HALAKHA

A woman following childbirth who is a convert or an emancipated maidservant – halakha.

If one had intercourse with a woman who gave birth to a male child within the last seven days or to a female child within the last fourteen days, whether she was an ordinary Jew, a convert, or an emancipated maidservant, he is liable to receive karet (Rambam Sefer Kadisha, Hilkhos Issurei Bio 4:2).

HALAKHA

No hallowed thing, to include teruma – halakha.

During her period of purity, it is permitted for a woman after childbirth to eat second tithe. However, it is prohibited for her to eat teruma, which disqualifies, as does one who was ritually impure who immersed on that day (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhos Metamei Mishkav UMoshav 5:4).

Rava said: Even without the rationale that those stringencies that apply to sacrificial food are more numerous, you still could not say that the verse that renders a woman pure at sunset refers to sacrificial food, as the verse states: “And the priest shall make atonement for her, and she shall be pure,” which indicates by inference that she remains ritually impure to some degree until she has sacrificed her offerings. And if it enters your mind that she may eat sacrificial food immediately after sunset, you should apply here what is stated in a different verse: “And the flesh that touches anything impure shall not be eaten” (Leviticus 7:19), which indicates that one who is impure with any type of ritual impurity is prohibited from eating sacrificial food. Rather, learn from this that the verse is referring to teruma.

Rava said: And is the verse not referring to teruma as well?
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But isn’t it written in that same section dealing with a woman after childbirth: “She shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed” (Leviticus 12:4), which comes to include teruma? Rather, the Torah considers several distinct matters separately, and not all the verses refer to teruma.

The Gemara asks: And why do I need three verses with regard to teruma? The Gemara answers: They are all necessary, as, had teruma been derived solely from the verse: “He shall not eat of the holy things until he be pure” (Leviticus 22:7), I would not have known by what means ritual purity is achieved, whether by immersion alone or in some other way. Therefore, the Merciful One writes: “And when the sun has set he shall be pure, and afterward he may eat from the holy things” (Leviticus 22:7), to teach that he must also wait for sunset.

And had the Merciful One written only: “And when the sun has set,” I might have said that this applies only to one who does not require an atonement offering, but as for one who requires an atonement offering, one might say that he may not eat teruma until he brings his atonement offering. Therefore, the Merciful One writes: “She shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed” (Leviticus 12:4), which indicates that she may eat teruma as soon as her days of purification are completed, and she need not wait until after she has brought her atonement offering.
And had the Merciful One written only: “Until the days of her purification are completed,” I would say that upon the completion of the purification period she is immediately purified even without immersion. Therefore, the Merciful One writes: “Until he be pure.”

The Gemara asks: And according to that tanna who disagrees with the tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael and says that the verse “Any man from the seed of Aaron who is a leper or a zav shall not eat of the holy things until he be pure” (Leviticus 22:4) is speaking of a zav who already experienced three sightings of an emission, and of a confirmed leper, both of whom must bring an offering as part of their purification process; and, this being the case, that phrase “until he be pure” must mean until he brings his atonement offering; then why do I need two verses with regard to sacrificial food, this verse and the verse with regard to a woman after childbirth: “And the priest shall make atonement for her, and she shall be pure” (Leviticus 12:8), to teach us that sacrificial food may not be eaten until after the atonement offering has been brought.

The Gemara answers: They are both necessary, as had the Merciful One written this halakha only with regard to a woman after childbirth, one might have said that it applies only to her because her period of ritual impurity is so long, as she may not return to eating teruma or sacrificial food for either forty days, in the case of a male child, or eighty days, in the case of a female. But with regard to a zav, say that this is not the case. And had the Merciful One written this halakha only with regard to a zav, one might have said that it applies only to him, as no exemption is ever made from its general prohibition and he is always impure. But as for a woman after childbirth, who is permitted to her husband for thirty-three or sixty-six days of that period, say that this is not the case. Both verses are therefore necessary.

