

*Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of ישראל צבי בן זאב גוטליב ז"ל*

*By the Weiss/Gotlib Families—London, England*

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Terumah that is tamei

Rava bar Masna cited a Mishnah that ruled: Terumah plants that became tmei'im and were subsequently replanted are tehorim as far as transmitting tum'ah to other things, but they are prohibited to be eaten. He then asked Abaye and R' Chananya the sons of Avin why the plants are prohibited to be eaten if they are tehorim.

After Abaye and R' Chananya failed to provide a satisfactory answer, Rava bar Masna explained in the name of R' Sheishes that the plants are prohibited for consumption because they were not properly guarded from tum'ah.

The Gemara challenges this explanation because it is only consistent with one explanation of why terumah becomes invalidated when not guarded properly.

The Gemara digresses and elaborates upon the disagreement between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish regarding the rationale why terumah becomes invalid as a result of inattention. According to R' Yochanan it is because of the possibility the terumah came in contact with tum'ah. According to Reish Lakish its status of being invalid results from the terumah itself.

R' Yochanan unsuccessfully challenges the position of Reish Lakish.

When R' Yirmiyah heard the explanation of R' Sheishes he sharply criticized the Babylonians. The actual reason the terumah may not be eaten, explained R' Yirmiyah, is based upon a principle originally taught regarding liquids, that planting the branches in the ground is not effective in removing the tum'ah completely.

This principle is examined.

Rava cites an example of a stringency applied to holy things. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is it prohibited to eat terumah plants that became tmei'im which one replanted?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Explain the dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish concerning היסח הדעת.  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Explain: אין זריעה להקדש.  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Why, according to R' Yochanan, is the juice of grapes tahor if the juice was squeezed from tamei grapes and then sanctified?  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The growth from terumah which is tamei*

גידולי תרומה תרומה

The Gemara (Shabbos 17b) teaches that the rabbis declared that if terumah is planted in the ground, and it grows, the growth which sprouts forth has the status of terumah. The reason for this ruling is that if we would allow it to be considered a new growth of chullin, this would encourage the kohen who has in his possession terumah that is tamei to keep it and plant it. The correct thing for the kohen to do is to dispose of the terumah which is tamei, in order to prevent any accidental consumption of this terumah. If, however, the terumah can be recycled, so to say, and produce new growth by being planted, the kohen would not dispose of it. To prevent this, we remove the incentive of planting the terumah, for the kohen no longer has anything to gain.

Tosafos mentions that this precaution is only in place regarding seeds of grain, which might produce new growth. If the new plants would be chullin, the kohen stands to gain significantly, and we must discourage this behavior. However, saplings of terumah which are tmei'im would only produce a small additional growth, which does not represent a meaningful profit, and the rabbinic ruling does not apply.

Rashi (ibid.) explains that the rule that the growth of these terumah seeds remains as terumah is that the growth will have the status of terumah and that it will be tamei as well. Tosafos, however, raises a question from our Gemara. Here, Rabba explains that the saplings of terumah which became tmei'im and were then planted into the ground are prohibited to non-kohanim, but they are permitted for kohanim. If the explanation of Rashi was correct, these growths would be tmei'im, and therefore prohibited for kohanim to eat as well.

Alternatively, Tosafos explains that the growth of terumah is deemed to be terumah, but not that it is tamei. Nevertheless, the rabbinic ruling only applies to seeds, because it is here where the financial gain stands to be the greatest. The entire pile of grain which is terumah could have been transformed into chullin, if not for the rabbinical injunction. Saplings, however, do not represent a significant financial gain by being planted, because it would only be the added growth which stands to be non terumah, and there is no risk that the kohen may hold on to these saplings just to gain this small benefit. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The residents of Bavel

ר' ירמיה אמר בבלי טפשיא משום דיתבי בארעא דחשוכא אמריתון שמעתתא דמחשכו.

R' Yirmiya said: Those foolish Babylonians! Because they dwell in a dark land they make "dark" statements.

We find many places in Shas<sup>1</sup>, where Amoraim seemingly speak disparagingly about one another when engaged in discourse (see, however, **Gemara Gem**, below).

