



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Niddah blood (cont.)

Another unsuccessful challenge to the Baraisa's analogy between a niddah and her blood is recorded.

2) Flesh of a corpse

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan offer different sources that the flesh of a corpse transmits tum'ah even when it is dried.

The practical difference between the two opinions is presented.

Reish Lakish's opinion is unsuccessfully challenged.

A challenge against both Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan is presented.

R' Ada bar Ahavah responds to this challenge.

R' Ada bar Ahavah's response is challenged and revised until found acceptable.

A second version of this discussion is recorded.

3) Zivah

A Baraisa presents the source that zivah transmits tum'ah.

The Gemara identifies the source for some of the other guidelines of the capacity of zivah to transmit tum'ah.

4) Saliva of a zav

A Baraisa presents the source that the saliva of a zav transmits tum'ah.

A point raised in the Baraisa is clarified.

The Gemara searches for additional sources related to the capacity of saliva to transmit tum'ah.

5) Body fluids

Rav and R' Yochanan disagree about the mucus referenced in the Mishnah.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges Rav's opinion that the Mishnah refers to mucus that is drawn out of one's mouth.

R' Yochanan's opinion that the Mishnah refers to mucus drawn out of one's nose is unsuccessfully challenged.

Tangentially, the Gemara presents the sources that tears, blood of a wound and milk from a zav convey tum'ah of liquids.

The Gemara begins to identify the sources that urine transmits severe tum'ah. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Skin from a human corpse is tamei

ומה טעם אמרו טמא גזרה שמא יעשה אדם עורות אביו ואמו שטיחין לחמור

The Mishnah in Chullin (122a) teaches regarding all creatures whose corpses are sources of tum'ah, that the skins of these creatures are also sources of tum'ah as much as the flesh.

In reference to this Mishnah, R' Ada b. Ahava explains that in order for anything to be tamei like the flesh of a dead creature it must share the following two characteristics with flesh: it must be a part of the body which was born with the creature, and it must be non-renewable if it would be cut off the live animal. This rule excludes teeth, which are not grown out when a creature is born, and it also excludes hair and nails, which are renewable when they become cut. The Gemara points out that the rule of R' Ada would seem to also exclude skin, which is renewable. Ulla explains that the law of the Torah is that the skin of a person is tahor because it is unlike the flesh of the dead. The reason it is tamei is rabbinic, and the reason the rabbis made this exception is that if the skin would be tahor, people would take the skin from their parents and process it and use it for a carpet. Now that it is tamei, people will bury the skin with the rest of the body.

Many Rishonim point out that it should not have been necessary to declare skin of a person to be tamei just in order to prevent relatives from using skins and make carpets from it. The halacha is that it is prohibited to benefit from the dead (see Avoda Zara 29b), so there should not have been any suspicion that people would take part of a dead person's body and use it for personal benefit. Several answers are offered to resolve this issue.

Tosafos explains that the issue of tum'ah was more serious in people's minds, more than the prohibition against using the dead for personal benefit. Tosafos also suggests that skin is not included in the prohibition against benefit from the dead. The source that the dead may not be used for benefit is from eglarufah, which itself is compared to an offering which may not be used for personal benefit. However, the skin of an animal used for an offering is eventually permitted for personal benefit, once the blood of the offering is placed on the Altar. Therefore, we might have concluded that the skin of the dead is permitted for benefit, until the rule of tum'ah was placed upon the skin.

Ramban explains that people would not use the skins for carpets for personal benefit, but they would delay the funeral of a relative to use the skin to place before themselves at the funeral for its emotional impact. The rabbis declared the skin tamei to prevent delays in conducting funerals and to avoid desecration of the dead. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Replacing a tooth on Shabbos

חוצ מן השנים

Except for the teeth

It happened once that a person's tooth fell out on Shabbos. A dentist advised him that if he were to return the tooth to its place immediately it would be possible that it would reattach and he would not need any additional dental procedures to save the tooth. The question was whether it is permitted to return the tooth to its place on Shabbos. The basis for leniency is based on an opinion cited in Shulchan Aruch¹ that permits violating a Rabbinic prohibition without even deviating from the normal way the melacha is performed in order to save a limb. Mishnah Berurah² rules that according to halacha this opinion is the primary opinion to follow. Accordingly, the question is whether the risk of losing a tooth qualifies for this leniency or perhaps losing a tooth is not considered a danger to a limb. Furthermore, it is not clear that replacing a tooth involves only a Rabbinic prohibition of construction, it may be that replacing a tooth violates the Biblical prohibition of construction.

Teshuvos Shevet HaLevi³ responded that it is obvious to him that the loss of a tooth does not qualify for the leniency that applies to a limb in danger since a tooth is not a limb. This is evident from our Gemara that teaches that a detached tooth from a corpse does not transmit tum'ah of a corpse. The reason is that people are not created with teeth

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that dried flesh from a corpse transmits tumah?

2. What is an example of something that transmits tumah to other things but it is tahor?

3. What is the point of dispute between Rav and R' Yochanan?

4. What are the nine liquids of a zav?

and if it is missing it does not leave a scar. The rationale why Rema⁴ permits a gentile to remove one's tooth that aches is that a toothache qualifies as an ache but it does not mean that a tooth is considered a limb. Additionally, he considers replacing a tooth a violation of construction on a Biblical level and as such does not even qualify for this leniency.

In the event that placement will only be temporary, and it will be necessary for the dentist to perform a procedure after Shabbos to save the tooth Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach⁵ rules that it may be returned to its place on Shabbos. ■

1. שריע ארייח סיי שכייח סעי' י"ז.
2. מייב שם ס"ק נ"ז.
3. שריית שבט הלוי חייח סיי צ"ב.
4. רמ"א סיי שכייח סעי' ג'.
5. נשמת אברהם סיי שיימ סק"ז 7. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Sharing the Holy Effect

לאחרים גורם טומאה לעצמו לא כ"ש

Rav Tzaddok Hakohein of Lublin, ז"ל, learns an inspiring lesson from a statement on today's daf. "It is only fitting that the Chanukah lights be called kodesh since they impart holiness in the heart of every Jew. The Chanukah lights make a Jew realize that Hashem dwells with us even now.

"This is similar to the statement of our sages in Niddah 55 regarding defilement: since it causes others to be impure, it should certainly be impure itself.

Yet the Gemara there rejects this kal vachomer, since we find that the se'ir la'azazel imparts impurity even though it is not impure. And in the Midrash we find that although a dead body imparts impurity, the body itself is surely not impure.¹ We can explain that a zav who saw impurity is not impure herself, he merely saw something that is impure and imparts defilement. And the same is true with a body. It imparts impurity because the neshamah left it."

He went on, "But Chanukah lights are different than other mitzvos. Even if the person feels holiness in his heart due to the mitzvah, this doesn't mean that the mitzvah should be called holy since the main influence of other mitzvos is

imparted while they are performed. But Chanukah lights are an exception, since they imbue holiness in a person's heart all the while that they shine, and they must remain lit for at least half an hour. During this time, they show that God dwells among us, similar to the function of the menorah in the Beis HaMikdash. We now understand why the Avudraham writes that the Chanukah lamps specifically are called kodesh since they resemble the Menorah in the Beis HaMikdash. We also understand why the kal vachomer is applicable here."² ■

1. ילקוט שמעוני, חוקת, רמז תשס"א, מספרי זוטא
2. פרי צדיק, חנוכה ■