

We follow its perforation

בתר נקבו אזלינן -

Overview

Abbayi ruled that if there was an עציץ נקוב, whose perforation was in ארץ ישראל, however the branches extended into חוץ לארץ, we look at the נקב, and since the נקב is in א"י, it is מחוייב במעשר. Our תוספות contrasts the nourishment received through the perforation with another type of nourishment.

למאן דאמר בהעור והרוטב (חולין קכח, א.) בדלעת¹ הנטוע בעציץ שאינו נקוב² -

According to the one who maintains in פרק העור והרוטב regarding a squash, which is planted in a non-perforated עציץ -

ויצאה חוץ לעציץ³ הטמא בטומאתו וטהור בטהרתו⁴ -

And part of the squash extended outside of the עציץ, the טמא retains its status, and the טהור retains its טהרה status; according to this מ"ד -

הוא הדין אם עציץ בחוצה לארץ ונפו נוטה לארץ -

The same ruling will apply if the עציץ is in חו"ל and its branch extends into א"י - דמהני יניקת הנוף לענין נוף גופיה וחייב במעשר -

That the nourishment of the branch from א"י will be effective regarding this branch itself that it is חייב במעשר, but not the part that is within the עציץ -

מכל מקום⁵ לא חשיבא יניקת הנוף כיניקת שורש -

Nevertheless the יניקת הנוף is not as significant as the nourishment of the root - דהא לא מטהרה יניקת הנוף מה שבתוך העציץ והכא מחייב נוף מחמת יניקת העיקר :

For the עציץ does not bestow טהרה on what is growing within the עציץ, only on what grows outside the עציץ, however here the נוף is obligated in מעשר on

¹ The הגהות הב"ח amends this to read בקישות הנטועה (instead of בדלעת הנטוע).

² An עציץ שאינו נקוב is not considered מחובר לקרקע, therefore anything which grows within this עציץ can be מקבל טומאה like all foods which are detached from the ground.

³ Regarding the part of the plant that extends outside of the עציץ, we consider it as if it is nourishing from the earth, and it is מחובר לקרקע, so it cannot be מקבל טומאה.

⁴ This (רבי שמעון) מ"ד maintains that the part of the plant that is within the עציץ is מקבל טומאה, and the part that extends outside the עציץ is not מקבל טומאה. The חכמים argue with ר"ש and maintains that everything is טהור. See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁵ In our גמרא the ruling is (according to אבבי) that since the עציץ is nourishing from the ground of א"י, the entire plant is מחוייב במעשר, even the part that is extending out of the עציץ into חו"ל (and receiving nourishment from there). However regarding the עציץ שאינו נקוב, the nourishment of the branches outside the עציץ from the ground, only makes the extended part מקבל לקרקע, but not the rest of the plant that is within the עציץ. Seemingly in both cases they are receiving nourishment; why by an עציץ נקוב does it effect the entire plant but by the עציץ שאינו נקוב the nourishment of the branch does not affect the entire plant. תוספות responds to this difficulty. See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

account of the nourishment of the main part of the plant.

Summary

The nourishment that the plant receives from the ground by an עציץ נקוב is greater than the nourishment it receives from the ground through its branches.

Thinking it over

1. תוספות finds it necessary to distinguish between the ruling of אביי (that the entire עציץ is במעשר), and the ruling in חולין (ר"ש) that only the extended part is considered מחובר (or is במעשר).⁶ However the חכמים disagree with ר"ש (there)⁷ and maintain that the entire עציץ is טהור (and will be במעשר); why is it necessary to reconcile אביי with a דעת יחיד?⁸

2. רבא argues with אביי and maintains that בתר נופו אזלינן and it is פטור. However according to תוספות that יניקת השורש is stronger than יניקת הנוף, so if the חכמים maintain⁹ that we follow יניקת הנוף, so in our case of עציץ נקוב we should certainly follow יניקת השורש, and it should be במעשר!¹⁰

⁶ See footnote # 5.

⁷ See footnote # 4.

⁸ See פני יהושע.

⁹ See footnote # 4

¹⁰ See פני יהושע and מהרש"א.