

**התם כדקתני טעמא כולי – There it is as the reason was taught, etc.**

## **OVERVIEW**

ר' always maintain בריה יש, and the reason why one may not separate תרו"מ from the wine utilizing בריה is out of concern that שמא יבקע. Our תוספות reconciles this statement of ר' with a seemingly contradictory statement.

anticipates a difficulty:

**בפרק בכל מערבין (עירובין דף לז, ב) מפרש ר' טעמא משום דבעינן ראשית ששיריה ניכרין<sup>1</sup> - תרו"מ disallow separating מ' from the wine, is because we require a ראשית, whose remnants are noticeable.<sup>2</sup>**

responds:

**ונראה דהתם גריס ר' אביי בתריה<sup>3</sup> ועוד<sup>4</sup> דהתם נמי מסיק טעמא כי הכא:**  
And it seems to תוספות that there in עירובין the גירסא is ר' not (like here), since ר' is cited after him (ר' אביי), and furthermore the גמרא there also concludes the reason given here of שמא יבקע הנוד.

## **SUMMARY**

It is (presumably) ר' who (seemingly) maintains the requirement of ניכרים שיריה.

## **THINKING IT OVER**

However there<sup>5</sup> מדאיירי אביי בתריה, since ר' there is גירסא 'proves' תוספות that ר' is challenging ר' (who stated ניכרים שיריה),<sup>6</sup> so obviously ר' is cited after ר'. How else could it be! What is תוספות proof?!

<sup>1</sup> See TIE footnote # 13. The תורה writes regarding הפרשת תרומה (in יח, ד) that ראשית (דברים [שופטים]) יהי, (that at the time of the ראשית ששיריה ניכרים meaning it is the first of what follows, therefore it requires a ניכרים (חולין) between the תרו"מ and the remaining תרו"מ). Therefore even if we maintain בריה יש, the תרו"מ will not take effect (by הלוקח יין וכו') because it is not ניכרים שיריה; we do not see which is the תרו"מ and which remains as חולין.

<sup>2</sup> The question is that here ר' explains it because שמא יבקע הנוד and there he explains that we require ניכרים ששיריה.

<sup>3</sup> Usually when we cite ר' אביי we first cite ר' and then ר' אביי. However regarding ר' (who was the teacher of ר' אביי) we cite ר' אביי after ר'. See (however) 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>4</sup> Even if the גירסא there is ר' there is still no difficulty. There, ר' gave the true reason of ר' that we require (עיי"ש, ש' אביי there, דרשה) like the question of ר' אביי. However it is possible that ר' will not agree to this דרשה. ר' argued that it is still אסור because שמע יבקע הנוד as the ברייתא states. In our גמרא where we are discussing the ברייתא so ר' utilizes the reason of the ברייתא, namely שמא יבקע הנוד.

<sup>5</sup> See footnote # 3.

<sup>6</sup> See footnote # 1.