

6 Tishrei 5775
Sept. 30, 2014



Chagigah Daf 22

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

Rava had presented 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 comments: Rava agrees with a statement made by Rav Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha, for he said: There are eleven stringencies for kodesh listed in the Mishna. [*This is the proof to the consistency: There are eleven halachos listed in the Mishna and Rav Nachman counts them separately. It is evident that the first case and the fifth case are based upon two different reasonings; the first (one utensil inside the other) is because we 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, and the fifth case (a garment with a knot) is because of chatzitzah.*]

The Gemora asks: What is the practical difference between the explanation of Rabbi Ila (*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.) and the explanation of Rava (*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 answers: A case that there would be a difference between them would be if one would fill a large basket or strainer with utensils and immerse them. There still would be a concern for a chatzitzah because the inner utensil would weigh down on the outer one; however, there would be no concern that people might immerse needles or spinning hooks inside a utensil whose opening is not the required size of a skin bottle’s tube because a large basket or strainer will always have a large opening and they would not be included in the decree.

The Gemora notes that Rava is consistent with his opinion stated elsewhere, for Rava said: If one filled a basket or large strainer with vessels and immersed them, they become tahor; but if a mikvah was divided by a basket or large strainer, then whoever immerses himself there, his immersion is not

effective for him, for the earth is entirely porous, nevertheless we require that there should be forty se'ah of water in one place. [Water flows through the porous earth, and water appearing at any particular spot is bound to be connected underground to some big stream elsewhere, yet this connection is not valid, for we require forty se'ah of water in one place.] (22a)

The Gemora qualifies the ruling: One cannot immerse one utensil inside another if the opening is less than the size of a skin bottle's tube is only when the outer utensil is tahor; however, if the outer utensil is tamei, we can utilize the principle of *migu* and say that since the immersion is valid in regards to the outside utensil (*and it is evident that the water from the mikvah is connected to the inside of the outer utensil*), it will be valid for the inner utensil, as well. The Gemora proves this from a Mishna in Mikvaos (6:2): If one filled vessels with vessels and immersed them, these interior vessels also become tahor (irrespective of the size of the opening of the outer vessel; this immersion is valid only for terumah but not for kodesh). But if he did not immerse the outer vessel, then the water (in the outer vessel) mingled (with the water of the mikvah) does not (purify that which is contained in the outer vessel) unless the water in the outer vessel and mikvah are mingled (by a stream) the size of a skin bottle's tube. The Gemora asks: What is the meaning of 'But if he did not immerse the outer vessel, etc.'? This is the meaning: But if he did not need to immerse the outer vessel (for it was tahor), then the water (in the outer vessel) mingled (with the water of the mikvah) does not (purify that which is contained in the outer vessel) unless the water in the outer vessel and

mikvah are mingled (by a stream) the size of a skin bottle's tube. (22a)

The Gemora states that the argument between Rava and Rabbi Ila is in fact a Tannaic dispute. We have learned in a braisa: If one would fill a large basket or strainer with utensils and immerse them, the utensils are tahor whether they will be used for terumah or even kodesh. (*This is consistent with Rava's viewpoint that the concern in the Mishna is because one might immerse needles or spinning hooks inside a utensil whose opening is not the required size of a skin bottle's tube, and this is not applicable by a large basket or strainer since they will always have a large opening and there is no reason for a Rabbinic injunction.*) Abba Shaul maintains that that the immersion is only valid for terumah, but not for kodesh. (*This is consistent with Rabbi Ila's viewpoint that the concern in the Mishna is on the account of chatzitzah and this would apply by a large basket or strainer, as well.*)

The Gemora asks: If we are concerned that the inside utensil weighs down on the outer one and thus prevents the water from circulating freely between them, why is the immersion valid for terumah?

The Gemora answers: Who is this decree for? Obviously, for the chaveirim (*people that are meticulous regarding the performance of mitzvos*), since the am ha-aretz (*one who is not particular in regards to the laws of tumah and tahara*) will not be listening to us regarding how to make a valid immersion. Accordingly, there is no basis for issuing a decree regarding terumah for the chaveirim will ensure that the inside utensil is not weighing down

on the outer one resulting in a chatzitzah, and if he observes that there is a concern, he will undoubtedly raise the inside utensil.

The Gemora asks: If so, let it be valid for kodesh, as well?

