

אָמְרֵי: מַעֲשֵׂר – דִּיגוֹן הוּא דְקָא גְרָם לֵיהּ.

The Sages of the Gemara say: With regard to **tithe**, the ground does not engender the obligation; **placement** of the produce in a pile engenders the obligation,^N as it is only at that point that one is obligated to tithe his produce. Therefore neutralization of the prohibition is not effected by planting it in the ground.

מְתִיב רַמִּי בַר חָמָא: "קוֹנָם פִּירוֹת הָאֵלוּ עָלַי", "קוֹנָם הֵן עַל פִּי", "קוֹנָם הֵן לְפִי" – אָסוּר בְּחִילּוּפֵיהֶן וּבְגִידוּלֵיהֶן. "שְׂאֵנִי אוֹכֵל" וְ"שְׂאֵנִי טוֹעֵם" – מוֹתֵר בְּחִילּוּפֵיהֶן וּבְגִידוּלֵיהֶן בְּדָבָר שֶׁזָּרְעוּ כָּלָה, אֲבָל בְּדָבָר שֶׁאֵין זָרְעוּ כָּלָה – אֲפִילוּ גִידוּלֵי גִידוּלֵי אֲסוּרִין!

Rami bar Hama raised an objection to the opinion of Rabbi Yannai based on the mishna (57a): For one who says: **This produce is *konam*^N upon me, or it is *konam* upon my mouth, or it is *konam* to my mouth, it is prohibited** to partake of the produce, or of its replacements, or of anything that grows from it. If he says: This produce is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not eat it, or for that reason I will not taste it, it is permitted for him to partake of its replacements or of anything that grows from it. This applies only with regard to an item whose seeds cease after it is sown. However, with regard to an item whose seeds do not cease after it is sown, it is prohibited for him to partake even of the growths of its growths. Apparently, permitted growths do not neutralize the prohibition.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא: שְׂאֵנִי קוֹנָמוֹת, הוּאֵיל וְאֵי בְּעֵי מִתְּשִׁיל עֲלֵיהֶוּ – הָוּוּ לָהּוּ בְּדָבָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לוֹ מִתְּיָרִין, וְאֵין בְּטִיל בְּרוֹב.

Rabbi Abba said: *Konamot* are different; since if he wishes to do so he can request that a halakhic authority dissolve the vows and render the objects of the vows permitted, their legal status is like that of an item that can become permitted,^N and its prohibition is not nullified by a majority of permitted items.

NOTES

Placement of the produce in a pile engenders the obligation – דִּיגוֹן הוּא דְקָא גְרָם: The Ran explains that the ground does not engender the obligation to tithe produce; rather, it is engendered by placement in a pile. The Rosh adds that it is not the sowing and growth of the produce that creates untithed produce; it is the actions of the person who harvests it and places it into a pile. Rashi states, consistent with his earlier explanation, that one's obligation to tithe this *litra* of onions was effected by its placement in a pile during the previous year, prior to its resowing.

This produce is *konam* – קוֹנָם פִּירוֹת: The commentaries (see *Shita Mekubbetzet*) note that the difficulty is not posed from the first *halakha*, as it could be explained that through the *konam* he renders forbidden to him not only benefit from the produce itself, but also any benefit that derives from it. The proof is from the second *halakha*: This produce is *Konam* for me, and for that reason I will not eat, or I will not taste it. In those cases, if the seeds do not cease, its growths are forbidden, proving that although he vowed that the produce itself is forbidden to him, since it does not cease entirely, its growths do not neutralize the prohibition of the original plant.

The early commentaries say: According to the principle: An item whose prohibition is engendered by means of the ground, its neutralization is effected by means of the ground as well, since the prohibition of *konamot* is not engendered by means of the ground, but by his vow, there is no reason to presume that their neutralization would be effected by means of the ground. The Rid explains that the Gemara could

have answered in that manner, but opted for the answer that an item forbidden by a *konam* is an item that can become permitted. Rabbi Avraham min HaHar cites an explanation in the name of Rashi that is even more radical: The Gemara at this stage of the discussion does not accept the principle: An item whose prohibition is engendered by means of the ground, etc. Others maintain that the Gemara continues to accept that principle. However, one might have thought that the growths of an item forbidden by a *konam* are similar to those of Sabbatical-Year produce; just as their prohibition results from the fact that they grew from a forbidden item, the neutralization of their prohibition is due to the fact that they grew in the ground (*Tosafot*). According to the Rosh, the growths of an item forbidden by a *konam* are different from those of tithes, as the prohibition of tithes is effected by the actions of a person after the produce was already detached from the ground, whereas in the case of *konam* the mixture of prohibited and permitted parts of the plant takes place while it remains connected to the ground.