There are opinions<sup>2</sup> which praise Talmidei Chachamim (scholars) who argue heatedly with one another<sup>3</sup> (even to the point of getting so excited as to sweat and clap their own hands in excitement<sup>4</sup>). The Chavos Yair<sup>5</sup>, however takes exception with such a position. He reconciles each occurrence in Shas<sup>6</sup> where such disrespect seemingly occurs. Furthermore, he writes that one can deliberate with others in a calm and pleasant manner, each one allowing the other to speak and not interrupting his fellow. Only then may one offer his opinion. The Chafetz Chaim<sup>7</sup> rules in accordance with this Chavos Yair.

Ramban (Nachmanidies)<sup>8</sup> also says that one should not argue zealously against a talmid chacham. Nonetheless, the

Shulchan Aruch<sup>9</sup> says that a Rabbi may display anger to his student if he sees him not conducting himself appropriately. But even in such a case, the Rabbi should not be genuinely angry in his heart. ■

1. כגון ביבמות ט' א'. ובב"ק ק"ה ב'. וגיטין מ"ה א'. וזבחים פ"ה, ועוד
2. כ"כ בספר זיקוקין דנורא, שהובא בתוך דברי החו"ז דלהלן
3. דהבינו כן בכונת הגמ' בקידוין ל' ע"ב. אמנם החו"י פירש כפשטות רש"י שם בד"ה נעשו אויבים
4. בשו"ת חות יאיר סימן קנ"ב, ועע"ש בסוף סימן קכ"ד בדברי השמן המאור
5. הח"ח בפתיחה וכן לאחר הלכות רכילות העתיקו. וכן מבואר דעת המהרש"א הנ"ל. וכ"כ הבן איש חי בהרחבה בהקדמת השו"ת שלו
6. בהקדמתו "למלחמות", כשחזר בו מהביטויים על בעל המאור
7. ביר"ד סימן רמ"ו סי"א
8. כ"כ החו"י הנ"ל
9. ופירוש סוגיין לדעת החו"י, נ"ל דה"פ, שאינו מגנה את הת"ח שבבל אלא ר"ל שמה שהתקשו וניצרכו לבדות טעם מליבם אינו אשמתם אלא מחמת שהם בארץ חשוך שטומאתה גורמת לכך. וכדאשכחן בסנהדרין ק"ט א' שאויר המגדל של נימרוד מלך בבל משכח תורה. [והטעם נ"ל ע"ד מש"כ אל תקרי ונטמאתם אלא ונטמטם שמטמטם ליבו בתורה ע"י טומאת עבירות, ונמרוד הרי היה הראשון לאחר המבול שמרד והמריד, וא"כ טומאת עבירות של כל העולם בכל הדורות על ידו] וכן עי' בסנהדרין כ"ט א' שבמחשכים הושיבני זה תלמוד בבלי, ומהרש"א (בב"מ פ"ה א' בסוד"ה דלישכח) פי' דר"ל חשיכה בתורה ודו"ק ■

## Gemara GEM

### The "dark land" of Bavel

ואמר בבלי טפשיא משום דיתבי בארעא דחשוכא אמריתון שמעתתא דמחשכו

We find a parallel situation in the Gemara (Beitzta 38a), where Rebbe Abba was arriving in Eretz Yisroel from Bavel. As he arrived, he offered a prayer that he succeed in presenting reasonable and acceptable arguments in the Beis Midrash. Apparently, coming from Bavel, he was aware that his words might be dismissed outright, so he prayed that he be heard. We might ask, though, why do we not find a similar prayer when the students of Eretz Yisroel arrived in Bavel? Is it not appropriate

to desire to say worthwhile Torah statements in Bavel as well?

We find that Reish Lakish declared that he was not surprised that the people of Bavel said "dark words," where they did not know the actual reason for the halachah they related. Is it possible that Reish Lakish should insult the scholars of Bavel with such a derogative generality?

The correct manner to understand this is that, in fact, Reish Lakish had great regard and a deep respect for his colleagues in Bavel. When he heard a statement which he found difficult to comprehend, he knew that these talented talmidei chachamim were not to blame. Instead, Reish Lakish blamed any deficiency in their remarks to the fact

that they were residing in a country which inhibited their progress. The very air of Eretz Yisroel causes a person to be wise (Bava Basra 158b). Had these Babylonian scholars been in Eretz Yisroel, Reish Lakish was sure that they would not issue unclear statements.

When Rebbe Abba issued his prayer, he only needed to do so when arriving from Bavel. Until now, if he made a mistake, he could blame it on his being in Bavel, a "dark land". Now, however, upon arriving in Eretz Yisroel, he no longer had any excuse, and he prayed that he merit to offer wise arguments. ■