

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) A vessel combines what is in it

The sons of R' Chiya asked about the status of an isaron of flour that was divided into two parts, placed in a bowl and then one of the halves was touched by a tevil yom. Does the vessel combine them together or not?

R' Kahana answered that the wording of the Mishnah indicates that the vessel combines the two parts together.

The sons of R' Chiya asked two similar questions that were answered by R' Kahana.

R' Kahana asked them about taking a kemitza from one half of the isaron for the other half contained within the same vessel.

The sons of R' Chiya suggested an answer but their parallel was rejected by Rava.

Rava suggested a resolution to this inquiry but it was rejected by Abaye.

R' Yirmiyah asked two related questions that are left unresolved.

### 2) A Minchah divided in two

Rava asks about the status of a part of an isaron that became tamei and was then touched by a tevil yom – was it saturated with tumah and incapable of contracting any further tumah or not?

Abaye demonstrates that objects do not become saturated with tumah.

Rava defends his inquiry.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges Rava from the next section of the cited Mishnah.

The Gemara presents two disagreements between Rava and Abaye about what happens when part of a minchah is lost, replaced and the lost part is then found.

R' Pappa and R' Yitzchok the son of R' Mesharshiya raise two challenges to the ruling that neither one is eaten.

R' Ashi resolves both inquiries. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The utensil combines all that which is in it*

הכלי מצרף מה שבתוכו לקדש

When R' Kahana moved to Eretz Yisroel, he found the sons of R' Chiyya who were discussing the question of an isaron of flour which was designated for a minchah. The case was where an isaron of flour was divided into two parts, and they were both placed into a utensil in which the minchah was normally mixed, and one of the portions of flour was then touched by a t'vil yom. Clearly, that section of the flour is tamei. We also know that we have a rule that a utensil combines the items contained within it in terms of impurity. The question is whether the rule of combining is only said where the various items inside the vessel are touching, or do we use this rule of combining even where the various items are not touching? R' Kahana answered the sons of R' Chiyya that the rule is not that the utensil joins parts which are touching, but it combines parts, even when they are not in direct contact with each other. Therefore, in this case the entire isaron of flour would be tamei.

The source for the halacha that a utensil combines that which is contained within it for purposes of impurity is learned from a verse which describes the tribute given by the princes of the tribes during the inauguration of the Mishkan. The verse states (Bamidbar 7:14), "One ladle of gold, its weight ten shekel, filled with incense." From here, the Gemara (Chagiga 23b) learns that the ladle causes everything in it to be considered "one". Tosafos (ibid.) explains that we are trying to establish a universal rule based upon a verse which is describing an event which was a one-time event (the inauguration of the Mishkan). Yet, there is an opinion that we do not learn rules to be applied universally from situations which were momentary. Nevertheless, Tosafos explains that we only avoid making such rules when we have a source which is standard. When the only source for this halacha is a verse which is in the context of a one-time event, we may use it to teach us this rule. Tosafos also notes that the verse repeats this emphasis a total of nineteen times throughout the narrative of the offerings of the princes. This is certainly in order to establish a rule for all generations.

Meshech Chochmah asks why this lesson is not derived from the word "אחת" which appears earlier in the listing of the tributes (v. 13), both in reference to the "single silver bowl" and regarding the "one silver basin." He points out that it was specifically the ladle which sanctified the dry in-

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the significance of the Mishnah's use of the term מצרף rather than מחבר?

