

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Nursing (cont.)

Different opinions are presented concerning when we presume a baby will refuse to nurse from another woman.

The Gemara rules like the opinion that says fifty days.

Shmuel's opinion that it takes a baby thirty days is challenged.

Rami bar Yechezkel states that one should ignore reports from his brother Yehudah because Shmuel ruled that the measure is whenever a baby recognizes his mother.

A related incident is recorded.

The way a blind child recognizes his mother is explained.

A Baraisa presents a discussion regarding the length of time a child may nurse.

The Baraisa's ruling that a child is not permitted to nurse after twenty-four months is unsuccessfully challenged.

Tangentially the Gemara teaches when human blood is prohibited.

The accuracy of the earlier Baraisa's understanding of R' Yehoshua is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yosef rules in accordance with R' Yehoshua.

2) R' Yosef's rulings

The Gemara cites two instances where R' Yosef issued a ruling related to a Baraisa.

3) Nursing (cont.)

A ruling is issued that once a baby who is twenty-four months old stopped nursing for three days he is not permitted to resume nursing.

A Baraisa presents different opinions concerning how long a widowed nursing mother is restricted from remarrying.

There is a disagreement over which opinion to follow.

A related incident is recorded.

A Baraisa rules that a nursing widow who gives her child to a wet nurse or weaned her child is permitted to marry immediately.

An incident is presented that relates to whether halacha is in accordance with this Baraisa.

The Gemara rules that if the child dies the mother is permitted to remarry but if the child is weaned there is a dispute whether the mother may remarry but the Gemara seemingly indicates that it is prohibited.

4) Wet nurse

A Baraisa issues rulings related to hiring a wet nurse.

A number of points in the Baraisa are clarified.

5) Influencing children

The Gemara lists different activities that a mother may practice and the effects these practices will have on her children. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Blood between one's teeth and blood of a wound

שבין השיניים מוצצו ואינו חושש

The Baraisa discusses the prohibition of consuming blood of a human being. We are taught that if blood appears on a slice of bread, the blood on the bread must be scraped off before the slice may be consumed. However, blood that is still between one's teeth and has not come out of the mouth may be sucked out of the teeth into one's mouth and swallowed.

Rashi explains the rationale why the blood is prohibited in one case and permitted in the other. Once the blood has come out of the body, as in the case of its appearing on the slice of bread, the blood is rabbinically prohibited, as it looks like blood of any animal, and it is prohibited in order that a person not come to think that blood of an animal may be consumed. However, blood that is still between one's teeth is not visible, and it is not subject to being confused with blood of an animal. Rashi's explanation suggests that it is only blood in one's teeth that is permitted, but blood of a wound would be prohibited, for example where a person places his mouth on a wound and sucks the blood off the wound.

ספר ההפלאה, however, based upon Rashi, writes that blood of a wound that has not exited the body would have the same halacha of blood between one's teeth, and it would be permitted. Since the only reason to disallow it is due to its appearing as blood of an animal, and this blood is not visible, there is no מראית עין.

The הפלאה then notes that the rule is that an action which is prohibited due to מראית עין is prohibited even where no one is around and no one can see the act. It is prohibited even "in the innermost room." Why, then, should this blood be permitted just because no one can or will see it?

He explains that there is a fundamental distinction between the cases. We only restrict an action where the questionable or prohibited item is visible, but the person doing the action is out of sight. However, if the questionable item is not visible, as is the case of the human blood in one's mouth or of a wound, we do not worry that it will be confused with animal blood, and מראית עין is not an issue. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Using a plunger to clear a drain on Shabbos

צינור שעלו בו קשקשין ממעכן ברגלו בצנעה בשבת

A gutter that became clogged with straw [can be cleared by] pressing down with one's foot in private on Shabbos

Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that if a person's gutter is clogged with grass and branches and the water backs up and drips into the house it is permitted, in private, to press down the grass with one's foot. The reason is that the repair is done in an unusual fashion and when faced with a loss a Rabbinical decree does not apply. On the other hand if one were to clear the debris in the normal fashion it is prohibited under the melachah of boneh - construction. Accordingly, Poskim discuss whether it is permitted to clear a clogged sink or toilet with a plunger on Shabbos.

Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach² asserts that it is permitted to use a plunger to clear a clogged sink or toilet, especially when there is the additional factor of human dignity (כבוד הבריות) involved. The reason is that the clog is no different than opening a bottle that is closed at the top. He adds that when it is not necessary one should avoid the use of a plunger because it represents a weekday activity (עובדא) (דחול). Dayan Yitzchok Yaakov Weiss³, the Minchas Yitzchok adds that although it is permitted to unclog a toilet with a plunger, when possible, one should ask a non-Jew to use the plunger or use the plunger in an unusual fashion, i.e. use one's left hand. Rav Moshe Feinstein⁴ wrote that if unclog-

REVIEW and Remember

1. How long is it acceptable for a baby to nurse?
2. What is the permitted method to repair a gutter?
3. When is a nursing mother permitted to remarry?
4. What are the terms of the agreement for a woman who is hirede to nurse another woman's baby?

ging the sink or toilet is a frequent activity it is permitted because it is not considered as if someone is repairing something that is broken. If, however, it does not happen often, unclogging the toilet is considered a repair and may only be done by a non-Jew when there is a great need.

Rav Yisroel Yaakov Fisher⁵ disagrees with Minchas Yitzchok's comparison of a clogged toilet to a bottle with a cap. A bottle is designed that the cap should be removed and replaced and when the bottle is covered with a cap it is not considered broken. In contrast, a toilet that is clogged is considered broken and in need of repair; consequently, unclogging the toilet is prohibited. ■

1. שוייע אוי"ח סיי שליו סעי טי.
2. מובא דבריו בשמירת שבת כהלכתה פי"ב העי נ'.
3. שוי"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ה סיי ע"ה.
4. שוי"ת אג"מ או"ח ח"ד סיי מי אות טי.
5. שוי"ת אבן ישראל ח"ה סיי ל"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Ruling in the Place of One's Rabbi

"לא לישרי איניש במקום רביה לא דמיחזי כאפקירותא אלא משום לדה מדתייאה מילתא למימרא..."

On today's daf we find that Chazal taught that one should refrain from issuing a ruling in the place of one's Rabbi, even when the matter is clearly permitted. This is not only because it is considered a display of arrogance; it is because offering his opinion without showing due deference to his Rabbi will guarantee that he will not have the necessary סייעתא דשמיא to rule correctly.

The Malbim, zt"l, as a young and already renowned genius, visited the yeshiva of the Chasam Sofer in Pressburg just after his work "Artzos HaChayim" on the beginning of Shulchan Aruch had been published. He entered the beis medrash, and began to give a public shiur without realizing that he was actually sitting in the regular seat of the Chasam Sofer himself! In the middle of his lecture, the Chasam Sofer walked in and the Malbim suddenly realized, to his great consternation, that he had taken the place of one of the Gedolei HaDor—he quickly made as if to clear the way for the Chasam Sofer, but the Rosh Yeshiva indicated that the Malbim should remain where

he was, waving his hand and saying, "No, no. Sit."

The Malbim sensed that despite the Chasam Sofer's waiving of his place, the Gadol did indeed hold the slight against him. In later years, the Malbim was known to remark that it was no surprise to him that his "Artzos HaChayim" never progressed past the first volume. Even though the Malbim had a long and prolific career and produced many wonderful chiddushim (such as his commentary on Tanach, etc.), he attributed the incompleteness of his work on Shulchan Aruch to the, "Sit!" of the Chasam Sofer—for he truly never "got up" past the opening section to bring it to completion! ■