



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Can a secondary matter be more stringent than the primary one?

Three unsuccessful challenges to R' Ada bar Ahavah's principle that a secondary matter can not be more stringent than the primary one are presented.

2) North (cont.)

An alternative source is offered that proves that the slaughter and receiving of the blood of an Olah must be to the north.

Expositions are cited that prove that the procedures on an Asham must also be to the north and that they are essential.

The exposition that proves that they are essential is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) The Metzora's Asham

Ravina explains why the Torah equates the Metzora's Asham to a Chatas and an Olah.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Something derived from a heikesh

Tangential to the previous discussion Rava suggests another source that something derived from a heikesh can not teach about another thing through a heikesh.

R' Pappa unsuccessfully challenges this interpretation.

The Gemara inquires whether something derived from a heikesh could teach about another thing through a gezeirah shavah.

An attempt to resolve this inquiry is suggested but rejected by R' Yochanan.

R' Yochanan suggests a proof to his principle.

This proof is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why does physical sanctity take hold onto a temurah?  
-----
2. How do we know that the receiver of the blood of an ashram must stand in the north?  
-----
3. Why does the Torah equate the Metzora's ashram to a chatas and an olah?  
-----
4. Explain the principal למידין למד מלמד.  
-----

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Comparing plagues of garments and plagues of people*

קרחת וגבחת באדם

The Gemara analyzes the rules of a law that is derived using a *heikesh*, an association or comparison between two subjects. The Gemara asks whether a law derived from a *heikesh* can then be applied to other areas of halacha using a *heikesh* once again. The Gemara cites a Baraisa which answers this question.

If a spot which is one of the four shades which are impure (see Mishnah Nega'im 1:1) appears on a wool or linen garment, the kohen inspects it and the garment is put away for seven days. If, after seven days the spot stays the same, the garment is laundered and put away for another seven days. If the spot dimmed, the place of the spot is cut out and the garment is pure. If the spot returns and appears on part of the garment, this "growing plague" — *פורחת* is impure and the entire garment must be burned. However, if the discoloring covers the entire garment, the garment is pure.

Rebbe Nosson b. Avtulmos teaches that the halacha that the garment which is completely covered is pure is learned from the law of plagues upon people. There, we find the terms *קרחת* (worn) and *גבחת* (new) in reference to both garments (Vayikra 13:55) and in reference to the head of people (ibid. v. 42). Just as the plague on a person's head is pure if it afflicts the entire head (as the Gemara proves), so too is the plague pure if it afflicts the entire garment.

Rashi explains that the terms *קרחת* and *גבחת* appear in regard to a plague on a place of hair on the head. Technically, *גבחת* is on the head from where the crown of the head slopes toward his face. *קרחת* refers to where the crown of the head slopes toward his back (see Rashi, Vayikra 13:41). The term *פריחה* is used in regard to a plague on the flesh. The rules of a spot in a hairy spot are not the same as the rules on the flesh of the body. A spot on the flesh is impure when there is a white hair, but an impure spot in a hairy place is impure when the color of the hair is yellow. Nevertheless, we can relate the term *פריחה* regarding a person to the same term as it is used for a garment by linking the two laws which use the similar terms *קרחת* and *גבחת* because there is a connection between the laws of spots on the flesh and those in the hair for people.

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Redeeming ma'aser sheni in our times

והרי מעשר דהוא נפדה

But what about ma'aser [sheni] that could be redeemed

The Gemara teaches that ma'aser sheni that becomes tamei can be redeemed even in Yerushalayim. In Mas-seches Ma'aser Sheni (3:9) the Mishnah teaches that even if the ma'aser sheni is only Rabbinically tamei it may be redeemed in Yerushalayim. This means that although Biblically the ma'aser sheni is fit for consumption, nevertheless, since the Torah teaches that when it may not be eaten it may be redeemed, that includes even if the restriction against eating it is merely Rabbinic.

Minchas Chinuch<sup>1</sup> asks why ma'aser sheni nowadays cannot be redeemed even while tahor. A prerequisite to eating ma'aser sheni is the presence of the altar. Since there is no altar we are not permitted to consume ma'aser sheni and thus it should be able to be redeemed. He answers that we always anticipate that the Beis HaMikdash will be rebuilt soon and when that happens the ma'aser sheni would be edible. Therefore, we do not redeem ma'aser sheni that is tahor for that reason. In contrast, ma'aser sheni that is tamei will never be fit for consumption and thus may be redeemed.

Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach<sup>2</sup> challenged this explanation of Minchas Chinuch. According to Minchas Chi-

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

Rambam (Hilchos Tum'as Tzara'as 12:8) rules according to Rebbe Nosson b. Avtulmos that if a garment becomes fully afflicted it is pure. He also rules this way in reference to a נתק (Ibid. 8:12). Yet, he does not rule that a fully-afflicted area is pure regarding קרחת and גבחת. It could be, however, that Rambam holds that the law stated in reference to נתקים are the same as those for קרחת and גבחת, and his ruling sufficed for all cases. ■

nuch's practical explanation we should say that if one, for example, has ma'aser sheni vegetables that are close to going rotten and it is Erev Shabbos afternoon it should be permitted to redeem them even though they are tahor. Since the Beis HaMikdash will not be rebuilt until the earliest after Shabbos the vegetables are in a state in which they will not be able to be consumed, therefore, it should be permitted to redeem them while yet tahor. Since we do not find such a halacha there must be an alternative resolution. Rav Auerbach suggests that the allowance to redeem ma'aser sheni is limited to circumstances related to the produce itself. If the produce is tamei it is permitted to redeem it but when the produce is inedible due to other circumstances, e.g. the Beis HaMikdash has not been rebuilt, there is no allowance to redeem the ma'aser sheni while in a state of taharah. ■

1. מנחת חינוך מצוה תע"ג אות ד'.
2. שו"ת מנחת שלמה ח"א סי' ס"ד אות ה'.

# STORIES Off the Daf

## An Obvious Blemish

"פרח בכולו טהור..."

Rav Dovid of Skver, zt"l, explained how to ensure that one's children grow up pure. "The main thing in chinuch is the quality of outside influences on one's children, especially their friends. This is what my father zt"l, would emphasize: only if there is a genuine circle of friends can there be continuity to the children's 'עשה טוב'. The way we fulfill 'סור מרע' with children is to protect them from bad friends, because they have a huge influence, especially

while one is still young and easily swayed.

"My father even recounted that one of the great tzaddikim of his generation worked very hard to educate his children to yir'as shomayim but was only partially successful since he was not discriminating about his children's friends."<sup>1</sup>

The Rama, zt"l, learned a similar lesson from a statement on today's daf. "On Zevachim 49 we find a paradoxical-seeming halachah. Although if one contracted צרעת that is larger than the size of a גריס he is defiled, if the צרעת spreads over his entire head or body, the plague no longer defiles and does not require quarantine.

"This halachah teaches us a very essential lesson about impurity. It is only when the impurity is not readily obvious that the impure can have an influence on the unwary or naïve. When the person only seems to be slightly blemished, one is prone to learn from his negative actions, rationalizing that he must not be so bad. But if his impurity is readily apparent, everyone knows that he is wicked and acts out of wickedness. Since no one will copy his evil ways there is no longer any reason to quarantine him!"<sup>2</sup> ■

- 1 קובץ משכנות יעקב, כסלו תשנ"ה, ע"ל ל"ב
- 2 תורת העולה, ח"ג, פס"ז ■