

וְאָמַר לִיהֵא רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק לְרַב  
חֵיִיא בַר אַבִּין: הֲאִי תַנָּא, מְעִיקְרָא  
אֲלִימָא לִיהֵא בְרַת, וְלִבְסוּף אֲלִימָא  
לִיהֵא מִיְתָהּ?!

And Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said to Rav Hiyya bar Avin in wonderment with regard to this *baraita*: This *tanna* initially considers the punishment of *karet* to be stronger by assuming that misuse of consecrated property was less severe because it was not punished by *karet*, and subsequently he considers the punishment of death at the hand of Heaven to be stronger by stating that one cannot deduce this principle from other sins whose punishment is not death at the hand of Heaven.

וְאָמַר לִיהֵא; הֲכִי קָאָמַר: לֵא, אִם  
אָמַרְתָּ בְשֵׂאָר מְצוֹת – שְׂכֵן לֹא חַיִּיב  
בְּהֵן מִיְתָהּ בְּפָחוֹת מִבְּזוּת, תֵּאמַר  
בְּמַעֲלֵלָה – שְׂחֵיב בְּהֵן מִיְתָהּ בְּפָחוֹת  
מִבְּזוּת. וְאָמַר לִיהֵא: תַּנּוּחַ דְּעֵתְךָ  
שְׂהַנְחַתְּ אֶת דְּעֵתִי וְאָמַר לִיהֵא: מֵאִי  
נִחוּתָא? דְּרַבְהֵא וְרַב שֵׁשֶׁת שְׂדוּ בֵּיה  
נִרְגָא: מֵאֵן שְׂמַעְתָּ לִיהֵא דְאָמַר

And Rav Hiyya bar Avin said to him that it is possible to maintain the accepted position that *karet* is more stringent by explaining that this is what he is saying: No, these are incomparable for the following reason: If you say that one is exempt from an offering when he violates the rest of the mitzvot, for which one is not liable to receive death at the hand of Heaven if he eats less than an olive-bulk of a forbidden substance, shall you also say that this is the case with regard to misuse of consecrated property, for which one is liable to receive death at the hand of Heaven if he eats less than an olive-bulk? Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said to him: May your mind be settled, as you have settled my mind and put it at ease by answering this question that was troubling me. Rav Hiyya bar Avin said to him: What is settling about this explanation? Rabba and Rav Sheshet threw an axe at my answer; i.e., they reject my explanation, as follows: Who did you hear that said

Perek II  
Daf 33 Amud a

HALAKHA

One who intentionally misuses consecrated items – *הַזֵּיד בְּמַעֲלֵלָה*: One who intentionally misuses consecrated property violates a negative commandment and is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Me'ila* 1:3).

NOTES

Sin with regard to misuse of consecrated items and sin with regard to *teruma* – *חֲטָא חֲטָא מִתְרוּמָה*: The Rabbis accept this verbal analogy and use it to derive other laws. However, they also have other derivations that teach that one who intentionally misuses consecrated property is not punished with the death penalty (*Tosefot Rabbeinu Peretz*).

הַזֵּיד בְּמַעֲלֵלָה בְּמִיְתָהּ – רַבֵּי הִיא.  
דְּתַנָּא: הַזֵּיד בְּמַעֲלֵלָה, רַבֵּי אָמַר:  
בְּמִיְתָהּ, וְחֻכְכְּמִים אֲמַרִים: בְּאִזְהָרָה.

that one who intentionally misuses consecrated items<sup>H</sup> is liable to receive death at the hand of Heaven? It is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As it was taught in a *baraita*: With regard to one who intentionally misuses consecrated items, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says that he is liable to receive death at the hand of Heaven. The Rabbis say: he violates a warning, a standard prohibition, and is flogged.

מֵאִי טַעְמָא דְרַבֵּי? אָמַר רַבֵּי אַבְהוּ:  
גְּמַר חֲטָא חֲטָא מִתְרוּמָה, מִהֵן תְּרוּמָה  
בְּמִיְתָהּ – אִף מְעִלָה בְּמִיְתָהּ.

The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? From where does he derive his opinion? Rabbi Abahu said: He derives it by means of a verbal analogy between the word sin stated with regard to misuse of consecrated items and the word sin stated with regard to *teruma*.<sup>N</sup> With regard to misuse of consecrated items, the verse states: “If any one commits a trespass, and sins through error, in the sacred items of the Lord” (Leviticus 5:15); with regard to *teruma*, the verse states: “Lest they bear sin for it, and die due to it, if they profane it” (Leviticus 22:9). Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi makes the following comparison: Just as eating *teruma* is punishable by the death penalty, so too, misusing consecrated items is punishable by the death penalty.

