

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara infers from the Mishnah that if a yevama has relations with someone other than her yavam she is not disqualified from marrying a kohen which would refute R' Hamnuna who maintains that she is disqualified.

The inference is refuted.

The Gemara infers that the Mishnah does not follow R' Yehudah who maintains that an איילונית is disqualified from marrying a kohen simply because she is an איילונית.

2) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses whether the wife of a סריס חמה, סריס חמה or סריס חמה is permitted to eat teruma. Additionally the Mishnah discusses whether an אנדרוניוס is permitted to marry.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The first ruling emphasizes that a kohen allows his wife to eat teruma even if he cannot father children.

4) The אנדרוניוס kohen

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan agree that the אנדרוניוס kohen gives his wife terumah but they disagree whether his wife is permitted to eat the priestly portion of kodshim kalim.

It is clarified that Reish Lakish's lenient position concerning terumah applies only for teruma that is Rabbinic.

It emerges from the dispute that Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan also dispute whether teruma nowadays is Biblical or Rabbinic.

The relevant Mishnah to this dispute concerning teruma is cited.

The Baraisa cited by R' Yochanan to support his position regarding nullification is cited and explained.

R' Chiya the son of R' Huna suggests an alternative explanation to the Baraisa that does not refute Reish Lakish. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the wife of a סריס חמה permitted to eat teruma?
2. What is the difference between the phrases כל שדרכו and את שדרכו לימנות?
3. What ratio is needed to nullify vineyard kilayim?
4. When does meat lose its importance so that it is no longer counted?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Nullifying an item which is prohibited from benefit
כולן ידלקו דברי רבי מאיר וחכמים אומרים יעלו באחד ומאתים

This Mishnah in Kilayim cites two opinions regarding kilayim produce which falls into and mixes with a larger amount of non-kilayim produce. Rebbe Meir holds that we do not rely upon ביטול, and the entire mixture must be destroyed by fire. Chachamim hold that if the kilayim is outnumbered by a ratio of 201:1, the blend may be salvaged. The entire pile is permitted for benefit and even to eat.

Tosafos (ד"ה כולן ידלקו) notes that there is a third opinion in this matter, that of Rebbe Eliezer, whose opinion is even accepted for the halacha. His opinion is that one bundle at random is removed and thrown into the Dead Sea, while the remaining bundles are permitted. Rebbe Eliezer appears in Avoda Zara 49b in the context of bread baked in an oven heated with prohibited avoda zara wood. The rationale for his opinion is that, after all, we do not allow the owner to benefit from the prohibited item. If there are 202 bundles, although we do not know which one is the prohibited item, we do know that only 201 of the bundles are permitted. The prohibited item is בטל, but one item must still be removed and destroyed. Why does the Mishnah in Kilayim not mention the opinion of Rebbe Eliezer?

Tosafos answers that Rebbe Eliezer only requires disposing of one item when it comes to avoda zara, which is more stringent than other cases of איסורי הנאה, such as kilayim.

Alternatively, Rebbe Eliezer only requires an item to be destroyed by being thrown into the Dead Sea in cases where the original source of איסור הנאה is no longer intact. These were a case of bread which was baked in an oven heated with sticks of avoda zara, and a garment woven using a needle of avoda zara. In both of these cases we take a token amount and toss it away, because the actual prohibited item is no longer intact. However, in the case of the bundles of kilayim, the actual prohibited item is still intact, mixed into the blend. In this case, Rebbe Eliezer would not necessarily permit the remaining bundles merely by destroying one bundle at random. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Nullifying mitzvah objects

אבל חתיכה של חטאת טהורה שנתערבה במאה חתיכות של חולין טהורות וכו' דברי הכל לא תעלה

But if one piece of tahor chatas meat becomes mixed with one hundred pieces of tahor chullin... all opinions agree that it does not become nullified

Rabbeinu Yisroel Isserlin¹, the Terumas Hadeshen, expressed uncertainty about the halacha of the following case. There were a number of people who lit their Chanukah menorah in the same room and one of the Chanukah candles became intermingled with two other candles used as the shamash. Is it possible to rule that the Chanukah candle is nullified by the majority of other candles and thus permitted to derive benefit from the three candles?

