



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Becoming tamei for a meis mitzvah (cont.)

The Gemara continues to cite a Baraisa that formulates the source that a Kohen Gadol should become tamei for a **מת מצוה**.

Another Baraisa is cited that formulates the source that a nazir should become tamei for a **מת מצוה**.

The Gemara challenges the premise of the Baraisa that the term **לאביו** is extra when it is needed to teach that a nazir is not permitted to become tamei for his father.

The Gemara concedes the point and asserts that the term **לאביו** can be used to teach that a nazir becomes tamei for a **מת מצוה** and the expositions made from other seemingly superfluous words are presented.

R' Akiva offers different expositions that one could make from the same verse.

The Gemara explains how R' Akiva will formulate the **שורה** of Rabbi even though he makes a different exposition from the word **לאמו**.

The source is identified, for R' Yishmael, that a Kohen Gadol who is a nazir becomes tamei for a **מת מצוה**.

The necessity for the word **אחות**, according to R' Yishmael, is explained. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What does the term **אמו** in the context of the Kohen Gadol mean?
2. What characteristic of a Kohen Gadol makes him more elevated than a nazir?
3. What Halacha is derived from the word **לאחותו**?
4. How does R' Yishmael know that a Kohen Gadol who is a nazir may become tamei for a **מת מצוה**?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of his father
ר' שלום בן ר' חיים אהרון, ז"ל
 by Rabbi and Mrs. Chayim Knobloch

Distinctive INSIGHT

The shared halachos of a nazir and a Kohen Gadol

אשכחן כהן גדול, נזיר מנלן

The Gemara had just derived that a Kohen Gadol may defile himself to participate in the arrangements of a **מת מצוה**. This is the lesson taught from the limit indicated from the word **לאביו** in Parashas Emor (Vayikra 21:11). The Gemara now searches for the source that a nazir may, and in fact must, also defile himself to attend to the needs of a **מת מצוה**.

Tosafos (ד"ה הכי גרסינן אשכחן) questions the need to seek out a new source for this halacha. We already identified a **שורה** featuring the words **אמו-אמו** which teaches us that the Kohen Gadol and the nazir share in common that they may be exposed to ritual impurities other than **טומאת מת**, such as **נגעים** and **זיבה**. This halacha originates with the laws of nazir, and the scriptural exposition allows us to extend it to Kohen Gadol as well. The general rule is that a **שורה** works both ways, and we should therefore be able to learn nazir from Kohen Gadol, as well, and say that just as a Kohen Gadol may become defiled for a **מת מצוה**, so too may a nazir. Why, then, asks Tosafos, does the Gemara have to search for a new source for this law?

Tosafos explains that if the Gemara would not find a special phrase in the verse in reference to nazir to teach that he may defile himself for a **מת מצוה**, we would have used the **שורה** only to learn that a nazir may attend to a **מת מצוה**, but we would not have known that a Kohen may become tamei for **נגעים** and **זיבה**, as we would have assumed that a metzora (נגעים) is similar to a **מת**, and they would be all in the same category. This is why we must learn the laws of nazir from a different verse, thus leaving the **שורה** available to teach that a Kohen may defile himself for **זיבה** and **נגעים**. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben
 in memory of
מרת ליבא בת ר' ישעי'

HALACHAH Highlight

Are people more cautious with multiple prohibitions?

מה לי חד לאו מה לי תרין לאווין

What difference does it make whether it is one prohibition or whether it is two prohibitions?

Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that a person who is suspected of violating severe prohibitions (איסור חמור) is certainly suspected of violating less severe prohibitions (איסור קל). The B'tzeil Hachochma² was asked to clarify how this principle will apply when a single food carries multiple prohibitions. For example, what happens if a person is suspected of violating a weighty prohibition related to food "A" and then food "A" becomes prohibited with an additional, less severe, prohibition than the first? Do we say that the two prohibitions combine to make a more weighty prohibition for which this person is not suspected of violating, or perhaps since the second prohibition is less weighty it does not create a more weighty overall prohibition and the person remain suspected for both prohibitions?

B'tzeil Hachochmah begins his analysis of this question by citing the dispute between R' Akiva and R' Yishmael in our Gemara. R' Akiva maintains that one exposition is

needed to teach that a Kohen Gadol should become tamei for a מצוה מת and a second exposition teaches that a Kohen Gadol who is a nazir should become tamei for a מצוה מת. R' Yishmael disagrees based on the rationale that once the Torah teaches that burying a מצוה מת has the capacity to override a prohibition there is no reason to distinguish between one prohibition and multiple prohibitions. It would seem that according to R' Akiva additional prohibitions create a more severe prohibition and thus a second exposition is needed, whereas according to R' Yishmael the second prohibition does not increase the severity of the prohibition. B'tzeil Hachochmah proceeds to suggest that perhaps in our case even R' Yishmael would agree. The reason to distinguish is because R' Yishmael and R' Akiva were addressing a case of something that was prohibited (a Kohen Gadol becoming tamei) for which the Torah made an allowance (for a מצוה מת). In this case it is possible that R' Yishmael maintains that once the Torah excluded מצוה מת from the general prohibition there is no reason to think it was excluded in only one case. However, when dealing with a person who will be violating prohibitions it is logical to assume that even R' Yishmael would agree that two prohibitions are more severe than one prohibition. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' קי"ט סע' ה'

2. שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ג סי' ל"א ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Meis Mitzvah

אל מיטמא הוא למת מצוה

Today's daf discusses מת מצוה. Rav Eliyahu Mann, shlit"a, once asked Rav Chaim Kanievsky, zt"l, "In which of the 613 mitzvos is מת מצוה included?"

"Gemilas Chasadim." responded Rav Chaim.

Any kindness which no one else will do is also an aspect of attending to מת מצוה.

The Chofetz Chaim, zt"l, started making concrete plans to move to Petach Tikvah in Eretz Yisrael toward the end of his life. Although his plans didn't materialize, when the people heard of his intentions, a shul was

built in Petach Tikvah to accommodate the crowds of people expected to wish to be near him when the Chofetz Chaim would finally emigrate. It was quite large and had every convenience, even outfitted with the most modern bathrooms of the times.

Although the Chofetz Chaim did not end up emigrating, the shul served the people of Petach Tikvah, especially during Shabbosos, Chagim, and the Yomim Noraim.

One Erev Yom Kippur, Rav Eliyahu Dushnitzer, zt"l, realized that no one had prepared toilet paper for the crowds of people who would come to the big shul for the "yom hakadosh." He immediately rushed to the bathrooms of the shul, cutting paper in one facility and then for the other to ensure that there would be enough for

all.

As he was doing this, a non-religious teenager passed by and was puzzled by the image of the elderly rabbi rushing from stall to stall with such a sense of purpose and joy. He was sure that the Rabbi was doing something important, but what could he be doing in the bathroom? He decided to ask. When Rav Dushnitzer explained, the young man was very impressed. "Rabbi, know that your paper cutting has made a great impression on my heart."

The young man decided to attend the Yom Kippur services for the first time in his life. This turned out to be a turning point in his life. In the merit of the rabbi's honest concern for his fellow man, this young man did a complete teshuvah! ■