

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The Mishkan coverings

A Baraisa describes the two coverings of the Mishkan and notes that the upper layer made of goat hair required greater wisdom to manufacture than the lower one.

2) The wagons used to transport the beams of the Mishkan

Rav states: The area beneath, between, and to the side of the wagons was public domain.

Abaye states: The space between the wagons was five amos, the same as the length of a wagon. The Gemara explains why the wagon was five amos long.

Rava explains how the five amos of the wagon was distributed and why it was distributed in that way.

The Gemara explains how we derive the requirement that a public domain must be sixteen amos wide.

3) MISNAH: The Mishnah spells out when a person would be liable for placing an object onto or removing an object from a rock or the bank of a pit.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains that the reason the Mishnah discusses the bank of a pit is to teach that we combine the depth of the pit and the height of the bank to create a ten tefach partition enclosing a private domain.

5) Questions of liability

R' Mordechai asked Rava: If someone threw an object from a public domain onto a pillar ten tefachim high and four tefachim by four tefachim wide, is he liable? Do we say he is liable because the object was lifted from the public domain and placed into a private domain or perhaps since it had to pass through an exempt area (the airspace above the public domain) he is exempt?

Rava, R' Yosef and Abaye all held that he is liable based upon our Mishnah, and R' Mordechai rejected their proof.

R' Meyasha quotes a question posed by R' Yochanan: If someone threw an object onto a wall that is not four tefachim wide but was built to enclose a karmelis, thereby making it into a private domain, is he liable? Do we associate the wall with the private domain and consider the entire area filled and therefore he would be liable, or do we look at the wall by itself and he would be exempt?

Ulla answered that if the wall can make another area into a private domain, it itself is certainly a private domain.

R' Yochanan asked: If a pit was nine tefachim deep and a person lifted a tefach of dirt and threw it into the public domain is he liable? Furthermore, if a pit was ten tefachim deep and a person threw a clump of dirt from the street thereby minimizing its depth, is he liable?

The Gemara unsuccessfully attempts to answer the in-

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Unity as we Traverse the Desert of the Diaspora

אמר רבא צידי עגלה כמלא רחב עגלה וכו'

The verse in Bamidbar 7:3 teaches that there were six wagon used to transport the Mishkan. Four were designated for the sons of Merari to be used to transport the beams of the Mishkan. The other two wagons were for the sons of Gershon, and they were used to carry the various curtains and coverings of the Mishkan.

The twelve nesi'im of the twelve tribes each joined together in pairs to contribute one wagon per couple. Sforno highlights that the fact that there was a wagon for every two of nesi'im was an indication of the brotherhood that existed between them. The princes were certainly wealthy enough so that each one could bring his own wagon. The reason that two shared one wagon was to demonstrate the unity which reigned in their midst.

The Sanctuary is called "Mishkan" - indicating that the Shechina dwells therein. Tradition teaches us that it only dwells in the midst of unity, while it departs when there is strife and friction in Israel. It is because of this unity that they were worthy of the Divine Presence dwelling among them, as we learn (Devarim 33:5): "And there was a king in Yeshurun when the heads of the people were gathered", as opposed to the picture that is presented in Hoshea (10:2): "Their heart is divided; now shall they bear their guilt." ■

REVIEW and Remember

- Which phrase indicates that the covering made of goat hair required greater wisdom?
- What is the source for the requirement that a public domain be sixteen amos wide?
- Why did R' Mordechai reject the proof offered by Rava, R' Yosef, and Abaye from our Mishnah?
- Why did the Gemara reject the comparison between the case of the fig thrown against the wall and the case of throwing dirt into a pit?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ ר' יהודה בן ר' דוד ע"ה
By the Schwabacher Family

HALACHAH Highlight

Is exiting the Mikveh the final component of the purification process?

בעי רבי יוחנן: בור תשעה, ועקר ממנו חוליא והשלימה לעשרה – מהו?
עקירת חפץ ועשיית מחיצה בהדי הדדי קאתו ומיחייב או לא מיחייב?

Rebbi Yochanan queried: if a pit 9 tefachim deep existed in the public domain and a person stepped forward and removed from the bottom of the pit a section of earth that was one tefach in depth, and placed the earth to the side of the pit in the public domain. This act of removal brought the total depth of the pit to the necessary 10 tefachim. In such a case, do we consider that the lifting of the item (i.e. – the earth) and the creation of a partition that classifies the pit as a private domain arrive simultaneously and as such the person would be liable, or not?