The Gemora answers: We are concerned that an am haaretz will observe a chaver immersing one utensil inside of another and he will not know that the chaver is making certain that there is no chatzitzah, and he will subsequently do the same.

The Gemora asks: If so, we should disqualify the immersion for terumah, as well (*perhaps an am haaretz will observe a chaver immersing one utensil inside of another and he will not know that the chaver is making certain that there is no chatzitzah, and he will subsequently do the same and use the utensil for terumah*)?

The Gemora answers: Regarding terumah we have an option, that we will not accept terumah from an am haaretz.

The Gemora asks: If that is an option, why don't we say the same thing by kodesh and not accept kodoshim from them?

The Gemora answers: This would create animosity between the am haaretzim and the chaveirim.

The Gemora asks: Won't there be animosity by the fact that we are not accepting terumah from them.

The Gemora answers: No, because the am haaretzim always have the alternative of giving their terumah to a Kohen am haaretz. (22a)

The Gemora notes: Who is the Tanna that is concerned for animosity? It is Rabbi Yosi, for it was taught in a braisa: Rabbi Yosi said: Why is everyone trusted throughout the year in regard to the taharah of the wine and oil (they bring for the Altar in the Beis HaMikdash)? It is in order that each and every person may not go and give and build a *bamah* (private Altar) for himself, and burn a parah adumah (red heifer) for himself.

Rav Pappa said: According to whom is it that we accept nowadays the testimony of an am ha-aretz? According to whom? According to Rabbi Yosi (since he is concerned for animosity). (22a)

The Gemora asks: Why do we permit the immersion of one utensil inside another for terumah; perhaps an am haaretz will observe this and do the same for his utensils, and subsequently a chaver will borrow the utensil from the am haaretz and use it for terumah? The Gemora cites a Mishna in Idiyos (1:14): An earthenware vessel protects everything (contained inside of it from contracting tumah from a corpse that is under the same roof; this is because earthenware is distinct that it only contracts tumah from its interior; not its exterior); these are the words of Beis Hillel. Beis Shammai say: It protects only food, beverages and other earthenware vessels. Beis Hillel said to Beis Shammai: Why (such a distinction)? Beis Shammai answered: It is because it is tamei on account of the am ha-aretz, and a vessel which is tamei cannot interpose (between the items

contained in the vessel and the corpse tumah). Beis Hillel said to them: But have you not declared the food and beverages to be tahor? Beis Shammai answered: When we declared the food and beverages to be tahor, we declared them tahor only for the am ha-aretz himself; but should we therefore declare also the (non-earthenware) vessel (contained in the earthenware vessel) to be tahor, which would make it tahor for you (a chaver) as well as for him (an am ha-aretz)? [This is because a chaver might borrow it from the am ha-aretz.]

[The Gemora will articulate its question, but first, it quotes a related braisa] It was taught in a braisa: Rabbi Yehoshua said: I am ashamed of your words, Beis Shammai! Is it possible that if a woman (in the upper floor of a house whose passageway is blocked by an earthenware vessel) kneads dough in a trough, the woman and the trough become tamei for seven days, but the dough remains tahor? And in the same vein, if there is (in the upper room) a flask full of beverages, the flask contracts seven-day-tumah, but the beverage remains tahor!? One of the disciples of Beis Shammai joined him in debate and said to him: I will tell you the reason of Beis Shammai. Rabbi Yehoshua replied: Speak! So he said to him: Does a tamei vessel interpose (the penetration of tumah), or not? He replied: It does not interpose. [The disciple continued] Are the vessels of an am ha-aretz tahor or tamei? He replied: tamei. [The disciple said] And if you would say to him that they are tamei, will he pay any heed to you? And not only that - but if you would say to him that they are tamei, he will reply: Mine are tahor and yours are tamei. And this is the reason of Beis Shammai. Immediately, Rabbi Yehoshua went and prostrated himself upon the graves of Beis

Shammai. He said: I have spoken against you, bones of Beis Shammai. If your unexplained teachings are so logical, how much more so the explained teachings. It is said that all his (R' Yehoshua's) days, his teeth were black by reason of his fasts.

Now, the Mishna had stated: for you (a chaver) as well as for him (an am ha-aretz); accordingly, we see that we borrow from them!?

The Gemora answers: If we borrow from them, we will immerse the utensil prior to using it.

The Gemora asks: if so, Beis Hillel should have replied to Beis Shammai that when we borrow from them, we immerse them (before using them)!?