וּמִיְנָה, מִהֵן תְּרוּמָה בְּכַזֵּית – אִף  
מְעִלָה בְּכַזֵּית.

From this verbal analogy, the comparison between *teruma* and misuse of consecrated property can be extended to other issues as well: Just as one is punished only for eating at least an olive-bulk of *teruma*, so too, one is punished for misusing consecrated items only if there is at least an olive-bulk of consecrated items. This indicates that the *baraita* cannot be explained in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, who requires that the item be worth at least a *peruta*.

וּמִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב פַּפָּא: מִמָּאִי דְרַבֵּי  
בְּרַבְּנֵן סְבִירָא לִיהֵא? דִּילְמָא כְּאֲבָא  
שְׂאוּל סְבִירָא לִיהֵא, דְאָמַר: יֵשׁ בְּהֵן  
שְׂוָה פְּרוּטָה – אִף עַל גַּב דְּלִית בְּהֵן  
כַּזֵּית.

Rav Pappa strongly objects to Rav Sheshet and Rabba’s rejection of the explanation of the *baraita*: From where do you know that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis that one is only punished after eating an olive-bulk of *teruma*? Perhaps he holds in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, who said one is liable for eating *teruma* provided the food contains the value of a *peruta* of *teruma*, even if it is less than an olive-bulk. As the *halakhot* of misuse of consecrated items are derived from *teruma*, one is liable for eating both *teruma* and consecrated items only if the object is worth at least a *peruta*. As such, Rav Hiyya bar Avin’s explanation of the *baraita* should not be rejected.

With and without intent – נְתִבּוּיִן וְלֹא נְתִבּוּיִן: With regard to the significance of intent in *halakha*, there is a three-tiered hierarchy: The *halakhot* of Shabbat, the rest of the mitzvot, and the *halakhot* of the misuse of consecrated items. One is liable to be punished for misusing consecrated items even if he does so unknowingly, without intent, and even unawares, i.e., while attempting to perform a different action. With regard to other sins, one is punished only when he derives benefit from the sin, e.g., consuming forbidden foods or engaging in forbidden relations, despite the fact that it was performed without intent to commit the sinful act. However, with regard to the *halakhot* of Shabbat, since the Torah prohibited only planned, thoughtful, or creative labor, one whose actions did not accomplish his intentions is exempt.

וְהָא רַב פַּפָּא הוּא דְאָמַר דְאָבָא  
שְׁאוּל תְּרִימִי בְּעֵינֵי אֱלָא שְׁמַע מִינָהּ:  
הֲדַר בֵּיהּ.

With regard to the issue mentioned previously, the Gemara asks: **But isn't Rav Pappa the one who said that Abba Shaul said that it requires two conditions, that the object be worth a *peruta* and that it be an olive-bulk in volume? Rather, learn from this that Rav Pappa retracted his statement with regard to Abba Shaul's opinion.**

מִר בְּרִיה דְרַבְנָא אָמַר, הָכִי קָאָמַר:  
לֹא, אִם אָמַרְתָּ בְשָׂאָר מִצּוֹת, שְׁלֹא  
עָשָׂה בְהֵן שְׂאִין מִתְּבוּיִן כְּמִתְּבוּיִן,  
שְׂאִים נְתִבּוּיִן לְחִתּוּךְ אֶת הַתְּלוּשׁ  
וְחִתּוּךְ אֶת הַמְּחוּבָּר – שְׁפָטוּר. תֹּאמַר  
בְּמַעֲיָלָה, שְׂאִים נְתִבּוּיִן לְהִתְחַמֵּם  
בְּגִיזֵי חוּלִין וְנִתְחַמֵּם בְּגִיזֵי עוֹלָה –  
שְׁמַעֲלָהּ.

