

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) An אנדרוניוס who sanctified the parah adumah ashes (cont.)

The Gemara records another exposition of one of the verses in the parsha of parah adumah.

2) One who is uncircumcised

R' Sheishes was asked whether one who is uncircumcised is permitted to consume maaser. The two sides of the inquiry are presented.

R' Sheishes attempted to demonstrate that one who is uncircumcised is prohibited to consume maaser.

This proof is refuted.

3) Bikkurim

Chachamim and R' Shimon dispute the permissibility of an און eating teruma. The rationale underlying the relative positions is presented.

The dispute concerning removal of bikkurim is explained.

The source for two laws is presented, namely, the law which prohibits deriving personal benefit from impure bikkurim and maaser sheni while it is burning and the law of one who eats bikkurim and maaser sheni that are impure is liable to lashes.

The source that it is permitted to derive benefit from impure teruma while it is burning is identified.

The source for this ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara infers from a previous statement that one who eats teruma that is impure is not subject to lashes but he has violated a prohibition.

The source for this ruling is identified.

4) One who is uncircumcised (cont.)

R' Ashi begins to suggest another refutation of R' Sheishes' conclusion that one who is uncircumcised is prohibited to consume maaser. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. Richard Tresley  
In loving memory of his father  
ר' יעקב בן ר' זאב, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Rabbi & Mrs. Avrum Reifer  
in memory of his father  
ר' צבי בן ר' שלמה דוד רייפער ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעילוי נשמת מרת נחמה בת ר' יוסף לייב ע"ה  
Mrs. Emma Meystel  
by her family

## Distinctive INSIGHT

Why no lashes for misappropriating מעשר שני

ואסור לבער מהן בטומא, ואוכלן בטומאת עצמן לוקה

Rambam writes (Hilchos Maaser Sheni 3:10): "Maaser Sheni produce must be eaten...it may not be used to buy other items. If someone uses maaser sheni produce to procure other items, even if they are mitzvah items, for example a coffin or shrouds for the dead, he must take money equal to the value of the fruit he misappropriated and take the money to Yerushalayim and buy food there and eat it as he would maaser sheni."

Earlier, in Halacha 2, Rambam writes a similar rule regarding igniting oil of maaser that became impure. Although maaser that has become impure should be ignited, this is not allowed until the value of the oil has been redeemed upon other oil that is pure, as the verse states (Devarim 26:14): "I did not burn from it while it was still impure." We see, however, that Rambam does not mention anything about lashes for someone who improperly uses maaser to buy non-food items, nor for igniting maaser oil that was burned before being redeemed.

Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 610) explains that there are no lashes in these cases because the sages determined that if someone uses maaser improperly, he must designate money to repay what he has taken. The rule is that a person cannot be penalized by having to make payment and to also receive lashes.

Minchas Chinuch notes that in all such cases where we cannot administer two punishments, the one response we have is to give the lashes, rather than to have the person pay the money and to remain exempt from lashes (see Mishnah, Makos 4a). Therefore, in this case where a person illegally expended maaser, we would expect that he would receive lashes, and be exempt from paying. He answers that it must be that our sages had a tradition that the proper response to this misuse of maaser requires that the person make financial restitution. Once this is determined, we then use the rule that he should not pay and also get lashes, and this is why the lashes are suspended. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
l'ilui nishmas for the yahrzeit of my Rebbe,  
Rabbi Yaakov Dovid Rennert  
from Madeline and Justin Schwartz, Monsey, NY

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
In loving memory of our mother's 12<sup>th</sup> yahrzeit  
שבוע שולה בת משה דב הלוי,  
oleho hasholom.  
by her children Alan Jay and Helene Gerber

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Non-kosher medication

טומאת עצמו מנין

What is the source that it is prohibited to eat maaser sheni that is impure?

Tosafos<sup>1</sup> questions the necessity for the Torah to prohibit an impure person from eating teruma. Once the Torah prohibited consuming teruma that is impure it would seem impossible to have a case where the person is impure but the teruma remains tahor. Tosafos answers that one case where this is relevant is where another person puts teruma into the mouth of another who is impure so that the teruma does not become impure. A second suggestion is where the teruma never became susceptible to tumah, e.g. it never came in contact with one of the seven liquids.