The Gemara asks: As for the verse stated with regard to a vessel that contracted ritual impurity through contact with a creeping animal: “It must be put into water, and it shall be impure until the evening; then shall it be pure” (Leviticus 11:32), why do I need it? Rabbi Zeira said: It is necessary in order to teach about touching. An impure vessel, even after it has been immersed, still imparts ritual impurity to the teruma that it touches until nightfall. The same applies to an impure individual who has already undergone immersion; not only is it prohibited for him to eat teruma, but also he renders it impure if he touches it.

As it is taught in a baraita: Had the verse stated only: “It must be put into water, and it shall be impure until the evening,” one might have thought that it remains ritually impure until the evening in all regards. Therefore, the verse states: “Then shall it be pure,” indicating that it is purify following immersion, even before sunset. And had it stated only: “Then shall it be pure,” one might have thought that it is purify following immersion in all regards. Therefore, the verse states: “And it shall be impure until the evening.” How so; how can the apparent contradiction between the two parts of the verse be resolved? Here, the verse is referring to second tithe, for which immersion alone suffices; and there it is referring to teruma, for which sunset is required.

The Gemara: But I can reverse this construct and say that the greater stringency should be applied to second tithe. The Gemara answers: It is reasonable to say that teruma is subject to the greater stringency, just as the eating of teruma is subject to greater stringency than the eating of second tithe, so too, the touching of teruma should be subject to greater stringency than the touching of second tithe.
HALAKHA

One who has immersed himself during that day – Rav Yehuda HaNassi taught: If a ritually impure person who immersed on that day touches teruma food or drink, he has disqualified it, as he is considered impure with second-degree ritual impurity. He thereby renders the teruma impure with third-degree ritual impurity, so that it is impure but does not further transmit ritual impurity (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Avei HaTuma 10:3).

NOTES

As she had already eaten – דא ריבא פסחא כלושי געשיה – כב אראה: הניה אכזרילה.

במי ימי אירה: אם התר教育培训ה

לברוח פסחא פסחא אכזרילה אכזרילה.的缘יא: אכזרילה.

בכ אלו אכזרילה.的缘יא: אכזרילה.

And if you wish, say that the prohibition with regard to the touching of teruma is derived from here: “She shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed” (Leviticus 12:4); this is a warning with respect to one who eats teruma after having immersed but before sunset. Or, perhaps, it is nothing other than a warning with respect to one who touches teruma before sunset, as is implied by the plain reading of the verse?

Therefore, the verse states: “She shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed” (Leviticus 12:4), thereby juxtaposing consecrated food to the Sanctuary. Just as the prohibition against entering the Sanctuary is a matter that involves the taking of life, as one who enters the Sanctuary while impure is liable to receive karet, so too, the prohibition against touching consecrated food must be a matter that involves the taking of life, e.g., eating teruma in a state of ritual impurity; but the prohibition against touching teruma in a state of impurity does not involve the taking of life, as there is no punishment of karet for mere touching.

And as for the fact that the verse expressed this halakha in terms of touching, this is what it is saying: The halakha governing touching is like that of eating, as they are both prohibited to an impure person, even after immersion, until sunset. But the verse is actually speaking of the prohibition against eating teruma in a state of impurity.

It is taught in the mishna that the wife of a priest with crushed testicles or a severed penis may eat teruma on his account, provided that they have not engaged in sexual relations since his injury. The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna who taught with regard to a woman awaiting intercourse that would disqualify her from marrying into the priesthood by Torah law, as in this case, where the woman would become disqualified from marrying into the priesthood if she had relations with her injured husband, that such a woman may eat teruma? Rabbi Elazar said: This halakha is subject to dispute, and it is taught in the mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon, who similarly stated that a widow betrothed to a High Priest may eat teruma on his account, provided that he has not engaged in sexual relations with her.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The mishna can be understood even if you say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who maintains that a widow betrothed to a High Priest may not eat teruma on his account, as it is different here, as she had already eaten teruma on her husband's account before his injury. Since she has done nothing to disqualify herself, she retains her presumptive status as one for whom it is permitted to eat teruma.

