

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Mechusarei kapparah (cont.)

Another Beraisa that discusses the korban of a convert is cited.

The Beraisa's assertion that a single bird is never offered by itself is unsuccessfully challenged.

The sources that our ancestors entered the covenant with circumcision, immersion and blood on the Altar are presented.

A Beraisa discusses one who converts when the Beis HaMikdash no longer exists.

Amoraim rule in accordance with R' Shimon's position.

According to another version the statement that halacha follows R' Shimon's position was stated in a different context.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates the four people who bring a korban for an intentional transgression just as they would for an inadvertent transgression. The Mishnah states that five bring a single korban for multiple violations and five bring a variable korban and then enumerates the five that bring a single korban for multiple violations.

### 3) Sources

The Gemara presents the sources for numerous rulings in the Mishnah.

### 4) Multiple violations

R' Chanina Tirna'ah inquires about the number of ashamos one must bring if he was with five different betrothed slavewomen in one lapse of awareness.

R' Yochanan answers that he is liable for each violation.

The subsequent exchange between them is recorded.

The Gemara searches for the Tanna who maintains that a nazir who contracted tum'ah on many occasions brings a single korban.

The related Beraisa is cited.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents another two of the people who bring a single korban for multiple violations. A disagreement regarding a metzorah who contracts tzara'as as he is ready to bring his korbanos from a previous affliction of tzara'as is recorded.

### 6) Sources

The sources for the two people who bring a single korban are presented.

### 7) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara clarifies the Mishnah's last section.

Another Mishnah is cited that presents the same dispute as the Mishnah.

A Beraisa adds a third opinion to this dispute.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav explains the point of dispute among the three opinions.

8) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the fifth case of one who brings a single korban for multiple violations.

### 9) Source

The Gemara cites and analyzes a Beraisa that provides the source for the Mishnah's ruling.

### 10) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Yehudah.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *A ger-toshav and Shabbos*

גר תושב מותר לעשות מלאכה בשבת לעצמו

Rashi and Rabeinu Gershom explain that a resident alien, a ger-toshav, is someone who has not converted to be Jewish, but he has accepted upon himself not to worship idolatry. Rambam (Hilchos Issurei Bi'ah 14:7) says that this term refers to one who has accepted upon himself to observe all of the seven Noachide laws.

In Avoda Zara (64b) we find a disagreement among Tanaim in regard to who is a ger-toshav. R' Meir says that this is someone who accepts upon himself not to worship idolatry. Chachamim say that this is someone who accepts the seven Noachide laws, and Acheirim say that this is someone who accepts all the laws of the Torah except the prohibition not to eat neveilah. Sefer v'Shav HaKohen notes that Rashi seems to rule according to R' Meir's view in Avoda Zara. However, Sefer Be'er Sheva (to Sanhedrin 96b) says that the discussion in that Gemara is not in terms of the definition of who is a ger-toshav, but rather in reference to when does a resident alien deserve to be supported by the community. In regard to other halachos, all agree that a ger-toshav is one who accepts not to worship idolatry. According to this, Rashi's comment is according to everyone. Nevertheless, Rashi in Arachin (29a) explains that even in regard to support, a ger-toshav is one who accepts not to worship idolatry, which means that Rashi is ruling according to the view of R' Meir in the three-way disagreement in the Gemara in Avoda Zara.

The Gemara in Yevamos (48b) analyzes the posuk regarding Shabbos (Shemos 22:12) which says that on Shabbos "the son of your maidservant and the stranger shall rest." The Gemara understands that the stranger described in this posuk is a ger-toshav. Rashi explains, as he does here, that the ger-toshav is one who has accepted upon himself not to worship idolatry, and the Torah here commands that he not violate the Shabbos, because anyone who violates the Shabbos is considered as if he has worshipped idolatry. The Rishonim find Rashi's commentary problematic, because our Gemara clearly states that a ger-toshav does not observe Shabbos, and the halacha follows R' Shimon who is of this view. Furthermore, the Gemara in Sanhedrin (58b) teaches that a non-Jew who observes a day of Shabbos is liable for death.