Rav Yehudah Rosanes<sup>2</sup>, the Mishneh Lamelech, expresses uncertainty whether swallowing a non-kosher food wrapped in another substance violates the prohibition of eating a non-kosher food. His conclusion is that it depends on whether the wrapping material is edible or not. If the wrapping material is edible the prohibition is violated, but if the wrapping material is not edible the prohibition has not been violated. Dayan Yitzchok Yaakov Weiss<sup>3</sup>, the Minchas Yitzchok, cites our Tosafos as proof to this conclusion. When Tosafos was searching for a case of where the person is impure and the teruma remains tahor, the case of wrapping the teruma in an inedible substance was not suggested. The reason, explains Minchas Yitzchok, is because wrapping the teruma in an inedible substance does constitute an act of eating and thus obviously does not violate the prohibition of eating teruma while impure.

Rav Shalom Mordechai Schwadron<sup>4</sup>, the Maharsham, suggests

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that a טבול יום is permitted to do the service of the parah adumah?
2. Who is the owner of teruma and bikkurim?
3. What is the source that an אונן is prohibited to eat bikkurim?
4. Is one permitted to derive personal benefit from teruma that is burning?

that one who must take medication that contains non-kosher ingredients can utilize the position of Mishneh Lamelech, namely to wrap the medication in an inedible substance before swallowing. Rav Nosson Gestetner<sup>5</sup>, the L'horos Nosson, makes the same suggestion for a person who must take medication on Pesach that contains chometz. If the chometz medication is wrapped in paper or a capsule it is not considered eating and thus permitted. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach<sup>6</sup>, however, writes that although the capsule is an inedible substance, nevertheless, since that is the normal way the medication is swallowed it is considered eating. Therefore, this is not a valid method of taking medication that contains a prohibited substance. ■

1. ד"ה טומאת עצמו
2. משנה למלך פי"ד מהל' מאכלות אסורות הי"ב
3. שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ט סי' ע"ט
4. שו"ת מהרש"ם ח"ד סי' קל"ז
5. שו"ת להורות נתן ח"א יו"ד סי' פ"ו
6. שו"ת מנחת שלמה תנינא סי' ס"ה וח"ב סי' ס"ג ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

*"And the pure will sprinkle on the impure..."*

והזה הטהור על הטמא טהור מכלל שהוא טמא  
לימד על טבול יום שכשר בפרה

Someone once asked the Vilna Gaon, ז"ל, "The Gemara in Yevamos 73a brings an idea that is somewhat difficult to understand. The verse says that, 'the pure will sprinkle on the impure.' This seems to clearly indicate that only one who is already ritually pure may sprinkle the ashes of the red heifer. Yet our Gemara states that from the very word 'pure' we learn that a טבול יום may also sprinkle the ashes of the heifer even though he hasn't yet completed his purification process. Where

did the Gemara learn this from? As we know, a verse does not deviate from its simple meaning. How did Chazal derive this interpretation that appears to contradict the verse itself?"

The Vilna Gaon explained without hesitation, "The general rule is every time we find an exclusionary statement that directly follows another, it is meant to be inclusive. The obvious question that comes to mind is why should the Torah make use of a 'double negative' in order to indicate positive inclusion? Why not just use inclusive language at the outset? The Yerushalmi explains that we need two מיעוטים because the use of inclusive language after exclusionary language would simply uproot the first statement. In other words, it would be too inclusive. If, on the

other hand, we use two מיעוטים, we achieve a more limited type of inclusion, which is the exact nuance needed in that particular situation.

The Gaon continued, "This is the explanation of our Gemara. In the verse it states, 'And the pure shall immerse in the water.' 'This is the first מיעוט—the pure, and not just anyone, will immerse. Then we find a second verse that also uses the term 'pure'—and that is the second מיעוט, which now opens a window of inclusion. It cannot come to include one who is completely defiled, since this would contradict the word 'pure' of the first verse entirely. For this reason, the Gemara concludes that the inclusion implied by the two exclusions is a טבול יום—someone who is somewhat, but not completely, pure!" ■