



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Tes Vuv

- **Q:** The Braisa said that **B"H and B"S** argued about all these 18 gezeiros. However, another Braisa says that were not in disagreement on these 18 gezeiros!? **A:** At first they disagreed, but after the vote they were in agreement.
- **R' Huna** said that **Hillel and Shammai** only argued in 3 instances. These 3 places are the following:
 - **Shammai** says that challah must be separated from bread made of one kav of flour. **Hillel** says challah is only separated if the bread is made from at least 2 kav of flour.
 - **Hillel** says that a "hin" (12 lugin) of mayim sheuvim make a mikvah passul. **Shammai** says 9 kav of mayim sheuvim passel a mikvah.
 - **Shammai** says, when a woman sees blood we assume that the blood left her uterus when she saw it and there is therefore no retroactive tumah. **Hillel** says, when a woman sees blood there is retroactive tumah (with regard to some halachos) which goes back until her last clean bedika.
 - Although they also argue with regard to doing "smicha" on a private korbon on Yom Tov, **R' Huna** doesn't mention that, because that same machlokes was argued by many for generations before them.
 - Although they also argue whether the juice that flows from grapes which were placed into baskets on their way to the press can make something muchshar l'kabel tumah, he does not mention that case because **Hillel** was silent in response to **Shammai's** arguments. Therefore, he does not consider it a place where they argue.
- A Braisa quoted earlier in the Gemara said, **Yose ben Yoezer Ish Tzreida** and **Yose ben Yochanan Ish Yerushalayim** were goizer tumah on land from chutz la'aretz (because they don't mark their graves) and on glass keilim.
 - **Q:** We have learned that the **Rabanan** who lived 80 years before the Churban Habayis (which is well after the 2 **Yose's** in the Braisa) were the ones who were goizer tumah on chutza la'aretz and on glass keilim!? **A:** The **Yose's** were goizer that the actual land makes terumah tamei to the point of requiring it to be burned, but they were not goizer any tumah for the airspace of chutz la'aretz. The **Rabanan** of 80 years before the Churban came along and were goizer that the airspace of chutz la'aretz makes terumah tamei, but such terumah must be left to rot, not burned.
 - **Q:** From **Ilfa's** statement it can be inferred that the initial gezeirah on chutz la'aretz was to leave terumah that was touched by it to rot, and not to burn it, which is not what we just said in the previous answer?! **A:** The **Yose's** were goizer that chutz la'aretz has tumah which requires terumah that came in contact with it to be left to rot, and they made no gezeirah on the airspace of chutz la'aretz. The **Rabanan** of 80 years before the Churban came along and were goizer that the terumah touched by chutz la'aretz must be burned and that terumah in the airspace of chutz la'aretz must be left to rot.
 - **Q:** **Ulla** said that the tumah of chutz la'aretz was a gezeira instituted in Usha, which was much later than 80 years before the Churban? **A:** The **Yose's** were goizer that terumah touched by **eretz ha'amim** must be left to rot, but made no gezeirah on the airspace of chutz la'aretz. The **Rabanan** of 80 years before the Churban added the gezeirah that terumah which was in the airspace of chutz la'aretz must also be left to rot. In Usha, they were goizer that terumah touched by chutz la'aretz must be burned.

- The Braisa also said that **Yose ben Yoezer Ish Tzreida** and **Yose ben Yochanan Ish Yerushalayim** were goizer tumah on glass keilim.
 - **Reish Lakish** explained that although D'Oraisa there is no tumah on a glass keili, since glass is created from sand, and is therefore somewhat similar to earthenware, they were goizer tumah on glass as well.
 - **Q:** If we treat it like earthenware, it should not become tahor by being placed in a mikvah, and yet we learned in a Mishna that glass does become tahor through tevila in a mikvah?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the glass keili got a hole, and therefore, because it lost its usefulness as a keili, it loses its tumah. The hole was then plugged up with metal. The Mishna follows the view of **R' Meir**, who says that the status of the keili follows the part that makes it useful, (in this case, the metal plug) and the glass keili therefore has the status of a metal keili. This is why the Mishna says that tevila in a mikva helps for this glass keili.
 - **Q:** If glass is treated as earthenware, it should not be able to become tamei through being touched on the outside (just like an earthenware keili)?! **A:** Since a broken glass keili can be made useful again (unlike earthenware, glass can be melted down and formed into a new keili), it is treated like a metal keili which can also be reconstructed in that way. Just like a metal keili can become tamei through being touched on the outside, the same is therefore true for a keili made of glass.