chicago center for Torah Chesed

COT

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Swallowed objects (cont.)

The reason why Rabbah's teaching was necessary is successfully challenged.

Rava in the name of R' Yosef offers another explanation for our Mishnah.

R' Yosef's teaching is further explained and clarified.

The Baraisa that records the dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva referenced in the previous discussion is presented.

The exchange between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva concerning their respective opinions is recorded.

2) MISHNAH: The Mishnah begins with a dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim regarding the tum'ah status of the limb of a fetus that sticks its hand out of its mother's womb and is severed. The exchange between them is also recorded. The Mishnah inquires after the source that slaughtering purifies a tereifah animal. A discussion is recorded whether this source proves its point.

3) The severed limb

The Gemara questions why the limb that was severed is considered tamei when seemingly the contact it made with the rest of its body was concealed and as such it should not transmit tum'ah. Seemingly both Tannaim follow R' Meir's position regarding concealed tum'ah.

This explanation is rejected in favor of another explanation.

Ravina offers an alternative explanation of the Mishnah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

- 1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva?
- 2. What is the point of dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim?
- 3. Explain the principle of טריפה שחיטתה מטהרתה?
- 4. What is the בית הסתרים?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Lessons of tum'ah learned from the verses רבי עקיבא אומר לרבות גולל ודופק

▲ he Mishnah (71a) taught that if a fetus dies within the womb of its mother, if a midwife reaches inside the mother and comes in contact with the fetus, the midwife becomes tmei'ah. The Gemara concludes that the fetus is a case of "swallowed up" tum'ah. Rabbi Akiva holds that the fetus can transmit tum'ah, and the midwife is tmei'ah, even mid'oraisa. R' Yishmael holds that the fetus does not transmit tum'ah, and, technically, the midwife cannot become tmei'ah due to contact with the fetus which is still in its mother's womb. Rava says that although according to R' Akiva the midwife is tmei'ah on a Torah level, Rav Yosef of Pumbedisa explained that according to R' Yishmael the reason she is tmei'ah is only rabbinic. When she touches the fetus, even within the mother, the rabbis declared that she is tmei'ah due to the possibility that the fetus's head might emerge from the mother, thus constituting its birth, and the midwife might not realize that the lifeless child has been "born" and is tamei. This risk does not apply to the mother, because the mother is aware when the head emerges, and she will know when the fetus is born. The mother, however, is too preoccupied to keep the midwife informed minute by minute.

The disagreement between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva regarding whether "swallowed up" tum'ah is tamei is based upon their analysis of the verse in Bemidbar (19:16), "And anything that will touch a corpse...on the face of the field." R' Yishmael explains that this teaches us that tum'ah is only imparted when coming in contact when it is something that is exposed and in the open, but not when the source of tum'ah is something that is "swallowed up" or hidden. R' Akiva holds that this verse does not exclude tum'ah from tum'ah which is covered up, such as a dead fetus in its mother. Rather, this verse teaches us that tum'ah applies to the גולל ודופק, stones which make up the structure of a grave. Rashi and Rambam explain that a גולל is the covering of the grave, and are the stones which serve as the walls of a grave.

Rabeinu Tam (Kesuvos 4b) questions Rashi's explanation based upon our Gemara, where we find that R' Aki-

HALACHAH Highlight

Reciting the beracha of המוציא on a whole loaf וכל העומד לחתוך כחתוך דמי

Anything that stands to be cut is considered as though it has been cut

eis Yosef¹ writes that one should preferably recite on a whole loaf even during the week. Nevertheless, one should slice the loaf before reciting the beracha so that there should not be a long interruption between the beracha and eating. Regarding the extent of the cut that the loaf should still be considered whole, Rosh writes that if one were to take hold of the smaller part of the loaf and the larger part would be lifted as well the loaf is considered whole. Rabbeinu Baruch asserts that even if the larger part would not be lifted it is considered whole but Beis Yosef rejects this opinion.

Teshuvas Sha'ar Ephraim² suggests that the disagreement between Rosh and Rabbeinu Ephraim relates to whether halacha follows Ravina's position recorded in our Gemara. Ravina maintains that anything that stands to be severed is considered as though it is already severed. Rabbeinu Baruch accepts Ravina's position and then reasons as follows. Since the loaf stands to be cut after the beracha it is considered as though it is already cut. Now if we consider the loaf to be whole when there is only a small cut there is no reason that it should not be considered

(Insight...continued from page 1)

va learns that tum'ah applies to these parts of the grave based upon the phrase in the verse which says, "the face of the field." Yet, according to Rashi's definition of these items, they are usually buried below ground, and are not found "on the face of the field."

Ritva answers that we can say according to Rashi that the custom was to elevate the frame of the grave above ground somewhat in order for people to be able to recognize that a grave is located here. Therefore, the covering and the walls of the grave were found above ground.

whole if it is cut deeper into the loaf, even if it is so deep that the larger part would not lift up with the smaller piece. Rosh disagrees and contends that halacha does not follow Ravina's opinion since it is clear from our Gemara that Ravina was coming to explain R' Meir's position and according to Chachamim it is unnecessary to resort to Ravina's explanation.

Shulchan Aruch³ rules in accordance with Rosh's position that during the week one should recite המוציא on a whole loaf but one should begin the cut before reciting the beracha of המוציא. One should make sure to cut only a small amount so that the bulk of the loaf will be lifted when he picks up the smaller part. In the event that one cuts deeper into the loaf it is no longer considered whole.

- בית יוסף אוייח סיי קסייז דייה ויבצע.
 - שויית שער אפרים סיי אי.
 - ■.שוייע אוייח סיי קסייז סעי אי

A Man of Pumbedisa

ייומנו בר יוסף...יי

av Yechezkel Abramsky, zt"l, once discussed the Torah genius of Rav Yosef Shalom Eliyashiv, zt"l. "When considering the brilliant answers that Rav Eliyashiv gives without a moment's hesitation to complex questions in all areas of Shas, I always recall the words of Rav Chaim Brisker, zt"l. He pointed out a seemingly enigmatic statement in Chullin 72: 'A man of Pumbedisa... Who? Ray Yosef.' Ray Chaim wondered what difference it makes to us

well known, every word in the Gemara is there for a reason. Rav Chaim con-Yosef."

Rav Abramsky then added, "Similarly, whenever I say, 'They say in Yosef Shalom Eliyashiv."

why Rav Abramsky singled out Rav Eliyashiv. "Surely there are many gedovashiv superior to these other poskim?"

ly true that there are many true gedo-

that Rav Yosef was of Pumbedisa. As is lim in Yerushalayim. Nevertheless, Rav Eliyashiv is unique even among the gedolei Yerushalyim. On what basis do cluded from this that every time an I say this? I have been around and spoanonymous teaching from Pumbedisa ken in learning with all of the greatest is cited, it refers to a teaching of Rav luminaries of Yerushalayim. Only Rav Eliyashiv always had a ready answer for me. No matter how outlandish or unusual the source, he replied immediate-Yerushalayim...' I mean Maran Rav ly. Speaking with him about it, it seemed as though he had just learned One of those present wondered it. It is true that the other gedolim are that way regarding Talmud Bavli. But in Yerushalmi, Tosefta and other less lim in Yerushalayim. Why is Rav Eli- familiar sources they rarely are sure how to answer since they are not hold-Ray Abramsky agreed. "It is certain- ing in the subject at that moment..."

1. עלינו לשבח, חייו, עי תפייג

