

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara inquires why the incident that served as the impetus to restrict transporting madras and kodesh did not extend to terumah as well.

The Tanna of the Mishnah, the Gemara explains, is R' Chanaya ben Akavya who limits the scope of a decree prompted by an incident to the exact circumstances of the original incident.

The incident of which R' Chanaya ben Akavya limited a decree to the circumstances of the original incident is presented.

Three inquiries regarding the restriction against transporting madras and kodesh together are presented.

The third inquiry is the consequence of transporting madras and kodesh items together and R' Iyla and R' Zeira dispute whether the kodesh remains tahor.

### 2) Completing a vessel in a state of taharah

Shmuel is cited as explaining that the ruling in the Mishnah that a vessel finished in a state of taharah requires immersion for kodesh is out of concern that saliva from an am ha'aretz may have touched the vessel.

The Gemara further clarifies that the concern is that the saliva landed on the vessel before it was completed and was still there when the utensil was completed.

The inference of the Mishnah is that a vessel completed in a state of taharah requires immersion but passage of nightfall is not required. This would mean that the Mishnah does not follow R' Eliezer who, as demonstrated from a Mishnah, requires the passage of nightfall in addition to immersion.

A number of resolutions, suggested by Rav, are presented and rejected until the matter is resolved with the assistance of Abaye.

### 3) A vessel combines its contents

R' Chanin identifies the source that a vessel combines its contents for the purpose of kodesh. This explanation is challenged. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Rabbi and Mrs. Michael Glassenberg  
 In memory of their father  
 ר' משה בן ר' ארי לייב, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 in appreciation to our Rosh Kollel, Rabbi Wurzburger shlita  
 for all you do from the Kollel Beth Hatalmud.  
 Dr Lanzer -Melbourne Australia

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The contents of the ladle are one entity*

דאמר קרא כף אחת עשרה זהב מליאה קטרת- הכתוב עשאו לכל מה שבכף אחת

**Y**alkut Ani notes that this verse (Bemidbar 7:14), which discusses the ketores refers to ketores as being contained in "one ladle." This elicits the lesson that the spoon combines its contents to be one entity. Yet the verse immediately preceding this one (ibid., v.13) also uses this terminology in reference to *one silver bowl*: "...וקרבנו קערת כסף אחת". The word "אחת" in the previous verse could have taught this lesson. Why, then, does the Gemara wait until the second chance to derive this teaching?

The answer can be understood based upon the words of Rambam (הל' פסולי המוקדשין ב:יב), where he rules that liquids blend together efficiently. The Shach rules (Y.D. 109:3) that flour blends together with other flour smoothly, and in this regard it has the law of being a liquid.

The bowl mentioned in verse 13 contained flour. There is no question that the contents of the bowl should legally be considered as one entity, because the commodity contained within it was flour, which flows and blends together naturally. This is especially the case here, where it is blended together with oil. Therefore, the ability to be considered as one would not be deemed to be the result of a legal ability of the bowl, but rather due to the contents themselves. However, in verse 14, we are talking about a combination of ketores, which is not a group of materials which blends together naturally. Nevertheless, the Torah rules that the ladle combines the contents, and if one part becomes impure, the entire contents become impure.

This rule, which is rabbinic, is said only in reference to ketores, which is קדש. This is why the ruling was said in regard to קדש, and not in reference to Teruma.

According to the conclusion of the Gemara, there are several factors necessary for this rabbinic ruling to apply, and each of these factors is rooted in the verse itself. One factor is that the utensil be a כלי שרת, similar to the ladle in the verse. Second of all, the commodity contained within the vessel must be קדש, similar to the ketores. Thirdly, the utensil must have the capacity to hold its contents (יש לו תוך), again similar to the ladle, which was not a flat board, but rather a curved spoon-like shape. Finally, the contents must be such that they need to be placed in the vessel for the service, and not something that was simply placed there for convenience. This, again, is learned from the ketores, which had to be placed in the ladle as part of the official procedure. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The decree of kitniyos

ר' חנניה בן עקביא אומר לא אסרו לא בירדן וספינה וכמעשה שהיה  
 R' Chananyah ben Akavya said that the restriction applies only when traveling by boat on the Jordan River which is how the original incident took place.

