Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o"h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

(Mnemonic: Hekeish and gezeirah shavah; kal vachomer.) [It is agreed that] that which is learned through a hekeish does not in turn teach through a hekeish, [this being learned] either by Rava's or by Ravina's [exegesis]. Can that which is learned through a hekeish teach through a gezeirah shavah[1]?

Come and hear: Rabbi Nassan ben Avtulmus said: From where do we know that a spreading outbreak [of tzaraas] in garments [covering the whole] is tahor? Karachas [baldness of the back of the head] and gabbachas [baldness of the front] are mentioned in connection with garments, and also in connection with man: just as in the latter, if [the affliction] spread over the whole skin, he is tahor; so in the former too, if it spread over the whole [garment], it is tahor. And how do we know it there? Because it is written, [And if the tzaraas . . . covers all the skin . . .] from his head even to his feet, and [thereby] his head is compared [through a hekeish] to his feet: as there, when it is all turned white, having broken out all over him, he is tahor; so here too, when it breaks out all over him, he is tahor[2].

Rabbi Yochanan said: In the entire Torah we rule that whatever is learned can teach, except in the case of sacrifices, where we do not rule that whatever is learned can teach. For if it were so [that we did rule thus], let 'northward' not be said in connection with an asham, and it could be inferred from a chatas by the gezeirah shavah of 'it is most holy'. Surely then its purpose is to teach that that which is learned by a hekeish does not in turn teach through a gezeirah shavah.

The Gemara asks: But perhaps [we do not learn it there] because one can refute it: as for a chatas, [it requires north] because it makes atonement for those who are liable to kares?

The Gemara answers: A superfluous 'most holy' is written. (49b3 – 49b4)

That which is learned through a hekeish teaches in turn by a kal vachomer.

[This follows] from what the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught. That which is learned through a hekeish, can it teach through a binyan av[3]?

Rabbi Yirmiyah said: Let 'northward' not be written in connection with an asham, and it could be inferred from a chatas by a binyan av. For what purpose then is it written? Surely to intimate that that which is learned through a hekeish cannot in turn teach through a binyan av.

The Gemara asks: Yet according to your reasoning, let it be inferred from an olah by a binyan av[4]? Why then is it not so inferred? Because you can refute it: as for an olah, [it requires the north] because it is altogether burnt. So in the case of a chatas too, you can refute it: as for a chatas, [it requires the north] because it makes atonement for those who are liable to kares! (49b4 – 50a1)

[1]Thus: The law, which is stated in A, is applied to B by a hekeish; can that then be applied to C, because there is a gezeirah shavah between B and C? Similarly in the other cases that follow.

[2] Thus we first learn by a hekeish that a karachas or gabbachas in human beings covering the whole head is tahor, and then that same law is applied to garments by a gezeirah shavah.

[3]Analogy. This differs from a hekeish, in that in a hekeish Scripture intimates that there is a certain similarity between two subjects, whereas in a binyan av the analogy is drawn from an inherent similarity between two subjects.

[4] For there it is explicitly stated, and the intermediate hekeish is not required at all.

One cannot be learned from one; [but] let one be learned from [the other] two? — From which could it be derived? [Will you say:] Let the Merciful One not write it in the case of an olah, and it could be derived from a chatas and an asham; [then you can argue,] as for these, [they require the north] because they make atonement. Let not the Merciful One write it in respect of a chatas, and let it be derived from the others; [then you can argue,] as for those, the reason is because they are males. Let not the Merciful One write it in connection with an asham and let it be derived from the others; [then you can argue,] the reason is because they operate in the case of a community as in the case of an individual. (50a1)

That which is learned by a gezeirah shavah, can it in turn teach through a hekeish?

Rav Pappa said: It was taught: And this is the law of the shelamim . . . if he offers it for a todah: [from this] we learn that a todah can be brought from maaser (sheini money), since we find that a shelamim can be brought from maaser (sheini money). And how do we know [this of] a shelamim itself? — Because 'there' is written in each case.

Mar Zutra the son of R. Mari to Ravina: But maaser (sheini) of grain is merely chullin[5]?

He said to him: Who says that which is learned must be holy, and that which teaches must be holy[6]? (50a1 – 50a2)

Can that which is learned by a gezeirah shavah teach by a gezeirah shavah?

Rami bar Chama said: It was taught in a Baraisa: Of fine flour scalded [murbeches]: this teaches that the rebuchah [scalded cake] must be of fine flour [soles]. How do we know [the same of] challos (loaves)? Because challos is stated in both places. How do we know it of rekikin [unleavened wafers]? Because matzos [unleavened bread] is written in connection with each[7].

Ravina said to him: How do you know that he learns [the gezeirah shavah of] matzos, matzos, from challos; perhaps he learns it from oven-baked [cakes][8]?

