

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Brine (cont.)

R' Dimi concludes his response to Abaye's challenge that was based on his position that nullified tum'ah cannot be reawakened.

Abaye defends his position.

Three challenges to R' Yirmiyah's position that tum'ah can be reawakened are presented and the third challenge leaves R' Yirmiyah silenced.

A possible answer for R' Yirmiyah is suggested but then rejected.

2) Tum'ah not fit for consumption

Bar Padda and R' Yochanan agree that lenient tum'ah, touching neveilah, loses its capacity to transmit tum'ah once it is unfit for a dog but they disagree about stringent tum'ah, carrying neveilah, whether it loses its capacity when it is not fit for a person or a dog.

The source for Bar Padda's position that it loses its capacity to transmit tum'ah when it is unfit for a person is presented.

The exchange between Bar Padda and R' Yochanan about this matter is cited.

R' Yochanan's assumption that neveilah that was always spoiled does not transmit tum'ah is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Brine (cont.)

A Mishnah rules that if water fell into fish brine owned by an am ha'aretz it is considered tamei.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha offers a rationale for this ruling.

This explanation is challenged.

Two resolutions to this challenge are recorded.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah presents two rulings issued by R' Shimon ben Gamliel concerning how we determine whether an animal is subject to the halachos of a bechor.

5) Rulings of this chapter

R' Nachman in the name of Rav asserts that halacha follows the rulings of the Tannaim of this chapter except for when there is a dispute.

R' Sheishes questions whether Rav was awake when he made this statement since the statement is not necessary.

The Gemara answers R' Sheishes's challenge.

Another challenge to Rav's statement is presented. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

When is a food no longer capable of transmitting tum'ah?
אחת זו ואחת זו עד לכלב

A neveilah is tamei, and its level of tum'ah is severe enough to can transmit tum'ah to one who merely carries it (משא). Bar Padda and R' Yochanan discuss the status of the tum'ah of a neveilah which begins to decompose and which becomes inedible. Bar Pada says that a neveilah maintains its level of tum'ah as long as it remains edible for humans. If it begins to decompose and spoil so that it is not edible by man, it no longer transmits tum'ah to one who carries it, but it still transmits tum'ah through direct contact (מגע) as long as it is edible for a dog. R' Yochanan contends that a neveilah maintains its ability both to transmit tum'ah to one who carries it as well as one who touches it directly as long as it is still edible by a dog.

The source for the view of Par Padda is from the posuk (Devarim 14:21) which describes a neveilah as something which can be given to a resident alien. As soon as it no longer serves this role, it does not have the full status of a neveilah. This means that the tum'ah is not so potent, and it does not effect one who merely carries it without direct contact.

R' Yochanan explains that the verse which indicates that tum'ah is suspended under certain circumstances is referring to a case where the neveilah was never fit for human consumption. For example, where a live animal was sick and its body was infested while it was still alive. When the animal died, it was already putrid and not edible by man. According to R' Yochanan, it is this animal which the verse excludes from tum'ah. Par Padda responds by noting that a neveilah which was never edible is not food at all. It is just like a

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the status of parah adumah ashes that become mixed with regular ashes?

2. What is done with a cake of blood discharged by an animal that has never given birth?

3. To what degree does tum'ah have to spoil so that it loses its tum'ah status

4. Why did R' Sheishes assume that Rav was sleeping when he made a statement regarding the Mishnayos of the perek?

HALACHAH Highlight

Nullification

ופלגא לא בטיל

And half is not nullified

Beis Yosef¹ cites authorities who maintain that one may make matzah using water that was not left out overnight if that water is nullified in a majority of water that was left out overnight. Other authorities also cite this principle although they maintain that a simple majority is not sufficient and it is necessary to have two parts water that was left out overnight to every one part of water that was not left out overnight. Maharlbach² notes that Rambam seems to indicate that when nullifying permitted and prohibited substances that blend together it is necessary for the permitted substance to be twice the volume of the prohibited substance. The case that Rambam discusses is a mixture of cheilev from the kidney, that is prohibited, and cheilev from the tail that is permitted that are melted together. He rules that the mixture is permitted, if the permitted cheilev is twice the volume of the prohibited cheilev. Maharlbach comments that he is unaware of an explicit source that establishes this principle other than the fact that when the Gemara discusses nullification it often uses the phrase **חד בתרי בטל** – one unit is nullified in two units. However, he maintains that when it comes to mixtures of dry foods (i.e. foods that do not blend together) it is sufficient if the permitted item is larger than the prohibited item.