And how does Rabbi Elazar counter this argument? He maintains that we do not say that since she had already eaten teruma on her husband's account she continues to do so, as, if you do not say that this argument must be rejected, then it should be permitted for an Israeliite woman who married a priest and her husband died without children to continue eating teruma on his account, as she had already eaten teruma because of him during his lifetime. However, such a conclusion is clearly incorrect. This halakha indicates that the fact that she had already eaten teruma is irrelevant.

And Rabbi Yoḥanan holds that the two cases are not comparable, as there, where the husband died, his acquisition of his wife has lapsed, i.e., they are no longer married, and therefore she cannot continue to eat teruma on his account, whereas here, where his genitals were injured, his acquisition has not lapsed. While sexual relations between them are forbidden, their marriage remains intact.
It is taught in the mishna: Who is deemed a man with crushed testicles? The Sages taught in a baraita: Who is deemed a man with crushed testicles? It is anyone whose testicles have been wounded, even if only one of them. Furthermore, a man is considered to have crushed testicles not only if they have been wounded, but even if they have been punctured, or have decayed as the result of an injury, or are partly deficient for some other reason. Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, said: I heard from the Sages in the vineyard in Yavne that anyone who has only one testicle is nothing other than a eunuch by natural causes, and he is fit.

The Gemara asks: As for one whose testicles were punctured, is he incapable of having children, so that he should have the status of one whose testicles were crushed? Wasn’t there an incident where a certain man was climbing up a palm tree, and rule that if only the left testicle was removed in a whole state, the man is fit. Although this ruling is in accordance with many authorities (Tosafot), according to the Rema this opinion should not be followed (Rambam Sefer Kadisha, Hilkhos Issurei Biur 16:5; Shulhan Arukh, Even Ha’zer 57).

The Jerusalem Talmud proves that this case is that of the removal of a testicle, as the Gemara there differentiates between the right and left testicle (see Hamakhtsa and Yam Shel Shlomo). Those who disagree argue that the Jerusalem Talmud demonstrates that this case is that of one who was injured at the hand of Heaven. They claim additional proof from the fact that the Gemara later joins Rabbi Yishmael’s opinion to that of Shmuel, who states that all of these blemishes render one disqualified only if inflicted by man. Another point of discussion is the contention stated in the Jerusalem Talmud that according to Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan, a man with only one testicle cannot father children, and yet he is still fit to enter into the congregation. On this point it has been noted that generally, a man with a single testicle can father children; see the early and later authorities in this regard, in particular the Riva.

Can it enter your mind that he is a eunuch by natural causes? The Rid and the Meiri explain this as follows: A seri hamanna is a man with a physical abnormality that prevents him from having children, whereas this individual merely suffers from a blemish in his testicles.

The vineyard in Yavne – kerem beYavne: The great yeshiva in Yavne, which served as a meeting place of the Sages and the seat of the Nasi after the destruction of the Second Temple, is commonly referred to as kerem beYavne or the vineyard in Yavne. According to the Jerusalem Talmud (Bekhorot 41b) the place was called a vineyard because the students would sit in rows, evoking the rows of grapevines in a vineyard. Since the majority of that generation’s leading Sages were gathered there, their decisions were decisive in safeguarding the continued existence of the Jewish people. The place is held in high esteem, and the halakhot taught in this vineyard (matnot dekarmah) have special authority.

Anyone who has only one testicle – seri hamanna: From a medical standpoint, a man who has only one testicle, whether from birth or due to the removal of or damage to the second testicle, can still be fertile and father children, provided that his condition is not the result of general underdevelopment.

