

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the tum'ah status of various categories of marrow bones. The Mishnah cites the exposition that teaches that carrying the sealed bone of a neveilah transmits tum'ah.

2) Marrow bone of a corpse

The Gemara infers from the Mishnah that marrow bone of a corpse transmits tum'ah through contact but not by ohel and searches for the case in which this applies.

R' Yehudah the son of R' Chiya concludes that marrow inside of a bone cannot regenerate flesh outside of it.

Two unsuccessful challenges to this explanation are recorded.

The novelty of these rulings is identified.

Abaye offers an alternative explanation for why the marrow bone of a corpse does not transmit tum'ah by ohel.

Support for this explanation is cited.

R' Yochanan suggests a third explanation for the Mishnah's ruling.

A detail in R' Yochanan's statement is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Mishnah is cited in support of R' Yochanan's explanation.

The Gemara rejects this interpretation of the Mishnah in favor of another explanation.

The alternative explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara cites another source for R' Yochanan wherein transmission of tum'ah by ohel is described as touching.

This interpretation is challenged.

Abaye and Rava offer alternative responses to this challenge.

Rava cites a Mishnah in support of his explanation.

Abaye rejects this source.

Abaye's interpretation of the Beraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Hidden tum'ah

The Gemara proceeds to search for the source that hidden tum'ah does not break through its covering. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Who is the one who says that touching and being under the same roof are in the same category?

ומאן תנא דקרי לאהל נוגע? ר' יוסי היא

The Mishnah spoke of where a person experiences tum'ah by means of "נוגע," which literally means "touching." In the Gemara, R' Yochanan explains that this case is actually referring to a situation where a person forms a roof over a piece of human bone. The reason the Mishnah uses the term "touching" when referring to tum'ah transmitted by forming a roof is that these two methods are in the same category. The Gemara identifies that the Tanna who supports this view is R' Yose of the Beraisa.

In the Beraisa, R' Yose states that a large spoonful of dust from a decomposed corpse transmits tum'ah through direct contact, through carrying, or by being under the same roof with it. We can understand the illustration of interaction with a full ladleful of this dust when it being carried, and also when one is under the same roof with this material. But the case of touching apparently cannot be where one is in contact with the entire ladleful at once. The person is only touching the particles which directly touch his hand. Rather, we must say that the word "נוגע—touching" in this context is where the person forms a roof over the ladleful of corpse dust.

Ra'aved (Eiduyos 3:1) points out that if someone is touching a half-k'zayis while he is simultaneously under a roof together with a half-k'zayis, R' Meir holds (Ohalos 3:1) that R' Dosa says that the person is tahor, but Chachamim say that touching and being under a roof with tum'ah are in the same category, so these situations combine and the person is tamei. Accordingly, why does our Gemara not identify the proponent of the view that touching and being under a roof are the same to be R' Meir?

Ra'aved answers that although R' Meir explains this concept in the context of the disagreement between R' Dosa and Chachamim, perhaps R' Meir himself does not agree with this view. This is why the Gemara identifies this view in the name of R' Yose, who says this in his own name.

Ramban answers that although R' Meir says that Chachamim hold that exposure to tum'ah by touching and by being under one roof combine, it could be that R' Meir is more lenient than that and the Chachamim may hold that any two forms of exposure to tum'ah combine, such as being under the same roof and carrying, which are two completely different categories. Therefore, there is no proof from the Mishnah in Ohalos that R' Meir holds that touching and being under the same roof are two forms of the same type of exposure with tum'ah. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
as a zechus for a refuah sheleimah for*

אברהם גרשון בן ציפי
שלמה ברוך בן שיינדל ברכה
מרים אורית בת דבורה

HALACHA Highlight

A sukkah under a skylight with netting

חבילי מטה וסריגי חלונות חוצצין בין הבית לעלייה

Ropes of a bed and meshwork of a window constitute a barrier between a house and the upper floor

Teshuvos Ginas Veradim¹ addressed a very important sukkah question that was prevalent in his time. Houses were built very close to one another and as a result they did not get sunlight or much air from the windows in the walls. Generally people added a sky light on their roof to allow sunlight and air into their home. On top of the sunlight they would spread out a netting of sorts to keep out bugs and prevent birds from entering their home. On Sukkos people would simply spread schach over this skylight and their house became their sukkah. Ginas Veradim cited our Gemara's discussion of interwoven ropes of a bed and meshwork of a window about which we are taught that they form a barrier to prevent tum'ah from rising from a first floor room that contains a corpse to a second story room above it. Although there are holes in the ropes or meshwork, Rashi² explains that as long as the holes are not the size of a tefach they work to contain the tum'ah. Accordingly the netting that is placed over the skylight upon which the schach is placed should invalidate the sukkah.

He then writes that although the laws of tum'ah see the space between the ropes or the meshwork as closed, regarding the laws of sukkah it is not considered closed. The

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that a sealed marrow bone transmits tum'ah by carrying ?

2. How does R' Yochanan explain the Mishnah ?

3. What is תרווד רקב ?

4. Explain the principle טומאה טמונה אינה בוקעת

laws of sukkah will see the ropes and meshwork as a tree and consequently the question is whether they produce more shade than sun or not. Since the ropes or meshwork produce little to no shade whatsoever they have no negative effect on the sukkah and it is valid. The reason for the distinction is that regarding the laws of tum'ah the essential question is whether the window is considered closed or not and once it is considered closed the tum'ah does not travel further. In the laws of sukkah the essential question is what is producing the shade, valid schach or invalid schach. As long as the valid schach is producing the shade if invalid schach is also present but produces little or no shade the sukkah remains valid. ■

¹ שו"ת גינת ורדים או"ח כלל ד' סי' ח'.
² רש"י ד"ה חוצצין בין בית לעליה. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Dust of the Remains

"רקב..."

On today's daf we find how much dust of decayed remains imparts impurity.

The Maharal, zt"l, explains the mechanics of idolatry. "Our sages teach that a Jew who gives charity on condition that his son recover from illness is a complete tzaddik. Conversely, charity given by a non-Jew on condition is meaningless. The gemara explains that

even if the child does not recover, the Jew will not want his money back, but the non-Jew will want a refund. To understand why, we must delve into the reason why people worshiped idolatry. They desired to excel in something, be it war, love, or the like. Idolatry meant only acting in a way that they held strengthened their goal. It is no wonder that an average idolater who gave money on this condition would demand a refund if the child did not recover. He only gave charity as a fee in the hopes that his son will heal. If this didn't provide excellent results, it was a waste of money from his perspective."

The Yaaros Devash, zt"l, gives us

insight into the idolatry served by the ancient Egyptians. The Egyptians were hyper-focused on death. To them this was the ultimate test which they were required to overcome. They knew that the nefesh of the deceased remains near the body for as long as it is extant. They figured logically that if they could only preserve the body, the deceased will be immortal and that they will be able to speak to him through sorcery. They mummified people, preserving the dust of their remains for as long as they could and secreting them in special chambers to keep them undisturbed.¹ ■

¹ יערות דבש, ח"א, דרוש ז' ■

