to perform a *mitzvah* and he could not complete it because of extenuating circumstances, it is considered as if he performed the *mitzvah*. Thus, thoughts play an important part in serving HaShem.

Rav Chaim Volozhiner writes in *Nefesh HaChaim* that one who entertains immoral thoughts is worse than the Roman general Titus, who defiled the Holy of Holies, because a gentile does not have the capability of reaching high spiritual levels, whereas a Jew has the ability to reach very high spiritual levels, and improper thoughts defile the spiritual Holy of Holies. This idea should teach us that not only do we have to be pure in our actions but we must also keep our thoughts pure and holy.

GLOSSARY

Terumah – the separation of a certain amount of produce which is then given to a *Kohen*

minchah – meal offering

komeitz - the scoopful

tumah – spiritual contamination

tahor – ritually pure

tamei – ritually impure

piggul - a *korban* whose *avodah* was done with the intention that it would be eaten after its designated time

nossar - sacrificial meat that has been leftover beyond the time that the Torah designated for its consumption

ma'aser - a tenth of one's produce that is given to the Levite

terumas ma'aser - the Levite takes one tenth of his *ma'aser* received, and gives it to the *Kohen*; it has the sanctity of *terumah*