

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Asham of a nazir and metzora (cont.)

Rav's statement that a nazir's asham is offered if it was slaughtered with incorrect intent is successfully challenged.

2) Minchas HaOmer (cont.)

Reish Lakish disagrees with Rav and asserts that a Minchas HaOmer brought with incorrect intent may still be offered but its remnants may not be eaten.

This position is challenged.

R' Adda bar Ahavah responds to this challenge.

R' Adda bar Ahavah's response is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Sheishes unsuccessfully challenges R' Adda bar Ahavah's response.

R' Pappa successfully challenges R' Adda bar Ahavah's response and then offers his own resolution to the challenge to Reish Lakish's position.

It is noted that Reish Lakish's position was inferred from another statement of his and was not said explicitly.

Rava asserts that a Minchas HaOmer brought with incorrect intent may be offered and the remnants may also be eaten.

3) Offering a tereifah

A Baraisa has a lengthy analysis which concludes that the words **מן הבקר** teach that one may not offer a tereifah as a korban.

Rav offers an explanation why the Baraisa rejected what seemed to be a logical kal vachomer.

This explanation is rejected.

Reish Lakish suggests a second reason why the Baraisa rejects the kal vachomer.

This explanation is rejected.

Mar the son of Ravina gives a third explanation for the

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What do the words **משקה ישראל** teach?

2. What is the correct procedure for the metzora on the final day of his purification process?

3. What is derived from the words **מן הבקר**?

4. How does Reish Lakish explain the logic of the Baraisa?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Sprinkling of the asham blood of the metzora before the oil

הקדים מתן שמן למתן דם וכו'

Rav said earlier (4a) that the minchah of the omer is disqualified if it has its kemitzah removed while having in mind a different minchah. The reason given is that the function of the omer is to permit the new grain to be eaten. If the omer was brought in a manner whereby this goal was not fulfilled, the entire offering is no longer valid.

The Gemara brought several questions against the opinion of Rav, and the Gemara concluded that the opinion of Rav is shown to be in conflict with a Baraisa regarding the law of a metzora. Rav's opinion is therefore declared refuted.

Reish Lakish disagrees with Rav, and his opinion is that if the kemitzah of a minchah of the omer is separated with the intent for a different minchah, that omer is still valid. The kemitzah may be burned on the Altar, and the remaining flour may be eaten, but only after a second omer is brought properly that same day. Reish Lakish agrees with the general rule that an offering may only be brought from something that is permitted to be eaten, and we know that while the first omer is awaiting the second omer to be brought properly it is not permitted to be eaten. Nevertheless, Rav Ada bar Ahava explains that Reish Lakish holds that as long as the first omer offering which had its kemitzah removed improperly will be permitted to be eaten later that same day, its current status of not being edible is not a deficiency.

Rav Sheishes questions the explanation of Rav Ada bar Ahava. We know that when a metzora comes to be purified, the kohen must take the blood of his asham and sprinkle it on the metzora. The kohen then takes from the log of oil and sprinkles it seven times before Hashem, and the oil is then sprinkled on the metzora. The order of these procedures is critical, and if the oil was sprinkled first, the log must be refilled and sprinkled a second time after the blood is sprinkled. Now, if Rav Ada's explanation of Reish Lakish is correct, the sprinkling of the oil which was done first should not be disqualified, because the blood which was not yet sprinkled had the potential of being sprinkled that same day. Rav Pappa answers that the laws of metzora cannot be compared to anything else, because we have a special verse indicating that the order of the procedures must be adhered to.

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Washing one's hands with water left overnight in a metal utensil

”ממשקה ישראל” מן המותר לישראל

“From the feast of Yisroel,” meaning from that which is permitted to Jews

The Gemara Nidah (17a) teaches that one who drinks beverages diluted in water that were in a metal utensil for a night takes his life in his own hands, meaning he does so at his own risk since it is dangerous. Shulchan Aruch HoRav¹ adds that if it is dangerous to drink beverages that were diluted with water it must certainly be dangerous to drink water that was left overnight in a metal utensil. This gives rise to the following question. Is it permitted for one to ritually wash his hands with water that was stored in a metal utensil overnight? The rationale to prohibit the use of such water is that it is unfit to drink and retains רוח רעה – a harmful vapor.

Teshuvos Ma'aneh Eliyahu² questions Shulchan Aruch HoRav's assumption from our Gemara. The Gemara relates that offerings in the Beis HaMikdash must be fit for consumption by a Jew. The Gemara Sukkah (48a) teaches that the water was collected on Erev Shabbos of Sukkos and stored overnight in a gold utensil for use on Shabbos day for the water libation. If water stored overnight in a

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Regarding the procedure of sprinkling of the blood of the asham of the metzora which must come before the sprinkling of the oil, Rashi explains that the source for this sequencing is based upon the verse (Vayikra 14:28) that states that the oil must be placed “on the place of the asham's blood.” This indicates that the blood must be placed first. The Gri”z comments that according to Rashi, this critical sequence only refers to the sprinkling which is on the metzora, but not to the sprinkling which is before Hashem. ■

metal utensil is unfit for drinking it should have been unfit for use as the water libation. He suggests as a possible resolution that perhaps רוח רעה did not reside in the Beis HaMikdash but rejects that resolution.

In the end he writes that common custom is that people are not strict about leaving water in a metal utensil overnight as we see that people keep water hot overnight in metal utensils. Since custom treats the water as a beverage that one may consume it may then certainly be used for washing one's hands. The reason to not apply Shulchan Aruch's logic is that matters related to רוח רעה do not necessarily follow logic patterns as we see them. As such, we can not state with certainty that if water mixed in another beverage is dangerous, certainly water by itself is dangerous.

1. שוייע הרי”ב חו”מ שמירת גוף והנפש סעי' ז.
2. שו”ת מענה אליהו סיי י”ח. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Metzora's Purification

”הלכות מצורע דכתיבא בו הויה...”

The Satmar Rav, zt'l, offered an inspiring teaching on the halachos of metzora. “Rashi explains why a metzora brings a branch of a cedar tree, a bundle of hyssop, and a tola'as shani. The cedar is a very tall and alludes to the arrogance that caused the tzora'as in the first place. He brings a bundle of the lowly hyssop and the tola'as shani which means both a red thread and a worm to hint that a metzora must lower himself like a worm to be healed.

“The Torah commands that the

metzora bring these items on the day he becomes pure to teach him some much-needed musar. He must understand that his arrogance caused this fall and a lasting cure is only possible if he changes his attitude.

“This is alluded to by the verse which states, זאת תהיה תורת המצורע — This shall be the law of the metzora.’ It would appear that the word תהיה is superfluous—why wouldn't, ‘This is the law of the metzora’ suffice? In Menachos 5 we find that the word תהיה teaches that a metzora must have havayah—being. On a simple level this means that the sacrifices of a metzora must be brought in the proper sequence, in the sense that they must be in order. But we can learn a moral les-

son from this as well. The word havayah can also mean that which has lasting existence. This teaches that the lesson of humility which a metzora is forced to learn in order to be healed must be internalized to effect a lasting cure. His repentance of his sin cannot be a temporary condition—it must become a part of his being. He must know that only through achieving lasting humility will his new state of health endure.”¹ ■

1. דברי יואל, פרשת מצורע ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Baraisa.

This explanation is rejected.

R' Adda bar Abba offers a fourth explanation for the Baraisa.

This explanation is rejected. ■