Their legal status is like that of an item that can become permitted – הָוּוּ לָהּוּ בְּדָבָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ: The Gemara does not say that it is an item that can become permitted, because a *konam* does not become permitted on its own like other prohibitions; one must find an extenuation for the vow to be dissolved. Although there is no certainty that he will be able to find an extenuation, its legal status is like that of an item that can become permitted, as nevertheless, the chance is good that he will find a way to have the vow dissolved (*Meromei Sadeh; Teshuva MeAhava*).

Which if he wishes he can request that a halakhic authority dissolve the designation of the produce as *teruma* – דָּאֵי בְּעֵי מִיתְשִׁיל עֲלֶיהָ – One who separated *teruma* and tithes and regretted doing so may request that a halakhic authority dissolve their designation, just as he would for a vow. The produce would then revert to its previous state (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumot* 4:17; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 331:48).

A *se'a* of ritually impure *teruma* – סָאָה תְּרוּמָה טְמֵאָה – If a *se'a* of impure *teruma* fell into less than one hundred *se'a* of other non-sacred produce, first tithe, second tithe, or consecrated produce, it becomes a mixture that contains *teruma*, and the status of the entire mixture is that of ritually impure *teruma*. Its consumption is forbidden, and it must be left to decay (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumot* 14:11).

וְהָרִי תְרוּמָה, דָּאֵי בְּעֵי מִיתְשִׁיל עֲלֶיהָ, וּבְטָלִי בְרוּב. דְּתַנּוּ: סָאָה תְרוּמָה טְמֵאָה שְׁנַפְּלָה לְפָחוֹת מִמֵּאָה חֹוּלִין – תִּרְקַב, הָא לְמֵאָה – תַּעֲלֶה! אָמְרוּ: בְּתְרוּמָה בְּיַד בְּהֵן עֶסְקִינוּ, דְּלֹא מִצִּי מִיתְשִׁיל עֲלֶיהָ.

אִי הָכִי אֵימָא סִיפָא: אִם הֵיִתָּה טְהוּרָה – תִּמְכֹּר לְכֹהֵן! אֶלָּא בִישְׂרָאֵל שְׁנַפְּלוּ לוֹ מִבֵּית אָבִי אִמּוֹ בְּהֵן עֶסְקִינוּ.

[וְהָא] קִתְנֵי סִיפָא: תִּמְכֹּר לְכֹהֵן חֹוּץ מִדְּמֵי אוֹתָהּ סָאָה!

The Gemara asks: **And isn't there the case of *teruma*, in which if he wishes he can request that a halakhic authority dissolve the designation of the produce as *teruma*^{HN} and yet it is nullified by a majority^N of permitted items? As we learned in a mishna (*Terumot* 5:1): A *se'a* of ritually impure *teruma*^H that fell into less than one hundred *se'a* of non-sacred produce must be left to decay.^N The impure *teruma*, which is forbidden to all, renders the entire mixture forbidden. The Gemara infers: If it fell into one hundred *se'a* of non-sacred produce, its prohibition is neutralized.^N The Sages of the Gemara say in response: **We are dealing with *teruma* that is in the possession of a priest,^N for which the owner can no longer request that a halakhic authority dissolve the designation.** However, as long as the *teruma* is in the owner's possession he can request that its designation be dissolved, and therefore its prohibition cannot be neutralized.**

The Gemara asks: **If so, say the latter clause of that mishna: If the *teruma* mixed with the non-sacred produce was ritually pure, it may be sold to a priest, who treats all the produce as though it were *teruma*.** This indicates that the mishna is dealing with *teruma* in its owner's possession that was not yet given to a priest. **Rather, we are dealing with the case of an Israelite who inherited the produce from a member of the house of his mother's father, who is a priest.** The heir owns the *teruma*; however, since he was not the one who designated it as *teruma*, he may not request that the designation be dissolved.

