



## Multiple Contributing Causes Involving an Issur

The *Mishnah* (3:1) discusses a case where a garment was dyed using the peel from an *orlah* fruit, e.g. the peel of a pomegranate. The *Mishnah* rules that the entire garment must be burnt. The *Mishnah* then discusses the case where the garment becomes mixed with other garments. *R' Meir* maintains that all must be burnt irrespective of the quantity of the permissible garments. The *Chachamim* however treat the case as a regular mixture involving *orlah*. Consequently, if there is a ratio of two-hundred permissible garments to the single *orlah* garment then the mixture would be permitted.

The *Lechem Mishnah* (*Maachalot Assurot* 16:20) however asks that this case should be considered *ze ve'ze gorem* and therefore be permitted. To explain, we have seen in the previous *perek* a number of cases where two components, one of which is forbidden, are mixed in and have an effect on the mixture. We learnt (2:4) that if *trumah* sourdough causes dough to leaven (*mechametz*) then it is not annulled irrespective of the quantities. If it cannot then we would apply the normal rules of *bitul* (annulment) and in the case of *terumah*, it would be annulled in a ratio of one-hundred parts to one. We also learnt about cases where both permissible and prohibited sourdough mixed with dough. If neither of the sourdoughs are enough to cause the dough to leaven, yet in combination they can, *R' Eliezer* maintains the dough is prohibited while the *Chachamim* disagree. The debate is based on the question of whether in general, a mixture involving something prohibited that required something permitted to have an effect, is prohibited. This is referred to as *ze ve'ze gorem* – “this and this cause”. The *Lechem Mishnah* asks that since the dye required the fire to have an effect it should be considered *ze ve'ze gorem* and be permitted (in line with the opinion of the *Chachamim*).

The *Lechem Mishnah* suggests that this case is different since the two elements are performing different actions. The *Tosfot Anshei Shem* explains that this means that a case is only considered *ze ve'ze gorem* if the two elements are

perform the same action. Using our previous example, both sourdoughs caused the dough to leaven. In this case however, the *orlah* dye causes the change in colour, while the heat causes the dye to be absorbed. The two are in fact performing different actions so the rule of *ze ve'ze gorem* cannot be applied.

The *Tosfot Anshei Shem* however cite the *Rambam* (*Avodah Zara* 7:14) that appears to contradict the *Lechem Mishnah's* explanation. The *Rambam* rules that one can plant vegetables under a tree of *Avodah Zarah* (*Asheria*). Despite the fact that the vegetables benefit from the shade, the earth also contributes to its growth. In other words, we find that even though the tree and earth are acting on the vegetables in different ways, the *Rambam* still defines this case as *ze ve'ze gorem*.

The *Tifferet Yaakov* however comes to the defence of the *Lechem Mishnah* explaining his words in a different manner. He explains that in this case the dye only takes effect because of the fire. *Ze ve'ze gorem* is only when each element contributes directly. In this case, it is only the dye that is having an effect, the fire is simply a *machshir* – an enabler. Were this not the case then one would define any case where a mixture is cooked together as being *ze ve'ze gorem*. Furthermore, one could even reason that in our example, since the dough also required water to rise, it should be considered *ze ve'ze gorem*. Consequently, he prefers this more restricted definition of *ze ve'ze gorem*.

The *Tifferet Yaakov* also suggests another answer. He explains that *ze ve'ze gorem* is only relevant where the prohibited element is not visually discernible; only its effect. Such is the case with *mechametz*, *metabel* (spicing) or bread baking in an oven fuelled with *asheira* wood. In this case however since we can still identify the *issur* the rule of *ze ve'ze gorem* is not relevant.

*Yisrael Bankier*

## Revision Questions

ערלה בי: ז' – ג' – ג'

- Last week we learnt that if a forbidden product adds a distinct flavour when mixed with an ordinary product it prohibits the entire mixture. When is the rule applied:
  - Only in a stringent manner? (בי: ז')
  - In both a stringent and lenient manner? (ז': ז')
- What is the law regarding dough, into which *chulin* leaven (enough to leaven the dough) got mixed in, followed by *trumah* leaven (enough to leaven the dough)? (בי: ח')
- What is the law regarding dough, into which *chulin* leaven (enough to leaven the dough) got mixed in and caused it to leave, followed by *trumah* leaven (enough to leaven the dough)? (בי: ט')
- Can different spices, each prohibited by the same prohibition, combine to prohibit a mixture? (בי: י')
- Can the same spices, each from prohibited by different prohibitions, combine to prohibit a mixture? (בי: י')
- What is the law regarding dough, into which *chulin* and *trumah* leaven became mixed and leavened the dough, yet each of which on their own were not enough to leaven the dough? (בי: י"א)
- There are two opinions about the previous question. *Yo'ezer Ish HaBira* explained that *Rabban Gamliel HaZaken* held like which of the two opinions? (בי: י"ב)
- What case relating to *tum'ah ve'tahara* is discussed in the *Mishnah* that is argued in a similar manner to the previous question? (בי: י"ג)
- If leaven that was *trumah* and leaven that was *kil'ei kerem* got mixed with and together leavened the dough, yet each on their own was enough to leaven the dough, can anyone eat from the dough? (בי: י"ד)
- Describe the case involving *tavlin* that is similar to the previous question. (בי: ט"ו)
- Describe the case involving *notar*, *pigul* and *kodshei kodshim* that is similar to the previous question. (בי: ט"ז)
- Who may eat from a mixture contain meat that is *chulin*, *kodshei kalim* and *kodshei kodshim* where there is enough *chulin* to annul the *kodshei kalim* or *kodshei kodshim* but not both? (בי: י"ז)
- What must be done with clothing that has be dyed using dye that was made from *orlah*? (בי: י"ח)
- The *Mishnah* discussed a case where someone dyed a thread using the peel of *orlah* fruit and then wove it into a garment, yet could not identify where this thread was used in the garment. What must be done with the garment? (בי: י"ט)
- What was the length of the thread that was discussed in the previous question? (בי: י"ט)
- What other *issurim* share the same ruling (as the first question) for the same minimum length of the thread and which *issurim* have no minimum length? (בי: י"ט)

### Melbourne, Australia

#### Sunday -Thursday

10 minutes before *Mincha*  
Mizrachi Shul  
 Melbourne, Australia

#### Friday & Shabbat

10 minutes before *Mincha*  
Mizrachi Shul  
 Melbourne, Australia

### Efrat, Israel

*Shiur in English*

#### Sunday -Thursday

Rabbi Mordechai Scharf  
 9:00am  
Kollel Magen Avraham  
 Reemon Neighbourhood

### ONLINE SHIURIM

*Yisrael Bankier*  
[mishnahyomit.com/shiurim](http://mishnahyomit.com/shiurim)

*Rabbi Chaim Brown*  
[www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/](http://www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/)

*Rabbi E. Kornfeld*  
*Rabbi C. Brown*  
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm>

### SHIUR ON KOL HALOSHON

*Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss*  
 In US dial: 718 906 6400  
 Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

### Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
29 January בי שבט	30 January ג' שבט	31 January ד' שבט	1 February ה' שבט	2 February ו' שבט	3 February ז' שבט	4 February ח' שבט
Orlah 3:4-5	Orlah 3:6-7	Orlah 3:8-9	Bikurim 1:1-2	Bikurim 1:3-4	Bikurim 1:5-6	Bikurim 1:7-8