### HALAKHA

The opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka – seri hamanna: The early authorities discuss the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, and arrive at different conclusions. According to the Rid, Rabbi Yishmael disagrees with the first tanna entirely, as he maintains that a man is disqualified only if both of his testicles are crushed, but the injury or deficiency of a single testicle does not impair his status. The Rav and Rashbi both claim that even Rabbi Yishmael agrees that one who is injured in one testicle is disqualified, but he contends that the ruling with regard to one whose testicle has been entirely removed is more lenient. They cite a proof for this opinion from the halakha of a defective spleen: The halakha is that a perforated spleen renders an animal a terifah, but if the organ is missing entirely, it is kosher. According to this opinion, Rabbi Yishmael maintains that a man with a single testicle is fit, as has been seen in the case of the man who was climbing up a palm tree. The Ra’avad and Rashbi together maintain that Rabbi Yishmael does not in fact disagree with the first tanna at all, as his statement refers to one whose testicle was removed not by way of an injury but at the hand of Heaven, i.e., by natural causes. A man of this kind is not disqualified.

This dispute among the early authorities is further complicated by the Jerusalem Talmud. The Ra’avad maintains that the Jerusalem Talmud proves that this case is that of the removal of a testicle, as the Gemara there differentiates between the right and left testicle (see Hamakhtsa and Yam Shel Shlomo). Those who disagree argue that the Jerusalem Talmud demonstrates that this case is that of one who was injured at the hand of Heaven. They claim additional proof from the fact that the Gemara later joins Rabbi Yishmael’s opinion to that of Shmuel, who states that all of these blemishes render one disqualified only if inflicted by man. Another point of discussion is the contention stated in the Jerusalem Talmud that according to Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan, a man with only one testicle cannot father children, and yet he is still fit to enter into the congregation. On this point it has been noted that generally, a man with a single testicle can father children; see the early and later authorities in this regard, in particular the Riva.

Can it enter your mind that he is a eunuch by natural causes? The Rid and the Meiri explain this as follows: A seri hamanna is a man with a physical abnormality that prevents him from having children, whereas this individual merely suffers from a blemish in his testicles.

### NOTES

Who is a man with crushed testicles – seri hamanna: If even one of a man’s testicles has been removed, damaged, or crushed, or is deficient or punctured, he is defined as a man with crushed testicles. Some authorities are lenient in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, and rule that if only the left testicle was removed in a whole state, the man is fit. Although this ruling is in accordance with many authorities (Tosafot), according to the Rema this opinion should not be followed (Rambam Sefer Kadisha, Hilkhos Issurei Biur 16:5; Shulhan Arukh, Even Ha’zer 57).
A thorn punctured him in the testicles – אַּךְ בַּיְּרוּדָּה שָׁמוֹלָא, פָּתַח בְּבוֹזִים.

A man wounded with crushed testicles at the hand of Heaven – A man wounded with crushed testicles, Ḥamzer

A similar idea was taught in a baraita. It is stated: “A man wounded [petzua] with crushed testicles [dakka] or a severed [kerut] penis shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:2), and it is stated in the very next verse: “A manzer shall not enter” into the congregation of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 23:3). Just as there, with regard to a mamzer, his blemish was created at the hands of man, i.e., by his parents who sinned, so too, here, with regard to one with crushed testicles, the verse must be speaking about one whose mutilation was at the hands of man.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: A man wounded with crushed testicles at the hand of Heaven, e.g., from birth or as the result of an illness, is fit to marry a woman who was born Jewish. Rav said: This is the reason that we read in the Torah: “A man wounded with crushed testicles, and we do not read: The man wounded with crushed testicles. In the Hebrew text, the latter phrase: The man wounded, can be understood to include one whose testicles have always been crushed, whereas “a man wounded” indicates that he was wounded, i.e., his disability is the result of injury.

