

כל אצולי טינוף לא קא חשיב –

Anything which prevents soiling is not to be considered

OVERVIEW

The גמרא cited a ברייתא which stated that if a זב carried out his attached pouch (which collects his זיבה), he is פטור. The גמרא initially concluded that since the only reason he is carrying this pouch is not to soil (himself or) his clothes, therefore this is not considered the usual manner of carrying. תוספות explains the continued dialogue in the גמרא concerning this matter.

תוספות anticipates a difficulty:

אף על גב דהוי אורחיה בכך –

Even though it is usual for a זב to carry his pouch in this manner to prevent soiling, so why is the זב פטור from a חטאת?

תוספות responds (with the גמרא's answer):

כיון דלא הוי אורחיה אלא משום אצולי טינוף לא חשבינן הוצאה כי אורחיה¹ –

Since it is only usual in order to prevent soiling, it is not considered הוצאה in the usual manner.

תוספות cites the גמרא as it explains this concept of לא קא חשיב:

תדע דהא הכופה קערה בשביל שלא ילקה הכותל אינו בכי יותן² –

You know that this is true; for one who turns over a bowl (upside down), in order that the wall should not be hit by the rain, this water which fell on the bowl is not included in יותן, כי יותן, it will not be מכשיר אוכלין to be מקבל טומאה –

אף על גב דניחא ליה שנופלים המים ברחוק מן הכותל על ידי הקערה –

Even though it pleases the owner that the rainwater falls a distance away from the wall because of the bowl, so seemingly this water should be included in יותן, nevertheless –

¹ See "Thinking it over".

² The תורה writes (ויקרא יא, לח) that וכי יתן מים על זרע ונפל מנבלתם עליו טמא הוא לכם. In order for מים to be מקבל טומאה they must first come into contact with one of seven liquids (water is one of them). Then they are considered מקבל טומאה. The word יתן is read as if it were written יותן (which indicates that water was placed on the food without the knowledge or consent of the owner). It is written however as יתן (which means that the owner placed the water on the food); implying willingness or consent by the owner to have the food come into contact with the water. We rule therefore that it is not necessary for the owner to place the water on the food (for the word is read יותן); however there must be some implied consent or willingness by the owner that the food come into contact with the water (for it is written יתן).

כיון דלא ניחא ליה אלא משום אצולי טינוף לא חשבינן נחותא לגבי הכשר –

Since he is only pleased because of אצולי טינוף (and not directly pleased with the water per se) his pleasure is not to be considered regarding הכשר for קבלת טומאה³, similarly -

הכא נמי לא חשיב הוצאה כי אורחיה –

Here too by the זב, it is not considered a usual הוצאה since he needs it only for אצולי טינוף.

גמרא continues explaining the discussion in the תוספות:

ופריך התם לא ניחא ליה בהני משקין כלל –

And the גמרא challenged this comparison from הכשר to זב; there by הכשר, he is not at all pleased with this rain; he would rather that there be no rain and no need for a bowl to protect the wall, therefore the water is totally not ליה -

הכא ניחא ליה בהאי כיס לקבולי ביה זיבה⁴ –

Here, however, by the זב, he is pleased with this כיס to contain the זיבה -

ובכהאי גוונא שמקבל מים לאצולי טינוף חשוב משקה לרצון כדמוכח מסיפא⁵ –

And in such a fashion where he accepts the water (even if it is) לאצולי it is considered acceptable משקין to be מכשיר, as is evident in the סיפא of that משנה in מכשירין -

וכי היכי דחשיב משקין המתקבלין אף על גב דלאצולי מטינוף –

And just as liquids which are accepted willingly are considered משקין to be מכשיר even though it is accepted מטינוף -

משום דאחשבינהו קבלתן –

For receiving them willingly, makes them worthwhile to be מכשיר –

הכא נמי חשיב כיס המקבל זיבה לאצולי מטינוף הוצאה כי אורחיה:

Here too the כיס which receives the זיבה in order לאצולי טינוף should be considered a usual הוצאה. The גמרא therefore offers a different explanation why the זב is פטור.

³ The water must be pleasing or acceptable to the owner of the אוכלין, otherwise they cannot be מכשיר the מקבל טומאה. The owner is not at all pleased with the water which is falling on his (inverted) bowl. Therefore it is not מכשיר.

⁴ See יב, א ד"ה מי on רש"י that by הכשר the water has to be pleasing, and the water is totally not pleasing, however by זב we require that there be intent to carry the כיס, and that intent is there.

⁵ See יב, א ד"ה מי on רש"י and גמרא. He placed an עריבה (a kneading bowl) on the ground to protect the floor from becoming wet from the dripping rain. The water which collected in the עריבה can be לקבל טומאה, even though he did not place it in the rain that it should be washed (as in the case of the קערה). This proves that if there is some indication of consent (keeping the עריבה upright so that it will receive the water), even if the purpose is for אצולי טינוף, nevertheless it is חשוב משקה לרצון. See שפ"א for a different explanation.

SUMMARY

If there is implied consent or willingness, even if it is for the purpose of אצולי טינוף, it is considered a valid consent and receives the appropriate consideration.

THINKING IT OVER

Initially we assumed that the זב is פטור for carrying out the כיס, since it is אצולי טינוף.⁶ Does this mean that (at this point we assume that) if someone carries out something for אצולי טינוף⁷ that he would be פטור?⁸

⁶ See footnote # 1.

⁷ He, for instance, carried out a bowl into the רה"ר with the intent to shield something there from the rain.

⁸ See אור החמה.