Pri Chadash³ writes at great length to prove that the notion that nullification requires two parts permitted items to one part prohibited substance is incorrect. Halachically, it does not matter whether a mixture is dry (items that do not blend together)

(Insight...continued from page 1)
piece of dirt in this regard, and we do not need a special verse to teach that there is no tum'ah.

Tosafos explains the rationale behind the opinion of R' Yochanan. The posuk (Shemos 22:30) discusses an animal which is a tereifah, and it teaches that when a tereifah dies and is a neveilah, it is to be thrown to the dogs to eat. This implies that a neveilah is still potent with its full capacity of tum'ah while it can be given to the dogs. Tosafos refutes this proof, however, because the point of the verse is simply that a neveilah is to be given to the dogs, but not that the meat has deteriorated to the extent that it cannot be eaten by man. Mishnah Acharona (Taharos 8:6) wonders why Tosafos rejects this proof, because the verse is still informing us that the tum'ah of a neveilah is in effect as it is tossed to the dogs to eat. Mishnah Acharona does note that the tossing to the dogs does not clearly mention that the dogs will eat it, so we do not have a proof that the dogs' consuming the meat is legally defined as eating in regard to tum'ah. ■

or liquid (items that blend together); either way a simple majority is all that is needed to nullify the prohibited substance. His primary proof is the pasuk that serves as the source for nullification. The pasuk says **אחרי רבים להטות** – the majority will decide the law. This pasuk does not indicate that a ratio of 2:1 is necessary to effect nullification. The reason the Gemara references the ratio of 2:1 is just that when dealing with units rather than liquids that blend together the only way to effect nullification is to have two pieces of permitted items. ■

1. בית יוסף או"ח סי' תנייה ד"ה כתב.
2. שו"ת מהרלב"ח סי' פ"ח.
3. פרי חדש יו"ד סי' ק"ט סק"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Destroying the Chometz

"עד לכלב..."

On today's daf we find that neveilah retains light defilement as long as it is edible for a dog.

The custom is to burn chometz, making fires to burn what will be forbidden for the duration of the Pesach. Obviously it is important for the fire to be strong enough to burn the chometz, yet sometimes it is difficult to ensure that the chometz is completely incinerated. Many people have a very simple solution for this. They add a flammable solution to the chometz to en-

sure that they have a good blaze that will not go out until the material has been entirely consumed.

Although Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, zt"l, also used such a solution he would not add it to the chometz until much more than a k'zayis was completely consumed by the fire alone. He would also warn his students to at least wait until a k'zayis burned before adding such a fluid. He explained, "It is only when one waits to add such a solution that he fulfills the mitzvah to burn the chometz. If one adds the solution immediately, the chometz is immediately rendered inedible for a dog and one does not fulfill his obligation to burn chometz with it."

He added, "This represents a lost op-

portunity both according to Rav Yehudah who held that chometz must be burned, and according to the sages who held that one may eliminate chometz in any way. Although the sages permitted one to break the chometz down and throw it in to the wind or water—as we find in Orach Chayim 445:1—merely rendering it inedible to a dog is not enough, since it hasn't been eliminated from the world."

Yet Rav Shlomo Zalman would add that we need not point this out to those who add such material from the outset. "It is somewhat plausible that the halachah views anything added to enhance the flame while the chometz is already on fire as part of the act of burning."¹ ■

1. הליכות שלמה, פסח, ע' קל"ח-קל"ט. ■