



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Pesachim, Daf ט' – Daf י

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ט'--14-----

### MISHNA

- **R' Chanina S'gan Hakohanim** said, the Kohanim never held back from burning Kodashim meat that had become tamei from a rishon (making the meat itself a sheni) together with kodashim meat that had become tamei from an av hatumah (making the meat itself a rishon), even though it would increase the level of tumah of the piece of meat that was a sheni.
- **R' Akiva** added, the Kohanim never held back from placing oil that had become tamei from a t'vul yom (making the oil itself a shlishi) into a metal oil lamp that itself was tamei from touching something that had touched a meis (making the lamp a rishon), even though it would increase the level of tumah of the oil to a sheini.
- **R' Meir** said, from the previous statements we can learn that one may burn the tahor terumah together with the tamei terumah on Erev Pesach.
  - **R' Yose** said, this is not a good comparison. In fact (**R' Yose** continues), **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua** agree that tamei and tahor terumah must be burned separately. They only argue whether terumah that is possibly (safek) tamei may be burned together with tamei terumah. In that case, **R' Eliezer** says even those should be burned separately and **R' Yehoshua** says they may be burned together.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** In **R' Chanina's** case the meat was a sheini, and they allowed it to touch a rishon. Contact with a rishon would make the meat a sheini again, which it already was, so of course that should be allowed!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, the Mishna meant to say that the meat was originally a shlishi, and now would become a sheini by touching the other meat.
  - **Q:** A Braisa teaches that food cannot make other food tamei!? This is not problematic according to **Abaye**, or **Rava** according to **R' Ada bar Ahava**, because they say that kodashim food can make other kodashim food tamei. However, according to **Ravina's** understanding of **Rava**, which makes no exception for kodashim, how could the food become tamei from other food!? **A:** There is liquid on the meat, and liquid could make food tamei.
    - **Q:** Based on this, the Mishna should have said that there is liquid there!? **A:** Food can make other food tamei D'Rabanan. The Kohanim were not concerned about this increase in the level of tumah D'Rabanan.

### HOSEF R' AKIVA MIMAYHEN SHEL KOHANIM LO NIMNI'U M'LIHADLIK...

- **Q:** The oil is a shlishi. By putting it into the lamp, it becomes a sheini. **R' Chanina's** case already taught that we can make a shlishi into a sheini!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, **R' Akiva** was discussing a metal lamp, which doesn't drop a level of tumah when it becomes tamei with tumas meis. Therefore, the lamp retains the level of an av hatumah and makes the oil (which was a shlishi) into a rishon. The chiddush is that we allow this to happen as well.
  - **Q:** Why did **R' Yehuda** have to answer that we are dealing with a metal lamp? Why couldn't he answer that the difference between this case and the last is that in the last case we were dealing with 2 tamei items, whereas in this case we are dealing with one item that is tamei and one that is "passul" (it is tamei but can't make something else tamei)!? **A:** The Mishna chose the example of tamei meis and a lamp. Why not choose tumas sheretz? It must be because we are dealing with a situation where there is a difference between tumas meis and tumas sheretz, which is the case when the item is made of metal.
- **Rava** says, it must be that **R' Akiva's** view is that liquids can make food tamei even D'Oraisa. Because, if that is only true D'Rabanan, then how do we explain this case of the oil? If the oil becomes a rishon, its status doesn't change for any purpose. It itself was tamei before and is tamei now. It couldn't make something else tamei before and can't do so now either. Therefore, we must say that he holds that it could make food tamei, and that

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

is what changed from its becoming a rishon from a shlishi. As a shlishi it couldn't make other food tamei. As a rishon it could.

- **Q:** Maybe the chiddush is that we are not concerned about increasing its tumah status on a D'Rabanan level!? **A:** D'Rabanan, a liquid that becomes tamei by any level of tumah (except by a t'vul yom) gets the din of a rishon. If we were only discussing the D'Rabanan halacha, there would have been no reason to give an example of an av hatumah. Without that, the liquid would have been a rishon.

AMAR R' MEIR MIDIVREYHEM LAMADNU...

- **Q:** From whose "words" is **R' Meir** learning his halacha? **R' Chanina's** case is different, because both items were already tamei! **R' Akiva's** case is different, because one item was tamei and one was "passul"! **R' Meir** is saying his halacha in regard to a tamei and a completely tahor item!? **A:** **R' Meir** held that the case of **R' Chanina** was dealing with a rishon meat that was tamei D'Oraisa, but with a sheni meat that was only tamei D'Rabanan. D'Oraisa, this second piece of meat was not tamei at all. Therefore, there is a good comparison to **R' Meir's** halacha. **A2: Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara** said, that **R' Chanina** is actually talking about tumah D'Oraisa, and therefore that cannot be the basis for **R' Meir's** halacha. His basis is from the "words" of **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua**.

