

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of ישראל צבי בן זאב גוטליב ז"ל

By the Weiss/Gotlib Families—London, England

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Finding a needle in the flesh of a slaughtered korban (cont.)

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel explains that the reason the flesh of the slaughtered korban is susceptible to receive tum'ah from the needle is that the Mishnah is discussing an animal that walked through a river on the way to the Beis HaMikdash and was still wet at the time it was slaughtered.

Two explanations are presented to explain the Mishnah's ruling that if the needle is found in the excrement of the slaughtered animal everything remains tahor.

2) Sheretz tum'ah

A teacher of Baraisos cited a Baraisa before R' Sheishes that listed the extent tum'ah from a sheretz may go.

3) Tum'ah in an earthenware utensil

A Mishnah is cited that teaches that when a sheretz is found in an earthenware oven the oven is a first-degree tum'ah and the bread is a second-degree tum'ah.

Rava cites a source which indicates that we do not look at the oven as if it is filled with tum'ah thus causing the bread to be a first-degree tum'ah.

4) Clarifying R' Yehoshua's position

R' Chisda notes a contradiction between R' Yehoshua's ruling in the Mishnah and a statement made by R' Yosi in a Baraisa. In the Mishnah he ruled that safek tum'ah may be burned with terumah that is definitely tamei, and yet in the Baraisa, R' Yosi implies that there is no Tanna who would permit such an act.

R' Chisda distinguishes between R' Yosi's understanding of R' Yehoshua and R' Shimon's understanding.

R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina notes a contradiction between R' Yehoshua's ruling in the Mishnah concerning terumah and his ruling regarding terumah on erev Pesach. He also resolves the apparent contradiction by distinguishing between R' Yosi's understanding of R' Yehoshua and R' Shimon's understanding.

R' Elazar notes a contradiction between two rulings issued by R' Yehoshua concerning terumah. He resolves the apparent contradiction by distinguishing between circumstances where the owner will suffer a financial loss and circumstances where the owner will not suffer financially.

Although Rava questions this distinction Abaye defends it and cites a Baraisa that also draws this distinction.

5) Taking measures to avoid a possible transgression

As a side note to the previous discussion, the Gemara teaches that there is a dispute between Tannaim whether one must take measures to prevent inadvertent violations with prohibited items. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

How does the meat become susceptible to tum'ah?

אמר רבי יהודה אמר שמואל כגון שהיתה פרה של זבחי שלמים והעבירה בנהר ושחטה ועדיין משקה טופח עליו

Rabbi Yehuda said in the name of Shmuel: We are dealing with a case where the shelamim animal was taken through a river, and when it was slaughtered it still has some water on its hide.

Rashi explains that after the animal was walked through the river, some of the water which remained on the hide then dripped on the flesh, thus rendering it susceptible to tum'ah. Tosafos points out a problem with this explanation. Any water which remains on the hide is now detached from its source (תלוש) because this water does not flow onto the flesh from the river itself. We learned earlier (16a) that such water can only be מכשיר if we have a verse which teaches us that it does so. There, Shmuel holds that the verse "יטמא" refers to the ability of the liquids themselves to contract tum'ah, and not that it has the power to be מכשיר while detached. How, then, can our Gemara be speaking about water which is תלוש and its ability to allow the meat to be susceptible to tum'ah?

Chazon Ish writes that Rashi simply means that such water can be מכשיר the meat מדרבנן. The Gemara is therefore explaining that this water which originated outside the courtyard of the Mikdash is not one of the "liquids of the courtyard—משקי בית מטבחיא" and it therefore has the ability to be מכשיר at least on a rabbinic level. Tosafos, on the other hand, holds that although this water came from outside the Mikdash, nevertheless, now that it has been brought in, it is under the category of משקי בית מטבחיא and it cannot be מכשיר while detached. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the principle of חיבת קודש?
2. What halachah is triggered by the image of a beer keg?
3. How could it be asserted that our Mishnah, which cites R' Yosi, is in reality a reflection of R' Shimon's opinion?
4. How did Abaye prove that we distinguish between a significant financial loss and a minor financial loss?

HALACHAH Highlight

Impure terumah – can one keep it?

דומי ליה בכלי מאוס, יין נמי רמי ליה בכלי מאוס, לזילוף קא
בעי ליה בכלי מאוס רמי ליה?

