

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of ישראל צבי בן זאב גוטליב ז"ל

By the Weiss/Gotlib Families—London, England

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Body fluids (cont.)

The Gemara continues to identify the sources that urine transmits severe tum'ah.

Tangential to this discussion the Gemara identifies the source that blood, in contrast to urine, is not a source of tum'ah.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

The response to this challenge is questioned forcing the Gemara to revise its answer.

2) Sheretz

Reish Lakish asserts that if the shape of a dry sheretz is intact it transmits tum'ah.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged from the Mishnah.

Rava suggests a practical application of this teaching.

Reish Lakish rules that a sheretz that was burned transmits tum'ah if its shape is intact.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Transmitters of tum'ah when moist

The sources for those items the Mishnah asserts transmit tum'ah only while moist are presented.

R' Yirmiyah questions whether the items in the Mishnah must be in warm water the entire time or as long as it was warm at the beginning of the day it is sufficient.

A Beraisa relates that this question is subject to a debate between Tanaim.

4) Dried flesh

Shmuel asserts that dry flesh transmits tum'ah as corpse dust.

A Beraisa is cited that echoes this ruling.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses how a sheretz and stain that are discovered render an item tamei retroactively and whether they transmit tum'ah even when dry.

6) The presumption that the alley is clean

The Gemara inquires about the exact nature of the presumption that the alley is clean and explains the practical difference between the two approaches.

A similar question is posed regarding a stain that is discovered.

A Beraisa is cited that proves that at the time of sweeping or laundering it is presumed examined.

7) Clarifying R' Shimon's position

R' Elazar asserts that a stain that is moist transmits tum'ah retroactively.

The reason the rationale behind this ruling does not apply to a sheretz is explained.

8) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the stains that come from different areas or groups of people and whether they transmit tum'ah or not.

9) Tarmod

R' Yochanan infers from the Mishnah that we may accept converts from Tarmod.

This statement seems in conflict with another statement of R' Yochanan that we do not accept converts from Tarmod.

The Gemara answers that there is a difference of opinion concerning R' Yochanan's position about this matter.

10) Cutheans

The Gemara clarifies the exact point of dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim concerning stained garments from Cutheans.

11) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion related to the status of bloodstained garments and then discusses the credibility of Cutheans. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Dr. & Mrs. Koenigsberg
In memory of his parents*

ר' דוב בן ר' יוסף, ע"ה, ומרת שיינדל בת ר' לייבש דוד, ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Does a search reveal things hidden in holes?

מאן דבדק בגומא נמי בדיק

The Mishnah rules that if a sheretz is found in a semi-public yard, we assume that the tum'ah has been there and has contaminated any kodoshim recently brought into the yard. This concern extends back until the last time the yard was checked or the last time it was swept out.

The Gemara clarifies what is meant by "until the last time the yard was swept." Does this mean that when a yard is swept the one who does so usually conducts a formal search, and it is the search that guarantees its being clear of tum'ah? Or, is the sweeping in and of itself adequate to rid the yard of tum'ah, and we do not rely upon the extra degree of the job being accompanied by a formal search? The difference between these approaches would be in a case where the person admits that he swept, but he did not conduct a formal search. According to the first approach, his sweeping without searching is inadequate, but according to the second approach, sweeping even without the search is enough.

Another difference would be in a case where the sheretz was found in a hole in the ground. According to the first approach, assuming a search of the yard was conducted, a typical search also checks into holes. Obviously, the sheretz must have come afterwards. According to the second approach, a cursory sweeping would not reveal the contents of a hole, so we assume that the sheretz must have been here from even before the last cleaning.

A Beraisa is cited, proving that the first approach is correct.

Regarding the comment of the Gemara that a search of an area includes inspecting of holes, Tosafos refers to the Gemara in Pesachim (7a) in order to contrast it with our conclusions. The Gemara there discusses a box which is sometimes used to keep regular money, and sometimes used for ma'aser funds. If a coin is found in the box, and we do not know if the coin is the owner's personal funds or if it is from ma'aser, the halacha is that we follow the majority usage of the box and that the coin came from the money which was used more often. The Gemara concludes that the general rule is that we follow the most recent usage of the box, but in this case the coin was found in a hole in the box. Rashi explains that in this case we cannot follow the most recent usage, because even after it was cleaned out, the one who checked it might have missed finding the coin in a hole. Tosafos asks why in our Gemara do we say that a search finds things in holes, while the Gemara

(Insight...continued on page 2)

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in loving memory of
ר' ישראל בן ר' דוד, ע"ה—Mr. Irving Weiss O.B.M.*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ הרב חיים מאיר אלטער מרדכי ניימן ז"ל בן ר' משה צבי ז"ל תנצב"ה
Rabbi Hyman M. Naiman, z'l
הנוצח ע"י המשפחה שיחיו*

