

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) An item shared by two people with different techumim (cont.)

The Gemara concludes that R' Oshaya accepts the principle of retroactive clarification for Rabbinic law and R' Yochanan rejects the principle.

Mar Zutra rules in favor of R' Oshaya.

Shmuel ruled that the ox of a fatterer can be transported wherever the buyer may travel, but the ox of a shepherd is limited to the techum of the residents of the city.

2) Borrowed utensils

The Gemara explains that the novelty of the Mishnah's ruling regarding borrowed utensils is that even if the borrower did not take possession until Yom Tov he may still transport the item anywhere within his techum.

This explanation supports a similar ruling issued by R' Yochanan.

The novelty of the Mishnah's ruling concerning a utensil borrowed on Yom Tov is explained.

The Gemara relates an incident in which R' Abba attempted to explain the Mishnah's ruling regarding borrowed salt and water. Some of his colleagues accepted his explanation and others rejected the explanation.

R' Safra and Abaye debate the merit of R' Abba's explanation.

Three explanations are presented to explain why dough manufactured with borrowed salt and water is restricted to the techum of the water and salt ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is a Gemara's conclusion regarding the principle of retroactive clarification?

2. What was R' Abba's prayer before going to Eretz Yisroel?

3. What is a person's liability for removing stones from a friend's pile of grain?

4. Explain איסורא בטיל ממונא לא בטיל.

Distinctive INSIGHT

Rebbe Abba and his move to Eretz Yisroel

כי סליק רבי אבא אמר יהא רעוא דאימא מילתא דתתקבל וכו'

Rebbe Abba wanted to move to Eretz Yisroel from Bavel. He uttered a prayer that upon his arrival, his words of Torah be acceptable among the new group of Torah scholars he would meet. What was the nature of his fear?

Chasam Sofer explains. Abaye states (Kesuvos 75a) that the scholars of Eretz Yisroel were very powerful, and that "one of them (the talmidei chachamim of Eretz Yisroel) were equal to one of us (the scholars of Bavel)." Knowing this, Rebbe Abba was wary whether he would be able to maintain his position in a discourse with them. Had Rebbe Abba been aware of the comment of Rava in that same Gemara, he would not have had any reason to worry. Rava states that "a scholar from Bavel, however, who moves and resettles in Eretz Yisroel is even greater, as he is equal to two of the scholars of Eretz Yisroel." The reason Rebbe Abba did not know of Rava's remarks were that Rava did not base his comment upon a verse, as did Abaye. Rather, Rava simply made an observation from what he had witnessed to be true, as in the case of Rabbi Yirmiyah, to whom Rava referred.

Although he pronounced a prayer before entering the beis midrash, the scholars did mock Rebbe Abba's statements. We might wonder why he suffered a less than gracious welcome upon his arrival in the holy land. Chasam Sofer explains that perhaps Rebbe Abba's prayer was misguided. He asked that his words "find favor in the eyes of the listeners." This request has a connotation of his desire to be personally accepted. His intent should have been simply to learn Torah for its own sake, and he should not have prioritized in his prayer that his personal reputation be advanced and for "his Torah words" to be acceptable among the scholars of Eretz Yisroel.

Some question this criticism of Rebbe Abba, because it could be that he wanted his words of Torah and for his own self to be accepted, all in order that the honor of heaven be promoted. This is a totally and completely virtuous intent. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Does Bitul B'Rov require a majority of pieces?

ולבטיל מים ומלח לגבי עיסה

Nullify the [borrowed] water and salt to the dough [so that the only relevant techum will be that of the flour.]

A person once had a utensil that required kashering. The utensil was very large and would not fit into the koshering pot at once. While koshering, he forgot to rotate the utensil so that the entire utensil would come in contact with the boiling water. He didn't realize his mistake until after he used the utensil for cooking. Is it possible to apply the principle of **ביטול ברוב** in this case or not? On the one hand, one could argue that since only a minority of the utensil was not kashered, that section, which is now "lost," is nullified to the rest of the utensil that was kashered. On the other hand, one could assert that to invoke the principle of **ביטול ברוב** there must be, in addition to the prohibited item, separate permitted pieces and in this case since it is all contained within the same utensil the principle may not be applied.

Rav Yosef Chaim of Baghdad¹, the Ben Ish Chai, responded that this issue is a matter disputed by Rav Yo-

nasan Eibishutz² in the Kreisi U'Pleisi and the Pri Chadash³. Pri Chadash rules that if a piece of meat absorbed blood into its outer surface (**כדי קליפה**) and one does not know which part of the meat absorbed the blood, the entire piece is prohibited. Kreisi U'Pleisi, however, limits this ruling to a case where it is possible that a majority of the meat came in contact with the blood. If only a small section of the meat touched the blood that small section would be nullified to the rest of the piece. Pri Chadash, who does not make this qualification, must hold that a minority portion of one piece can not be nullified to the rest of the very same piece. Thus we see that the point of dispute relates to whether separate pieces are needed to affect bitul or even different sections of one piece are sufficient.

Ben Ish Chai finds support for Kreisi U'Pleisi from our Gemara. Our Gemara entertains the possibility that, for techum purposes, the water and salt belonging to one person should be nullified to the dough in which it is found. This clearly demonstrates that **ביטול ברוב** could even be utilized to nullify components within a larger entity and it is not necessary to have separate permitted items to nullify the prohibited item. ■

1. שו"ת רב פעלים ח"א יו"ד סי' כ"ט

2. כרתי ופלתי סי' ס"ט פלתי סק"כ

3. פרי חדש יו"ד סי' ק"ה סק"ה וסי' ק"ט סק"ד ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The mocking of Rav Abba

וחדי אחיכו עליה אמר להו גולתיכו שקלי הדור אחיכו עליה אמר רב אושעיא שפיר עבוד דאחיכו עליה

Hoping to be well received upon reaching Eretz Yisroel, Rav Abba offered to explain our Mishnah. The scholars who heard his logic laughed at him. Not only did they reject his answer, they even laughed at his attempt to challenge their laughter!

One time, Rav Mendel of Premishlan, ז"ל¹, invited all of his friends to a festive meal. They asked, "What could be the occasion for such an elaborate meal in the middle of the week?"

Rav Mendel said, somewhat cryptically, "It's a seudas hoda'ah," but did not elaborate.

During the meal itself, the Rebbe explained what he had meant. "After recuperating from an illness, it is customary to offer thanks to Hashem with an elaborate meal. We all know the reason for this; the person is celebrating the fact that he has recovered. Now, when we consider the fact that all sickness comes from sin, this seems a strange thing to celebrate. Usually a criminal who was punished for committing a crime would hardly celebrate when the court finishes punishing him! Quite the contrary—after it is all over, the former criminal tries to move on and forget the past. So why do we celebrate recovering from ill-

ness?"

All the participants sat attentively, waiting to hear his answer.

The Rebbe continued, "What we are celebrating is the fact that being healed from a sickness is an outward sign that one's sins have been forgiven, and one can now enjoy a true connection to the Hashem unencumbered by the sins that had been serving as obstacles. Similarly, Chazal taught that the sins of a person who has been publicly embarrassed are all forgiven."

He concluded joyfully, "Today, I was shamed so thoroughly in public I am sure that all my sins have been pardoned. So this meal is my thanks to Hashem for granting me a clean slate!" ■