Terumas Hadeshen writes that the principle that objects that are counted are not nullified is not limited to the way the objects are sold in the market; rather even objects sold by weight but counted when utilized for a mitzvah are also considered objects that are counted and are not nullified in a majority. Accordingly, although candles are sold by weight, nevertheless, since when used for the mitzvah of lighting candles on Chanukah they are counted, they are considered objects sold by number and are not nullified by a majority. Therefore, concerning the question at hand the mitzvah candle that became

mixed amongst two other candles is not nullified and all three candles are prohibited from benefit. Proof to this principle can be found in Tosafos' comment to our Gemara. Tosafos² notes that a piece of Korban meat is not considered significant (ראויה להתכבד) since it is only fit to be eaten by kohanim, even though were it not for its sanctity it would be a significant piece of meat. Tosafos thus focuses on the present condition of the object (i.e. its sanctity) rather than its general condition (i.e. significant for guests) even to be lenient, certainly in our case where this principle is used for stringency the principle will hold true.

This ruling is cited by Rema³ but Rav Shlomo Luria⁴, the Maharshah, disagrees and maintains that the candle is nullified. Rav Dovid Halevi⁵, the Taz, writes that even according to Rema this ruling is limited to when the candles became intermingled during Chanukah and could be used for the mitzvah the following day. If they were mixed up on the last day of Chanukah or later the candles revert back to their standard status of an object sold by weight that could be nullified by a majority. Mishnah Berurah⁶ notes that a majority of authorities follow the ruling of Rema. ■

1. שו"ת תרומת הדשן סי' ק"ג
2. תוס' ד"ה דברי הכל
3. רמ"א או"ח סי' תרע"ג סע' א'
4. ע' מ"ב שם ס"ק כ"ב שמביא דבריו
5. ט"ז שם סק"ו
6. ע' שער הציון שם ס"ק כ"ד ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Lechem HaPanim

פרוסה של לחם הפנים טהורה שנתערבה במאה פרוסות של חולין

It is well known that the famous Rashash learned the entire Shas in depth. But many are unaware that he was also a wealthy banker. When the Shaagas Aryeh, ז"ל, visited the Rashash's well-appointed home, the two spoke in learning. During their conversation, the Shaagas Aryeh exclaimed, "All this opulence and you can also learn?"

Once, when the Netziv, ז"ל, was a young man, he visited the Rashash who was twenty three years his senior. The Rashash asked the Netziv a difficult question that had been on his mind.

"The Gemara in Yevamos 81b im-

plies that if any amount of bread was mixed with the lechem hapanim and a person is not able to distinguish one element from the other, the entire mixture must be treated with the sanctity of the lechem hapanim. Tosafos explains why bitul does not apply in this case. Since the lechem hapanim is more 'chamir' (material or corporeal), such bread is considered important enough to serve a guest of honor. This is one of several categories that Chazal decreed cannot be nullified when in an admixture. It is not clear, however, why something chamir is in this category. What makes the matter more difficult to understand is that Tosafos in Zevachim 72b says that the lechem hapanim cannot be nullified in a mixture because the flour is so very fine. This makes lechem hapanim a delicacy that one would give an hon-

ored guest. Is this not clearly in contradiction with the Tosafos in Yevamos?"

The Netziv considered this question and said, "Instead of 'chamir' the word should be 'chavir,' which means fine. Sometimes we find that two letter vavs in a manuscript run into one another and resemble a mem. The printer must have inadvertently changed chavir to chamir. Then we find that the two Tosafos are in perfect agreement!"

Although the Rashash was thrilled with this answer, he still had a question. "Why didn't I find the solution myself?"

The Netziv explained, "His honor toils in Torah amidst great wealth and honor. I learn Torah in difficult material circumstances. Such challenges force one to exert greater effort. Naturally, more toil opens up much deeper wellsprings of understanding!" ■