Mar, son of Rabbana, said the following to resolve the difficulty in the *baraita*: **This is what it is saying: No, if you say that one is exempt from an offering with regard to the rest of the mitzvot, where acting without intent is not treated as though one acted with intent,<sup>n</sup> i.e., if one intended to cut something that is detached from the ground on Shabbat, which is not prohibited by Torah law, and mistakenly cut something that is attached to the ground, then he is exempt because he acted without intent; shall you also say the same with regard to misuse of consecrated items, about which the *halakha* is stringent, such that if one intended to warm himself with non-sacred wool shearings, and owing to an error or lack of information he warmed himself with shearings from a burnt-offering, then he has misused consecrated property?** Thus misuse of consecrated property is more stringent than other commandments, in that one violates it even when acting without intent, and one cannot deduce the *halakha* in the case of misuse of consecrated property from the *halakha* in the case of the rest of the mitzvot.

רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק אָמַר, הָכִי קָאָמַר:  
לֹא, אִם אָמַרְתָּ בְשָׂאָר מִצּוֹת, שְׂבִין  
לֹא מִתְּחִיבֵי בְהֵן שְׂאִין מִתְּעַסֵּק  
כְּמִתְּעַסֵּק, שְׂאִים נְתִבּוּיִן לְהַגְבִּיחַ אֶת  
הַתְּלוּשׁ וְחִתּוּךְ אֶת הַמְּחוּבָּר – שְׁפָטוּר.  
תֹּאמַר בְּמַעֲיָלָה, שְׂאִים הוֹשִׁיט יָדוֹ  
לְכָלִי לִטּוֹל חֶפֶץ, וְסָךְ יָדוֹ בְּשִׁמּוֹן שֶׁל  
קוֹדֶשׁ – שְׁמַעֲלָהּ.

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that the *baraita* should be understood differently, and **this is what it is saying: No, if you say this leniency with regard to rest of the mitzvot, where one who is acting unawares is not liable in the same way as one who is acting aware of his actions, such as in a case where one intended to perform a permitted act and mistakenly performed a prohibited one, i.e., if one intended to lift something that is detached from the ground, but his knife happened to cut something that is attached to the ground, in violation of the act of harvesting on Shabbat, then he is exempt; shall you also say the same with regard to misuse of consecrated items, where if one places his hand in a vessel to take an object and unknowingly places his hand in consecrated oil then he is has misused consecrated items?** Therefore, misuse of consecrated items is more stringent than other commandments, as one commits the sin of misusing consecrated property even if he uses the consecrated object while attempting to perform a different action and is unaware that he is performing a prohibited act.

אָמַר מֶר: בְּמָה דְבָרִים אָמוּרִים –  
בְּמַפְרִישׁ תְּרוּמָה וְהַחְמִיצָה, אֲבָל  
הַפְרִישׁ חֶמֶץ תְּרוּמָה – דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל  
אֵינָה קְדוּשָׁה.

The Master said above in the *baraita*: **In what case is this statement said that the *tanna'im* disagree with regard to the obligation to pay for *teruma* of leavened bread? It is said with regard to a case where one separated *teruma* in a permitted manner and it became leavened during Passover. However, if he separated *teruma* from leavened bread during Passover, everyone agrees that it is not consecrated since it is worthless.**

מִנָּא הֵינִי מִלִּי? אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר  
יִצְחָק, אָמַר קָרָא: "תִּתֵּן לוֹ" – וְלֹא  
לְאוּרוֹ.

The Gemara asks: **From where are these matters derived, that a worthless item cannot be designated as *teruma*?** Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that **the verse states:** "The first fruits of your grain, your wine, your oil, and the first of the fleece of your sheep, shall you give to him" (Deuteronomy 18:4), **and not to his fire.** One must give the priest something that he can use for any purpose, and not something that the priest will be forced to burn as fuel. Even those who permit one to derive benefit from leavened bread during Passover agree that it may not be eaten, and therefore leavened bread cannot be consecrated as *teruma* in this case.

NOTES

Separating *teruma* from ritually impure produce for ritually pure produce – תרומה מן הטמא על הטהור: If one separated *teruma* from impure produce for pure produce, this is considered *teruma* according to Torah law. However, the Sages penalized a person who does so, because he gives the priest something unusable (Rabbi Shimshon of Saens).

It became leavened while attached to the ground – דאחמיץ במחובר: The same must be said with regard to ritually impure *teruma*. If such produce was never acceptable as *teruma* and one separates *teruma* from it, this does not become *teruma* at all (*Tosefot Rabbeinu Peretz*).