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it taught in that latter clause of that mishna: It must be sold to a priest; however, the price must reflect the value of the entire mixture except for the value of that *se'a* of *teruma* that fell into the non-sacred produce, as the *teruma* belongs to the priest.** If the mishna is referring to the case of an heir who owns the *teruma*, why can he not collect the value of that *se'a* as well, as it is his property?

NOTES

In which if he wishes he can request that a halakhic authority dissolve the designation of the produce as *teruma* – דָּאֵי בְּעֵי – מִיתְשִׁיל עֲלֶיהָ: Some commentaries ask: Since Rabbi Yannai states this *halakha* with regard to an onion of *teruma*, doesn't this constitute a direct contradiction of his ruling? The Ran answers that Rabbi Yannai was referring to *teruma* whose designation cannot be dissolved, e.g., *teruma* that is in the possession of a priest or that he received as an inheritance from his maternal grandfather.

And yet it is nullified by a majority – בְּטָלִי בְרוּב – This is difficult, as *teruma* is never neutralized by a simple majority; it requires one hundred permitted parts to neutralize one part of *teruma*. Although that is a stringency by rabbinic law, the *halakha* that an item that can become permitted is not neutralized is also by rabbinic law; therefore the discussion is not about the *halakha* by Torah law but rather about rabbinical ordinances and decrees. Therefore, the Vilna Gaon deletes the word majority. Others explain that majority in this context means most of its growth, which includes not only a simple majority but even a majority of one hundred to one (Rashi; Rabbi Avraham min HaHar; *Shita Mekubbetzet*).

Left to decay – תִּרְקַב: There is no remedy for this produce, as it is forbidden to an Israelite since it is *teruma*, and to a priest as it is impure. A priest may not even use it to kindle a fire, despite the fact that in general he may use impure *teruma* for that purpose. The Sages prohibited doing so in this case lest he keep the mixture in his possession for an extended period and inadvertently eat it (Ran).

If it fell into one hundred *se'a* of non-sacred produce, its prohibition is neutralized – הָא לְמֵאָה תַּעֲלֶה: The result is that the impure *teruma* is completely neutralized, and there is no obligation to give any part of that mixture to a priest. There is no concern that he will thereby be stealing from the tribe of priests, as that *se'a* of *teruma* is not given to any priest because the *teruma* is impure and fit only for kindling (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar).

Teruma that is in the possession of a priest – בְּיַד בְּהֵן – Many commentaries question why one cannot request dissolution of the designation of *teruma* once the *teruma* is in the possession of the priest. Rashi and the Ran explain simply that once another person has acquired it, the original owner does not have the right to dissolve its designation (see *Beit HaLevi*). The Rosh cites the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer of Metz, who explains that the priest cannot dissolve its designation as *teruma* because he was not the one who separated it. The Rosh adds that according to that approach, the Israelite who separated the *teruma* can request to have its designation dissolved.

However, that is an unlikely scenario, as the only reason that he might do so is because there is nothing else to eat. By the time that he gives the *teruma* to the priest, all the produce from which he separated the *teruma* and tithes is available to him. Because that is unlikely, the *teruma* is not considered an item that can become permitted. The *Shakh* (*Hoshen Mishpat* 255:6) explains that giving the *teruma* to the priest is accomplished through action and dissolving its designation is accomplished through speech; the principle is that speech cannot negate an action.

There is a mitzva to request that a halakhic authority dissolve them – מצוה לאיתשולי עליהן – Therefore, even though he did not yet request to dissolve the vow, because there is a mitzva to do so, it is as though he already did so, and therefore it is an item that can become permitted (Rashi; Ran). The Rosh explains that an object that is forbidden by a *konam* is considered an item that can become permitted because presumably he will request the dissolution of the vow.

What mitzva is there to request that a halakhic authority dissolve its designation – מאי מצוה לאיתשולי עליה – Since there is no mitzva to do so, presumably, he will not request dissolution of the designation (Rashi). The Ran explains that since the prohibition surrounding the item will not lapse on its own, and although in theory he can request dissolution of its designation he has no reason to do so, it is considered an item that cannot become permitted.

