

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Tum'ah of a neveilah (cont.)

The source that non-domesticated animals are included in the term בהמה is presented.

The source that domesticated animals are included in the term חיה is presented.

The Gemara illustrates the significance of these rules with four different halachos.

2) Explaining the dispute (cont.)

The Gemara explains how Tanna Kamma utilizes the verse cited by R' Yosi HaGalili.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses if and when the midwife or the mother become tamei if a fetus dies while in the womb.

4) Swallowed objects

Rabbah teaches that just as a swallowed object that is tamei does not transmit tum'ah so too a tahor object that is swallowed does not become tamei.

The source that a swallowed object that is tamei does not transmit tum'ah is presented.

This source is unsuccessfully challenged.

The source that a tahor object that is swallowed does not become tamei is presented.

This source is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara inquires after the source that these same rules apply to tum'ah swallowed by the lower orifice.

The source that is presented is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara inquires after the source that these same rules apply to objects swallowed by animals.

A source is presented.

This source is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava notes that both principles of Rabba can be found in the Mishnah.

The Gemara explains why Rabbah's teaching was necessary. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Tum'ah as it applies to man vis-à-vis its application to animals

בכדי אכילת פרס פת חטים ולא פת שעורים מיסב ואוכל בליפתן

The Gemara discusses various aspects of tum'ah which is "swallowed up." After the Gemara identifies the source for this halacha in regard to man, and that a person's body can shield tum'ah from spreading, the Gemara continues and searches for the source that this limit for tum'ah also applies to something that is inside the body of an animal.

The Gemara presents a kal vachomer to prove that if swallowed-up tum'ah does not have an effect regarding man, it should certainly not have an effect for an object in the body of an animal. The logic is based upon a contrast between tum'ah and how it applies to man and animal. A person may become tamei while alive, but an animal cannot be tamei while it is still alive. We see that man is more susceptible to the laws of tum'ah than is an animal. If, nevertheless, swallowed up tum'ah does not apply for man, it certainly should not apply to animals.

The Gemara challenges this logic, because we find the reverse regarding a house which is plagued and is therefore tamei. If a person enters a plagued building which is tamei, the person only becomes tamei if he remains in the house for at least the time it takes to consume half of a loaf of bread. However, when an animal which is carrying a load enters into this building, the animal and its load are tmei'im immediately. Using this contrast, we see that an animal is more susceptible to the laws of tum'ah. Accordingly, it could be that swallowed-up tum'ah is restricted only for man, but not for animals.

We see that the timeframe for tum'ah when a man enters a house which is tamei is the amount of time it takes to eat half a loaf. Because this amount of time has to be standardized, the Gemara clarifies that the loaf referred to is one made of wheat, and not barley. It is measured where the person eats it while reclining, and with a relish. Each of these features helps one consume the half loaf more quickly.

There is a disagreement among Tannaim (Eiruvin 82b) regarding the volume of this loaf. According to Rashi, Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai holds that it is the volume of four eggs, while according to R' Shimon it is the volume of three eggs. Rambam (Hilchos Shvi'as HoAsor 2:4) rules according to R' Shimon. Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 612:4) cites both views, but does not rule decisively between them. Mishnah Berura (ibid. #8) writes that regarding Torah law, one should conduct himself strictly, while in regard to a rabbinic law one may be lenient.

Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 313) says that the standard of wheat bread is only true in regard to the time one carries in a plagued house, but in reference to other halachos of eating we measure in terms of a volume of three or four eggs of the food actually being eaten. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in celebration of
Howard & Vanessa Jackson's 10th wedding anniversary.*

MAZAL TOV!

HALACHA Highlight

Is the pregnant wife of a kohen permitted to enter a room with a corpse?

כך טהרה בלועה אינה מטמאה

So too a tahor object that is swallowed is not susceptible to tum'ah

Shach¹ in the name of Rokeach writes that it is permitted for the wife of a kohen who is pregnant to enter a room that contains a corpse. Even though it is possible that she is pregnant with a male it is permitted. The reason is that there is a “double doubt” which allows for leniency. The first doubt is that even if the fetus is male perhaps it is a stillborn. The second doubt is the possibility that the fetus is a female. Magen Avrohom² and Radvaz³ question this ruling since even if the fetus is a male and is alive it should be permitted for the mother to enter a room with a corpse since our Gemara teaches that objects that are swallowed are not susceptible to tum'ah.

Radvaz answers that Rokeach refers to a woman who is close to delivering the baby. The mother is permitted to enter a room with a corpse even though it is possible that she will give birth and if the baby is male and alive it will become tamei. Nevertheless, she does not have to be concerned with that possibility since there is a “double doubt.”

Pri Megadim⁴ challenges this ruling from the principle that one may not intentionally put himself into a circum-

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the significance that an non-domesticated animal is called a בהמה ?
2. What is טהרה בלועה ?
3. What is the source that the principle of בלועה applies to animals as well ?
4. What is the novelty of Rabbah's teaching ?

stance of doubt even when there is a “double doubt.” Additionally, the possibility that the fetus may not be alive should not be considered a doubt since it is a statistical minority. Therefore he explains that the Gemara's principle that objects that are swallowed are not susceptible to tum'ah is true only Biblically but Rabbinically swallowed objects are susceptible to tum'ah and a person may not put himself into a circumstance in which he may violate a Rabbinic injunction. However, when there is a “double doubt” regarding a Rabbinic injunction it is permitted for one to put himself in that circumstance of doubt even when one of the doubts is weak. ■

¹ ש"ך יו"ד סי' שע"א סק"א.

² מג"א סי' שמ"ג סק"ב.

³ שו"ת הרדב"ז ח"א סי' ר"י.

⁴ פמ"ג א"א סי' שמ"ג סק"ב. ■

STORIES off the Daf

For One Halacha

”חבל על בן עזאי שלא שימש רבי ישמעאל...”

Rav Chaim Shmuelevitz, zt”l, excelled at nurturing his students’ growth. He would advise each according to his nature, spurring dynamic growth in a balanced, healthy manner. A certain student became very sincere, learning at every available moment. He began to draw near to the many gedolei Torah in the Mirrer Yeshivah. Rav Chaim drew him close, treating him with abundant warmth.

Once Rav Chaim invited this student to a talk he was to give in Yeshivas Meah Sharim. Every year he would give a few mussar talks there. Since he felt this student would especially benefit from hearing the most recent schmooze, he invited him to come. Rav Chaim’s words changed his life. “In Chullin 71 we find that Ben Azai bewails that he never served Rabbi Yishmael. ‘It is unfortunate that I never served R’ Yishmael,’ he decries. Who lost out? Rashi explains that this was a loss to the entire world. ‘It is a loss and damage to the world that an accomplished student such as myself never served Rabbi Yishmael.’

“Ben Azai was indeed accom-

plished. As we find in Bechoros 51, Ben Azai compares the chachamim to garlic shells when compared to himself. Despite his greatness, it is a terrible loss for the world that Ben Azai did not serve Rabi Yishmael. Why? If he had served Rabi Yishmael he would have understood a different way to look at this halacha. It is due to his lack of this one halacha that Ben Azai bewails never having met Rabbi Yishmael. When an important person is missing even one halacha it is a vast loss for the entire world.”¹ ■

¹ קול התורה, תשרי תשס"ג, ע' צ"א. ■