

## או דילמא בתר השתא אזלינן - Or perhaps we follow his current intention

### Overview

The גמרא asked a series of queries concluding (as of now) with the query of one who carried out the size of a גרוגרת to eat it, and it shriveled and he reconsidered to carry it out for planting; if we follow his initial intention he is פטור (for now there is no שיעור), or do we follow his current intention (בתר השתא) and there is a שיעור. The גמרא continues, if we assume בתר השתא what will be the ruling in another case<sup>1</sup> (whether we apply דיחוי by שבת or not).

משמע דאי בתר השתא אזלינן ליכא למיבעיא מידי -

It seems from the גמרא that if we follow בתר השתא, there is no more room to query regarding this case of הוציא כגרוגרת וצמקה (he is certainly חייב), assumes this -

מדקאמר אם תמצא לומר בתר השתא אזלינן הוציא גרוגרת לאכילה וצמקה וחזרה ותפחה מהו -  
Since the גמרא follows up and says, 'if we assume that בתר השתא אזלינן, what will be the ruling in a case where he was מוציא a גרוגרת for eating and it shriveled, and it expanded back to its original size (is there דיחוי or not); however the גמרא -

ולא מיבעיא ליה אקמייתא<sup>2</sup> -

Did not continue and query regarding this original case (of הוציא כגרוגרת וצמקה) -

ואמאי אכתי תיבעי ליה אי הוה דיחוי<sup>3</sup> אצל שבת או לא<sup>4</sup> כדבעי בסמוך -

But why is it so; the גמרא can still query whether there is דיחוי regarding שבת or not in our case, just as the גמרא queries shortly regarding the case of ותפחה וחזרה וצמקה. The reason the query of דיחוי applies in our case of צמקה (only) -

דהא מיד כשצמקה נדחית -

For as soon as it was צמקה to less than a גרוגרת it was נדחית. Why did not the גמרא pose the query of דיחוי regarding our case of צמקה?

answers: תוספות

<sup>1</sup> See footnote # 5.

<sup>2</sup> Indicating that if we assume בתר השתא אזלינן there is nothing more to query about in this case for he is certainly חייב.

<sup>3</sup> The concept of דיחוי (pushed away) is found primarily by קדשים. It (usually) refers to a case where something was at one point not fit for קדשים and later it became fit; do we say דיחוי, meaning that since it was נדחה (pushed away) once, it is always נדחה, even later when there is no longer the problem, or do we not apply דיחוי and instead we assume that since now it is ראוי (קדשים) it is acceptable regardless that previously it was נדחה.

<sup>4</sup> He took it out לאכילה and it was צמקה and there is no (לאכילה) הוצאה, so the שבת איסור was נדחה. Therefore if we assume דיחוי by שבת, we will rule that since during this מלאכה the הוצאה איסור was נדחה, therefore it remains נדחה, even though later he thought לזריעה, and then there is a שיעור. Or perhaps the concept of דיחוי is not applicable by שבת, and since by the (לצורך אכילה) עקירה there was a (כגרוגרת) שיעור and by הנחה there was a (לזריעה) שיעור, therefore he is חייב (regardless that in between [after it was צמקה and before he thought לזריעה] it was נדחה).

ויש לומר דדוקא ההיא דבסמוך<sup>5</sup> חשיב ליה דיחוי -

**And one can say that only specifically in the following case can it be considered a דיחוי -**

**שנדחית בין משיעור ראשון בין משיעור אחרון<sup>6</sup> -**

**- שיעור ראשון and the last שיעור נדחה both from the first שיעור and the last שיעור** Since, when it was צמקה it was נדחה both from the first שיעור and the last שיעור אבל הכא דמשיעור אחרון מיהא לא נדחית<sup>7</sup> לא חשיב ליה דיחוי:

**שיעור** However here (in the case of צמקה alone) it was never נדחית from the last שיעור (the הנחה שיעור), therefore the גמרא did not consider it a דיחוי.

### **Summary**

The concept of דיחוי לענין שבת is only if it was נדחה both from the עקירה and the הנחה, but not if it was not נדחה from the הנחה.

### **Thinking it over**

1. There are three steps in the מלאכה of (מרה"י לרה"ר) הוצאה. There is the עקירה, the הנחה, and in between the העברה (transfer).<sup>8</sup> מרה"י לרה"ר claims that in our case (where it was just צמקה and לזריעה) it was not נדחה האחרון.<sup>9</sup> However if it was צמקה before the העברה and the נמלך לזריעה took place after the העברה, then at the time of the העברה (which is [perhaps] the main part of the מלאכה), it was נדחה (for then it was נמלך as of yet). Will it be necessary to say that the נמלך לזריעה needs to take place either before the העברה (or before the צמקה), in order that it should not be considered a דיחוי?

2. What would be in a case where הוציא כחצי גרוגרת לזריעה and נמלך לאוכלה and later it was תפחה לכגרוגרת?<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The following query (regarding דיחוי) was in a case where he took it out לאכילה (and did not change his mind [it was always לאכילה] however in between the עקירה והנחה it was צמקה (which is a דיחוי) and חזרה ותפחה (which made it 'fit' again).

<sup>6</sup> The שיעור ראשון refers to the amount required by the עקירה (which is כגרוגרת) and the שיעור אחרון is the amount required by the הנחה (which is also כגרוגרת since his intention was always לאכילה exclusively). Therefore when it was צמקה it was נדחית (unfit) both for the עקירה and the הנחה since at that point it did not have the כגרוגרת, שיעור.

<sup>7</sup> The שיעור for the הנחה, which for זריעה is a כחצי גרוגרת, is always there, so therefore even when it was צמקה it still had the שיעור of the (eventual) הנחה לזריעה. This is not considered a דיחוי at all. See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

<sup>8</sup> In the העברה itself there are also three stages; while it is still in the רה"י (before the העברה), once it is in the רה"ר (after the העברה), and the point of העברה (when the item passes מרה"י לרה"ר).

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 7.

<sup>10</sup> See שפת אמת בד"ה בגמ' בעי רבא and מהרש"א.