

5 Tishrei 5775  
Sept. 29, 2014



Chagigah Daf 21

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Mishna had stated: We may immerse utensils inside of other utensils in a mikvah for terumah, but not for kodesh.

The Gemora asks: Why is this forbidden to do by kodesh?

Rabbi Il’a answered: It is because the weight of the inside utensil prevents the water from circulating freely between the two utensils; if this would occur, the immersion would not be valid because the water must touch every part of the utensil. *[This case would not constitute a Biblical chatzitzah (an interposition between the water and the utensil) because the water does find a way to pass through the utensils, but since it appears like a chatzitzah, the Chachamim were stringent regarding kodesh, but not in regards to terumah.]*

The Gemora asks: One of the other stringencies listed later in the Mishna is on account of chatzitzah; this would imply that the reason for the first stringency is not because of chatzitzah. The Mishna had stated: When immersing garments for kodesh, one must first untie them and dry them, but for terumah one may immerse them while they are knotted (*and/or wet*). The reason for this halachah is because of chatzitzah (the water cannot touch every part of the garment when it is tied); shouldn’t the first stringency be on account of something else?

The Gemora answers: Both of these stringencies are in fact because of chatzitzah, and they are both necessary. The first stringency is based upon the logic that the weight of the utensil causes the chatzitzah; this does not apply by the latter case, which is referring to a garment where there is no weight. The second stringency is based upon the logic that a knot prevents the water from touching all parts of the garment; this does not apply by the former case, where the water can cause the inside utensil to float and the water will be able to circulate freely. (21a – 21b)

The Gemora comments: Rabbi Il’a is consistent with a different statement that he said in the name of Rabbi Chanina bar Pappa. He said: There are ten stringencies for kodesh listed in the Mishna. *(This is the proof to the consistency: There are eleven halachos listed in the Mishna and yet Rabbi Il’a said that there were only ten. It is evident that two of them are based upon the same reasoning; the first (one utensil inside the other) and the fifth (a garment with a knot) are both because of chatzitzah.)*

Rabbi Il’a continues: The first five apply to kodesh and to chulin which was made according to the taharah standard of kodesh (*pious people would treat chulin in their house as if it was kodoshim in order to train the members of their family with these stringencies*). The last five only apply to kodesh.



The Gemora asks: Why is there this distinction?

The Gemora answers: The first five are stricter because they have legitimate Biblical concerns; the last five are merely Rabbinic decrees and therefore they apply to kodesh, but not to chulin which was made according to the taharah standard of kodesh. (21b)

Rava presents an alternative explanation to the Mishna: The reason that the Chachamim issued a decree against immersing one utensil inside the other is because they were concerned that people might immerse needles or spinning hooks (*small items*) inside a utensil whose opening is not the required size of a skin bottle's tube (*if the opening is less than that, the immersion is not valid because we view the water inside the utensil as separate from the water in the mikvah*).

The Gemora cites a Mishna in Mikvaos (6:7) which states: In order to connect a mikvah which is lacking forty se'ah to a mikvah which contains forty se'ah, there must be an opening in the wall separating the two mikvaos at least the size of a skin bottle's tube. The Mishna explains that we measure the outer circumference of the tube, which the Chachamim established to be where one can freely rotate his two fingers inside the hole. (*The connection of the two mikvaos is known as hashakah.*) (21b – 22a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### FOOD FOR THOUGHT

\*\*\* There are eleven halachos (stringencies that apply by kodesh and not terumah) listed in the Mishna and

yet Rabbi Il'a said that there were only ten. It is evident that two of them are based upon the same reasoning; the first (one utensil inside the other) and the fifth (a garment with a knot) are both because of chatzitzah.)

If they are both on the account of chatzitzah, why did the Mishna separate them; shouldn't they be listen one after the other?

(Turei Even, Merumei Sadeh)

\*\*\* The Mishna had stated: We may immerse utensils inside of other utensils in a mikvah for terumah, but not for kodesh.

Rabbi Il'a answered: It is because the weight of the inside utensil prevents the water from circulating freely between the two utensils; if this would occur, the immersion would not be valid because the water must touch every part of the utensil. (*This case would not constitute a Biblical chatzitzah (an interposition between the water and the utensil) because the water does find a way to pass through the utensils, but since it appears like a chatzitzah, the Chachamim were stringent regarding kodesh, but not in regards to terumah.*)

In the sefer Masaas Binyomin (81), he rules that a woman who is physically unable to stand can be immersed in the mikvah while she is laying on a mat that is not susceptible to tumah.

The Sidrei Taharah (198: 47) asks from our Gemora: Shouldn't her weight on the mat constitute a chatzitzah; the water will not be able to circulate freely between the woman and the mat?



I had a similar question on the Gemora above: If a wave that consisted of forty se'ah separated from the sea and fell on a person or utensils that were tamei, they become tahor. The Gemora explains that the Mishna is referring to a case where the person is sitting on the shore waiting for the wave to separate from the sea and fall on him or on the utensils. It is evident from our Gemora that even though the person did not directly immerse the utensils in the water; he was merely anticipating that the wave will detach itself from the sea and fall on the contaminated utensils, this is sufficient, provided that he has intention that the water should purify the utensils.

How does the water get in between the person or the utensils and the ground on the shore?

\*\*\* Dayan Weiss (4:35) has a teshuva regarding the validity of immersion while wearing a bathing suit.

\*\*\* Shoel Umeishiv (I:2:122) writes: "In the year 5615, I was learning Meseches Chagigah on the yahrtzeit of my mother because my father told me that the holy seforim say that it is beneficial to study Meseches Chagigah on a yahrtzeit."

What is the source for this and what is the reasoning?

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Yitzchak's Food*

The Malbim asks: Our forefather Yitzchak certainly ate his chullin only in a state of taharah; accordingly, how did he partake of that which Esav had brought for him?

He answers, based on a Gemora in Sotah (48a), which states that at the time when the Jewish people were tahor and they were occupied with taharah, the Holy One, Blessed be He, would purify the fruits from any foul taste and bad odor, but after the purity has ceased from the Jewish people, the taste and aroma of the fruits were taken with it. The Gemora (49a) relates that Rav Huna once found a juicy date which he took and wrapped in his kerchief. His son, Rabbah, came and said to him, "I smell the fragrance of a juicy date." His father said to him, "My son, there is purity in you" (for you are conducting yourself in purity, and that is why the aroma of the fruits have not been negated for you).

Accordingly, it can be suggested that after Yitzchak smelled the aroma emanating from the clothes of the person standing before him, he realized that this person is meticulous with the laws of taharah, and therefore he was able to eat from the food which was hunted for him.