The permitted part of the *litra*, to where did it go – היתר שבהן להיכן הלך: The Rosh explains that this question is based on the assumption that the prohibited growths cannot neutralize the prohibition of the permitted original plant. Therefore, Rav H̄isda asks: The permitted part of the *litra*, to where did it go? The Ran disagrees and holds that the question is raised according to all opinions: Since the *baraita* said that one tithes the *litra* based on a calculation of how much *teruma* of the tithe needed to be taken, the question arises: Why is the produce tithed according to the entire crop; the permitted part of the *litra*, to where did it go? The neutralization of the prohibition of the original plant by its growths is irrelevant here.

אלא אימא: בשלמא קונמות – מצוה לאיתשולי עליהן, משום דרבי נתן. דאמר רבי נתן: כל הנודר – באילו בנה במה, והמקיימו – באילו מקטיר עליה. תרומה מאי מצוה לאיתשולי עליה?

Rather, say that there is another distinction between *konamot* and other cases where one may request dissolution by a halakhic authority. Granted, in the case of *konamot*, there is a mitzva to request that a halakhic authority dissolve them,^N due to the statement of Rabbi Natan, as Rabbi Natan said: Anyone who vows, it is as if he built a personal altar outside the Temple, and one who fulfills that vow, it is as though he burns an offering upon it. However, in the case of *teruma*, what mitzva is there to request that a halakhic authority dissolve its designation?^N Therefore, items forbidden by *konamot* are considered items that can become permitted, and *teruma* is not.

גופא, אומר רבי יוחנן: ליטרא בצלים שתקנה וזרעה – מתעשרת לפי כולה. יתיב רבה וקאמר להא שמעתא. אמר ליה רב חסדא: מאן צאית לך ולרבי יוחנן רבך! היתר שבהן להיכן הלך? אמר ליה: מי לא תנן דכוותה: בצלים שירדו עליהם גשמים וצימחו,

With regard to the matter itself, Rabbi Yohanan said: With regard to a *litra* of onions that one tithed, and then sowed, it is tithed according to the entire crop. Rabba sat and stated this *halakha*. Rav H̄isda said to him: Who listens to you and Rabbi Yohanan, your teacher?^P The permitted part of the *litra*, to where did it go?^N The original *litra* that he sowed was permitted by virtue of the fact that he tithed it, but why is he obligated to tithe the entire crop? The original *litra* should be subtracted from the crop that must be tithed. Rabba said to Rav H̄isda: Didn't we learn a corresponding *halakha* in a mishna (*Shevi'it* 6:3): With regard to sixth-year onions upon which rain fell during the Sabbatical Year, and they sprouted,

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Yohanan, your teacher – רבי יוחנן רבך: In the Talmud, there is no record of Rabba ascending to Eretz Yisrael; however, it is related that his brothers, who immigrated to Eretz Yisrael, implored him to follow them to Eretz Yisrael and study Torah under the tutelage of Rabbi Yohanan. That could be the impetus that led him to go to Eretz Yisrael for a brief period, study Torah

with Rabbi Yohanan, and occasionally cite *halakhot* in his name. It could not have been any more than a brief period, as the Gemara relates that Rabba died at the age of forty. However, it is also possible that Rabba considered himself a student of Rabbi Yohanan from a distance and was exposed to Rabbi Yohanan's Torah through his brothers.

Perek VII

Daf 59 Amud b

אם היו עלין שלהן שחורין – אסורין, הוריקו – מותרין. וכי שחורין אמאי אסורין? לימא: היתר שבהן להיכן הלך? אמר ליה: מי סברת על עיקר קתיני? אתוספת קתיני אסורין. אי הכי מאי אתא רבן שמעון בן גמליאל למימר? דתניא, רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: הגדל בחיוב – חייב, הגדל בפטור – פטור. תנא קמא נמי הכי אמר!

if their leaves were black,^N the onions are forbidden. If their leaves turned green, the onions are permitted. And if the leaves are black, why are the onions forbidden? Let us say in this case too: The permitted part, the original onion, to where did it go? Rav H̄isda said to Rabba: Do you maintain that this *halakha* is taught about the primary, original onion, that it is prohibited? It is taught with regard to the additional growth^N that sprouted, and it is those leaves that are forbidden. The Gemara asks: If so, what is Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who apparently disagrees with the *tanna* of the mishna, coming to say? As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: That which grew during a period of liability is liable^N and is considered Sabbatical-Year produce, and that which grew during a period of exemption is exempt. According to Rav H̄isda's explanation, the first *tanna*, cited in the mishna, also said that.

