

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the dispute in the Mishnah (cont.)

R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan concludes his explanation of the dispute between R' Yishmael and Rabanan.

R' Yochanan's initial statement that stones that fell from markulis are forbidden is successfully challenged and thus revised.

R' Yochanan's assertion that according to R' Yishmael stones that are outside of the immediate vicinity of markulis are permitted even though they are within its four amos is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yochanan's understanding of R' Yishmael's position concerning the configuration of stones to constitute markulis is unsuccessfully challenged.

A related incident is cited and explained.

Another related discussion is recorded.

The Gemara digresses to present another incident involving the same Amoraim analyzing a difficult Baraisa.

2) Serving an idol with a rod

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav presents the parameters for liability for an idol that is served with a rod.

Abaye challenges this ruling.

Rava answers Abaye's challenge.

The Gemara begins to challenge Rava's explanation.

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to R' Yochanan, what is the point of dispute between R' Yishmael and Rabanan?

2. Why was Menachem the son of R' Simai called **בן של קדושים**?

3. Regarding melacha, what is the difference between Shevi'is and Chol HaMoed?

4. How does Rava differentiate between breaking a rod before an idol and throwing a rod before an idol?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of his father
ר' שלום בן ר' חיים אהרון, ז"ל
 by Rabbi and Mrs. Chayim Knobloch

Distinctive INSIGHT

Two forms of זיהום

תרי זיהומי הוי חד לאוקומי אילני ושרי וחד לאברויי אילני ואסור

The Gemara discusses several questions which were posed by Rabbah bar Yirmiyah. One of them was regarding a process called זיהום, which is done for young saplings.

זיהום is translated by the Rishonim in different ways. Rambam (Commentary to Mishnah, Shvi'is 2:4) explains that it refers to a bad odor. Farmers smeared a foul smelling substance on young trees so that worms or other creatures which damaged trees would smell it and stay away from the trees. Meiri explains that if a young tree becomes damaged, and some of its bark falls off, some fertilizer is placed near the damage. This assures that the tree will not die (Rashi, Bertinoro), and to help the tree recover and heal (Rosh, Tiferes Yisroel). רשב"ץ says that this is a process where moldy or rotten parts of the tree are removed.

The Gemara notes what seems to be a contradiction between a Baraisa and a Mishnah regarding care of trees during Shemittah. The Baraisa rules that זיהום is permitted during Shemittah, while the Mishnah (Shvi'is 2:4) rules that זיהום may only be done for saplings until Rosh HaShana of the Shemitta year, but not at all during Shemittah.

This issue is resolved in our Gemara as it notes that the type of זיהום which is prohibited during Shemittah is where the tree is improved and strengthened. The process which is allowed is where damage is avoided or prevented, but no actual benefit is given to enhance the growth of the tree. The Yerushalmi (Shvi'is 2:3) provides a different response to deal with this question. There, the two sources are not resolved to be in agreement. The Mishnah which prohibits זיהום once Shemitta begins is the opinion of Rebbe, while the Baraisa which allows this procedure during Shemittah is ascribed to the opinion of Rabbanan.

Rambam (Hilchos Shemittah v'Yovel 1:5) rules according to the Yerushalmi. He lists the farming activities which are prohibited on Shemittah, and he includes זיהום, which he defines as the smearing of a foul smelling substance on a sapling to keep birds away while the tree is young. Lechem

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben
 in memory of
מרת ליבא בת ר' ישעי'

HALACHAH Highlight

Melacha during Chol HaMoed

מועד אפילו טירחא נמי אסור

During Chol HaMoed, even exertion is prohibited

The Gemara relates that in contrast to Shevi'is during which melacha is prohibited but exertion is permitted; during Chol HaMoed even exertion is prohibited. Rishonim debate the exact nature of the prohibition against work during Chol HaMoed. According to some opinions, melacha is prohibited on Chol HaMoed the same as it is on Shabbos except that certain exceptions were put in place so that people could attend to their Yom Tov needs. According to others, it is only those melachos that involve exertion that were prohibited but melachos that do not involve any exertion are permitted.

Rashi¹ writes in explanation of our Gemara that Chazal only prohibited those melachos that involve exertion. In contrast Tosafos² seems to follow the position that any activity that is categorized as a melacha is prohibited regardless of whether it involves exertion. Shulchan Aruch³ seems to follow Rashi's approach that only melachos that involve exertion are prohibited. Shulchan Aruch writes that it is permitted to take a clump of dirt from the floor of one's house even though doing so violates the prohibition against construction. The reason it is permitted must be that grabbing a clump of dirt from the floor does not involve any exertion and as such it is permitted. Mishnah Berurah, however, explains the halacha differently. He writes that one may pull up the clump of dirt only if it serves a Yom Tov need. This indicates that even

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Mishneh (Hilchos Yom Tov 8:10) asks that Rambam does not distinguish between a process which prevents damage and one which enhances and improves the tree. He prohibits all forms of זיהום, which indicates that Rambam does not hold according to the answer of the Bavli, but rather the approach of the Yerushalmi. Rambam rules according to the Mishnah (the opinion of the Rebbe) and not the Baraisa (the opinion of Rabbanan). Lechem Mishneh explains that Rambam prefers the approach of the Yerushalmi in this case because our Gemara prefaces the presentation of its solution reluctantly, by saying, "ודלמא—perhaps we can solve this using the distinction of Rav Ukva." ■

activities that do not involve exertion must have an additional reason to be permitted.

A number of interesting applications arise for those who adopt the stringent opinion and prohibit any melacha even though it does not involve exertion unless there is an additional rationale to permit the activity. One example⁵ is whether one may blow out a match on Chol HaMoed. Extinguishing is a melacha that does not involve exertion. According to the stringent approach it is better to throw the match in a way that the flame will go out on its own rather than extinguish the flame by blowing on it. ■

1. רש"י מועד קטן ב ד"ה בשלמא
2. תוס' מו"ק י"ב ד"ה מכניס
3. שו"ע או"ח סי' תק"מ סע' ב'
4. מ"ב שם סק"ז
5. ספר חוט השני חו"מ עמ' קע"ו ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Child of Holy Ones

בן של קדושים

The Bnei Yissaschar, זת"ל, shares a sharp lesson from today's daf to rebuke those who act in a grandiose manner due to their distinguished lineage. "On Avodah Zarah 50 we find that Menachem ben Simai was called the child of holy ones because he did not gaze at the form of coins which were stamped with images. Tosafos explains that although only he took this added precaution, he is called the child of holy ones because his father was also holy.

"On the surface this seems strange. We find many places where a tanna or amora does something remarkable which is not attributed to his distinguished lineage. For example, Rabbi Yehudah Ha-Nasi never placed his hand below his belt—obviously a reference to personal purity—yet his father, Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel who was certainly a kadosh, is not mentioned.

"It is possible to suggest an answer with a lesson that sadly rings true too often due to our many sins. We can explain that this refers to the 'children of holy ones' whose only thought is money. These people diligently consider how to cash in on their yichus, using the honor of their ancestors to collect vast sums.

Sadly, these people flatter anyone with influence and wreak terrible havoc, since others see how they act and also become willing to do anything for money.

"This is the meaning of our Gemara. If a person never 'looks at the coin,' he is a child of holy ones who is connected to the merit of his ancestors, and their merit will protect him. Although I am being a little sharp in my comment, it is really unfortunate that this attitude is very prevalent today. I am speaking about this, since perhaps one 'child of holy ones' with great yichus will change his ways, and will be saved. If I even save one it is worth all the effort!"¹ ■

1. דברי תורה ח"ב אות ק"ד