-----Daf 10---15-----

- **Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara** said, that the basis for **R' Meir's** halacha in the Mishna was the halacha of **R' Yehoshua**.
  - **Q:** Which halacha of **R' Yehoshua**? It can't be his halacha from a Mishna in which he says that if terumah becomes safek tamei, we may take that terumah and leave it in a compromising position which may cause it to become tamei with certainty (there is no need to guard it against become certainly tamei), because there he is not *directly* causing the terumah to become tamei. However, **R' Meir** allows him to *directly* make it tamei!? **A:** It is his halacha from another Mishna. **R' Yehoshua** argues with **R' Eliezer** and says, if tahor terumah wine is spilling into tamei chullin wine, and there is no way to save even a revi'is of the terumah wine from becoming tamei (he has no tahor keilim), one may try and catch the terumah in tamei keilim to prevent it from mixing with the chullin and making the chullin unusable as well. We see that he holds that if the terumah is unusable (it is headed to the tamei chullin) one may make it tamei even *directly*. Based on that, **R' Meir** said that the chametz terumah (which is assur to eat and therefore unusable) may be made tamei even *directly* by burning it together with the tamei items.
    - **Q:** If this is the basis of **R' Meir's** opinion, why does the Mishna say that it is based on "their" words, it should say that it is based on "his" words!? **A:** It is based on **R' Yehoshua's** words as part of his machlokes with **R' Eliezer**. That is what is meant by "their" words.
    - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** also said that **R' Meir** based his opinion on the halacha of **R' Yehoshua**.
      - **Q: Rava** asked from a Braisa that explains **R' Yose's** response to **R' Meir**. The Braisa explains that **R' Yose** said to **R' Meir**, you can't learn your halacha from **R' Chanina**, because in that case both pieces of meat were already tamei, and you can't learn your halacha from **R' Akiva**, because over there the oil was "passul" (tamei) as well. Obviously, **R' Meir** is basing his opinion on them, which is why **R' Yose** was saying that it is not correct to do so!? **A: R' Yose** thought that **R' Meir** was basing his opinion on them. When he was told that the opinion was based on **R' Yehoshua**, he then asked, that **R' Yehoshua** agrees with **R' Eliezer** that tahor and tamei terumah must be burned separately.
        - **Q: R' Yehoshua's** halacha with the terumah wine falling into the chullin wine seems to be a perfect comparison to **R' Meir's** case of chametz. Why does **R' Yose** think it is not!? **A:** It could be that it is allowed in the case of the wine to prevent the loss of the chullin wine. In the case of the chametz, there is no loss that we are trying to prevent. The loss of having to use more wood for a second fire is considered insignificant.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the machlokes is in the 6<sup>th</sup> hour (when the chametz is only assur D'Rabanan). In that case **R' Meir** says one may burn the tahor terumah with the tamei terumah, and **R' Yose** says they must be burned separately. However, once the 7<sup>th</sup> hour begins (when the chametz is assur D'Oraisa), even **R' Yose** would agree that they may be burned together (the issur on the terumah puts it on even standing with the tamei and they can therefore be burned together).
