

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Beitza Daf 13
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
Tosfos.ecwid.com
Subscribe free or Contact: tosfosproject@gmail.com

Daf 13a

The Gemara asks: (if it's true that you allow to rub grain to remove the chaff), then you can cause a situation where you could make produce obligated in Trumah on Yom Tov, and we know that anytime the obligation comes on Yom Tov, you may separate it on Yom Tov. So, why does our Mishna say that you can't separate Trumah on Yom Tov?

The Gemara answers: if this grain becomes obligated in Trumah by rubbing them will be dependent on the following Taanic argument. The Braisa says; if you bring stalks of grain in to make dough from them, you may eat from it in a temporary manner (since you didn't finish its process by smoothing out the grain pile). If you brought it in to rub the grain (to eat the kernels), Rebbi holds they're obligated in Trumah (since this is its final preparation, since you don't need to make such grain into a pile), and R' Yossi b. Yehuda says that he's exempt (since you always need to make grain in a pile to obligate it in Trumah, since that's the connotation of 'Dagan').

(Rashi explains that, only according to Rebbi do these grain need Trumah removed, and therefore, when he rubs them on Yom Tov, they'll become obligated in Trumah, and therefore, you can separate Trumah on Yom Tov. However, our Mishna that never allows taking off Trumah on Yom Tov is according to R' Yossi b. Yehuda who says that these grains are still exempt from Trumah.)

The Gemara asks: even according to R' Yossi b. Yehuda you'll find a case where the obligation comes on Yom Tov, when you originally brought the grain in to make dough (and you could still eat it in a temporary manner) and then on Yom Tov, you change your mind to rub them and eat the kernels. (Since, originally it was designated for something that obligates it for Trumah) it now becomes obligated in Trumah (since it's no longer meant to make into a pile, we consider it as if it's in its final pile).

The Gemara answers: (when we said in the Mishna you can't take off Trumah on Yom Tov), we only meant that most of the time you can't, (although there might be a lone case where you could).

Tosfos quotes Rashi's explanation and text as we explained: that we find Trumah becomes obligated according to Rebbi who hold that, just the gathering of grains for rubbing is its final preparation, and it's as if it's made into a pile. However, R' Yossi b. Yehuda holds that it's never obligated until it's made into a pile, since the Torah wants it to be 'Dagen,' and this is just a gathering (which doesn't meet the criteria). Therefore, the Gemara text later reads "even according to R' Yossi b. Yehuda."

Tosfos explains: we must say that, when R' Yossi b. Yehuda exempts it from Trumah, it's even exempt when he eats them in an established manner. After all, if not, then this could be a case where the grain can become obligated in Trumah on Yom Tov, when you want to eat it in an established manner on Yom Tov.

However, Tosfos asks on this: this doesn't seem to be the Braisa's implication. After all, the

Braisa starts off saying if you bring it in to make dough, it's exempt from Trumah when you eat in a temporary manner. On that, the Braisa has an argument between R' Yossi b. Yehuda and Rabbi whether if you bring it in to rub if they're Chayiv or not, implying, in the same manner as we said before, if it can't be eaten anymore in a temporary manner. (However, everyone holds it's forbidden to eat it in an established manner.)

Another question: according to Rabbi, it became obligated in separating Trumah when you brought it in, which was on Erev Yom Tov. So, since you brought it in before Yom Tov, how can you have a right to separate Trumah on Yom Tov.

Rather, Tosfos explains: R' Yossi b. Yehuda who exempts from Trumah, since the gathering the stalks in is not like making a pile, when he starts eating it on Yom Tov in a established manner, he's obligated to take off Trumah. Therefore, he is the one who holds that you can take off Trumah on Yom Tov. This, that we say you can't take off Trumah on Yom Tov is according to Rabbi. Therefore, at the Gemara's conclusion, the Gemara should read, "even according to Rabbi (you can find a case that the obligation came on Yom Tov, by bringing it in to make dough and then you changed your mind on Yom Tov to rub the chaff off and eat.)"

