

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Intent for purifying one's hands (cont.)

R' Nachman suggests a proof that intent is not needed to purify one's hands for chulin.

This source is successfully challenged and an alternative source is offered.

Rabbah presents two unsuccessful challenges to R' Nachman's ruling.

2) Intent while immersing

R' Elazar rules that one who immersed and came out of the mikveh without intent for a particular level may choose whatever level he wishes.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged from a Baraisa.

R' Pedas asserts that the Baraisa is consistent with an opinion of R' Yehudah recorded in a Mishnah in Mikvaos.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha explains the dispute in the previously-cited Mishnah in a way that is consistent with R' Pedas.

A second version of R' Nachman's statement is presented which results in R' Nachman disagreeing with R' Pedas.

Ulla asked R' Yochanan whether, according to R' Yehudah, needles and spinning forks placed on the head of a person whose foot is in the mikveh are considered immersed.

R' Yochanan cites a Baraisa that indicates that it is a valid immersion.

Ulla successfully challenged R' Yochanan's conclusion.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

An inconsistency in the Mishnah is noted concerning the dispute between Rabanan and R' Meir whether chullin and maaser sheni are separate levels of sanctity or the same level of sanctity.

The Gemara notes that it is indeed inconsistent.

R' Acha bar Ada adds an additional case to the Mishnah so that the entire Mishnah follows Rabanan.

4) Chullin prepared with the standards of kodesh

R' Meri infers from the Mishnah that chullin prepared with the standards of kodesh is like kodesh itself, i.e. susceptible to tumah like kodesh. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating foods that have become impure

חולין שנעשו על טהרת הקדש

Rashi explains that a person who regularly would eat קדש (meat from offerings) would choose to maintain even his חולין food on the level of purity necessary for the meat from the korbanos.

The Gemara in Bava Metzia (87a) teaches that Avraham Avinu used to eat from his חולין food when it was pure. This is why although he offered to serve bread to the angels who came to visit his tent, he did not actually end up providing it to them. The reason is that Sarah had become a נדה, and the dough had become impure, thus rendering it unfit for consumption.

Rabbi Yonasan Eybeschutz notes that the Gemara does not say that the bread became impure and thus unable to be served, but rather that the dough became impure. Why doesn't the Gemara simply say that the bread became טמא? Furthermore, although Avraham had adopted the custom to eat only foods that were kept on a high level of purity, why did he feel it inappropriate to offer impure bread to his guests? They appeared to him as Arabs, and there was apparently no reason to believe that they maintained such a standard for themselves.

The answers to these two questions are found within one idea. Our sages tell us that the date when this visit took place was the first day of Pesach. The Gemara in Beitza (21a) teaches that although cooking and food preparation is allowed to be done on Yom Tov, this is only allowed for food for a Jew. It remains prohibited to cook or bake for a non-Jew. If the bread or matzah had already been baked, it could have been served to

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is it not acceptable to immerse in the arches of waves?

2. What is the basis for R' Yehudah's lenient ruling concerning two people immersing in a mikveh that contains exactly forty seah?

3. Explain who applies the phrase גוד אסיק to a mikveh.

4. What is the dispute between Rabanan and R' Meir regarding chullin and maser sheni?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Immersing in snow

דתניה מטבילין בראשין ואין מטבילין בכיפין לפי שאין מטבילין באויר
As was taught in a Baraisa: We immerse in the heads [of detached waves] but we do not immerse in the arches because we do not immerse in midair

The Mordechai¹ cites the analysis of Rabbeinu Simcha concerning the question of whether immersing in frozen snow is an effective immersion. Rabbeinu Simcha initially ruled, based on a Mishnah in Mikvaos², that it is an effective immersion. The Mishnah there states that snow and hail contribute to the volume of the mikvah and do not disqualify the mikvah. Obviously the Mishnah is addressing the case of frozen snow because if it was addressing melted snow there is no reason to think that melted snow is any different than rainwater. Rabbeinu Eliezer disputes Rabbeinu Simcha's conclusion and explains that the novelty of the Mishnah ruling that melted snow increases the volume of the mikvah is that one may have thought that it should be disqualified as drawn water (מים שאובין). In the end of his analysis, Rabbeinu Simcha concluded that immersing in frozen snow is not effective and one of the reasons that led him to this conclusion is that our Gemara declares that one may not immerse in the arch of a wave.