  - **Q: R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, from the fact that **R' Yochanan** says that **R' Meir** only permits burning the tahor with the tamei during the 6<sup>th</sup> hour, it shows that **R' Chanina** must be the basis of **R' Meir's** halacha. He will say that **R' Chanina** is discussing a case where the sheini meat was only tamei D'Rabanan. We see that a D'Rabanan is enough to allow the tahor to be burned with the tamei. (If his basis was **R' Yehoshua's** case with the wine, it would not need an issur D'Rabanan to be burned, and could therefore be burned together with the tamei terumah even before the 6<sup>th</sup> hour)? **A: R' Assi** said, this is correct!
  - We can bring a proof that **R' Yose** would agree that tahor terumah may be burned with tamei terumah beginning at the 7<sup>th</sup> hour of the day. In the Braisa quoted earlier, **R' Yose** brought down the shita of **B"H** that piggul, nosar, and tamei may all be burned together. Presumably his point is that something that is assur D'Oraisa (like piggul and nosar) may be burned with tamei, but something only assur D'Rabanan (like chametz during the 6<sup>th</sup> hour) may not.
    - It could be that piggul and nosar may be burned with tamei, because a Braisa says that they themselves are tamei D'Rabanan. However, chametz in the 6<sup>th</sup> hour, although assur D'Rabanan, is not tamei at all, and therefore could not be burned along with tamei items.
  - A Braisa, which must follow **R' Yose**, says that inedible (moldy bread), tahor terumah may be burned with tamei terumah. Based on this, in the 7<sup>th</sup> hour, when it is assur D'Oraisa, it will be considered inedible and therefore allowed to be burned with tamei items. This is a proof that **R' Yose** would agree with **R' Meir** in the 7<sup>th</sup> hour.
    - It could be that he says that only in regard to moldy bread, because it is truly inedible and the equivalent of dirt. However, when something is inedible due to an issur, he would not allow it to be burned with tamei items.
  - **Q: If the basis to R' Meir's** halacha is **R' Chanina**, why does **R' Yose** bring down the machlokes between **R' Yehoshua** and **R' Eliezer**?! **A: R' Yose** was telling **R' Meir**, that even according to **R' Yehoshua** who is lenient and allows *safek* tamei to be burned along with definite tamei, it would be assur to burn *tahor* terumah and tamei terumah together.
  - **Q: If R' Yose** agrees that an issur would allow the tahor to be burned with the tamei (although according to him it would have to be an issur D'Oraisa), **R' Chanina's** case (which we said is talking about tumah D'Rabanan on the piece that is a sheini) is a perfect comparison to the case of chametz, so why did **R' Yose** say that it is not!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, **R' Chanina's** case is talking about where the sheini meat became tamei from a liquid that itself became tamei from a sheretz. **R' Meir** says that liquids can only make other things tamei D'Rabanan, and therefore this case is one of a D'Rabanan. **R' Yose** says that liquids can make other things tamei D'Oraisa, and therefore this case is one of a D'Oraisa. Therefore, according to **R' Meir** the case is a perfect comparison to the chametz which is only assur D'Rabanan. According to **R' Yose**, it is not.