**R'** Chananyah ben Akavya relates that the only restriction of transporting midras and kodesh is to transport them on a boat while traveling over the Jordan River. Rashi<sup>1</sup> explains that according to R' Chananyah ben Akavya, decrees of Chazal are structured after the incident which inspired the decree and are not extended to circumstances that are similar; therefore, R' Chananyah ben Akavya does not extend the restriction to other forms of transporting the kodesh.

Rabbeinu Mordechai ben Hillel<sup>2</sup> cites Sefer Mitzvos Katan who writes that kitniyos is prohibited on Pesach not because there is a fear that it will leaven but the decree is the result of a different concern. Due to three similarities between grain and kitniyos there is a genuine concern that people may confuse the two, which could potentially lead to a violation of the Biblical prohibition against chometz on Pesach. The first similarity is that both grains and kitniyos are cooked in a pot, e.g. cooked oatmeal and lentil beans. The second similarity is that both items are stored in piles and the third characteristic is that both items can be ground into flour and baked as bread. Rabbeinu Yaakov Ba'al Haturim<sup>3</sup> adds another concern, namely, it is common to find kernels of grain mixed together with beans which could also cause an inadvertent violation of the prohibition against chometz.

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Food Under the Bed

"...וכמעשה שהיה...."

**S**omeone asked Rav Moshe Sternbuch, zt"l, "If some food was left under a plane seat while a person slept in it, does the food have the same problem as food that was left under a bed?"

Rav Sternbuch replied, "The Nachalas Avos cites the opinion of his father's uncle, the Vilna Gaon, zt"l: 'Even food left beneath a sofa or a box that was later slept upon should not be eaten since we are more stringent with things that are dangerous than with halachic prohibitions. Even though we see that one who eats this does not seem to be damaged in any way, Chazal were not necessarily discussing

danger to the body only, but predominantly that which could impact the nefesh. For this reason, everyone should be exceedingly careful to wash mayim achronim even though we don't find in today's day and age the 'salt of Sodom' that can cause physical blindness.'

Rav Sternbuch continued, "I rule that food left under an airplane seat which was then slept on is permitted. It is even possible that the Gaon would permit this, since he only prohibited food left beneath an object on which one sleeps in the usual fashion and not on a chair where one cannot really stretch out."

However, Rav Pinchas Epstein, zt"l, argued on the Vilna Gaon and permitted food left under any object other than a bed. He said, "In Chagiga 23a we find that the Mishnah prohibits one to take spring water mixed with the ashes of a red

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What was the incident that inspired the restriction against carrying madras and kodesh?

---

2. Why is the tube used for parah adumah ashes made tamei and then immersed before use?

---

3. What type of innovations were not introduced into the topic of the parah adumah?

---

4. What phrase teaches that a vessel combines its contents?

---

Rav Tzvi Ashkenazi<sup>4</sup>, the Chochom Tzvi, addressed the question of whether coffee beans are included in the Ashkenazi custom to refrain from kitniyos on Pesach. He ruled that coffee is permitted because there is no reason to assume that it is worse than other beans mentioned in the Rema that are permitted and furthermore, since coffee was not available at the time the custom was adopted it could not have been included in the original decree. Finally, Chochom Tzvi writes based on our Gemara that since the custom was adopted because of specific concerns, which do not apply to coffee, the custom can not be extended to include coffee. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה ר' חנניה בן עקביא.
2. מרדכי פסחים פ"ב סי' תקפ"ח.
3. טור או"ח סי' תני"ג.
4. רמ"א או"ח סי' תני"ג סעי' א'.
5. שו"ת חכם צבי ליקוטי תשובות סי' קכ"ז אות ב'.

heifer on a ship traversing the Jordan River. It says that someone once did so and found a k'zayis of a corpse on the ship which defiled the water since it was under the same roof as the k'zayis. There is an argument between the Sages and Chananya ben Akavya if this only applies to a ship on the Jordan River, or to any case where they are likely to become defiled. Tosfos explains there that even the Sages only prohibited 'mei chatas' (spring water and the ashes) and nothing else, since this is what was defiled.

Rav Epstein concluded, "We see from here that a prohibition only applies to that which was explicitly prohibited and nothing else. The Sages prohibited food that had been left under a bed. Anything else is not a problem!" ■