Rava said: The verse dealing with injured genitals speaks of three types of injury: Wounded [petzua], crushed [dakka], and severed [kerut]. Wounded applies to all of them; crushed applies to all of them; and severed applies to all of them, as will immediately be explained. Wounded applies to all of them, whether the member was wounded, or the testicles were wounded, or the spermatic cords were wounded. Similarly, crushed applies to all of them, whether the member was crushed, or the testicles were crushed, or the spermatic cords were crushed. And severed also applies to all of them, whether the member was severed, or the testicles were severed, or the spermatic cords were severed.

This is the reason that we read: A man wounded with crushed testicles [petzua] – אֶבֶד מָעַלּוֹ, רַבָּא אֲנָחָה בְּבוֹזִים; Rashi indicates that the difference here is between: The man with crushed testicles [happatza], a formulation that would include any man suffering from that blemish, no matter its source, and: A man with crushed testicles [petzua], which refers specifically to the victim of an injury. The Yerushalmi wonders why the RashAsh dissagrees with the Rambam with regard to one whose blemish was caused by an illness. Rabban Gamliel Hananel has a different version of the text in which the distinction is between the words petzua and petzia. Rashi understands that petzua is a passive form referring to one who was injured by others, whereas petzia is an adjective that can be applied to anyone suffering from this blemish.

And it is stated: A mamzer shall not enter – אַּךְ בַּיְּרוּדָּה שָׁמוֹלָא. In the Babylonian Talmud the only opinion cited is that one who was wounded at the hand of Heaven is not disqualified, but in the Jerusalem Talmud a dispute in this regard is mentioned, as there is an opinion that even one injured at the hand of Heaven is unfit. There, too, the Gemara derives a proof from the case of a mamzer that this qualification must be the result of human action. Some, however, see this as a proof supporting the contrary opinion: Since the actual creation of a mamzer is in the hand of Heaven, here too the case must be that of a congenital defect.

Wounded applies to all of them – אַּכָּר בַּיְּרוּדָּה שָׁמוֹלָא. If the same halakha applies to both testicles and penis, whether they were crushed or severed, why does the Torah choose the particular formulation: “A man wounded with crushed testicles or a severed penis” (Deuteronomy 23:2)? It may be suggested that this formulation is used because it is more likely for the penis to be severed and for the testicles to be crushed.
One of the Sages said to Rava: From where is it derived that this phrase "petzua dakka," literally meaning wounded by crushing, is referring to a man who suffered an injury in that place, i.e., his genitals? Say that perhaps it is referring to one who was injured on his head. Rava said to him: From the fact that the verse does not mention the number of generations of his descendants that may not enter into the congregation, as do the verses with regard to a mazmer or an Ammonite or Moabite, learn from this that it is referring to a man who suffered an injury in that place. The blemish is evidently one that prevents him from having children, and therefore he has no generations of descendants.

The Gemara asks: But perhaps the fact that the Torah does not mention the number of generations of his descendants that may not enter into the congregation is due to a halachic reason rather than a biological one, i.e., that only he is prohibited from entering into the congregation, whereas his son and his son's son are fit to do so?

The Gemara explains that the identity of a petzua dakka is derived in a different way: The case of a petzua dakka is similar to that of one whose penis has been severed, mentioned immediately afterward: Just as one whose penis has been severed suffered an injury in that place, so too, this man was injured in that place.

The Gemara asks: As for the one whose penis has been severed [kerut sho'khka] himself, from where is it derived that the phrase kerut sho'khka, literally meaning severed emission, is referring to a man who suffered an injury in that place, i.e., his genitals? Say that perhaps it is referring to one who was injured to his lips, from where spittle is discharged. The Gemara answers: It is written "sho'khka," which indicates that the injury was in a place that pours out [shofer], whereas spittle is spat out.

The Gemara asks further: But say that perhaps it is referring to one who suffered an injury to his nose. The Gemara answers: Is it written bidpokh, which would indicate a place from which there is a discharge even if nothing was severed? Rather, it is written "kerut sho'khka," implying something that pours out as a result of an organ having been severed. But in the absence of an organ having been severed, the semen does not pour out; rather, it is ejected out. This comes to exclude this possibility of the nose, as whether it is in this state or that state, i.e., severed or not, the mucus pours out.