HALACHA Highlight

Cleaning the house before searching for chometz

בודקין מבואותיהן בשעת כבודה

Search their alleys when they sweep it

R' Meir cited in a Beraisā states that when a dead sheretz is found in an alley all the tohoros that were in the alley are retroactively temei'im until the point at which it was last checked or swept. The rationale behind this ruling is that there is a presumption that people examine their alleys at the time of their sweepings. Mordechai¹ taking into account the principles of our Gemara rules with regards to the search for chometz that a search is not considered thorough unless it is accompanied by cleaning. Cleaning by itself is ineffective since it is possible that some chometz fell into a hole and one passed over it and it will not be discovered without a search. This ruling is recorded by Rema² when he writes that a person must clean the rooms of his house before he searches for chometz. Mishnah Berurah³ relates that the custom is to clean one's house on the 13th of Nissan so that one will be able to properly search for chometz at the beginning of the night of the 14th of Nissan. On the night of the 14th one should search for chometz using a feather and clean out the holes and cracks so that one fulfills the obligation to clean on the night of the 14th as well.

Teshuvah Maharish⁴ was asked about the practice of many people to perform a mere perfunctory search for chometz rather than a more thorough search as described by the Gemara. He suggested that the practice could be justified based on the following

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the defining characteristics of saliva that then serve as the paradigm for fluids of a zav that transmit tum'ah ?
2. Is the dried flesh of a corpse tahor ?
3. What is the point of dispute in the Mishnah concerning blood-stains on garments from Rekem ?
4. Regarding what matters are Cutheans trusted ?

rationale. In the time of the Gemara they would not clean the holes and crevices in advance of the search; therefore, it was necessary for them to perform a thorough search in all the holes and crevices. In contrast, nowadays people thoroughly clean their homes before they begin to search for chometz and that cleaning includes the holes and crevices. This cleaning in actuality counts as a search for chometz since by the time the cleaning is completed no chometz remains. In order to fulfill the obligation to search on the night of the 14th it is necessary to search for chometz but that search need not be any more than a perfunctory search. ■

¹ מרדכי פסחים רמז תקל"ו.

² רמ"א אר"ח סי' תל"ג סעי' י"א.

³ מ"ב שם ס"ק מ"ו.

⁴ שו"ת מהרי"ש המובא בשערי תשובה שם ס"ק י"ב. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Cracks and Crevices

"דאשתכח בגומא..."

In a town called Borochoy, in Russia, the simple Jews had to house soldiers and allow them to eat in their homes. One Jewish woman almost lost her mind when she noticed the soldiers throwing the remaining crumbs from their bread onto the household's matzos. When a Jewish traveler heard about this, he told the woman that this case had occurred to him and his rabbi had ruled that the matzos could be rendered kosher with relative ease. "All one must do is to shake each matzah off very well. Then the matzos are kosher for Pesach."

But of course the woman would not rely on hearsay, especially regarding such a serious prohibition. She decided to ask a

great halachic authority. When this question was brought to Rav Efraim Auerbach, zt"l, he ruled that the matzos were forbidden.

"This is the same as the case of the Chayei Adam, zt"l. He discusses a case where a sack of barley fell on baked matzos. The Chayei Adam prohibits using these matzos even for dry consumption. And the same is presumably true in our case."

But since he was unsure he directed this question to the illustrious Maharsham, zt"l. "It would appear as though the ruling of the Chayei Adam is difficult to understand when we consider the Gemara in Niddah 56. There we find a question whether we assume that a rodent that was found in a crevice after the courtyard was swept had died in the crevice after the sweeping or not. Presumably the same is true in our case. If one cleans the crevices well, we can be sure that nothing remains."¹

Once the Chazon Ish, zt"l, was in a

matzah bakery when a matzah fell while being taken out of the oven. Since there were bits of dough on the floor, this caused an upheaval. Matzos were expensive and everyone wondered who would bear the loss of this matzah.

The Chazon Ish was not bothered by this however. He quickly scooped up the matzah and carefully blew on both sides so that every part of it, including the crevices was clean. "I have one matzah. Please give me two more..."² ■

¹ שו"ת מהרש"ם, ח"ב, סי' ר"ג

² מעשה איש, ח"ה, ע"ז צ"ד ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

in Pesachim says that a search might not find things hidden in a hole?

Tosafos answers that the hole in the coin box was deeper and hidden, thus the coin eluded the searcher. The hole in the yard in our Gemara was more superficial, and a search would find a sheretz hidden in it. ■