### -----Daf טו-----16-----

- **Q: The Gemara** quoted a Braisa which said that **R' Elazar** held like **R' Meir**, who said that liquids can become tamei D'Oraisa, but can only give off tumah to other items D'Rabanan. However, there is another Braisa which says that **R' Elazar** says liquids are not subject to any tumah D'Oraisa!? **R' Elazar** brings a proof from **Yosef ben Yoezer Ish Tzreida** who said that all liquids of the butchering area in the Beis Hamikdash are tahor (the **Rabanan** did not place tumah in this case). We see that **R' Elazar** holds there is no tumah D'Oraisa!? This is not problematic according to **Shmuel**, who says that **Yosef ben Yoezer** meant that the liquids don't make other items tamei D'Rabanan, but the liquids themselves become tamei D'Oraisa, however, according to **Rav**, who says that he meant there is no tumah at all, **R' Elazar's** statements are contradictory!? **A: R' Nachman bar**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Yitzchak** said, **R' Elazar** meant that he held like one of the halachos of **R' Meir** (that liquids can only make other items tamei D'Rabanan), but argues with the other halacha (that they themselves become tamei D'Oraisa) and says that is only D'Rabanan as well.

- **Q:** In the first Braisa **R' Elazar** says that he holds like **R' Meir's** “words” (plural)!? The Braisa also says “v'chein” (and also) **R' Elazar** says like **R' Meir**, which seems to imply a full agreement!? **A:** This remains a KASHYEH.
- We said above, **Rav** says that **Yosef ben Yoezer** said the liquids of the Beis Hamikdash butchering area are entirely tahor (the liquids on their own and with regard to making other items tamei). This is because **Rav** holds that liquids are only tamei D'Rabanan, and in the Mikdash the Rabanan are not goizer. **Shmuel** says that **Yosef ben Yoezer** said that the liquids of the Mikdash butchering area don't make other items tamei, but are tamei themselves. This is because **Shmuel** holds that liquids are tamei themselves D'Oraisa, but make other items tamei only D'Rabanan, and in the Mikdash the Rabanan are not goizer.
  - **Q: R' Huna bar Chinina** told his son to ask **R' Pappa**, how could **Shmuel** say the liquids are tamei but don't make other things tamei in the Mikdash? A pasuk says that meat of kodashim that touch “anything tamei” may not be eaten. If liquids are tamei, the pasuk would seem to say that it would make the kodashim tamei as well!? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, we find the concept (a revi'i l'tumah) that kodashim can become tamei but not have the ability to spread tumah further.
    - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, a revi'i is not called “tamei”, and therefore would not be subject to that pasuk. However, according to **Shmuel** liquids are called “tamei” in a pasuk, and therefore are subject to this pasuk!? **A:** This remains a KASHYEH.
  - **Q:** A pasuk says, “all liquids that one drinks in any keili shall be tamei”. This is problematic according to **Rav**!? **A:** The pasuk means that if the liquids come into contact with foods, the foods become susceptible to tumah (muchshar l'kabel tumah).
    - **Q:** The halacha of “hechsher tumah” was already taught earlier in that pasuk!? **A:** The pasuk teaches that water detached from the ground is muchshar and then teaches that water still attached to the ground is muchshar. We couldn't learn one from the other because we would say that water detached from the ground is more significant, because one has detached it, and water still attached is more significant because it has not been moved.
  - **Q:** A pasuk says, “a spring, bor, or gathering of water shall be tahor”. We see that water attached to the ground is tahor, but detached waters would presumably become tamei!? **A:** The pasuk means that one who is toivel in these waters becomes tahor.
    - **Q:** How can we say that detached waters are machshir l'kabel tumah? **R' Yose in the name of R' Chanina** said that the liquids of the butcher area in the Mikdash are tahor and are not machshir either!? **A: R' Chanina** was referring to blood. As **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, blood of kodashim is not machshir, because it does not fall into the pasuk of “ahl ha'aretz tishpichenu kamayim”, since this blood is not spilled on the floor (it is caught and offered on the Mizbe'ach).
      - **Q:** Only the “lifeblood” is offered on the Mizbe'ach, which should mean that it is the only type of blood that is not machshir. However, the butchering area of the Mikdash had other blood as well, and **R' Chanina** said that it is not machshir!? **A: R' Zeira** said, blood other than lifeblood is never machshir (even outside of the Mikdash), because it does not have the status of blood.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the blood of a korbon became tamei and was then offered on the Mizbe'ach, if it was done b'shogeg, the korbon is valid, if it was done b'meizid, it is not. We see that liquids can become tamei, not like **Rav** said!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to tumah D'Rabanan, and the Braisa argues on **Yosef ben Yoezer** who said there is no D'Rabanan tumah on the blood.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the “tzitz” brought acceptance for korbonos of which the blood, meat or fats became tamei and were then offered. We see that liquids can become tamei, not like **Rav** said!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to tumah D'Rabanan, and the Braisa argues on **Yosef ben Yoezer** who said there is no D'Rabanan tumah on the blood.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that when Aharon wore the tzitz, it would bring forgiveness for the bringing of a korbon which was tamei. Presumably the Braisa is referring to a korbon whose blood was tamei. We see that liquids do become tamei!? **A: R' Pappa** said, it refers to the flour of a korbon mincha that became tamei.
- **Q:** A pasuk says that upon the return of the Kohanim after the galus Bavel, Chaggai Hanavi posed a hypothetical question of tumah to see if they knew the halachos of tumah. The question involved the tumah touching wine and oil, which in turn touched other items. Ultimately, the Kohanim said there would not be tumah. **Rav** said about this that the Kohanim were mistaken. We see that even **Rav** says that liquids can become tamei!? **A: Rav** said that the liquids of the butchering area (water and blood) do not become tamei, but would agree that the liquids of the Mizbe'ach (wine and oil) can become tamei.