In the study hall they teach in accordance with my opinion – מורין בבי מדרשא כותי: This statement is puzzling, as there would not appear to be any practical ruling that could be derived from this discussion given that the *halakha* states that it is forbidden to derive benefit from leavened bread on Passover. However, despite the fact that in this case there are no practical ramifications to the ruling, the principle of impure *teruma* that was never fit is relevant in other contexts (Rabbi Elazar Moshe Horowitz).

HALAKHA

One may not separate *teruma* from ritually impure produce for ritually pure produce – אין תורמין מן הטמא לטהור: One may not separate *teruma* from ritually impure produce for ritually pure produce. However, if one did this unwittingly then the produce he separated becomes *teruma* (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Teruma* 5:8).

Perek II  
Daf 33 Amud b

NOTES

Its remnants are recognizable – שרייה ניכרין: This explanation is challenged because it assumes that there is no significance to whether the *teruma* itself was of leavened bread or *matza*, but rather that the determining factor is the status of the remaining produce. Accordingly, it is possible that if the *teruma* taken is leavened bread but the remaining produce is *matza* then this would be acceptable *teruma*, while the reverse would not be acceptable *teruma*. This issue is raised in the Jerusalem Talmud. The resolution suggested there is that separating *teruma* in such a manner is prohibited because it involves separating *teruma* from a food that is obligated in *teruma* for a food that is exempt from *teruma*, which is unacceptable (see *Gilyon HaShas; Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya; Rashash*).

The liquid is stored – משקין מיפקד פקדי: This dispute about the way liquid is stored within various fruits, and the way blood is stored in the body in certain circumstances, is not a factual dispute but a conceptual one. The question revolves around the status of the juice before it is pressed. Is the juice considered to be a separate entity even before it is pressed, or is it considered to be part of the fruit itself so long as it is inside the fruit, in which case it undergoes a significant change in state when it is pressed from the fruit? Alternatively, the dispute may center on the question of whether the miniscule places where the liquid is stored can be considered independent containers, or whether the liquid is merely part of the larger entity, i.e., the fruit. There is no empirical way to resolve this issue.

מתלב רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: אין תורמין מן הטמא לטהור, ואם תרם בשוגג – תרומתו תרומה. ואמאי? לימא "לו" ולא לאורו! לא קשיא, התם – היתה לו שעת הכושר, הכא – לא היתה לו שעת הכושר.

ודלא היתה לו שעת הכושר היכי דמי – כגון דאחמיץ במחובר, אבל אחמיץ בתלוש – הכי נמי דקדשה? אמר ליה: אין "בגורת ערין פתגמא ובמאמר קדישין שאילתא" וכן מורין בבי מדרשא כותי.

כי אתא רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, raised an objection based on that which was taught in a mishna: **One may not separate *teruma* from ritually impure produce for ritually pure produce,<sup>NH</sup> but if one unwittingly separated it in this manner then his *teruma* is valid *teruma*. And why should this be valid *teruma*?** Let the priest say: The verse requires that the *teruma* be given "to him" and not to his fire, and this ritually impure *teruma* must be burned. In that case, why should this produce actually become *teruma*? The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**. **There**, in the case of impure *teruma*, **it had a period of fitness**, and it could have been given as *teruma* before it became impure. **Here**, in the case of leavened bread, **it did not ever have a period of fitness**, and therefore it cannot be consecrated as *teruma*.

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances in which this leavened bread did not have a period of fitness even on Passover?** This could have happened only in a case where it became leavened while it was still attached to the ground<sup>N</sup> and could not yet become *teruma*. **However**, if it became leavened after being detached from the ground, then can this leavened bread indeed become consecrated as *teruma*, even though the *baraita* indicates that no leavened bread can be designated as *teruma* during Passover? Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said to Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua: **Yes**, this is indeed the case despite this puzzling limitation, and the biblical expression can be applied homiletically: **"The matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the sentence by the word of the sacred ones"** (Daniel 4:14). The Sages, who are compared to celestial beings, agree with my statement. **And so too, in the study hall, they teach in accordance with my opinion,<sup>N</sup> despite the puzzling nature of this ruling.**

When Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, came,

אמר: אמר קרא "ראשית" – ששוריה ניכרין לישראל, יצתה זו שאין שרייה ניכרין.