New Sugya

The Gemara's first version; Abaya said that they only argue if you bring in stalks of grain, but if you bring in stalks of beans, all agree that, by making them into bundles, they're obligated in Trumah (since it's more apt for someone to bring them in with the stalks, and then remove the beans periodically when you need to cook them).

The Gemara wants to bring a proof to this from the following Braisa; if you have bundles of fenugreek or Tevel, you smash them (to remove the seeds from their shells) and assess how many seeds there are, and you separate Trumah and Maasar from the seeds and not from the wood. Let us assume it's R' Yossi b. Yehuda who held grains in their stalks are not Tevel, but here he admits that it's Tevel.

The Gemara answers: no, it's Rabbi. The Gemara asks; if it's Rabbi, why did he say the case of fenugreek? He should have said the bigger Chidush that grains are Tevel too.

The Gemara asks: we can ask a similar question even if it's like R' Yossi b. Yehuda; why not say a case of other beans and we would say, of course, it applies to fenugreek (where it's the most apt to only remove it from the stalks when you need to cook it)?

The Gemara answers: (really it's Rabbi), and it tells us a special Chidush by fenugreek, that you don't need to separate Trumah on its wood despite that it has the same taste as the seeds.

The Gemara's second version: Abaya said they only argue by stalks of grain, but by stalks of beans, everyone holds that their bundles are not Tevel (since it's only normal to bring them in to make a pile out of the beans).

The Gemara asks from the above Braisa that considers the fenugreek bundles as Tevel, and we'll assume that it's regular Tevel that you still need to remove the first Trumah.

The Gemara rejects this. We refer to a case where the Levi already received it as his Maasar while it was still in their stalks (before it became obligated to take off Trumah). So, as Reish Lakish

says; the very dedicating these produce as 'Maasar' makes them Tevel and you're obligated to separate Trumas Maasar from them.

The Gemara asks: if that's true, why does the Braisa requires him to smash them to remove the shell? Why can't the Levi claim that he'll give to the Kohain in the stalks the same way he received them?

The Gemara answers: the rabbis fined him for taking the Maasar before the Trumah was separated, (since the Torah forbade changing the order of separating Trumos and Maasar).

Tosfos quotes R' Shimshon of Coucy who asks: we never find two opposite versions like those brought here. Usually you'll have the first version that says everyone agrees to a case, and the second version says they argue in that case too, or you'll have the second version saying they only argue about the case that the first version says all agree, however, everyone agrees about the case that the first version says they argue. However, you never find that the two versions argue like here. Our Gemara should have said that the second version was: they argue about beans, but everyone agrees that grains are exempt.

Tosfos answers: we must explain the first version as follows; they only argue regarding stalks of grain that were brought with the intent to be left in their stalks (until you're ready to thresh them), but all agree that bean stalks explicitly brought in to rub off their pods to eat is Tevel. However, (all the in-between cases, like) stalks of grains and beans without any explicit intent, they still argue. The second version holds; they only argue by grains that you had no explicit intent, but all agree that beans brought in without intent isn't Tevel. They also argue in all other cases, like if the beans and grains are brought in to rub and to eat .

Therefore, according to this, the two versions are not polar opposites. The case that the first version says they argue, the second version says they all hold it's not Tevel.

Tosfos asks: the Braisa only says the cases that they explicitly intended for certain uses (either to make dough, or to rub off the shells and eat. So, how can we say they're arguing in that Braisa if he had no explicit intent?)

Tosfos answers: (we should read the Braisa as follows; if you brought it in to make a dough, you're exempt.) However, if you bring it in without intent, it's as if you explicitly brought it in to rub off the shells and you're obligated.

Tosfos asks: why did the Gemara ask from the Braisa of fenugreek that beans are obligated? After all, according to this version, Rebbi only exempts them if you didn't have intent. We can say the Braisa that obligates fenugreek is according to Rebbi and refers to a case where he explicitly intended to rub off the shells and eat them.