NOTES

If their leaves were black – אם היו עלין שלהן שחורין: Some commentaries, consistent with their overall approach, maintain that there is no dispute here with regard to the original plant, as it certainly retains its status; the dispute concerns only the leaves. Therefore, they explain that the problem is with regard to leaves that grew in the sixth year (*Tosafot*), or to that portion that sprouts from the original plant (Ran), and the question is: Are they forbidden as Sabbatical-Year produce?

It is taught with regard to the additional growth – אתוספת קתיני: Only the additional Sabbatical-Year growths are prohibited, and were it possible to distinguish between the portion that grew before the Sabbatical Year and the portion that grew during that year, the former would be permitted. The practical implication of this distinction is that if these growths are mixed

with permitted produce, that produce must be sufficient to neutralize only the prohibited portion of that growth (Rashba; Rosh). The Rashba maintains that Rav H̄isda is explaining that although the onions are completely forbidden, it is not because the forbidden growth exceeds the volume of the original plant; rather, it is because of the prohibition that imbues the entire plant.

That which grew during a period of liability is liable – הגדל בחיוב תיב: Most commentaries explain that this *baraita* originally addressed this mishna, and the opposing opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel is cited as a continuation of the mishna. The Rosh disagrees and explains that the *baraita* addresses an entirely different issue: Concerning a tree that grew on the borders of Eretz Yisrael, that part of the tree that

grew in Eretz Yisrael is liable and that part of the tree that grew outside Eretz Yisrael is exempt. Although this *halakha* does not completely parallel the discussion here, it is clear that only Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel maintains that there can be a plant part of which is forbidden and part of it is permitted, and neither part neutralizes the prohibition of the other. According to this approach, the Gemara's answer should be understood: Anywhere this opinion is found in a mishna or *baraita*, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel taught it. The *Keren Ora* raised several difficulties with regard to the explanation of the Rosh and rejects it even though he fails to resolve the difficulties raised by the Rosh, e.g., the use of the terms liable and exempt, which are not appropriate in the case of the onion.

בולה מתגמלין רבן שמעון בן גמליאל
קתני לה. ועד כאן לא שמעת ליה לרבן
שמעון בן גמליאל – דלא קא טרח,
אבל היכא דקא טרח – בטייל ברובא.

וכל היכא דקא טרח בטייל ברובא?
והרי ליטרא מעשר טבל, דקטרח,
וקתני: ואותה ליטרא מעשר עליו
ממקום אחר לפי חשבון! שאני גבני
מעשר דאמר קרא "עשר תעשר" וגו',
והיתירא – זרעי אינשי, איסורא – לא
זרעי אינשי.

גופא, אמר רבי חנינא תורתא אמר
רבי ינאי: בצל של תרומה שנטעו, ורבו
גידוליו על עיקרו – מותר. למימרא
דגידולי

The Gemara explains: This is not difficult, as this **entire mishna, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel taught it**. In the *baraita* Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel is not disagreeing with the opinion of the first *tanna* of the mishna; he is merely restating it. **And nevertheless**, the mishna and the *baraita* pose no difficulty with regard to the opinion of Rabba, as **you heard that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said that the prohibition of the primary, original part is not neutralized only^N in a case where he did not exert himself**, and the leaves sprouted on their own. **However**, in the case **where he exerted himself^N**, e.g., by sowing or planting, the prohibition of the original onions is **neutralized by the majority**.