With regard to this issue, it was taught in a baraita as follows: It is stated: "A man wounded with crushed testicles shall not enter into the congregation," and it is stated: "A mazmer shall not enter into the congregation." Just as there, the blemish of a mazmer comes from that place, through sexual misconduct, so too, here, a man with crushed testicles is one who suffered an injury in that place that is connected to cohabitation.

The Gemara considers the following case: If a man's member was punctured from one side below the corona, i.e., at the corona itself, and the puncture ended on the opposite side above the corona which is nearer the body, Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba thought to render him fit for marriage on the grounds that on one side the puncture was below the corona. Rabbi Asi said to him: This is what Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: A puncture in the corona of any size impedes the man’s fitness, even if one end of the puncture is below the corona, as any puncture in the corona affects his fertility.

It is taught in the mishna that if there remains a portion of the corona, even as much as a hairsbreadth, he is still fit. Ravina sat and raised the following dilemma: This hairsbreadth of which they spoke, must it surround the entire member or only a majority of it? Rava Tosfa’i said to Ravina: A hairsbreadth of the corona must surround a majority of the member, and toward its head, that is, in the portion closer to the body.
To mislead Mareimar – like a quill.

Rav Huna said: If a man’s member was cut like a quill [kulmus], 6 which is sharp on all sides, he is fit; but if it was cut like a gutter, 7 which is partly open, he is unfit. He explains: In this case, where it was cut like a gutter, he remains fit because the air does not penetrate and the semen is unaffected. And Rav Hisdai said the reverse: If a man’s member was cut like a gutter, he is fit; but if it was cut like a quill, he is unfit. This is because in this case, where it was cut like a gutter, the member rubs against the woman’s sexual organ and becomes aroused, whereas in that case, where it was cut like a quill, it does not rub against it, as it is too thin and insubstantial.

The Gemara adds: And Ravina asked this question only because he wanted to mislead Mareimar 8 and test his understanding of the issue.

The Gemara relates: A certain incident actually occurred in the town of Mata Mehasya, where a man’s member was cut like a gutter. Mar bar Rav Ashi cut back the flesh on all sides until it was like a quill and thereby rendered him fit to enter into the congregation. A certain incident occurred in Pumbedita, where the seminal duct of a certain man became blocked, 9 and he emitted semen through the urinary duct. Rav Beivai bar Abaye thought to render him fit, as his genitals were neither crushed nor severed. Rav Pappi said: Because you come

Background

Like a quill... like a gutter – כַּקְלָמָם. Running along both sides of the penis are blood vessels that enable an erection, and on the inside is the urethra. As long as at least one of the blood vessels is whole and there is no damage to the urethra, a man is capable of fathering children. Damage to the penis, e.g., being cut like a quill or a gutter, might make sexual contact difficult but does not necessarily cause infertility.

Stopper of a barrel – פְּסוּלָה. Ceramic wine barrels had openings at their tops that were closed up by means of a stopper.

The seminal duct became blocked, etc. – כָּפְסָדָה. Both semen and urine exit the body through the urethra, but there is a special mechanism of nerves and muscles that closes the urethra to urine during ejaculation. It is possible for this mechanism to malfunction due to injury or disease. In that case, the sperm might not exit normally but instead enter the bladder through the urethra and later exit the body in the urine. A man suffering from this problem would be incapable of having children through normal intercourse.

Halakha

Like a quill or like a gutter – כַּקְלָמָם כַּגְּנוּפָה. If a man’s member was cut above the corona, sloping downward like a quill, he is fit.

If it was cut like a gutter, the inner portion having been removed and only the outer layer remaining intact, Rashi and the Rosh disqualify him in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, following the practical ruling of Mar bar Rav Ashi. According to the Rambam one is fit even if his member was cut like a gutter, as he rules in accordance with the opinion of Mar Zutra and understands that the incident of Mar bar Rav Ashi involved a different type of injury, not similar to a gutter (Rambam Sefer Ketusha, Hakhot Issurei Bi’A 164 and Kesef Mishne there; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 5:3).

