



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

Go After the Root

Rava inquired: What would be the law regarding *ma’aser*? The case is where the ears of grain were tithed by estimation and the rest was replanted and had increased in size. Should you say that we do not go after the root, so that the additional growth must be tithed, the question will remain: What about the root itself?

Abaye said to him: Why would this differ from ordinary wheat and barley (*which are also planted after being tithed, and the new growth must be completely tithed*)?

He replied. In those cases where the seed decomposes, I have no doubt at all (*that the new growth must be tithed in its entirety; this is because there is nothing left from the original seed*); my question only refers to the case where that which was planted does not decompose. What would be the law in this case?

The *Gemora* tries to resolve this from that which Rabbi Yitzchak said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: If one separated the proper tithes (*terumah and ma’aser*) from a *litra* of onions and then replanted them, he must tithe the new growth in its entirety. [*This shows that even where the root does not decompose, the new growth requires tithing in its entirety!*]

The *Gemora* deflects the proof: In this case, it is the usual manner of planting (*and that is why the root onion is insignificant*); but in the case where the grain is replanted,

that is not the usual manner of planting (*and perhaps the root should be considered in its own right*). (69b – 70a)

Flowerpots

Rabbi Chanina bar Manyumi inquired of Abaye: What is the law with regard to the growth in a flowerpot that was not perforated? [*Can ma’aser be separated from another such pot onto this one?*]

Abaye replied: But surely if it is not perforated, it is not perforated! [*Since it is not nourished from the ground of Eretz Yisroel, it is not Biblically subject to the laws of terumah and ma’aser; if so, why would it not be effective?*] Perhaps you are referring to a case where he later (*after it began growing*) perforated it (*and his question would be similar to Rava’s; can ma’aser be taken from it itself?*)? [*Abaye explains why it is not exactly the same:*] Here, there is but one planting, and it has now (*at the time of perforation*) become joined to the ground and is growing further (*and therefore it may be regarded as one entity, and the root will become subject to terumah and ma’aser just like the additional growth*); whereas there (*when the grain is replanted*), there were two plantings. (70a)

Smoothed and then Replanted

Rabbi Avahu inquired: What is the law if an ear of grain, which had been smoothed in the pile (*the stage where it becomes subject to terumah and ma’aser*), had been replanted and designated as *terumah* when it was still attached to the ground? Do we say that once it was smoothed in the pile, it becomes *tevel* (*untithed produce*),



and therefore when it is later designated as *terumah*, it is consecrated as *terumah*; or perhaps, since it was replanted, its *tevel* status has left it?

The Rabbis said to Abaye: If we would say so, then we would have found a case where produce that is attached to the ground is consecrated as *terumah*, and we have learned that we do not find produce that is attached to the ground consecrated as *terumah*!?

Abaye replied. That was taught only in connection with the liability of death (*at the hands of Heaven – for one who deliberately eats terumah*) and the payment of the added fifth (*for one who inadvertently eats terumah*). The reason for this is as follows: If one plucked it out and ate it, one has then eaten what was detached from the ground, and if one bent down and ate it, that act is negated by the views of other people (*who do not regard that as “eating”*). (70a)

Mishna

Wheat, barley, spelt, oats and rye are subject to the *challah* obligation (*a portion of dough which is separated and then given to a Kohen; has halachos like terumah*), and they can be combined together (*for the minimum amount requirement – one and a half kavim of dough*). They are forbidden to be eaten as *chadash* (*new produce*) before the *omer*, and they may not be harvested before *Pesach* (*when the omer is offered*). If they had taken root before the *omer*, the *omer* permits them; otherwise, they are forbidden until the next year's *omer*. (70a)

Species of Grain

A *braisa* was taught: Spelt is a type of wheat; oats and rye are types of barley.

The *Gemora* notes: Rice and millet are not subject to the obligation of *challah*.

Rish Lakish said: This is derived through a *gezeirah shavah* of *bread, bread* from *matzah*. And Rish Lakish, and so it was taught in the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael and also in the Academy of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov said that the rule that *matzah* may only be made from these species is derived from the verse: *You shall not eat leaven with it; for seven days you shall eat with it matzos, the bread of affliction*. It is only with grain that can come to the state of leavening, a man fulfils his obligation of *matzah* on *Pesach*; accordingly, these (*flour from rice and millet*) are excluded, since they cannot come to the state of leaven, but only to the state of spoilage.

The *Mishna* had stated that the various species of grain combine together.

A *braisa* was taught: Grain, flour and dough can combine together.

Rav Kahana said that this is in connection with the new produce. [*If one eats in total more than the size of an olive from these types of food before the omer was offered, he will incur lashes.*]

Rav Yosef said that this is in connection with eating *chametz* on *Pesach*.

Rav Pappa said that this is in connection with eating *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 Shemittah cycle; it can also be redeemed with money and the money is brought up to Yerushalayim, where he purchases animals for korbanos*); accordingly, if one were to eat it outside the wall of Yerushalayim, one would incur lashes.

Rava said that it is in connection with food *tumah*, and it teaches us that grain and flour (*in order to become tamei*) must be like dough: just as the dough must be the complete amount of foodstuff (*equaling the volume of an egg*), so here too, the grain and flour must be the complete amount of



foodstuff (which excludes the husks of the barley and the bran in the flour; they do not contribute to the minimum amount).

The *Gemora* cites a supporting *braisa*: The kernel of wheat, whether it is peeled or not, can combine together with other foodstuffs (for the amount required to contract *tumah*; this is because its husks are edible), but the kernel of barley can combine together with other foodstuffs only when peeled, but not when not peeled.

The *Gemora* asks: But is this so? Behold a *braisa* was taught in the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael, which stated: Upon any edible seeds which are plantable; they are subject to *tumah* if they are seeds that people would take them out for planting, namely wheat in its husk, barley in its husk, and lentils in their husks!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is no difficulty, for the latter *braisa* is speaking of moist seeds (which combines for the amount required for *tumah* either because it protects the food, or because they are regarded as food), whereas the other *braisa* is referring to dry seeds. (70a – 70b)

Before the Omer

The *Mishna* had stated that the new produce is forbidden to be eaten before the *omer* has been offered.

Rish Lakish said that this (the prohibition applies to the five species of grain, and not to rice or millet) is derived through a *gezeirah shavah* of bread, bread from *matzah*.

The *Mishna* had stated that there is a prohibition against harvesting new grain before the *omer*.

Rabbi Yonah said that it is prohibited to consume the new produce until the harvesting of the *omer* (and it would be permitted to eat from the new produce at sunrise of the

sixteenth). Rabbi Yosi bar Zavda said that it is prohibited until the *omer* has been offered.

The *Gemora* proves from our *Mishna* that it is prohibited until the *omer* has been offered. The *Gemora* revises their argument: The *Mishna* had stated that if the new grain took root “before the *omer*,” it is permitted. Rabbi Yonah said that “before the *omer*” means before the *omer* has been offered. Rabbi Yosi bar Zavda said that it means that it took root before the *omer* had been harvested.

DAILY MASHAL

“Who Made Me a Kohen”

Rabbi Tzadok HaKohen of Lublin asked why *Kohanim* don't pronounce “who made me a *Kohen*” in the morning *berachos*. The Gerer Rebbe, author of *Imrei Emes*, replied: The firstborn were rejected from service in the Temple because of their sin with the golden calf and the *Kohanim* and Levites, who didn't sin, were chosen in their stead. It turns out, then, that such a *berachah* would involve a transgression of receiving honor at the expense of another's disgrace (*Mima'yanos HaNetzach, Korach*).