Oil which is tamei should be placed in a repulsive container (כלי מאוס) and the container will act as a reminder that its contents are tamei. This will prevent the owner from inadvertently using it whilst in a state of purity. The Gemara asks: Perhaps tamei wine should also be placed in a כלי מאוס and preserve it (wine which has just been produced and needs to mature). The Gemara responds: Where the person is preserving the wine for fragrance he will not wish to place it in a כלי מאוס! Since the purpose of keeping the wine would be to use it as a room freshener, if it would be placed in an odious container the wine would smell terrible as well.

The implication of the Gemara and Rashi's¹ explanation is that mature wine that could be used immediately is permitted to be used for זילוף, i.e. to exude a pleasant fragrance. Since it can be used immediately there is no suspicion that the owner may mistake it for pure wine and unwittingly breach his state of purity. Likewise, impure oil is permissible to be used, as it can be used immediately.

Rambam and Meiri² contest this understanding and rule that even mature wine is forbidden to be used for its fragrance because of the fear of unwitting usage.

Rema³ rules that nowadays when no terumah is con-

sumed there is no fear of misuse of terumah temeiah (impure terumah). One may leave it in his house in a normal container and he does not have to place it in a כלי מאוס. However, the Gra disagrees with this ruling. R' Chaim Kanievsky⁵ writes that the Rema's ruling was only for his time, but in today's times when there are so many Jews in the land of Israel and therefore significant amounts of terumah, one should be cautious. Therefore, he writes, our custom is to wrap the terumah temeiah in paper and place it in the garbage, as the Chazon Ish writes.

Today, it seems that there are huge containers which are not at all repulsive and are used to contain impure terumah oil. This oil is later given to shuls⁶ for the purpose of lighting. Apparently they rely on the opinion of the Rema and disagree with R' Kanievsky's understanding. Accordingly, one should ask his Posek what to do. ■

1. וכ"כ עוד כמה ראשונים עי' בדרך אמונה בהלכות תרומות פרק י"ב בציון ההלכה ס"ק ע'
2. המעירי כאן נראה שמפרש כן בכונת הרמב"ם בהלכות תרומות הנ"ל, וג"ז בצ"ה הנ"ל
3. הרמ"א בעור"ד סימן של"א סעיף י"ט. ושי"ך שם ס"ק ל"א
4. בגר"א שם ס"ק מ"ב. ולכאור' ר"ל רק להקשות ואצ"ל שהגר"א חולק לדינא. ובד"א שם ק"ה וכן שם פ"ב בצ"ה ס"ק ת"ג הבין שהגר"א חלק על קולת הרמ"א לדינא—וצ"ע
5. בהלכות תרומות פ"ב הי"ד בבאה"ל בסוד"ה מדליקין, אמנם בד"א גופא שם בפ"ב ס"ק ק"ה סתם כרמ"א וגר"א גם בזמה"ז. וצ"ע
6. ונראה שטעמם הוא יפ"י הרמ"א הנ"ל שמותר להדליק לכהן ואח"כ ישראל יהנה ע"ש. וסומכים על חזקת כהנים שבזמה"ז שהם כהנים (וכמו שסומכים לענין פדיון הבן ולענין לברך ברכת כהנים. וכעב"ש ביור"ד סי' ש"ה סנ"ה, וכן עי"ש בגליון מהרש"א שם בס"ח, ופת"ש ס"ק י"ב ודלא כיעב"ץ, ואכמ"ל ושוב מצאתי דרך אמונה בהלכות תרומות פ"ב ס"ק קל"ט דלא נח"ל בחזקת כהנים בזה ■

STORIES off the Daf

Kodesh has a special status

חיבת הקדש מכשרתן

The idea that because something has more holiness should actually cause it to become impure is beautifully explained by the Or HaChaim HaKodosh in Parshas Chukas. The Or HaChaim questions why it is that a person who dies is more tamei than

an animal, and why a Jew is more tamei than a non-Jew? He explains this by way of a parable. Two pails of garbage might be sitting one next to the other, and while one will attract thousands of insects, the other sits untouched. The reason for this is simple: the first pail contains remnants of sweet fruits and vegetables; the second contains more dirt and wood shavings. The insects are attracted to the first because it contains the residue of something sweet, as opposed

to the second container.

Or HaChaim points out that the same is true with tum'ah. By nature, tum'ah is attracted to things which have or had at one time a high level of kedushah. This also explains why our Gemara says that although most foods, which are plain Chulin, need special hechsher, i.e. exposure to liquid, to attract tum'ah, however, kodesh due to its higher level of sanctification attracts tum'ah by virtue of itself. ■

