

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Immersing one vessel inside of another (cont.)

Rava's explanation was that one may not immerse a vessel inside another due to a concern regarding immersing needles inside of a utensil that does not have the requisite size opening. It is noted that this is consistent with R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha who enumerated eleven differences in the Mishnah between Terumah and kodesh.

A practical difference between Rava and R' Iyla is identified.

Another statement of Rava that is consistent with this explanation of the Mishnah is cited.

The Gemara traces the dispute between R' Iyla and Rava to a dispute between Tannaim.

2) Concern for hatred

The Gemara declares that our Mishnah that is concerned about generating hatred follows the position of R' Yosi who elsewhere expresses concern for generating hatred.

R' Pappa explains another practice in light of R' Yosi's position.

3) Immersing one vessel inside of another (cont.)

The Gemara earlier asserted that one may immerse a utensil inside another for Terumah because we do not accept Terumah from an **עם הארץ**. This assertion is unsuccessfully challenged from a Mishnah and a Baraisa.

An implication of the discussion indicates that an **עם הארץ** is not believed regarding matters related to immersion. This assertion is challenged.

Abaye and Rava suggest alternative resolutions to this challenge.

Abaye's answer is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara defines the words **תוך** and **אחורים**.

Two definitions are presented for the phrase **בית הצביטה**.

A related Baraisa is cited and a detail in the Baraisa is clarified.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel relates the incident that led to the decree that one who is transporting medras may not transport kodesh. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

The case in which R' Iyla and Rava disagree

מאי איכא בין רבא לדר' אילא

Two reasons are given why the rabbis prohibit immersing one vessel within another. R' Iyla explains that it is due to the concern that the weight of the inner utensil will press down on the outer utensil, thus creating a **חציצה** where the water will not be able to intervene. Rava explains that we disallow this procedure as a precaution so that a person will not come to immerse needles within a bottle with a narrow neck, whereby the waters of the mikveh will not be able to be legally connected to the water in the bottle. The Gemara then probes to discover what the practical difference would be whether we explain this case of the Mishnah according to the explanation of R' Iyla or that of Rava.

Tosafos (**ד"ה מאי איכא בין רבא לר' אילא**) notes that the Gemara seems to overlook an obvious fact about which these opinions differ, other than the rather obscure case which is actually brought. The difference is simply in regard to the validity of the immersion of the outer vessel itself. According to R' Iyla, the outer vessel remains impure, because the concern of a **חציצה** is shared mutually by the inner and outer vessel at the same moment. The same problem of water not touching and surrounding the inner utensil is because it is in direct contact with the outer vessel, thus rendering neither with adequate contact with the mikveh waters. However, according to Rava, the concern of the narrow-necked bottle only affects the utensils on the inside, but the immersion of the outer vessel would be valid.

Rabeinu Elchanan in Tosafos answers that the case of the Mishnah is clearly speaking about a case where the outer vessel is already pure. Therefore, the Gemara could not suggest that the status of the outer vessel is a point of dispute between R' Iyla and Rava, because even if the weight of the inner utensil presses down, the outer vessel is still pure. Furthermore, this explanation is quite reasonable, because Rava himself explains in the next lines of the Gemara that we are speaking about where the outer vessel is pure. If it would be impure, the immersion for itself would allow us to validate the immersion of the utensils contained within it, as well.

Rava must hold that, in fact, the Gemara could have given this suggestion, but this would have meant that the illustration provided would result in the inner utensil's remaining impure. The Gemara preferred to give a case where not only is the outer vessel pure, but, according to Rava, the inner vessels are also pure. This is the power of purity. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of
שאוּל יעקב בן צבי מאיר
 by the Karp family, Far Rockaway, NY

Distinctive INSIGHT

Requesting forgiveness from the deceased

מיד הלך ר' יהושע ונשתטח על קברי בית שמאי אמר נענית לכם עצמות בית שמאי

R' Yehoshua immediately went and prostrated on the graves of Beis Shammai and said, "I have spoken against you, bones of Beis Shammai."

