



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Offering animals from the mixture (cont.)

Rava's ruling that any one of the collection of animals that contains the prohibited animal is prohibited for use as a korban is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) A mixture that contains the ring of an idol

Rav is cited as ruling that if the ring of an idol became intermingled with other rings and one ring from that mixture fell into the sea the remaining rings are permitted.

Rava unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav issues another ruling related to the ring of an idol becoming intermingled with permitted rings.

The ruling as presented is challenged and consequently revised.

Shmuel maintains that when it comes to idolatry even when numerous doubts exist an item will be prohibited.

Shmuel's position is challenged.

The Gemara responds that there is, in fact, a disagreement amongst Tannaim about this matter and it identifies which opinion Shmuel follows.

R' Shimon's position cited in a previous Baraisa is clarified.

Another suggestion of which Tanna Shmuel follows is presented.

3) Terumah wine

Reish Lakish teaches that if a barrel of terumah wine becomes intermingled with other barrels of wine and then one of those intermingled barrels falls into the sea the ones that remain are permitted.

The necessity for a ruling regarding the ring of an idol and terumah wine is explained.

Rabbah and R' Yosef disagree about an application of Reish Lakish's ruling.

Two additional cases involving mixtures containing terumah wine are discussed.

4) A tereifah animal that becomes mixed with korbanos

D'vei R' Yannai explains the circumstances in which a tereifah animal became mixed with other animals in a manner such that one cannot discern which is the prohibited animal.

Reish Lakish offers a second explanation for this case.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yirmiyah suggests a third explanation.

The Gemara explains why the Amoraim rejected one another's explanation.

5) Korbanos of the same variety that become intermingled

The Mishnah's ruling that the intermingled korbanos could be offered is challenged from the halacha that the owner must lean on the head of his korban.

R' Yosef answers that the Mishnah addresses the case of korbanos belonging to women. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

When a prohibited item will become permitted with time
 אבל תרומה דיש לה מתירין לא

A ring which was used to decorate an idol is prohibited from benefit. If this ring fell into a group of regular rings, the entire mixture is prohibited. Service items for idolatry are not nullified even if they are outnumbered one thousand to one. If, subsequent to the prohibited ring's falling into the permitted pile, one of the rings in the mixture fell into the sea, Rav Nachman ruled that the remaining rings are permitted. We can say that the one that fell in to the pile is the same one that now fell into the sea.

The Gemara now brings the view of Reish Lakish who issued a similar ruling. A sealed barrel of teruma becomes mixed with another one hundred sealed barrels of regular wine. A sealed barrel of wine is among the items which the Gemara (72b) said are "important" and cannot become nullified. If one of the barrels subsequently falls into the sea, the remaining barrels are permitted, as we say that the prohibited barrel which fell into the permitted group is the same one which fell into the sea.

The Gemara explains why both the ruling of Rav Nachman and that of Reish Lakish had to be presented. Rav Nachman's ruling was regarding idolatry, an item which can never become permitted with time (דבר שאין לה מתירין). We might have thought that we issue a lenient ruling only here, but not regarding teruma which can become permitted. On the other hand, the ruling of Reish Lakish was issued regarding a barrel of teruma, where the barrel's falling into the sea is clearly noticeable, as opposed to where a ring falls out of a pile, which is not noticeable. Nevertheless, we are lenient in both the case of a barrel of teruma as well as in the case of a ring.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What was R' Nachman's ruling regarding an idol's ring that becomes intermingled with other rings?

2. What is the point of dispute between Rav and Shmuel?

3. Why are R' Nachman's and Reish Lakish's similar rulings necessary?

4. How is it possible to have a tereifah that is indiscernible?

HALACHAH Highlight

Using wheat kernels that are repulsive to make matzah

כגון דאיערב בנפולה

For example, it became intermingled with an animal that fell

It happened once that upon opening a bag of wheat kernels set aside for Matzah, mouse droppings were discovered in the bag. The owner of the bag inquired of Kesav Sofer¹ whether the wheat is disqualified since it is disgusting, based on the verse קריבהו נא לפחתך—Would you offer this to your governor? Kesav Sofer answered that the wheat is not disqualified since mouse droppings are commonly found in sacks of wheat and it is standard procedure for wheat sellers to sift through the wheat kernels before they grind them into flour. Consequently, the wheat is not disqualified for use for matzah either.