The Beis Yosef³ questions the relevance of our Gemara to the question at hand. The reason we do not immerse in the arch of a wave is that it is completely detached from the ground as opposed to snow which is in contact with the ground; therefore,

(Insight. Continued from page 1)

the Arabs. However, it was still in the unbaked state of dough. When it became impure, it was no longer fit for Avraham to eat, because he did not eat impure foods. Although the Arabs guests would have eaten the impure matza, that was only after it would have been baked, but now that the baking would be only for the Arab visitors, it was prohibited for Avraham and Sarah to bake the dough on Yom Tov exclusively for the non-Jews. This is why Avraham did not serve them bread or matzah, although he had originally planned to do so. ■

immersing in snow should be valid the same as it is valid to immerse in deep waters even though the water rises well above the ground below. Rav Yaakov Yisroel Kanievsky⁴, the Steipler, explains the intent of Rabbeinu Simcha in light of a Gemara in Niddah⁵. The Gemara there relates that if part of a pile of snow becomes tamei the entire pile is not tamei as opposed to water where the entire collection of water becomes tamei. The reason for the distinction is that the droplets of water fuse together to form one mass whereas each snowflake remains independent and does not fuse together with the others. Consequently, the snowflakes on the top of the pile are not considered connected with the snowflakes at the bottom of the pile and as a result they are similar to the arch of the wave that is completely detached from the ground. ■

1. מרדכי שבת פ"ד סי' של"ב
2. מקואות פ"ז מ"א
3. בית יוסף יו"ד סי' ר"א ד"ה כתב מרדכי
4. קהלות יעקב מקואות סי' ד' אות ב'
5. גמ' נדה יז ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Washing one's hands

ואם בשביל שיודחו ידיו ידיו טהורות והפירות הרי הן בכי יותן

On today's daf, the Gemara explains that if someone places his tamei hands into a pool of water to withdraw some fruit that fell into it, the fruit is not made liable to receive ritual impurity because the person is not interested in the water itself, but rather the fruits. In contrast, when a person actually means to make use of the water, the fruit does become liable to receive tumah. His desire to have benefit from the water determines the status of the fruit.

Similarly, if one's intention when "grabbing hold of the fruits" or taking the helm of Rabbonus, is for the sake of heav-

en, for the fruits themselves, his community will remain pure. If, on the other hand, the Rav has ulterior motives, if he has made the secondary "water" of honor or money into his primary purpose, then he will not have the siyata d'shmaya to keep the community pure.

When Rav Samson Raphael Hirsch, zt"l, was serving as Chief Rabbi and parliamentary representative of Bohemia and Moravia, representatives of the Jewish community of Frankfurt approached him and asked him to leave his prestigious position to lead their unimpressive community. German Reform was so influential at the time that Shechitah had been outlawed as cruel, and the only chance for Torah-true Judaism to survive would be if a strong and persuasive leader could successfully establish the Orthodox community as a distinct and independent legal entity.

Rav Hirsch heard about all of the problems facing the community, and nevertheless acquiesced to become the Rav. The community's joy knew no bounds; the only thing left to negotiate was the new Rabbi's salary.

The representatives asked, "Rabbi, tell us what your expectations of salary are?"

Rav Hirsch replied, "In my house, I am in charge of the spiritual matters and my wife is in charge of worldly concerns. She is in the kitchen. Why don't you speak this issue over with her?"

Rav Shlomo Wolbe, zt"l, would cite this story and say, "If you want to succeed in something for the klal you must forgo all thought of money and honor just like Rav Hirsch. He went to a small community instead of a big one and didn't think about money at all. His sole intention was for Hashem." ■