The Kesef Mishneh¹ presents a remarkable assertion. He posits that a ritually impure individual who has immersed in a Mikveh only attains the desired state of ritual purity when he exits the Mikveh after immersion, and not after immersion alone. This intriguing assertion has been the center of much discussion in the Rabbinic literature. Amongst the noteworthy deliberations of this concept is in Avnei Nezer². The Avnei Nezer notes that the language of the Torah³ regarding purification from ritual impurity by immersion in a Mikveh is **ורחץ במים** (and he will immerse in water), this would appear to indicate that the immersion alone is the purifying factor, and does not require exiting the Mikveh to attain purity. However, he concedes that the language in the Gemara⁴ that states **טבל ועלה - אוכל במעשר** (if he immersed and exited – he may eat Ma'aser) implies that the exiting is the necessary completing step of the purification process, although he notes that indeed that passage would need clarification.

One of the reasons that the Avnei Nezer suggests in his dismissal of the Kesef Mishneh's concept involves our passage. If an individual immersed themselves in a Mikveh that has precisely forty se'ah of water in it, which represents the minimum quantity of water for an acceptable Mikveh, their immersion is considered valid⁵. This is true notwithstanding the fact that when they exit the Mikveh they will carry with them a small amount of water

(Overview...continued from page 1)

quiry from another ruling of R' Yochanan.

Rava asked: If a person threw a board onto pegs making the structure into a private domain and at the same time threw another object that landed on the board, is he liable? Do we look at the situation as if the two objects landed simultaneously resulting in the thrower being exempt, or do we look at it as if they landed one after the other resulting in liability.

The Gemara concludes with **תיקו**.

Rava begins laying the groundwork for a question related to objects at rest rather than floating. ■

that will reduce the water level to below the minimum and invalidate the Mikveh for further usage. This would seem to contradict the opinion of the Kesef Mishneh, because when the person exits the Mikveh, the Mikveh will no longer be valid⁶. Possibly one would contend that being that the Mikveh was valid prior to his exiting, even though it became invalidated upon his exiting, we would follow the original status of the Mikveh (**בתר מעיקרא אזלין**). The Avnei Nezer counters this proposal by remarking that if this was so, then the Gemara could resolve the question presented in our passage. The Gemara could resolve Rebbi Yochanan's inquiry by referencing the matter of an impure person immerses in a Mikveh that contains precisely forty se'ah. The resolution would be: as in the case of Mikveh, we follow the original status of the Mikveh, so to here in our passage as well we should be able to follow the original status, and the pit would not be granted the new status of private domain. Being that the Gemara does not utilize this option must indicate that it is incorrect, and as such could not be applied to Mikveh either. ■

1. כסף משנה (פ"ו מהל' שאר אבות הטומאות ה"ז)

2. שו"ת אבני נזר (חח"מ סוף סי' עב)

3. ויקרא (יד, ח. טו, ה) ועוד הרבה פעמים

4. פסחים (דף לה ע"א), יבמות (דף עד ע"ב), נדה (דף עא ע"ב)

5. ע"י שו"ע (נ"ד סי' רא סעיף סב)

6. לצ"ח שבשו"ת פרי יצחק ח"ב (סי' לה) ובדבר אברהם ח"ג (סי' יט) דנו לדעת הכסף משנה אם צריך לצאת כולו מן המקוה או אפילו עליית מקצתו מספיק. ע"ש. ■

Gemara GEM

The Holy Connection

ונראין קרסין בלולאות ככוכבים ברקיע

The Gemara describes how the hooks which were used to connect the two panels of the curtains shined forth and had the appearance of the stars of the heavens. This is based upon the verse (Shemos 26:3): "Five curtains shall be coupled together one to another; and the other five

curtains shall be coupled one to another." The ten rows of curtains for the top of the Mishkan were made into two sets of five curtains. These two sets were then connected by a series of loops and hooks.

Why, though, were these originally to be two sets, and then connected? They could have been sewn as one larger group of ten rows, and there would have been no need for the loops and hooks?

Shem MiShmuel explains that it was essential that the outer chamber of the Mishkan and the inner sanctum - the Ko-

desh Kodoshim - be separate and distinct areas. If they were to be covered by a single roofing unit, these two rooms would have been united under one roof, thus transforming them into two sections of a single building. Now, however, they were each covered by a separate section of five curtains. Although these pieces were connected, the loops and hooks straddled the tops of the beams which divided the holy from the holy of holies. In this manner, the two areas were distinct structures with independent roofing. ■

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center, under the leadership of

HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"א

HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HaRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, Rosh Kollel; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.

Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.