The Gemora answers: Something which has become tamei with corpse tumah requires sprinkling on the third and the seventh day (of the taharah process), and people usually do not lend a vessel for a seven day period.

The Gemora asks: And are they not believed regarding immersion? [Why is it necessary for the chaver to immerse the utensil after borrowing it?] Didn't we learn in a braisa that an am ha-aretz is believed that an immersion was done in regards to corpse tumah?

Abaye answers: He is believed in respect to his body but not in regards to his utensils.

Rava answers: He is believed to say that he never immersed one utensil inside another, but he is not believed to say that he immersed the utensil inside



another one, but the opening was at least the size of a skin bottle's tube.

The Gemora cites a braisa to support Rava: An am ha-aretz is believed that his produce is not in a state where it is susceptible to become tamei (*it never got wet*), but he is not believed to say that it was susceptible to become tamei, but it didn't occur. (22a – 22b)

The Mishna had stated: Different parts of the utensil are considered separate for terumah, but not for kodesh (*if one part becomes tamei, the rest of the utensil becomes tamei*).

The Gemora explains this by citing a Mishna in Keilim (25:6): If a wooden or metal utensil becomes tamei from a liquid that touches the outside of the utensil (*this tumah is only Rabbinic because a utensil can only become tamei from an av hatumah, i.e. any original source of tumah, such as the spit or urine from a niddah or a zav*); only the outside of the utensil will become tamei; the inside, the lip, and its handles will remain tahor. (*If the situation would involve a Biblical tumah, the entire utensil would become tamei.*) If the utensil became tamei on the inside, the entire utensil becomes tamei. (22b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

AVOIDING STRIFE

There are numerous places throughout Chazal, where the sages permitted various things (that should have been prohibited) because otherwise it

would create animosity amongst each other. Here, in brief, are some of these situations.

*** If a Kohen Gadol became unfit on Yom Kippur and we appointed another Kohen Gadol to replace him for that day; the first one returns to his position and the second one cannot serve as a Kohen Gadol or as a Kohen Hedyot (common Kohen). He cannot serve as a regular Kohen because of the principle that one can ascend in matters of sanctity but one cannot descend in matters of sanctity. He cannot serve as a Kohen Gadol because this would create animosity between him and the original Kohen Gadol. There is an opinion that disagrees and allows the substitute Kohen Gadol to serve as a Kohen Gadol. (Yoma 12a)

*** Even according to the opinion mentioned above that we allow the substitute Kohen Gadol to serve as a Kohen Gadol, that is only by a similar type of Kohen Gadol; however, we do not allow the Kohen Gadol who was appointed to lead the battle to serve in the Bais HaMikdosh together with the other Kohen Gadol; this would create certain animosity.

*** We do not anoint two Kohanim Gedolim simultaneously because it will create animosity. (Yerushalmi Yoma 1:1)

*** One who makes a vow that his friend should eat with him (otherwise, he will be forbidden to derive benefit from him) and the friend does not trust the one who took the oath in regards to maaser; he is permitted to eat by him the first Shabbos (a marital feast) because otherwise it would create animosity. (D'mai 4:2)

*** One who is particular not to eat bread baked by a non-Jew is permitted to eat the bread if he is eating at the same table along with those that are not particular on this stringency. This is because otherwise, it would create animosity. He is not permitted to eat the butter of a gentile because it is not considered the primary part of the meal and he could say that he is not interested in eating butter now. (Beis Yosef in the name of Rabbeinu Simcha Y”D 112)

*** We are required to make Eruvei Chatzeros with a full loaf of bread and not with pieces since this will lead to strife among the partners; those who give full loaves might resent those who give pieces. (Eruvin 81a)

*** We should not have festivities for two brides in the same city unless there are enough people to bring about joy to each of them. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar says: Even in that case it’s forbidden because one might be pretty and the other not; they might bestow more honor on one than the other and this will lead to animosity.

*** The Mishna in Taanis ruled that if it still did not rain after the seven fasts, they should conduct less business. They should not become involved with building, planting, marrying or greeting their friends. They should conduct their lives as if they were condemned by Hashem.

The Gemora elaborates on the ruling of the Mishna that one should not greet his friend. The Gemora states that Torah scholars should not greet each other at all. If an unlearned man greets a Torah

scholar, he should respond in a low tone and in a somber manner because otherwise it would lead to strife amongst them.