### -----Daf 17-----

- **Rav** said that the Kohanim erred in answering Chaggai, because he asked them a case that should have resulted in a revi'i l'tumah (the sheretz touched bread, which touched a stew, which touched wine, which touched oil), and they said it would be tahor. **Shmuel** says the Kohanim answered correctly, because Chaggai's question provided a hypothetical which would have created a 5<sup>th</sup> level of tumah (the sheretz touched the garment, which touched the bread, which touched a stew, which touched wine, which touched oil), which is why the Kohanim correctly answered that it was tahor.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says, Chaggai asked, if one who was tamei meis would have touched the bread (instead of it having been a sheretz), would the oil become tamei? The Kohanim answered that in this case it would become tamei. According to **Shmuel**, just like they didn't err in the first question, they didn't err with regard to this one either. However, according to **Rav**, why is it that they erred there, but not here!? **A: R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, they were familiar with the laws of tumas meis, but not with regard to tumas sheretz. **A2: Ravina** says, the first question dealt with a revi'i l'tumah, and they were not familiar with that. This question dealt with a shlishi, which they were familiar with.
  - **Q:** The pasuk continues, and Chaggai says that because of the answers that were given, "Hashem says that all their Avodah and their korbonos should be tamei". According to **Rav**, he said this because they were not knowledgeable in the halachos, and therefore, their avodah had to be considered tamei. However, according to **Shmuel**, why did Chaggai say this!? **A:** Chaggai said this as a praise (as if to say, they are so knowledgeable in the halachos, is it possible that anything they do will be considered tamei?).
    - **Q:** The pasuk says "v'chein" (so too their work should be tamei), which suggests it was not said as a praise!? **A: Mar Zutra (or R' Ashi)** said, since they later did bad things, Chaggai was saying that at that time their Avodah would be considered as if done b'tumah.
- **Rav** said that **R' Yose ben Yoezer's** statement referred to the liquids in the butcher area of the Beis Hamikdash. **Levi** said it referred to the liquids brought on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Levi** must hold like **Shmuel** that when **R' Yose ben Yoezer** said the liquids are tahor D'Oraisa, he was only referring to their ability to make something else tamei (and Chaggai asked his question where the tamei meis touched each of the food items directly). Because, if he held like **Rav**, the liquids cannot become tamei at all.
  - **Shmuel** (who says the Kohanim answered the first question correctly, that a revi'i cannot make a chamishi) must hold like **Rav**, that **R' Yose ben Yoezer** meant that the butcher area liquids cannot become tamei, but wine and oil could. That's why it would become tamei if it was only a revi'i. Because, if he held like **Levi**, wine and oil don't become tamei at all.
  - There is a Braisa that is a proof to **Levi**, that liquids used on the Mizbe'ach are not subject to tumah, and there is a Braisa that is a proof to **Rav**, that only the liquids used in the butcher area are not subject to tumah.
- **R' Pappa** says, it is possible to say that liquids in general are subject to tumah D'Oraisa, but a Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai teaches that the liquids of the butcher area are not subject to tumah.
  - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** asked **R' Pappa**, if that is true, how could **R' Elazar** have brought a proof that liquids are not subject to tumah at all from **R' Yose ben Yoezer**? **R' Yose** was discussing the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

butcher area of kodashim, which you say is NOT subject to tumah based on the Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai – which only applies to kodashim, and cannot be used to teach regarding other liquids!? **Q2: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, we said earlier that **R' Shimon** says liquids become tamei D'Oraisa, yet we find that he makes a difference between water in a keili and water in the ground in the butcher area. If the Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai teaches that there is no tumah there, why is there a difference between in a keili and in the ground!? **A: KASHYEH.**

- **R' Pappa** explains, according to **R' Shimon**, who says there is a difference between liquids of the butchering area that are in a keili and liquids in the ground, that is only with regard to water. This difference would not hold true for blood. Even for water, it is only true if the water in the ground is at least a revi'is, because that would be enough to be considered a mikvah D'Oraisa.
- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that **R' Yehuda** says, anything (even keilim) that may have been touched by tamei liquids, are considered to be tamei. This would suggest that he holds liquids make keilim tamei D'Oraisa. However, in another Braisa, **R' Yehuda** is more lenient regarding the status of keilim that came into contact with tamei liquids than he is with regard to keilim that came into contact with a sheretz. If they are both D'Oraisa, no differentiation should be made!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, **R' Yehuda** retracted his halacha of the first Braisa. **A2: Ravina** said, in the second Braisa the liquid discussed is liquid that touched unwashed hands, which are only tamei D'Rabanan. However, liquids that are tamei D'Oraisa may in fact make keilim tamei in the same way that a sheretz does.
  - **Q:** According to **Ravina**, **R' Yehuda** should use the difference between the level of tumah of the liquids (whether they were touched by unwashed hands which is only D'Rabanan, or they were tamei D'Oraisa) to differentiate? Why does he use the example of a sheretz to differentiate? **A:** It must be like **Shmuel** said, that **R' Yehuda** retracted his halacha.