NOTES

Quill (kulmus) – קָסָל. This word derives from the Greek κάλαμος, kalamos, meaning a reed, especially one that is fashioned into a writing utensil.

BACKGROUND

Like a quill... like a gutter – כַּקְלָמָם כַּגְּנוּפָה. Running along both sides of the penis are blood vessels that enable an erection, and on the inside is the urethra. As long as at least one of the blood vessels is whole and there is no damage to the urethra, a man is capable of fathering children. Damage to the penis, e.g., being cut like a quill or a gutter, might make sexual contact difficult but does not necessarily cause infertility.

Stopper of a barrel – פְּסוּלָה. Ceramic wine barrels had openings at their tops that were closed up by means of a stopper. In order to pour a large quantity of wine at once, the stopper was removed and the wine poured out. However, if one’s intention was to pour only small amounts of wine from time to time, especially in the case of large barrels, a special craftsman would bore a hole near the bottom of the barrel that would be plugged with a conical-shaped piece of wood wrapped in rags.

The seminal duct became blocked, etc. – כָּפְסָדָה. Both semen and urine exit the body through the urethra, but there is a special mechanism of nerves and muscles that closes the urethra to urine during ejaculation. It is possible for this mechanism to malfunction due to injury or disease. In that case, the sperm might not exit normally but instead enter the bladder through the urethra and later exit the body in the urine. A man suffering from this problem would be incapable of having children through normal intercourse.

HALAKHA

Like a quill or like a gutter – כַּקְלָמָם כַּגְּנוּפָה. If a man’s member was cut above the corona, sloping downward like a quill, he is fit; but if it was cut like a gutter, which is partly open, he is unfit. He explains: In this case, where it was cut like a gutter, he remains fit because the air does not penetrate and the semen is unaffected. And Rav Hisdai said the reverse: If a man’s member was cut like a gutter, he is fit; but if it was cut like a quill, he is unfit. This is because in this case, where it was cut like a gutter, the member rubs against the woman’s sexual organ and becomes aroused, whereas in that case, where it was cut like a quill, it does not rub against it, as it is too thin and insubstantial.

Rava said: It stands to reason in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, that in this case the air penetrates, whereas in that case the air does not penetrate. With respect to the rubbering, this is just as it is in the case of a stopper of a barrel. Although one end of the stopper tapers to a sharp point, the stopper nevertheless closes the hole when it is jammed inside and its other end makes contact with the sides of the hole. Here, too, sufficient contact and friction can be created by the upper end of the man’s member.

Ravina said to Mareimar that Mar Zutra said in the name of Rav Pappai as follows: The halakha is that whereas the man’s member was cut like a quill or like a gutter, 6 he is fit. However, he raised a dilemma as to whether this is referring to a cut below the corona, i.e., on the corona itself, or above it, on that part of the penis that is closer to the body. The Gemara answers: It is obvious that this is referring to a cut above the corona, as, if it enters your mind that it is referring to below the corona, i.e., on the corona itself, this would be difficult because even if the end of the member was completely severed, he would also be fit, provided that a hairsbreadth of the corona remained. The Gemara adds: And Ravina asked this question only because he wanted to mislead Mareimar 8 and test his understanding of the issue.

The Gemara relates: A certain incident actually occurred in the town of Mata Mehasya, where a man’s member was cut like a gutter. Mar bar Rav Ashi cut back the flesh on all sides until it was like a quill and thereby rendered him fit to enter into the congregation. A certain incident occurred in Pumbedita, where the seminal duct of a certain man became blocked, 9 and he emitted semen through the urinary duct. Rav Beivai bar Abaye thought to render him fit, as his genitals were neither crushed nor severed. Rav Pappi said: Because you come