יתב רב אחא בר רב עובא קמיה דרב חסדא, ויתב ואמר משמיה דרבי יוחנן: ענבים שנטמאו – דורכן פחות פחות מכביצה, ויין כשר לנסבין. אלמא קסבר: משקין מיפקד פקדי, לאימת קא מיטמאי – לכי סחיט להו, לכי סחיט להו ליתיה לשיעוריה.

he said that the verse states: "The first fruits of your grain, your wine, your oil, and the first of the fleece of your sheep, shall you give him" (Deuteronomy 18:4), implying that its remnants are recognizable<sup>N</sup> for an Israelite, as the notion of a first part indicates that there is another portion remaining which is fit to be consumed by the Israelite. **This *teruma* is excluded as there is no recognizable remnant left that may be consumed by the Israelite**, because it is leavened bread. Since even after this portion has been separated the remainder of the produce may not be eaten, that which was separated does not become *teruma*.

Rav Aha bar Rav Avya sat before Rav Hisda, and he sat and said in the name of Rabbi Yohanan: With regard to grapes that became ritually impure,<sup>H</sup> one should tread on them less than an egg-bulk at a time, and the wine that comes from them is kosher even for libations because it is ritually pure. **Apparently Rabbi Yohanan holds: The liquid is stored<sup>N</sup> inside the grape**, as the juice is not considered to be part of the grape itself but rather stored in the grape as though contained in a receptacle. According to Rabbi Yohanan's opinion, **when do these liquids become ritually impure?** This occurs only **when one squeezes them**, and prior to this the juice remains pure even if the grape was impure. **And when one squeezes them, there is less than the minimum measure of grape flesh that would transfer ritual impurity**, as food can impart ritual impurity only if it is at least an egg-bulk in size.

HALAKHA

Grapes that became ritually impure – ענבים שנטמאו: Grapes may be used even for libations, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yohanan (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 6:7).

Olives or grapes in the exact amount of an egg-bulk – **זיתים וענבים כביצה מכוונת** – If one who is ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse pressed precisely an egg-bulk of olives or grapes that had become susceptible to impurity, the liquid itself is pure provided the person did not touch the liquid (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhoh Tumat Okhalin* 9:2).

**Teruma that became ritually impure** – **תרומה שנטמאת**: *Teruma* bread that becomes impure should be placed with firewood until it is burned, and oil that becomes impure must be stored in a filthy vessel until it is used for lighting. If wheat becomes impure, it must be boiled and then stored in a filthy vessel until it is used for kindling (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhoh Terumat* 12:12).

NOTES

Berries, olives, and grapes – **תותין זיתים וענבים**: Many versions of the text do not contain the word olives because what is squeezed from olives, i.e., olive oil, is fit for lighting even if it is ritually impure. However, it appears that some accept the version that mentions olives and distinguish between oil, which is ready for use, and olives, where there is a greater risk that one will forget their status and eat them or treat the oil squeezed from them improperly (see *Yefe Einayim*).

אי הכי כביצה נמי דהתנן: טמא מת שפחט זיתים וענבים כביצה מכוונת – טהורין! התם – דאי עבד, הכא – לכתחלה, גזירה דילמא אתי למיעבד יותר מכביצה.

The Gemara challenges this statement: **If that is so, then even if he squeezes an egg-bulk of grapes, the juice will still not become impure. Didn't we learn in a mishna: In the case of one who is ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse and who squeezed olives or grapes in the exact amount of an egg-bulk,**<sup>h</sup> the liquid is ritually pure. Once the first drop of liquid is squeezed out, less than an egg-bulk of food remains, and it cannot render the liquid impure. In that case, why did Rabbi Yohanan permit squeezing only less than an egg-bulk? The Gemara answers: **There**, it was speaking of a case where the ruling was **after the fact**; however, **here**, it is discussing the ruling *ab initio*, and the mishna states that one may press juice only from less than an egg-bulk of grapes due to a rabbinic decree **lest one come to perform** the act of squeezing on **more than an egg-bulk**, causing the liquid to become impure.

אמר ליה רב חסדא: מאן ציית לך ולרבי יוחנן רבך! וכי טומאה שבהן להיכן הלכה? אלמא קא סבר: משקין מיבלע בליעי, וכיון דאיטמו ליה אוקלא – איטמו ליה משקין.

Rav Hisda said to Rav Aha bar Rav Avya: **Who will listen to you and to Rabbi Yohanan your teacher with regard to this issue? As, where did the impurity that was in the grape juice go?** The Gemara notes that **apparently Rav Hisda holds: Liquids are absorbed within the fruit and are therefore considered to be part of the grape itself. And since the flesh of the grape became ritually impure, the liquid became ritually impure as well.**

אמר ליה: ואת לא תיסברא דמשקין מיפקד פקדי? והתנן: טמא מת שפחט זיתים וענבים מכוונת כביצה – טהורין. אי אמרת בשלמא מיפקד פקדי – משום הכי טהורין, אלא אי אמרת מיבלע בליעי אמאי טהורין?