Tosfos answers: the Braisa implies it's obligated in all situations, even without intent.

Alternatively, we would like to fit that Braisa according to all Tannaim, (even R' Yossi b. Yehuda).

We have a Braisa to support this concept of a fine. When they give a Levi his Maasar in the stalks, he needs to make it into a pile of grain before he gives the Kohain his Trumas Maasar. If he

receives grapes, he must make it into wine before he gives it. If he receives olives, he needs to make it into oil before he gives it. They made Trumas Maasar the same as the first Trumah. Just as the first Trumah, he only takes it off after he made it into wine or made a pile of wheat, so too Trumas Maasar.

Daf 13b

The Gemara asks: the Braisa says that you estimate how many seeds there are and take off Trumah. If we're referring to Trumas Maasar, which unlike regular Trumah, needs a specific amount (a tenth), so, how can you take off by estimating without measuring exactly?

The Gemara answers: the author of this Braisa is Abba Elazar b. Gimal who allows separating Trumos Maasar by estimation. He brings the Pasuk "you shall 'think' your Trumos (in the plural)." It refers to both types of Trumah, the first Trumah and Trumas Maasar. So the Torah is comparing them. So, just like you can separate the first Trumah with just thinking (without picking it up and without pronouncing anything, but rather by just looking at it and think what you want to make it Trumah), and you separate through estimation, so too, you may do so by Trumas Maasar.

Tosfos asks: why do you need to learn that you may separate Trumas Maasar with just thinking from the first Trumah? After all, it says explicitly 'thinking' by Trumas Maasar.

Rashi answers: the Gemara wasn't exact when it said you also need to learn 'thinking' from Trumah, but we only need it to learn separating through estimation.

Alternatively, Tosfos answers: if it wasn't for the fact that we learn Trumas Maasar from the first Trumah, we would never say that you can separate by thinking. Even though the Torah wrote 'thinking' by Maasar, we would say it only refers to the first Trumah. As the Yerushalmi says; by all subjects in the Torah, we say that it teaches laws about its own Halachos and we can extrapolate to other Halachos, except for Trumas Maasar. It only teaches us about other Halachos and not about itself. After all, from the word "from it," which we learn that you should separate the Trumah while it's next to the rest of the produce, since "from it" connotes that you take from what's next to it. We say it only refers to the first Trumah, but the Trumas Maasar doesn't need to be separated while it's next to the rest of the Maasar, at least according to Torah law. Therefore, the same way we said the Pasuk "from it" written by Maasar refers exclusively to the first Trumah, so too the Pasuk of 'thinking.'

The Gemara explains the reason for Reish Lakish's statement; that when you give Maasar early while the grain is still in the stalks, just by designating the grain as 'Maasar,' it makes it Tevel that you need to take off Trumas Maasar: since it received the title 'Maasar' on it. (After all, the Torah says "you need to remove a tenth from Maasar." Once it's Maasar, no matter in what form, you need to take off a tenth.)

New Sugya

Reish Lakish says that if you give the Levi his Maasar while it's still in the stalks, it's exempt from separating the first Trumah. As the Pasuk says "you should remove the Trumah, a tenth from the Maasar," and not the first Trumah plus an extra tenth (Trumas Maasar).

R' Pappa asked Abaya: if so, then it should be exempt from the first Trumah even if he gives the

Levi his Maasar first after it was made into a pile? Abaya answers: on that, the Pasuk says “when you take off the presents, you should take off all the Trumah.”

The Gemara asks: how do you know to reconcile in that way? (**Rashi- perhaps it's the opposite, you're obligated when it's given in the stalks and it's exempt when given from the pile of grain.**) The Gemara answers: (since Trumah is obligated when it's called 'Dagan'), and after its made in a pile it's called 'Dagan,' and before that, it's not called 'Dagan.'

