

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Contact between qualified and unqualified korbanos (cont.)

Shmuel continues to cite the sources related to the principle that applies when qualified sacred items come in contact with unqualified sacred items.

A Baraisa in the name of R' Akiva cites an alternative set of halachos that emerge from the cited juxtaposition.

As the Baraisa is cited the Gemara clarifies different points in the Baraisa.

Expositions in the Baraisa are unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Laundering

Rava presents a couple of inquiries related to blood of a Chatas that splatters on a garment and the inquiries are left unresolved.

הדרן עלך דם חטאת

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a presentation of different categories of kohanim and whether they are entitled to portions from a korban. The Mishnah concludes with the general principles that apply to these different categories. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why are two expositions necessary to teach the halacha of something that absorbs taste from a korban?
2. What is the source that a chatas must come from private rather than communal funds?
3. Are people particular if they have more than one type of stain on their garment?
4. Who is given a portion of the skin of an animal korban?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Blood on the hands of a butcher, ink on the hand of a dyer

דם על בגדו חוצץ ואם טבח הוא אינו חוצץ

The halacha is that a person who needs to be immersed in a mikveh must be free of any interpositions on his body which prevent direct contact of his body with the water. Torah law is that if the interposition covers most of one's body, and the substance on one's skin is one about which the person cares to remove, the immersion is not valid. If it only covers a minority of one's body, or if it covers a majority, but the person does not care that the substance remains on his body, the immersion is only rabbinically disqualified. These are also the guidelines if an object must be immersed and it has some intervening substance on its surface. If it covers most of the object and the owner cares to remove it, the immersion is invalid by Torah law. If only one of these factors is present, the immersion is unacceptable rabbinically.

Rava states that it is obvious to him that if a person has a blood stain on his body, this is the type of substance a person cares to have removed from his skin before immersing himself in a mikveh. Rashi, among other Rishonim, explain that if a person is a butcher who handles blood all day long and he does not care if there is blood on his clothes or hands, then blood on his clothing or body does not constitute an interposition. Whether a substance is a problem is a function of one's own level of caring to remove that substance, and a butcher does not care about blood on him.

Beis Yosef (Y.D. 198) asks why we allow this evaluation to be subjective. Why is it based upon each individual to determine whether an object bothers him or not? We should rather say that this person's lack of concern is to be disregarded, and the determination whether something belongs on one's skin should be based objectively, upon what most people feel. Beis Yosef answers that the Gemara is saying that blood on the skin of a butcher is something that no butcher cares about, and we are not just judging this one person. Therefore, in any area of professionals, if they, as a group, do not care about a particular substance being on their skin, that substance would not constitute an interposition.

HALACHAH Highlight

Is it permitted to wipe blood from one's hands onto a friend's soiled garment?

דם ורובב על בגדו מהו

If one has blood and grease on his garment what is the halacha?

Teshuvos Torah Lishma¹ presented the following question. There was a person whose hands were dirty with blood and he wanted to know whether he was allowed to wipe his hands on his friend's garment that was already soiled with fat and grease. On the hand one could argue that since the garment was already dirty and in need of laundering adding blood doesn't make the garment any worse and it is permitted. On the other hand, one could argue that the owner doesn't mind the grease and fat on his garment since he works in a profession that leaves his garment dirty from those substances, but he may be particular about the appearance of blood on his garment and it would be prohibited for one to wipe blood off his hands onto his friend's dirty garment. Similarly, one could ask about a circumstance of a person whose garment is commonly soiled from grease and fat and occasionally he has blood on his garment as well. In such a case would one be permitted to wipe blood on his friend's garment that is not currently soiled with blood or not?

Torah Lishma answered his questions from our Gemara. The Gemara teaches that a person whose garment is commonly soiled with fat is particular if there is a blood

(Insight...continued from page 1)

The Rishonim write, based upon this principle, that ink does not serve as an interposition on the hands of a dyer for immersion or for netilas yadayim. Divrei Chamudos (Hilchos Mikva'os) comments that it seems from the ruling of the Rosh that ink would not be a problem for a dyer anywhere on his body, such as on his face. However, Tur writes that it is only on the hands of a dyer that ink would not be a problem. Meiri (to Niddah 66b) disagrees with this dispensation, and he notes that even dyers are careful to remove ink from their hands on erev Shabbos. ■

stain on that garment and as such a blood stain would constitute an interposition as far as immersing the garment in the mikvah is concerned. This establishes a principle that even though a garment may be soiled one may still be particular about additional stains from different substances. Therefore in the first case it is not permitted for one to wipe blood from his hands on his friend's grease stained garment. Rava goes on to inquire about a garment-stained with blood and fat of a person who works with fat and blood and whether the substances constitute an interposition. The Gemara does not resolve this matter, therefore, regarding our question of whether one could wipe blood from his hands onto the fat-stained garment of someone who also occasionally has blood stains on his garment, one must take a stringent approach and it is prohibited. ■

1. שו"ת תורה לשמה סי' ש"ס. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Dyes and Stains

"פשיטא לי דם על בגדו חוצץ..."

Women have always devised many ways of beautifying themselves, with customs changing with the times and the places. Many centuries ago, it was a common practice for women in Arabic lands to color the face, hands, or hair. A certain person wondered specifically about coloring hands; need the dye be removed before the woman immersed in the mikvah or not? Although he suspected that this is not a

problem, especially since the prevalent custom was not to bother about this and the halachic authorities didn't protest, he wished to receive a clear ruling from a great authority.

When he asked the Rashba this question, he agreed that it was permitted. "This is clear from Rava's statement in Dam Chatas. There he says that blood on a garment is chotzetz, but if the owner is a butcher, it is not chotzetz. Similarly, a stain from fat or wax on a garment is chotzetz, but if the owner sells the item which has been stained it is not a chatizah. Clearly we can learn from here that your question is not a problem. I merited to tell this

over to my teacher, the Ramban, and he agreed that it was possible to rely on this proof for halachah l'maaseh!"¹

When the Rosh, zt"l, was asked the same question regarding dying hair and the like he gave a very compelling reason why this should not be a chatzizah. "Women do this since they understand that it beautifies them, so how could it be chotzetz? Not only is she not bothered by this, she is bothered when it fades and rushes to reapply the dye! How could this possibly constitute a chatzizah, when she is bothered when she lacks it?"² ■

1. שו"ת הרשב"א המיוחסות לרמב"ן, סי' קכ"ד

2. רא"ש בהלכות מקואות, סי' כ"ז ■