Kesav Sofer then raises a difficulty with this approach from our Gemara. The Gemara relates that if a tereifah becomes intermingled with other korbanos all of the animals become disqualified from use as a korban. The reason² is that each animal would have to be examined to determine whether it is a tereifah and it is disrespectful to perform that examination. Accordingly, one could assert that if it is necessary to examine the wheat to separate mouse droppings, the wheat should also be disqualified for use for the mitzvah. He dismisses this suggestion since there is a fundamental difference between examinations that are commonplace and those that are not commonplace. It is only in the Gemara's case that the animals are disqualified for use as a korban since an examination of the animals would be required and it is uncommon for animals

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Rashi explains that teruma is something which can become permitted by being sold to kohanim, who can eat the entire mixture. Ritva notes that in Bava Metzia (53a), teruma is identified as something which is not permitted with time. It is never permitted for the non-kohen, and it was always permitted for the kohen. This is not what is meant by something which becomes permitted with time. Rather, our Gemara simply means that although teruma will not become permitted with time, Reish Lakish treated this case leniently as if it would become permitted, because of the possibility of selling the mixture to a kohen.

The commentators discuss whether teruma is considered permitted with time because its designation can be released by appealing to a panel of judges (אפשר בשאילה). The Gemara (Nedarim 59a) rejects this notion because there is no mitzvah for this to be done. Alternatively, ט"ז writes that the release is not due to any error in the teruma, but rather due to the mixture. ■

used as korbanos to be examined to determine whether they are tereifos. In contrast, since it is commonplace for people to separate mouse droppings from wheat kernels it is not considered disrespectful and thus the wheat kernels may be used for making matzah. In conclusion, however, he writes that since the one who asked the question was repulsed by the thought of mouse droppings being found in the sack of wheat kernels he should not use those wheat kernels for the matzah that he will use for the mitzvah. ■

1. שו"ת כתב סופר או"ח סי' פ"ח

2. ע' רש"י ד"ה נפולה ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Trappings of Idolatry

טבעת של עבודת כוכבים

Today's daf discusses the jewelry of idolatry.

A certain person was the son of a convert, and his non-Jewish grandmother was a well-meaning woman who wished to help her family as much as possible. Once she saw a silver atarah on someone's tallis and decided that she wished to donate her own fine silver jewelry to be used to fashion a stunning atarah for her grandson's tallis.

Although the grandson wished to do

anything permitted to make his grandmother happy, he wasn't certain that there was no halachic problem with this. After all, we do not use old garments for tashmeshei kedusah. Perhaps just as we may not fashion a paroches from old garments, we also cannot make an atarah from silver used by a civilian? In addition, perhaps she went with this very same silver to church. Wouldn't that be absolutely forbidden to use as an adornment for a mitzvah?

When this question came before Rav Yitzchak Zilberstein, shlit"א, he permitted the grandson to use the silver to fashion an atarah on his tallis. "As far as your first concern, that is certainly no problem as we find in the Bach.¹ The

second concern is also not a problem since this silver jewelry was not itself used for avodah zarah, merely to adorn the grandmother when she went to church. This is similar to the psak of the Pri Megadim regarding using church pews to sit on in shul. He permits this since the benches in shul are not in themselves kadosh and the same is true regarding an atarah. Although it beautifies the tallis, it is not in itself a mitzvah, merely beautifying a garment that is a way to fulfill the mitzvah of tzitzis. This is certainly no worse than church pews which the Pri Megadim permitted."² ■

1. שו"ת הב"ח סי' י"ז

2. ברכי נפשי ויקרא ע' תר"א