Tosafos answers that it is true that a ger-toshav does not observe Shabbos for himself, but the posuk in Shemos is warning that he not perform any forbidden labors on the behalf of other Jews. This is not a restriction against him, because we have said that a ger-toshav should not observe the Shabbos. Rather, this is a Torah mitzvah for other Jews not to command him to do labor for them on Shabbos. This is distinct from the rabbinic rule not to ask any non-Jew to do forbidden labors for a Jew on Shabbos. ■

# HALACHA Highlight

*A convert immersing his utensils*

מה אבותיכם לא נכנסו לברית וכו'

*Just as your forefathers entered the covenant etc.*

**S**hulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> rules that one who purchases food utensils from a gentile must immerse those utensils. Teshuvah Maharia HaLevi<sup>2</sup> was asked the following related question. According to the opinion that maintains that there is a Biblical obligation to immerse utensils why do we not find that the Jewish People immersed their utensils following Matan Torah since it is clear from our Gemara that at the time of Matan Torah the Jewish People went through the steps of a conversion? Maharia HaLevi responded that he does not know of a single source that indicates that a convert is obligated to immerse his utensils upon completing his conversion. Furthermore, even if one were to accept the premise that theoretically there was a requirement to immerse their utensils, nevertheless, they would not have been required to immerse their utensils since they were not going from tum'ah to taharah being that they were already in a state of taharah before the Torah was given. Therefore, there was no requirement for them to immerse their utensils.

Sefer Giv'as Olam<sup>3</sup> in the name of Rav Elyashiv rules that a convert is obligated to immerse his utensils following the completion of his conversion and even if the utensils were immersed before his conversion was completed he would be obligated to immerse them again. Teshuvah Shevet HaLevi<sup>4</sup> raises the question of whether a convert is obligated to immerse his utensils. Is there an obligation because the utensils are going from gentile ownership to Jewish ownership or per-

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What is derived from the phrase ככם נגר יהיה ?

---

2. Who are the five people who bring a single korban for multiple violations ?

---

3. When does a nazir who became tamei resume counting his nezirus ?

---

4. What is the point of dispute between R' Yehudah and Chachamim ?

---

haps there is no obligation since there was never a transfer of ownership. His conclusion is that there is an obligation for a convert to immerse his utensils and the fact that there was no transfer of ownership is not essential to the obligation. Ateres Moshe<sup>5</sup> suggests that there is no obligation for a convert to immerse his utensils. At the moment of conversion all of his possessions become ownerless. When he then takes them back he is not acquiring them from a gentile and as such there is no obligation to immerse them. ■

<sup>1</sup> שו"ע יו"ד סי' ק"כ סעי' א'  
<sup>2</sup> שו"ת מהרי"א הלוי ח"א סי' ק"ט בסופו.  
<sup>3</sup> ספר גבעת עולם דיני טבילת כלים סעי' ל"ו.  
<sup>4</sup> שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ד סי' צ"ב אות ב' וח"ו סי' רמ"ה אות ב'.  
<sup>5</sup> עטרת משה יו"ד סי' ס"ה אות ב'. ■

# STORIES off the Daf

*A Special Soul*

**N**"אף הם לא יכנסו לברית אלא במילה וטבילה..."  
 Nearly one hundred fifty years ago, long before the contemporary teshuvah and giur explosion, a very special soul lived. Born to non-Jewish parents, he felt very drawn to Jewish practice and decided to convert. He was told that the most prestigious beis din was in Yerushalayim, so he undertook many weeks of arduous and dangerous travel to pursue his geirus in the holy city. On Tuesday, the twenty-third of Adar Sheni 5708, he underwent milah. Not surprisingly, the doctor forbade him from immersing before his wound healed completely. By Shabbos it was still not fully healed and he had not yet immersed.

Nevertheless, the ger was thrilled to be

able to keep his first Shabbos. He was so enthusiastic that he told everyone he ran into on the holy day. When the rav heard about this, it was already after minchah. Nevertheless, he sent a message to the ger explaining that since he had not yet done tevilah, it is still forbidden for him to observe Shabbos fully. The ger understood and immediately wrote a few words in order to violate Shabbos.

The next day, when the other rabbanim of the city heard this—both Sefardim and Ashkenazim—they were enraged and took this rav to task. "The custom has always been to allow such a ger to observe the Shabbos after he has done milah, even if it before the tevilah."

The rav protested. "But in Kareisos 9 we find that one becomes a ger only after he did milah and immerses with the intention of accepting the mitzvos, and this is the law in Shulchan Aruch!"

The other chachamim of Yerushalayim

rejected this out of hand. "But the man has done milah and accepted all mitzvos; he is only waiting to heal to complete his conversion. Since there is no source that such a person may not keep Shabbos and the custom was that he does, you are obviously mistaken."

When their question reached the Binyan Tziyon, zt"l, he agreed that the ger should have kept Shabbos. "Although on the surface it appears that even such a ger should be forbidden to keep Shabbos, the custom here as well is to allow them to keep Shabbos. Although you make a good point, I believe that Tosefos in Kareisos, indicates that you are incorrect. There we find that from when our ancestors did milah they were considered to have entered the bris. Clearly one who has done milah in order to accept Torah and immerse is already separated from the non-Jews! It follows that he can keep Shabbos." ■

<sup>1</sup> שו"ת בנין ציון, סי' צ"א ■