Rather said Rava: It was taught (regarding the bull of the Kohen Gadol): And its innards, and its waste, [even the whole bullock] shall he carry forth [outside the camp]: this teaches that he carries it forth whole. You might think that he burns it whole; [but] 'its head and its legs' is stated here, and 'its head and its legs' is stated elsewhere: as there it means after cutting up, so here too it means after cutting up. If so, as there it is after the flaying [of the skin], so here too it means after the flaying? Therefore, it says: 'and its innards and its waste'. How does this teach [the reverse]? — Said Rav Pappa: Just as its waste is inside of it, so must its flesh be within its skin. And it was [further] taught, Rebbe said: Hide and flesh and waste are mentioned here, and hide and flesh and waste are mentioned elsewhere: as there [it was burnt after] being cut up, but without flaying, so here too [it is burnt after being] cut up, but without flaying[9]. (50a2 – 50b1)

Can that which is learned by a gezeirah shavah teach in turn by a kal vachomer?

[It can, and we learn this by a] kal vachomer: If [that which is learned by] a hekeish, which cannot teach by a hekeish, as follows from either Rava's or Ravina's [proof], can teach by a kal vachomer, which follows from what the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught; then [what is learned through] a gezeirah shavah, which can [in turn] teach by a hekeish, as follows from Rav Pappa, can surely teach [in turn] by a kal vachomer!

[5] And therefore not relevant to our discussion.

[6] It is unnecessary for both to be holy, but only one. We wish to learn about a shelamim, and that indeed is holy.

[7] Thus we first learn by a gezeirah shavah that challos must be of fine flour, and then by a further gezeirah shavah we learn from challos that rekikin too must be of fine flour.

[8] Thus it can be learnt direct, without any intermediate gezeirah shavah.

[9] Thus the result of one gezeirah shavah is transferred by another gezeirah shavah.

That is well according to he who accepts Rav Pappa's teaching; but what can be said on the view that rejects Rav Pappa's teaching?

Rather [this is the] kal vachomer: if [what is learned by] a hekeish, which cannot [in turn] teach by a hekeish, as follows either from Rava or from Ravina, can teach [in turn] by a kal vachomer, which follows from what the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught; then a gezeirah shavah, which does teach by a gezeirah shavah like itself, which follows from Rami bar Chama, can surely teach through a kal vachomer. (50b1)

Can that which is learned by a gezeirah shavah subsequently teach by a binyan av? — The question remains unresolved. (50b1)

Can that which is learned by a kal vachomer teach in turn by a hekeish?

[Yes, and we learn this by a] kal vachomer: if a gezeirah shavah, which cannot be learned from a hekeish, as follows from Rabbi Yochanan's [dictum], can nevertheless teach by a hekeish, in accordance with Rav Pappa; then a kal vachomer, which can be learned from a hekeish, in accordance with the school of Rabbi Yishmael, can surely teach by a hekeish!

That is well on the view that accepts Rav Pappa's [dictum], but what can be said on the view that rejects Rav Pappa's [dictum]? Then the question remains unresolved. (50b1 – 50b2)

Can that which is learned by a kal vachomer teach in turn by a gezeirah shavah?

[Yes, for this follows by a] kal vachomer: if a gezeirah shavah, which cannot be learned from a hekeish, in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan, can teach by a gezeirah shavah, in accordance with Rami bar Chama; then is it not logical that a kal vachomer, which can be learned by a hekeish, in accordance with the school of Rabbi Yishmael, can teach by a gezeirah shavah? (50b2)

Can that which is learned by a kal vachomer teach in turn by a kal vachomer?

[Yes, for this follows from a] kal vachomer: if a gezeirah shavah, which cannot be learned by a hekeish, in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan, can teach by a kal vachomer, as we have [just] said; then a kal vachomer which can be learned from a hekeish, in accordance with the school of Rabbi Yishmael, is it not logical that it can teach by a kal vachomer?

The Gemara asks: And this is a kal vachomer derived from a kal vachomer. Surely this is a secondary derivation from a kal vachomer[10]?

Rather, [argue thus: Yes, and this follows from a] kal vachomer: if a hekeish which cannot be learned through a hekeish, in accordance with either Rava or Ravina, can teach by a kal vachomer, in accordance with the school of Rabbi Yishmael; then a kal vachomer, which is learned through a hekeish, in accordance with the school of Rabbi Yishmael, can surely teach through a kal vachomer! And this is a kal vachomer derived from a kal vachomer. (50b2 – 50b3)

Can that which is learned by a kal vachomer teach in turn through a binyan av?