The Rema¹ writes that one who spoke negatively about someone who is deceased must, amongst other things, go to the grave of the deceased, if the grave is nearby, to request forgiveness. If the deceased is not buried nearby, an agent should be sent to the grave to ask for forgiveness on the offender's behalf. The Magen Avrohom², however, cites authorities who maintain that one is obligated to go to the grave only if the offensive remark was made before the other person passed away. If the remark was made about a person who was already deceased the request for forgiveness is made in the place the offensive remark was said. The Kaf HaChaim³ cites authorities on both sides of the debate.

The Gaon Chida⁴ challenges the position of Magen Avrohom from our Gemara. In our Gemara R' Yehoshua made what proved to be a disrespectful remark about Beis Shammai. After he realized that he was mistaken he went to the graves of Beis Shammai and asked for forgiveness. Seemingly, according to Magen Avrohom there was no reason for R' Yehoshua to go to the graves to ask forgiveness. Rather, he should have asked forgiveness from Beis Shammai in the place the offensive remark was made.

STORIES Off the Daf

Speaking with Respect

"...א"ר יהושע בושני מדבריכם ב"ש..."

A certain Gadol once asked Rav Moshe, zt"l, "I would like to move to Bnei Brak, but I suspect that this is not a good idea. Since I argue on the Chazon Ish, zt"l, quite a bit, and since many people hold like him in Bnei Brak, perhaps it is not fitting for me to live and give shiurim there. Don't we see that this is the case from Chagiga 22b where Rav Yehoshua fasted until his teeth grew blackened for having insulted Beis Shammai?"

The Posek Hador replied, "In my opinion there is no reason to worry about

this. On the contrary, it is an honor to the Chazon Ish, zt"l, that his words are deserving of such consideration even if the scholar considering them comes to a different conclusion. It certainly never occurred to the Chazon Ish that no one would disagree with him!

Rav Moshe continued, "However, one must always take care to speak of the Rav with whom one disagrees in terms of the highest respect. Rav Yehoshua fasted until his teeth blackened not because he argued with Beis Shammai, but because he referred to them in a demeaning manner. When the opinion of Beis Shammai was explained to him, Rav Yehoshua repented and fasted for having insulted them. However, if one speaks with derech eretz, there is no objection to arguing

with another Chacham. Actually, in Bava Basra 130 we see that Rava told his students that if they have questions on a decision of his they should do as they see fit, since a judge only decides based on 'what he sees before him.' However, they should not disregard what he said since it is likely that if they ask him he will be able to answer their question. The Rashbam adds that maybe they will find their own answer to the difficulty. However, until they do, they should decide as they understand.

Rav Moshe concluded, "One certainly should not worry about arguing on even the greatest poskim of the generation if one has good questions that no one seems to be able to answer. As long as one speaks with derech eretz!" ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. If one immersed utensils in a strainer is the immersion effective?
2. Why do we accept the testimony of amei ha'aretz?
3. What caused R' Yehoshua's teeth to turn black?
4. Why is an am ha'aretz believed to declare that he immersed?

Teshuvos Siach Yitzchok⁵ deflects the challenge against Magen Avrohom in two ways. The first approach is to suggest that this case is unique in that R' Yehoshua did not merely offend a person but offended the entire collection of students who identify themselves as Beis Shammai. Since the offensive remark was made against a group rather than an individual, R' Yehoshua was compelled to go to their graves to ask them for forgiveness. A second approach is that R' Yehoshua's behavior in this incident does not reflect what halacha demands of a person in this circumstance but rather the righteousness of R' Yehoshua who took upon himself a higher standard of behavior. ■

1. רמ"א חו"מ סי' תי"ב סעי' ל"ח.
2. מג"א סי' רצ"ו סק"ז.
3. כף החיים שם ס"יק ל"ה.
4. פתח עיניים ומובא דבריו בשיח יצחק דלקמן.
5. שו"ת שיח יצחק (ווייס) סי' רצ"ו. ■