Tosfos asks: how can the Gemara have an assumption that it could be reconciled in the opposite direction? After all, if you're obligated to take off while it's in the stalks, you should be obligated to take it off in the pile, since you're always more obligated in Trumah the later in the process it is.

Tosfos answers: the question is; why should we assume that you're always obligated after it's made into a pile and only exempt while it's in the stalks? Perhaps both the Pasuk obligating and exempting refer to after it's made into a pile. It's exempt before it arrives in a house and it's obligated after it arrives in a house. On that the Gemara answers; since the pile of grain is called 'Dagan,' it should be obligated in Trumah wherever it is.

New Sugya

Someone could peel individual barley kernels and eat them immediately. However, if instead of eating each one after he peeled them, he gathered them in his hand, then you can't eat them (without taking off Trumah and Maasar). R' Elazar says, that the same applies for Shabbos, (that if you don't eat each individual kernel as you peel them, it's forbidden, since it's like threshing). The Gemara asks: but didn't Rav and R' Chiya had their wives peel cupfuls of them on Shabbos?

Tosfos quotes Rashi: we refer to peeling them while they're still in their stalks.

Tosfos asks: we said before that you may only rub the chaff off on Friday, implying that it is forbidden to do so on Shabbos.

Tosfos answers: we only prohibited there when it's still attached to the stalks. So, removing it from the stalks is a form of threshing. However, our Gemara refers to when it's already detached from the stalks and all you need to do is to peel off its outer shell. Therefore, it's permitted.

Tosfos quotes Rashi: the reason you can't eat the handful of peeled barley without taking off Trumah is because you're now eating it in an established manner. Tosfos disagrees. After all, later it seems the reason given is because you finished its process. Since you peeled many together, it's as if you now have a small pile of grain.

Rather, if he said to compare it to Shabbos, he must have said it regarding the end of the Braisa. If you rub the chaff off wheat, you blow the shells off and eat it. However, if you place the kernels in your lap, you can't eat it without separating the Trumah and Maasar. R' Elazar says, the same applies to Shabbos.

R' Abba b. Mamal asks: how can we say that the first case in the Braisa only applies to Maasar and not to Shabbos? Where do we ever consider something to be a Melacha for Maasar (finishing

process), but not regarding Shabbos?

R' Sheishes b. R. Idi counter-asks: don't we see the concept of making a pile (that obligates to take off Trumah and Maasar)? As the Braisa says; for cucumbers and gourds, it becomes obligated in Maasar when the flowering at its tip falls off, and even before it falls off, it's obligated when you make a pile of them. The same by onions, it's obligated when you make them into a pile. Although you're not Chayiv on Shabbos for making a pile of these vegetables in your house. So, we must say there is a difference, that they only prohibited specialized Melacha on Shabbos.

New Sugya

How do you rub the chaff off? (After all, you need to do it in an irregular way, so you shouldn't do a weekday-like act.)

Tosfos explains: we refer to rubbing them on Yom Tov, since it's forbidden to do so on Shabbos. However, afterwards, when we explain how to blow off the shells, we refer to Shabbos, since you may separate them on Yom Tov even with a funnel or large plate.

Abaya quoted R' Yosef: you rub with your thumb and forefinger. R' Aviya quoted R' Yosef: with your thumb against two fingers. Rava says: once you're removing the shells in an irregular way, you may rub your thumb against all your fingers.

How do you blow off the chaff? Rav said that you can only blow off the kernels that can fit in your hand above the knuckles.

Tosfos asks: before, we said that you can blow it from your hand as long as you don't use a funnel or large plate. (So, it implies you can use your whole hand, as we only prohibited a funnel.)

Tosfos answers: when we said you can blow it from your hand, we meant from above the knuckles. We only contrasted it with the funnel, since we were contrasting Shabbos to Yom Tov, and on Yom Tov you may even use a funnel.

Daf 14a

They "laughed at him in the west" (Eretz Yisrael), that, once you're blowing in an irregular way, you should be able to do it with your whole hand. So, R' Elazar says, you blow with a full hand and with all your might.