Rabbi Yirmiyah said: Come and hear: If one (a Kohen) performed the melikah [of a bird sacrifice] and it was found to be a tereifah, Rabbi Meir said: It does not contaminate with tumah in the throat; Rabbi Yehudah said: It does contaminate with tumah in the throat[11]. Rabbi Meir said: It is a kal vachomer: if the

[10] Lit., 'the grandson of a kal vachomer'. Thus: A, which is learnt through a kal vachomer, teaches B by means of a kal vachomer; that it does so is learnt from the fact C. Now, even if C were directly stated, B would still be the derivative (lit., 'son') of the first kal vachomer. Since however C itself is known only through a kal vachomer, B becomes the secondary derivative (lit., 'grandson'). That is so in the present case. Possibly, however, this is straining the powers of a kal vachomer too far, and is inadmissible, in which case the problem remains unanswered.

[11] A bird chatas was not slaughtered by the usual ritual method (shechitah), but had its neck plucked (melikah). If an ordinary bird of chullin, or any animal, is killed by any method other than shechitah, it becomes neveilah (carrion). The term tereifah is applied to a bird or an animal which was ritually slaughtered, but which was found

shechitah of an animal purifies it, even when tereifah, from its tumah, yet when it is neveilah, it contaminates with tumah through contact or carriage; is it not logical that shechitah purifies a bird, when tereifah, from its tumah, seeing that when it is neveilah it does not contaminate with tumah through touch or carriage? Now, as we have found that shechitah which makes it [a bird of chullin] fit for eating, purifies it, when tereifah, from its tumah; so performing melikah, which makes it [a bird sacrifice] fit for eating, purifies it, when tereifah, from its tumah. Rabbi Yosi said: It is sufficient that it be like the neveilah of a tahor [i.e., edible] animal, which is purified by shechitah, but not by performing melikah. Yet that is not so: even granted there that it is so, yet it is deduced from the shechitah of chullin. (50b3 – 51a1)

Can that which is learned by a binyan ab teach by a hekeish or by a gezeirah shavah or by a kal vachomer or by a binyan av?

Solve one [of the questions] from the following: Why did they say that if the blood is kept overnight [on the altar] it is fit? Because if the sacrificial parts are kept overnight they are fit. Why are the sacrificial parts fit if kept overnight? Because the flesh is fit if kept overnight. [Flesh that] goes out? Because [flesh that] goes out is fit at the high place [bamah]. Tamei [flesh]? Because it was permitted in public service. [The sacrificial parts of an olah intended to be burnt] after time? Because it effectuates in respect of its piggul status. [The sacrificial parts of an olah intended to be burnt] out of its designated area? Because it was likened to [the intention to burn it] after time. Where disqualified [people] received [the blood] and sprinkled it — in the case of those disqualified people who are eligible for public service.

The Gemara asks: Can you then argue from what is its proper way to that where the same is not the proper way?

The Gemara answers: The Tanna relies on the extension indicated by 'this is the law of the olah.' (51a1 – 51a2)

DAILY MASHAL

The Shelah HaKadosh writes in the name of Rav Moshe Kordovero that a person who is being troubled by sinful thoughts should repeat our verse, which will help him remove the forbidden ideas from his mind. He adds that it is clear that this remedy was revealed to Rav Kordovero by Eliyahu HaNavi himself, but in his great humility he chose not to disclose the source of his knowledge.

Rav Shimshon Pinkus suggests that while there are certainly mystical concepts at work, we may also attempt to understand the logical significance of this technique. The Ramban writes in one of his treatises (Drashas Toras Hashem Temimah) that the entire Torah consists of various Divine names, and every verse contains names relevant to the concept discussed therein.

For example, one of Hashem's names which is associated with the revival of the dead is contained in the episode in which the prophet Yechezkel revives dry bones (Yechezkel 37:1-14). Similarly, the Mishnah Berurah writes (98:2) that the recitation of the verse (Tehillim 51:12) Lev Tahor b'rah li Elokim v'ruach nachon chadesh b'kirbee – create in me, Hashem, a pure heart, and renew within me a proper spirit – can be helpful in restoring purity of mind and heart.

Rabbeinu Bechaye writes (6:2) that the Korban Olah is burnt throughout the night because it comes to atone for inappropriate thoughts, which are most prevalent during the night. In light of this, it isn't surprising that a verse discussing a sacrifice which effects atonement for impure thoughts also contains within it a special ability to ward them off!

---

to be suffering from a disease or other physical defect which renders it forbidden as food. Now when a tahor animal, i.e., one permitted for food, becomes neveilah, it contaminates with tumah any person who touches it or even carries it without actually touching it. A tahor bird which becomes neveilah does not contaminate with tumah thus, but only the person who eats it, i.e., when it enters his throat. In the present instance melikah was performed to the bird; had it been chullin, it would have become neveilah, and contaminate with tumah accordingly. When it is found to be tereifah the sacrifice cannot be proceeded with, as the bird is unfit. Rabbi Yehudah holds that it is the same, therefore, as chullin, and contaminates with tumah as such. Rabbi Meir, however, holds that since it was intended for a sacrifice when melikah was performed, this was its correct method of slaughter, and so it does not contaminate with tumah.

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H