

*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) Benefit that comes to a person against his will (cont.)

Abaye and Rava present the source for their respective rulings.

The Gemara digresses to discuss the teaching of Bar Kappara that sound, appearance, and smell are not subject to the prohibition of me'ilah.

Following a challenge to this ruling R' Pappa limits Bar Kappara's ruling to sound and appearance.

Two unsuccessful attempts are made to support the second version of Rava's position.

The Gemara successfully refutes the first version of Rava's position.

### 2) Benefiting from prohibited substances

A Baraisa is cited that teaches the consequences for heating an oven with a prohibited substance.

A contradiction is noted between the previously cited Baraisa which rules that a new oven heated with a prohibited substance must be destroyed and a second Baraisa that rules it need only be cooled.

The Gemara answers that the two Baraisos reflect the disagreement between R' Eliezer and Rabanan regarding benefiting from something which is the joint product of prohibited and permitted items.

A search begins to identify the original ruling of R' Eliezer's strict ruling. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Is it prohibited to derive benefit from gazing at the Beis HaMikdash?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. When is a sacred item no longer subject to the prohibition of me'ilah?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Why is it prohibited to spread out a found item (which should be returned) in front of guests?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Explain: זזה וזה גורם.  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The calf which comes to thresh*

הכניסה לרבקה ודשה כשרה

Rashi explains that this discussion refers to the calf used for the procedure of Eglar Arufa. The law is that the only animal which is eligible to be used for this mitzvah is one which was never used to do physical labor. However, the question here is about a calf that was placed in a group of animals which were tied together in order to trample upon stalks of grain to thresh them. The farmer, though, only included this calf with the group in order that it nurse from its mother at will, but not specifically in order that it participate fully in the threshing task. This calf is therefore still eligible to be used for Eglar Arufa. Rabeinu Dovid explains that the farmer did not want it to do threshing, but Ritva (to Bava Metzia 30b) writes that we do not require that the intent be against its working, only that the threshing not be a specific intent.

Rabeinu Chananel explains that the farmer placed this calf in this group in order to fatten it (the word רבקה means to be fed, as we find in Yirmiyahu 46:21—"עגלי מרבק—fatted calves.") This is why the Gemara states that when the owner found out that the animal participated in threshing, he was disappointed, because any toil which the animal did would have caused a loss of weight, and the farmer's intent was for the animal to gain weight. (Rabeinu Dovid).

Tosafos explains that this discussion of the Gemara is dealing with a calf which is to be used for the Parah Aduma, which also needs to be an animal which has never been involved in physical labor. Although the Gemara brings the verse לא יעבוד בו from Devarim 21, which is clearly in the parsha of Eglar Arufa, this is because the halachos of Parah Aduma are learned from Eglar Arufa via a גזירה שוה.

Chazon Ish points out that according to Rashi, who explains that we are dealing with Eglar Arufa, there is a problem. The halachah of Eglar Arufa is that it would not be disqualified by threshing with its feet. Technically, the only labor which disqualifies this calf is when it pulls a yoke (Sota 46a). Chazon Ish explains that we must say that it did threshing by pulling a special piece of equipment used for threshing.

Meiri explains that the Gemara which says that it is only disqualified by pulling a tool is when the labor involved requires such an act. However, threshing would disqualify the animal even if it is done without pulling a special piece of equipment, because it is done by foot. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Smelling the aroma of forbidden foods

והמריח בה פטור אלא שמעל

The one who smells it (the incense used in the Temple) is exempt (from kareis) but he has committed me'ilah (profane use of holy goods).

The Rishonim<sup>1</sup> explain that the above law includes all types of issurei hana'ah (items which are forbidden to be used to derive any form of benefit from). Therefore any issur hana'ah which was made for its fragrance – may not be smelled. However<sup>2</sup> if an איסור הנאה was not produced for its fragrance, smelling it is not classified as 'deriving benefit' and is permitted. This is the accepted ruling of the Poskim<sup>3</sup>. However the Beur Halachah<sup>4</sup> writes that if an issur hana'ah was produced to be eaten, but because of its delicious taste has an enticing smell, it is preferable not to smell it lest one would come to eat it. Clearly one should not smell it to awaken his desire for the forbidden food.

Thus one should not smell<sup>5</sup> chometz during Pesach, similarly one should not smell orlah fruits (fruits in the first 3 years of the tree's growth) since they are איסורי הנאה.<sup>6</sup> According to the Beur Halachah it would be preferable not to smell the aroma of non-kosher meat emitted from non-kosher restaurants, lest he come to want to eat these foods. ■

1. כן מבואר במרדכי בריש פירקין. (וכ"כ בשו"ת הרשב"א ח"א סימן רל"ד. ואורחות חיים בהלכות יין נסק סוף סימן ל"א. והובאו בב"י ביור"ד סוף סימן ק"ח) שם
2. שבשו"ע יור"ד סימן ק"ח סעיף ו' התיר להריח דבר שאינו עומד לריח. וכ"ה בבה"ל ריש סימן תמ"ג. והדין שמותר להריח דבר האסור רק באכילה, כ"כ בה"ל סימן רט"ז ס"ב בד"ה המוסק.
3. בבה"ל הנ"ל בסימן רט"ז ס"ב. ועי' ביור"ד סימן ק"ח בפת"ש ס"ק ה' בשם ש"ג. וקצ"ע
4. וכ"כ להדיא בה"ל בריש בימן תמ"ג
5. כמפורש בשו"ע ביור"ד ק"ח ס"ז. ועי' שע"ת באו"ח רי"ז ס"ק ו' שפרחים של ערלה (ולפני שנעשה פרי גדול קצת) מותר להריחם. ועע"ש בשו"ע רי"ז ס"ד ה', שהמריח דבר שאסור להריחו אין לברך עליו ברכת בשמים ■

# STORIES off the Daf

## Utmost caution regarding Sha'atnez

והצנועין מפשילן לאחוריהן

The Steipler Gaon, zt"l, was already famous as a young man for his great diligence in learning and his strict adherence to all mitzvos. When he printed his first pamphlet of original chiddushim it came to the attention of the Chazon Ish, who decided that he would be a perfect match for his pious younger sister. Further inquiries were made and a meeting between the two was arranged.

The young Steipler, knowing he was going on a long trip during which he would be unable to study with full concentration, stayed up the night before studying to make up for the lost time.

In the morning when he boarded the train and was ready to some well-deserved rest, he noticed that the seats were all upholstered. As he didn't know which materials were used, he would not sit down so as not to transgress the prohibition of sha'atnez.

When he finally arrived, exhausted from the long journey, he was welcomed with great honor and respect. His prospective match was introduced and they began talking. Just then, the effects of the trip caught up with him and he

promptly fell asleep. When he was told what happened, the Chazon Ish realized that there must be a good explanation for this behavior. When the Steipler awoke, he indeed explained the reason for his exhaustion and apologized profusely.

All of this served to convince the family of his greatness even more, and the match was speedily concluded. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
As a zechus for a refuah sheleimah for  
אברהם ירחמיאל בן זלטה גולדה

