

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying R' Meir's statement in the Mishnah (cont.)

Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara explains that R' Meir's ruling in the Mishnah is an application of a ruling of R' Yehoshua who permits making terumah if it is about to become unusable. Along the same lines, R' Meir permits burning terumah that is טהורה with terumah that is טמאה before Pesach since it is going to be burned anyway. R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha interpreted the Mishnah the same way as Reish Lakish.

Rava unsuccessfully challenged R' Nachman's understanding of R' Meir.

2) The dispute between R' Meir and R' Yosi

R' Yochanan states that the dispute between R' Meir and R' Yosi applies during the hour chometz is Rabbini-cally prohibited, but during the seventh hour everyone agrees that terumah that is tehovah may be burned with terumah that is טמאה.

R' Zeira noted that R' Yochanan is interpreting the Mishnah differently than Reish Lakish and R' Meir is drawing his opinion from the ruling of R' Chanina, Sgan HaKohanim.

R' Zeira's understanding is supported by a statement of R' Yochanan.

Two unsuccessful attempts are made to support R' Yochanan's understanding.

As the Gemara tries to fit R' Yochanan's interpretation into the words of the Mishnah, R' Pappa explains that R' Meir and R' Yosi disagree as to the meaning of R' Chanina's ruling. R' Chanina ruled on a case of meat that became tamei by touching a liquid that touched a sheretz. R' Meir maintains that Biblically, liquids can not transmit tum'ah, whereas according to R' Yosi liquids transmit tum'ah even Biblically. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת ברוך יהושע בן אלחנן שלמה זלמן
by the Goldstein family*

Distinctive INSIGHT

The source for the opinion of R' Yehoshua

רבי יהושע אומר אם היה מונח במקום המוצנע יניחנה במקום הטורפה

Our Gemara initially brings this Mishnah from Terumos (8:8) to show that the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua cited could be the source for the words of Rabbi Meir in our Mishnah that terumah tehovah can even be burned together with terumah that is tmei'ah. From where did R' Meir see any indication of this in the words of the Mishnah? Perhaps it is from the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua who says that terumah that is טמאה מספק can be left in an insecure condition. The Gemara quickly points out that there is no proof to the rule of R' Meir from here, because, at worst, R' Yehoshua was dealing with terumah that is טמאה מספק, and not with terumah which is tehovah.

Pnei Yehoshua points out that according to the conclusion of the Gemara in Bechoros (33b), the reason why R' Yehoshua allows this barrel to be placed in a precarious position is that he interprets the הנה נתתי לך את משמרת תרומתי to apply only to terumah which is

(Distinctive Insight...continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to Reish Lakish what is the source of R' Meir's ruling?

2. Why did R' Yosi oppose burning terumah that may be t'meiah (ספק) with terumah that is certainly tmei'ah?

3. Why was it decreed that nosar and pigul make a person's hands tmei'os?

4. What is the halachah regarding bread that is too moldy for human consumption but still edible for dogs?

HALACHAH Highlight

May one pour terumah wine down the drain?

חבית של תרומה שנשברה בגת העליונה ותחתיה חולין טמאין מודה ר"י ור"א שאם יכול להציל ההנה רביעית בטהרה יציל ואם לאו ר"א אומר תרד ותטמא ואל יטמאנה בידו ור' יהושע אומר אף יטמאנה בידו.

If a cask of terumah (wine) broke in the upper vat of a winepress and the lower container (into which the juice would flow) contains chullin wine, R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua agree if one can save even¹ one revi'is of the terumah wine he should save it. If not even a revi'is can be salvaged², R' Eliezer says the terumah wine should be allowed to run down into the lower container and automatically become tamei, and one should not actively make it tamei by collecting it in an impure vessel. R' Yehoshua says one may even make it tamei through his own actions. The halachah follows R' Yehoshua³.

The Amoraim differ in understanding the rationale behind R' Yehoshua's ruling, who says that it is permitted to apply tum'ah to terumah which is pure, in order to save it from being ruined (in our case it would fall into the impure chullin wine, rendering the mixture unfit for consumption).