2. Explain R' Yirmiyah's case of צירוף כלי וחיבור מים.

3. What is the point of dispute between Rava and Abaye?

4. What happens when half of a mincha becomes lost?

# HALACHAH Highlight

*Do prohibitions remain dormant until they can apply?*

סדין טמא מדרס ועשאו וילון

*A sheet that was tamei madras and then made into a curtain*

The Gemara teaches that one does not have the wherewithal to prohibit someone else's property. Consequently, one who bows in worship to his friend's animal does not cause that animal to become prohibited as an object of idolatrous worship. What happens if the one who worshipped his friend's animal subsequently purchases that animal<sup>1</sup>? Do we say that now that the animal is his property the prohibition begins? Precedent for this perspective is found in the Gemara Yevamos (32). The Gemara discusses the case of two brothers married to two sisters. When Reuven marries Leah she becomes prohibited to Shimon as his brother's wife. When Shimon then marries Rochel, the additional prohibition to marry Leah that she is his wife's sister does not become activated since there is an existing prohibition that prevents Shimon from marrying Leah. If at some point Reuven and Leah are no longer married and the prohibition against marrying his brother's wife no longer applies, Leah remains prohibited to Shimon since she is his wife's sister. In this regard the prohibition of marrying one's wife's sister hangs in the background until it can be relevant. Perhaps the same thing will apply in our case. The animal cannot become prohibited since it belongs to someone else, but the prohibition hangs around in the background and as soon as it can become activated the prohibition will immediately appear.

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

cense which teaches us this lesson, because the dry powder has nothing combining other than its all being in the same utensil. The other utensils each sanctified the minchah of flour after it was saturated with oil, so it was the object which allowed the utensil to combine the entire minchah which was placed into them. ■

Teshuvos Emek Halacha<sup>2</sup> asserts that the two cases are not similar. In the case in Yevamos the reason the prohibition becomes activated is that the prohibiting relationship remains present, just without room to express itself. In contrast, in our case when the animal was worshipped it was not his to prohibit and when the worshipper acquires the animal it is not being worshipped to now become prohibited. As such, the original prohibition expires rather than remain in a dormant state. Proof to this can be found in our Gemara. Abaye challenged the principle that objects could become saturated with tumah from a Mishnah that discusses a sheet that was tamei and was then made into a curtain. The difficulty with Abaye's question is that perhaps the sheet was saturated with tumah and the second source of tumah is forced to remain in a dormant state until the first tumah could be removed. The reason this is not part of the discussion must be based on our previous explanation. At the time of contact with the zav there was no room for the tumah to take effect since it was already tamei. Now that the original tumah has been removed the second tumah cannot take effect since it is no longer present. ■

1. כל זה בשויית עמק הלכה דלקמן.

2. שויית עמק הלכה ח"א סי' נ"ד. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

*Appeasing the King*

"לא ישים עליה שמן ולא יתן עליה לבונה..."

Rav Zalman Sorotzkin, zt"l, gives a very practical explanation of the verse brought on today's daf. "לא ישים עליה 'שמן ולא יתן עליה לבונה'. The verse teaches that one must not put oil or frankincense on a sin offering. This teaches that Hashem does not want gifts from a person as long as he remains sullied in sin."

He wrote, "This is clear from the gemara in Zevachim brought in Rashi on Chumash which explains why we first bring a korban chatas and only then an

olah. This is compared to an advocate who first works to appease the king and only then does he send his sovereign his gift. While the king is not appeased, it is inappropriate to send a gift. We do not allow oil or frankincense on a korban chatas for a similar reason. These substances are mehaddrim the sacrifice and are like a gift, which is not appropriate for a sinner until he first appeases the king with his sin offering."

He continued, "We can learn a practical lesson from this regarding someone who wishes to do teshuvah. If this person knows in his heart that he should fast yet he cannot, since doing so would ruin his constitution, the seforim give clear direction regarding what he should do. Instead of fasting he should subsist

on the simplest foods he can. First and foremost he should avoid all superfluous food eaten only for pleasure. If possible, he should live on bread and water for a certain amount of time (with the exception of Shabbos of course)."

He concluded, "This is a practical way for one to fulfill the sacrifice of דלי דלות. As the Gemara in Nedarim 40 explains 'אין דל אלא חולה' — There is no poor man like a sick man.' Today, when we are not healthy enough to fast, we should at least fulfill what we can. 'לא ישים עליה שמן ולא יתן עליה לבנה כי חטאת היא'; through eating bread and water or avoiding whatever ta'anugim we can, our sins will be atoned." ■

1. אזנים לתורה, ויקרא, ה' י"א. ■