

And let him derive this

ותיפוק ליה -

Overview

טובי taught that a ריק is not מבטל בחלון. The גמרא explained that he mentioned (and not עבה) to teach us that even though ממאס, nevertheless he is not מבטל it and therefore it is not מבטל. The גמרא then asked, let him derive that the ריק is not מבטל since it is a המקבל טומאה. Our תוספות discusses this question.¹

אפילו² אם יבטלו³ דאינו חוצץ משום דמקבל טומאה -

[The explanation of the s'גמרא question is] even if he is מבטל the ריק to the חלון, it will not block the טומאה from expanding since the ריק is מקבל טומאה, and the rule is that a דבר המקבל טומאה אינו חוצץ בפני הטומאה -

תוספות asks:

ותימה אם יבטל ליה תו לא מקבל טומאה וטהור כדמוכח בפרק העור והרוטב (חולין דף קכט,א ושם) -
And it is astounding; if he is מבטל the ריק to the חלון,⁴ it will not be מקבל טומאה anymore, as is evident in פרק העור והרוטב -

דאמר כיפת שאור שייחדה לישיבה בטלה⁵ ובית שסיככו בזרעים טהורים⁶ -

Where the גמרא states; 'A ball of sourdough which he set aside for sitting, is nullified (and not considered שאור anymore), and a house which was covered with seeds in their stalks are טהורים', they are not מקבל טומאה -

אלמא כיון דבטליה לא מקבל טומאה⁷ -

It is evident that since he was מבטל them from being food they are no longer מקבל

¹ Seemingly טובי did not give any reason why the ריק is not מבטל בחלון, so how can the גמרא ask ותיפוק ליה that it is a המקבל טומאה; who says that this is not the reason why מבטל?!

² The תוס' amends this to read פירוש אפילו אם (instead of אם אפילו).

³ The גמרא previously asked why state ריק and not עבה, which is a greater חידוש (see previous מאי [TIE footnote # 3]), and the גמרא answered that there is a greater חידוש by ריק for since it is ממאס he may be מבטל. The גמרא therefore asks that the whole issue of מבטל is irrelevant, for since it can be מקבל טומאה it is not חוצץ, so the original question remains why state ריק and not עבה. This may explain the word 'פירוש', which the תוס' inserts. See (however) 'Thinking it over'.

⁴ דבר just explained the s'גמרא question to mean that even if he is מבטל it still will not be חוצץ, since it is a מקבל טומאה, but this is not so, for once he is מבטל it from being food, it no longer is מקבל טומאה.

⁵ Once he designated this ball of sourdough to be used as a chair it is no longer considered שאור (which one may not have in his possession on פסח), but rather it is considered to be a chair and he may keep it in his רשות (and it is also not מקבל טומאה [as a food] since it is בטל from being food).

⁶ He covered the roof of his house with stalks of grain, so even the grain in the stalks cease to be considered זרעים (which normally are מקבל טומאה) and are טהור that they cannot be מקבל טומאה since they cease to be considered אוכלין.

⁷ How can the גמרא ask (see footnote # 3) that even if he is מבטל, it is still not חוצץ because it is מקבל טומאה, when in fact once he is מבטל, it is no longer מקבל טומאה!

טומאה; the same should be here regarding the ריק that once he was מבטל it (since it is ממאס) it should no longer be טומאה מקבל!

answers: תוספות

ויש לומר דהתם מיירי כגון דעבד בהו שינוי מעשה –

And one can say that there (in פרק העור והרוטב) it is a case where he did an act to change the food into something else -

דהא אמרינן (שבת דף נב,ב) כל הכלים יורדין לידי טומאה במחשבה⁸ -

For the משנה states all utensils become capable of receiving טומאה by thought alone -

ואין עולין מטומאה אלא על ידי שינוי מעשה והוא הדין באוכלין דבעינן שינוי מעשה⁹ -

But it does not leave it status of being טומאה מקבל, only through a מעשה שינוי, and the same law which applies to utensils applies to food that we require a מעשה שינוי in order that it should cease being אוכלין –

מתורת אוכלין we also require a שינוי מעשה to remove them: תוספות proves that by

דאפילו בידות האוכלין¹⁰ מוכח בפרק קמא דסוכה (דף יד,א ושם) -

For it is evident in the first פרק of מסכת סוכה that even regarding the 'hands' of food -

דאיכא תנא דאית ליה דבעינן בהו שינוי מעשה:

That there is a תנא who requires שינוי מעשה by ידות that they should cease to be מקבל טומאה, so certainly all would agree that by actual food we require a שינוי מעשה to no longer consider them food.

Summary

ביטול however שינוי מעשה it requires for a food not be considered food any longer alone is insufficient. במחשבה

⁸ A כל does not become טמא unless it is a finished product. In certain instances the decision whether at this point it is a finished product or more needs to be done, depends on the person. If at some point he decides במחשבה that it is complete, then it can be טומאה מקבל.

⁹ Therefore by the זרעים, where he was מייחד it (by shaping it in a certain way) and by the שזור, where he placed them on the roof to become roofing material there was a שינוי מעשה and therefore they are not טומאה מקבל, however here, he merely placed the ריק in the window with the intention (perhaps) to eat it later, nothing was done to indicate that it is no longer considered food, so even if he was מבטל במחשבה not to eat it, that is not sufficient to remove it, since there was no מעשה, מתורת אוכלין.

¹⁰ ידות האוכלין refers to the stem of a fruit (or stalk of grain) which is attached to the fruit and is a 'handle' how we hold the fruit. If the ידות are detached from the food they are not טומאה מקבל, however when they are attached to the fruit they are considered part of the fruit and are טומאה מקבל (even if the טומאה touched them alone or the fruit alone in all cases the ידות are טמא).

Thinking it over

From תוספות (introduction and question) it seems that תוספות understood the question of ותיפוק ליה as a continuation of the previous discussion (whether there is a greater חידוש by ריק over עבה), and therefore תוספות asks his question.¹¹ However it is possible that the גמרא is asking a new question (regardless whether it is ריק or עבה); what is the חידוש of ר' טובי, it is obvious that it is not ממעט, since it is an אוכל!¹² חוצץ בפני הטומאה which is מקבל טומאה, and something which is not מקבל טומאה

¹¹ See footnote # 3.

¹² See נחלת משה.