R' Nachman in the name of Raba bar Avuha and Reish Lakish explains that the dispute of R' Meir and R' Yosi (in the Mishna 14a) is how to interpret and apply the reasoning of R' Yehoshua. According to R' Meir the reasoning of R' Yehoshua is that if the terumah will definitely be ruined it is permitted to render it tmei'ah (impure), as there is no commandment to protect impure terumah

from tum'ah⁴. But according to R' Yossi⁵ the rationale of R' Yehoshua is that the Rabbis permitted terumah to become tamei only in order to prevent a loss to chullin. R' Yochanan⁶ argues and maintains that even R' Meir would agree to this reasoning.

Rambam⁷ rules that it is only permitted to make terumah tmei'ah in the case of great monetary loss. However this is only in the case of pure (tahor) terumah, that will become ruined. However if the terumah has already become tmei'ah, as in our times when we are all assumed to be טמאי מתים (tmei'ah from a corpse), there is no prohibition to touch impure terumah.⁸ This is clear from our Mishnah, and Rambam⁹ rules this way.

Chazon Ish¹⁰ took care not to pour impure terumah down the sink as it would land up in the sewage, and this would be a disgrace for the terumah. One should also not pour terumah down the toilet. Rather, one should pour it onto a piece of ground where it will not be tread upon. ■

1. המאירי, שכ"ש דיותר מרביעית שרי ופפוט
2. פחות מרביעית אינו נחשב לכלום. כ"כ פיהמ"ש בתרומות פ"ח. ואפשר שגם רש"י (ד"ה ואם לאו) מודה לכך
3. רמב"ם בהלכות תרומות פי"ב ה"ד
4. ברש"י בד"ה ואם לאו. וברש"י (בע"א בד"ה יניחנה) מבואר עוד שר"א ור' יהושע נחדקו בזה בהאם יש אם למסורת או למקרא, וכדאיתא בבכורות ל"ד א' ודו"ק
5. ובגמ' בע"ב וברש"י שם (בד"ה נימא קסבר רבי יוחנן וכו' דטעמעה וכו' עכ"ל) משמע שהטעם דהפסד הוא טעם בפ"ע, בגמ' להלך כ' ע"ב
6. כמפורש ברש"י בע"ב בד"ה נימא, הנ"ל
7. בהלכות תרומות פי"ב הלכה ד' וה' בבאה"ל בד"ה חבית
8. כ"כ כל הפוסקים וכגון המשנה ברורה בסימן תנ"ז ס"ק כ'
9. בפסולי המוקדשין פי"ט ה', שמותר לעשות שלישי ראשון ואפילו בקדשים. ואיירי כשכבר נטמאה מדאורייתא
10. כ"כ בד"א בציון ההלכה בהלכות תרומות פ"ב ס"ק שצ"ט. וכן עי' בקיצור הלכות תרומות ומעשרות פ"ט סוף ה"ג ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

לך. Only terumah which is potentially useful must be guarded, but that which is תלויה (doubtful status) no longer needs to be supervised. Therefore, it should be permitted to even apply tum'ah to it directly (בידים) and not only incidentally (גרמא). Therefore, this opinion of R' Yehoshua should be a proof for the words of R' Meir to allow us to apply tum'ah directly to terumah which is

no longer going to be edible.

Pnei Yehoshua answers that it is true that on a Torah level, once the verse of "guarding" is suspended, it is actually permitted to apply tum'ah to this terumah directly. However, the rabbis enacted a rule to prohibit applying tum'ah בידים. In this case of the barrel, we can therefore only allow the tum'ah to come in contact with the wine indirectly. In the next case of the Gemara, when the te-

rumah is about to spill from the upper level of the wine-press to the lower level and mix with the chullin, the rabbis did not make their גזירה, and in consideration of the loss of chullin, they allow the Torah law of applying tum'ah directly to the terumah which will otherwise go to waste. ■

