



## Immersing in a Wave

The *Mishnah* (5:6) taught that if a large wave, with a volume of forty *se'ah*, detached from the ocean and landed on a person, then they are *tahor*. This *Mishnah* requires thought. How does the wave can affect *tahara*? Since it is moving, it would appear to act like a *maayan* (a spring). If that were the case, then there should not be a requirement of a volume of forty *se'ah*; any amount of water can affect *tahara* in a spring. The requirement of forty *se'ah* appears to fit that of a *mikveh*. Yet a *mikveh* can only affect *tahara* if it is still water. How then do we define this wave?

The *Tosfot Yom Tov* comments that despite the fact we have learnt that once a collection of water is no longer connected to a *maayan* it is defined as a *mikveh*, that is only once it has come to rest. This case is therefore different and the wave is still defined as a *maayan*. That being the case, why then is forty *se'ah* needed in the wave? The volume required should just be enough to completely cover the person, which would depend on his size.

The *Tosfot Yom Tov* cites that *Rosh* who explains that when the *Mishnah* taught the a *maayan* is different from a *mikveh* in that there is no minimum volume, that was only for purifying *keilim* (utensils). For purifying people however, forty *se'ah* is always required. The *Tosfot Yom Tov* maintains that our *Mishnah* is a solid proof.

The *Tosfot R' Akiva* however cites the answers of the *Taz* and *Shach*. The *Taz* explains that the reason the *Mishnah* mentions forty *se'ah* is because that is the amount of water in which it is generally enough for a person to full immerse. In other words, the forty *se'ah* mentioned in this *Mishnah* is not a rigid requirement and the wave is still treated like a *maayan*.

The *Shach* however explains that since the wave is detached from the sea, while it still can affect purification when it is flowing, forty *se'ah* are now required for purification. Interestingly, this means that wave is neither a *maayan* or *mikveh* yet shares characteristics of both.

The *Tosfot Chadashim* however understands that the once the wave is detached it is defined as a *mikveh*. This understanding explains why forty *se'ah* required, but how then can it purify as it splashes on the person? The *Tosfot Chadashim* explains that this case is not considered *zochalin* – flowing. How so? *Zochalin* is when the water is flowing like river or stream. In this case however, the water from the wave is one collected mass. That being the case, it is no different if the collection is in the ground or in the air.

The advantage of this explanation is the our *Mishnah* is not limited to a single opinion. Recall in the earlier *Mishnah* (5:4) the *Tanaim* debated the state of the seas and ocean. It was only *R' Yossi* that understood that all seas have the status of a *maayan*. According to the earlier explanations of the *Mishnah*, our *Mishnah* must be according to the *R' Yossi*, since they explain that the wave came from a sea that is considered a *maayan* – this is indeed how the *Rosh* understands the *Mishnah*. According to the *Tosfot Chadashim* however, since the wave is considered a *mikveh*, the *Mishnah* can be understood whether the sea is defined as a *mikveh* or *maayan*.

The *Bach* (YD 201, s.v. *aval zarak*) however understands the status of a sea differently. He understands that the seas can only purify despite that fact the water there is not settled, because the *Torah* referred to them as a “*mikveh*”. In other words the seas are a special type of *mikveh* that can purify despite flowing. This explains why *R' Yossi* maintains that one cannot purify a *zav* or *metzora* that require spring water for purification in the sea – the seas are not defined as a *maayan* but rather a special *mikveh*. They are nevertheless a *mikveh* which explains why forty *se'ah* is required. According to the *Bach*, this would mean that the wave has exactly the same status as the sea from which it was cast. The novelty of the *Mishnah* then is that it retains its status, despite no longer being attached to the sea.

### Revision Questions

מקואות א' – ג' – בי

- What is the law regarding a pit of drawn water through which a stream passes? (ג: ג)
- Explain the debate regarding a *mikveh* into which two people pour one and a half *lugin* of drawn water. (ג: ג)
- If the water was poured with how many utensils would the *Chachamim* agree? (ג: ג)
- In what case would the *Chachamim* disagree even if it was poured with one hundred utensils? (ד: ג)
- What is the *tzinor* that is referred to in the fourth *perek*?
- Can water in a utensil that was placed under a *tzinor* be used for a *mikveh*? (ד: א)
- Is the material of the utensil important? (ד: א)
- Explain the debate between *Beit Shammai* and *Beit Hillel* regarding the previous questions. (ד: א)
- When would a *tavla* placed under a *tzinor* invalidate the water that passes over it for use in a *mikveh*? (ד: ב)
- If one carved holes in the *tzinor*, when would it invalidate the water? (ג: ד)
- How could the situation be remedied naturally? (ג: ד)
- What is the law regarding a *tzinor* that widens in the middle? (ג: ד)
- What is the law regarding a case where rain water and drawn water mixes prior to entering the *mikveh*? (ד: ד)
- What if both streams entered the *mikveh* directly? (ד: ד)
- What is the difference if a *shoket* was present in an existing rock or if it was originally a separate *kli* and connected to the ground? (Five different laws.) (ד: ה)
- In the later case, how large must a hole be in its base such that water that passes over it is valid for use in a *mikveh*? (Include all opinions.) (ד: ה)
- Is water in a *shoket* flowing from a *maayan* valid? (ה: א)
- Regarding the previous question, when could the water that collects further down stream be valid? (ה: א)
- What is the law regarding water that collected in a *breicha* from a *maayan* that was divided then reconnected with the stream from the *maayan*? (ה: א)
- Explain the debate regarding water from a *maayan* that passed over *keilim*. (ה: ב)
- Regarding water that spread from a *maayan* into multiple streams, when would adding drawn water to it change its status? (ה: ג)
- Explain the debate regarding the status of the oceans. (ה: ד)
- What is the law regarding “*zochalin*”? (ה: ה)
- What is the law regarding “*notfin*”? (ה: ה)
- Explain the debate regarding immersing in *notfin* that became *zochalin*. (ה: ה)
- When can a wave detached from the ocean purify? (ה: ו)
- When can the foot-holes created by donkeys qualify as a *mikveh*? (ה: ו)
- What is the case of the *chardelit* that is the subject of debate between *Beit Shammai* and *Beit Hillel*? When do they agree? (ה: ו)

### 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
8 August א' אב	9 August א' אלול	10 August ב' אלול	11 August ג' אלול	12 August ד' אלול	13 August ה' אלול	14 August ו' אלול
Mikvaot 6:2-3	Mikvaot 6:4-5	Mikvaot 6:6-7	Mikvaot 6:8-9	Mikvaot 6:10-11	Mikvaot 7:1-2	Mikvaot 7:3-4