Rav Aha said to him: **Do you not hold that liquids are stored inside the grape? Didn't we learn in the mishna: In the case of one who is ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse and who squeezed olives or grapes in the exact amount of an egg-bulk, using a flat wooden utensil without touching the liquid itself, the liquid is ritually pure. Granted, if you say that the juice is stored inside the grapes, then it is due to that reason that the liquid is pure. But if you say that the liquid is absorbed within the grapes, why is the juice pure?** According to this opinion, once the grape itself becomes impure, the juice, which is attached to it and absorbed in it, becomes impure as well.

אמר ליה: הכא במאי עסקינן – בענבים שלא הוכשרו. לאימת מתבשרי – לכו סחיט להו, כי סחיט להו בציר להו שיעורא. דאי לא תימא הכי, הא דתנינא: הא למה זה דומה – לתרומת תותין (זיתים) וענבים שנטמאה, שאין לו בה לא היתר אכילה ולא היתר הפקה. הא היתר אכילה נמי אית ביה, דאי בעי דריך להו פחות פחות מכביצה!

Rav Hisda said to him: **With what are we dealing here?** We are dealing with a case where **the grapes have not been rendered susceptible** to ritual impurity, since they have not come in contact with liquids. **When do they become susceptible to ritual impurity?** This is only **once one presses them** and they become wet with their own juice. However, **when he presses them**, they decrease in volume **and are lacking the measure** of volume required to become impure. This must be the explanation, **for if you do not say so**, it is difficult to reconcile this mishna with **that which was taught** in the *baraita* cited above: **To what may this case of teruma of leavened bread be compared?** It may be compared to *teruma* of berries, olives, and grapes<sup>n</sup> that became impure, which can neither be eaten nor burned. However, according to Rabbi Yohanan's statement **they may even be eaten, as if one wishes he may tread less than an egg-bulk at a time.**

אמר רבא: גזירה דילמא אתי בהו לידן תקלה. אמר ליה אביי: ומי חיישינן לתקלה? והא תנינא: מדליקין בפת ובשמן של תרומה שנטמאת! אמר ליה: פת – זריק ליה בין העצים, שמן של תרומה – רמי ליה בכלי מאוס.

Rava said: It is possible to reject this proof, as even if this action is permitted in principle, there is a **rabbinic decree prohibiting it lest he encounter a stumbling block**. If one keeps ritually impure fruit of *teruma* in order to press it for its juice, it is possible that he will forget its status and accidentally eat it. **Abaye said to him: Are we concerned about this type of stumbling block? Wasn't it taught in a baraita: One may light a fire with bread and oil of teruma that became ritually impure?**<sup>h</sup> It can be deduced from this *baraita* that there is no concern that a person will forget and eat these foods. Rava said to him: **Bread is only permitted when one throws it among the wood used for fuel so that it is ruined and no longer considered edible. Teruma oil is permitted only when one puts it into a repulsive vessel so that no one will drink it.**

גופא, מדליקין בפת ובשמן של תרומה שנטמאת. אביי אמר משמיה דחזקיה, ורבא אמר דבי רבי יצחק בר מרתא. אמר רב הונא: לא שנו אלא פת, אבל חיטי – לא, שמא יבא בהן לידן תקלה. ורבי יוחנן אמר: אפילו חיטי. ואמאי? ניחוש דילמא אתי בהן לידן תקלה! כדאמר רב אשי:

With regard to **the matter itself**, it was taught: **One may light with bread and oil of teruma that became ritually impure.** The Sages limited the application of this *halakha*, as **Abaye said in the name of Hizkiya and Rava said in the name of the Sages from the school of Rabbi Yitzhak bar Marta that Rav Huna said: They taught that one may use impure teruma as firewood only with regard to bread; however, with regard to wheat, no, one may not light a fire with it, lest one encounter a stumbling block and eat it, because wheat will not become inedible by being placed among the firewood. And Rabbi Yohanan said: Even wheat may be used as fuel. The Gemara asks: And why does he permit this? Let us be concerned lest he encounter a stumbling block.** The Gemara answers based on what Rav Ashi said with regard to a different issue: