



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Vetch (cont.)

R' Huna concluded his proof that the Mishnah's intent was that the hole must be large enough that vetch can be easily inserted and removed.

Tangentially the Gemara concludes the discussion between R' Tachlifa and R' Chisda. This involves the citation of a Baraisa related to the tum'ah of a utensil.

The Gemara clarifies the intent of the Baraisa.

The earlier implication that flat wooden utensils are Biblically able to contract tum'ah is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Pappa offers another explanation of the point of dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel.

This explanation is successfully challenged.

R' Nachman suggests an alternative explanation of the point of dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates additional blemishes that permit a bechor for slaughter.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Pappa identifies the condition called הריס.

The Gemara discusses the condition called דק.

The Gemara inquires whether the intent of the Mishnah was to use two names for the same blemish or perhaps they are two separate blemishes.

An incident is cited that teaches that the two names enumerated in the Mishnah refer to the same blemish.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges how R' Shimon ben Yosi ben Lekunya could issue a novel ruling related to his own animal.

The Mishnah that teaches that defects in the white part of the eye do not constitute blemishes is associated with R' Yosi's

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does not an earthenware utensil become tamei?

2. Is it possible for a wooden utensil without a hollow interior to become Biblically tamei?

3. What is the point of dispute between R' Meir and R' Yosi?

4. How do we determine whether a bechor's watery eyes is a blemish?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In memory of Lilya Bas Lev
 by the Manuilov Family (Moscow, Russia)

Distinctive INSIGHT

A blemish which can be treated

וסימניך ברקא

The Mishnah lists conditions of the eye of a bechor which are blemishes. One of those conditions is if the eye has a "dak" on it, which is a thin film over the eye, generally understood to be a cataract.

A Baraisa cited in the Gemara further clarifies that there are different types of cataracts. We are taught in one Baraisa that a sunken cataract is a blemish, while a raised cataract is not. Another cited Baraisa reports the exact opposite of this. The Gemara concludes and resolves this issue by saying that both Baraisos are referring to a cataract which is on the black part of the eye, because there are no blemishes on the white eye. If the cataract itself is white, if it is raised it is a blemish, but if it appears sunken, it is tahor. The first Baraisa is speaking about a black cataract. In this case, if it appears sunken it is a blemish, and if it is raised it is not a blemish. Because this can be confusing, the Gemara gives a sign how to remember it. The sign is "barka". This is a shiny condition, which was known to be a blemish, which appears as white and raised. If a white, raised cataract is a blemish, we can remember that a black cataract is a blemish when it is the reverse, which is when it appears sunken.

Tosafos notes that our Gemara indicates that "barka" is a condition which is a permanent blemish. Yet, Tosafos points out that the Gemara in Gittin (69a) describes a remedy for barka, thus showing that it is not irreversible. Tosafos answers that the Gemara in Gittin may be speaking about barka only when it is in its initial stages, before it is fully developed. Our Gemara is describing a barka that has already solidified and firmed its position on the eye, at which point the remedy is no longer effective. Alternatively, Tosafos suggests that our Gemara describes barka as a permanent condition which will not heal on its own. Nevertheless, as the Gemara in Gittin indicates, it can be treated and healed with medication. There are, explains Tosafos, remedies to alleviate even what the Gemara calls permanent blemishes.

Mari"t Algazi (#52) notes that earlier, Tosafos (34a) explained that a blemish that can be healed, either on its own or with treatment, is called a temporary blemish. Tosafos was describing the case of a bechor which was gripped with an illness, and the remedy was to let blood. The question was how and where to wound the animal, but the issue was that the animal was experiencing a dangerous condition, but it was able to be alleviated with intervention. Tosafos notes that on its own, the animal was dying. Why was this not a blemish? Tosafos' second answer there was that this is a "temporary" blemish, because it can be treated. This disagrees with the explanation given by Tosafos on our daf. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of our grandfather
 ר' יוסף חיים בן יהודה לייב ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Can a Torah scholar decide prohibition-related matters by himself?

כל תלמיד חכם שמורה הלכה ובא וגו'

Any Torah scholar who presents a halachic ruling etc.

It happened once that an animal suffered from a condition about which there was a dispute whether it rendered the animal a tereifah. One rov ruled the animal was permitted, a second rov ruled the animal was prohibited and the third rov who happened to be the animal's owner agreed with the lenient opinion that the animal was permitted. The question was whether the owner's opinion counts to constitute a majority opinion that the animal is permitted or perhaps since he owns the animal his opinion does not count. Teshuvos Shoel v'Nish'al¹ began his analysis of the matter with our Gemara. R' Huna teaches that the acceptance of a novel ruling of a Torah scholar depends on the following matter. If he had presented the teaching before the practical question arose he is trusted but if he presents the teaching only after the practical question arises we do not rely upon his teaching. Tosafos² adds that this restriction is true only when the question concerns a matter that is relevant to the Torah scholar but if the question is not related to an interest of his, he is trusted even if he does not introduce the teaching until after the practical question was raised.

Beis Yosef³ cites authorities who contend that R' Huna's ruling applied in earlier generations when Torah scholars memorized the material but now that people study Torah from texts and cite proofs from Gemaras one may even present a teaching after the question arises since a proof to the ruling will be cited. Rosh disagrees and maintains that since many times decisions are

(Overview...continued from page 1)

position.

Rav provides the source for R' Yosi's position.

R' Meir's position is explained.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses additional blemishes of the eye.

5) **The author of the Mishnah**

The Gemara asserts that the Mishnah follows the opinion of R' Yehudah as recorded in a Baraisa.

This assertion is unsuccessfully challenged.

6) **Moist-dry fodder treatment**

A statement in the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

Additional details are presented related to the moist-dry fodder treatment.

The amount of fodder that the bechor must be fed is explained.

Rava begins an inquiry relates to details of this treatment. ■

made by comparing one case to another there is a concern that a Torah scholar's judgment and analysis may be flawed since he has a financial interest in the case. Rabbeinu Yerucham⁴ adds that even according to Rosh if the relevant ruling is explicit in a Mishnah, Gemara or the writings of one of the great Poskim, the Torah scholar is believed. Rema⁵ follows this approach, therefore, since the case involved the animal that was a questionable tereifah and the matter depended upon judgment in comparing two cases the owner's opinion does not count to create a majority opinion. ■

1. שו"ת שואל ונשאל ח"ג יו"ד סי' שע"ד.
2. תוס' ד"ה אם.
3. ב"י יו"ד סי' רמ"ב ד"ה בפרק הערל.
4. רבינו ירוחם אדם וחיה נתיב ב' סוף ח"ה.
5. רמ"א יו"ד סי' רמ"ב סעי' ל"ו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Protecting One's Eyes

"הריס של עין..."

Today's daf discusses various blemishes that invalidate a bechor to be brought as a sacrifice. God calls the Jewish people His firstborn son, 'בני בכורי ישראל'. Like a bechor, Jews must be careful not to blemish their eyes.

Being careful with one's eyes is the only way to avoid violating the Torah: "ולא תתורו" "ולא תתורו", yet it is rare to find a person who is truly scrupulous about this in our generation. In many chassidic circles, however, there is still a high level of awareness regarding this Torah command-

ment. When a certain young man who needed chizuk in this area came to see Rav Shalom of Shatz, zt"l, the rebbe said, "Yungerman, the main elements of chassidus are guarding one's eyes and mouth..."¹

When a few chasidim went to see the Yismach Yisrael of Alexander, zt"l, one of them asked the rebbe for a segulah to improve his memory. After the rebbe gave the young man several ideas, a second chassid also mentioned that his memory was weak.

The rebbe looked at him in a marked manner. "I am afraid that for you there is a much simpler solution. The verse states, 'ולא תתורו אחרי לבבכם ואחרי עיניכם', למען" and immediately afterwards it says, 'תזכרו'. This teaches that one who fails to guard his eyes will find it difficult to re-

member Torah and other holy matters. But if this person strengthens himself and begins to guard his eyes, his memory will be restored."

The rebbe continued to speak in a pained manner. "And if you ask how I can say this to you in front of a few people, I will reply that I believe that this is the only way that you will accept it. If you point out that if I am wrong I have lost my olam haba—the halachah of one who embarrasses a fellow Jew in front of his fellows—I can answer that too: when I became a rebbe I decided to only think about helping my fellow Jews. Since this can only be done by not thinking about my olam haba, I was mafkir my olam haba to begin with."² ■

1. פיה שיחתו, ח"א, ע' קפ"ב
2. שיח זקנים, ח"ג, ע' שע"ז ■