The Gemara asks: **And anywhere that one exerts himself, is the original part nullified by the majority?** The Gemara asks: **And isn't there the case of one who sowed a *litra* of untithed tithe, where he exerts himself to sow it, and it is taught: And that original *litra* of untithed first tithe that he sowed, one proportionally tithes for it from produce in a different place, and its prohibition is not neutralized by the growth.** The Gemara answers: **It is different with regard to tithe, as the verse states: "You shall tithe^N all the produce of your seed that is brought forth in the field" (Deuteronomy 14:22), indicating that all permitted seeds that are sown must be tithed, since permitted seeds that were tithed, people typically sow. Forbidden seeds that were not tithed, people do not typically sow, but the Sages penalized one who sowed untithed seeds and required him to tithe that which he was originally obligated to tithe and decreed that it is not neutralized by the majority.**

§ With regard to the matter itself, **Rabbi Hanina Tirta'a said that Rabbi Yannai said: With regard to an onion of *teruma* that one planted, if its growths exceeded its principal, it is permitted.** The Gemara asks: **Is this to say that growths that are**

NOTES

And you heard that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said only – ועד כאן לא שמעת ליה: According to Rashi, this is the Gemara's answer: There is no proof from the ruling of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel that he holds that growths never neutralize the prohibition of the original plant, as perhaps that is his opinion only in a particular case, where one did not exert himself at all as the onions were planted, and the rain caused them to sprout. The Ran explains it slightly differently: The Gemara is saying that although no proof can be cited from here that growths neutralize the prohibition of the original plant, this *baraita* poses no difficulty to the *halakha* of a *litra* of onions, as that is a case where one exerted himself. Others maintain that this is Rabba's answer to Rav H̄isda: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel addresses only a situation where one exerted himself (*Tosafot*; Rabbi Avraham min HaHar; Meiri). The Rosh, consistent with his general approach, explains that this is an additional answer to the Gemara's question. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel's opinion is not an individual opinion, as the *tanna* who taught the *halakha* of sixth-year onions agrees with him in a case that does not involve exertion. However, he concedes that in a case that involves exertion, e.g., where he sowed the plants, the growths neutralize the prohibition of the original plant.

אבל היכא – However, in the case where he exerted himself – דקא טרח: There are various explanations for the difference between a case that involves exertion and one that does not. Rashi explains simply that since he performed an action the prohibition of the plant is neutralized. The Ran explains that the difference is between the case where one exerted himself to neutralize the prohibition of the original plant and the case where one did not exert himself to do so. *Tosafot* explain that if he did not exert himself to facilitate the growths but they grew on their own, they are not significant to him, and therefore, they do not neutralize the prohibition of the original plant. Conversely, if he exerted himself he demonstrates that the growths are significant to him, and therefore, they neutralize the prohibition of the original plant. Rabbeinu Meir's opinion, cited in *Tosafot*, is that this must be understood in light of the Gemara

in *Menahot* (70a), which distinguishes between conventional sowing, in which case the growths neutralize the prohibition of the original plant, and conduct that is not considered sowing at all, which the Gemara characterizes as a case where he did not exert himself.

As the verse states: You shall tithe – דאמר קרא עשר תעשר: The proof from this verse is explained as follows: Although he sowed seeds that are completely permitted, the prohibition of the original plant is neutralized and all the produce that grows from it is untithed produce. That is true only with regard to sowing permitted seeds. However, the Torah did not address the unusual case of one who sowed forbidden seeds, and therefore, the Torah did not determine that the prohibition of the original plant would be neutralized in that case (Rosh; Rid). The Ran explains in a similar manner that the Torah decree is that when permitted seeds are sown, they grow into untithed produce. However, the Ran asks: Since the verse is referring only to that produce that one is obligated to tithe by Torah law, and there is no grain whose seeds do not cease, what relevance does this verse have for the matter under discussion in the Gemara? Therefore, he explains that the verse is a mere support, not an actual derivation, and the primary proof is from the general *halakha* that in a mixture between permitted and forbidden items, the prohibition can be neutralized; however, if it is a mixture between forbidden items, there can be no neutralization. Therefore, in any case where the seeds themselves are forbidden as untithed Sabbatical-Year produce, no other forbidden item can be neutralized by it.

Some commentaries note that the Gemara could have resolved this difficulty in several alternative manners. For example, the Gemara could have said that the *halakha* of untithed produce is different, as it is an item that can become permitted. Alternatively, the Gemara could have answered that this is in accordance with the opinion of the *tanna* with regard to onions, who holds that growths do not neutralize the prohibition of the original plant, but the Gemara preferred a response based on a verse in the Torah.