### -----Daf פ"ט--18-----

- **Q:** Did **R' Yehuda** retract his ruling (that liquids can make other items tamei D'Oraisa) only regarding keilim, or did he even retract it regarding making other food tamei as well, meaning that he now holds like **R' Meir**? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, we can bring a proof for a Mishna. The Mishna says, if a cow drank from the “mei chatas” (the parah adumah water used to sprinkle on people who are tamei meis), and is then slaughtered, the meat is tamei (the halacha is that anything that touches the mei chatas becomes tamei, and the cow's innards have touched the mei chatas after death). **R' Yehuda** says, once it enters the innards of the cow it no longer has the halacha of mei chatas and therefore does not make the meat tamei. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, if **R' Yehuda** holds that liquids do give off tumah to other foods D'Oraisa, then even if the water in the cow is not considered to be mei chatas, at the very least it should be considered water that touched the mei chatas (which is therefore tamei) and should pass along tumah to the meat of the cow! We see from here that he must hold like **R' Meir**, that D'Oraisa, liquids pass along no tumah.
  - In the Mishna **R' Yehuda** may mean that the cow does not become tamei from the stronger tumah of mei chatas. But, maybe he does say that the meat would get the more lenient tumah from the water which has touched the mei chatas!?
  - **R' Ashi** says that **R' Yehuda** may hold that liquids make food tamei even D'Oraisa. However, with regard to the case of the Mishna, he will say that the water does not have that capacity, because the water becomes disgusting by entering the cow and therefore loses its status as water altogether.
- We said earlier that **R' Yose** and **R' Shimon** say that liquids can make food tamei D'Oraisa, but can make keilim tamei only D'Rabanan.
  - **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of Reish Lakish** said, this shifah of **R' Yose** was said in accordance with the shifah of his rebbi **R' Akiva**. **R' Akiva** said that the pasuk says “yitmah” which can be read as “yitamei”. This teaches that a sheini food (the pasuk discusses food that was in a keili that itself became tamei from a sheretz, thereby making the food a sheini) can make a shlishi even by chullin. **R' Yose** uses that same drasha for the word “yitmah” that is said regarding liquids, and learns that the liquids can make food tamei as well.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe it means that the liquids can make other liquids tamei? **A: R' Pappa** said, we learn from a word in the pasuk that food cannot make other food tamei. Similarly, liquids would not be able to make other liquids tamei. **A2: Ravina** said, the pasuk says the word “yitma” twice, the first to teach that food can make liquids tamei, the second must be to teach that liquids can make foods tamei. If it taught that liquids can only make liquids tamei, the pasuk should only say “yitmah” once!
- **Q:** Maybe the second “yitmah” teaches that liquids can make keilim tamei? **A:** A kal v'chomer would teach that that is not the case. If a keili, which can make liquids tamei, cannot make other keilim tamei, then liquids, which cannot make other liquids tamei, surely cannot make keilim tamei.
  - **Q:** Maybe liquids which became tamei from keilim can't make keilim tamei, but liquids that became tamei from a sheretz can make keilim tamei? **A:** We only know that liquids become tamei from a sheretz through a kal v'chomer (if liquids become tamei from keilim, for sure they become tamei from a sheretz). If so, the concept of “dayo” teaches that we cannot derive a din which is stronger than the source. Meaning that liquids can only be metameh things that keilim can make tamei, and since a keili can't make another keili tamei, liquids (even having become tamei from a sheretz) can't make keilim tamei.
- **R' Akiva** said that the word “yitmah”, read as “yitamei”, written by tamei foods teaches that it can make liquids tamei.
  - **Q:** Maybe it teaches that the food can make keilim tamei? **A:** We learn a kal v'chomer. If liquids, which can make food tamei, can't make keilim tamei, certainly food, which cannot make other food tamei, cannot make keilim tamei. The word “yitmah” must teach that the food can make liquids tamei, because we find that liquids are more easily made tamei.
    - The fact that food can make liquids tamei is not a chumra of foods, it is a chumra of the liquids, because they are more easily made tamei, in that they do not have to become muchshar l'kabel tumah.
  - The word “yitmah” as written, teaches that food cannot make other foods tamei, and liquids cannot make other liquids tamei.
    - **Q:** This concept is learned from another pasuk that says “tamei hu” (this food is tamei but it cannot make other foods tamei)!? **A:** Both pesukim are needed: one to teach that liquids that became tamei from a sheretz cannot make other liquids tamei (even though they have a more stringent source of tumah) and one to teach that liquids that became tamei from keilim also cannot make other liquids tamei (although this could have been learned via a kal v'chomer, sometimes a pasuk teaches something directly that could otherwise have been learned via a kal v'chomer).
- **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, we find that **Rava** says (and proves) that **R' Yose** does not share **R' Akiva's** shita in this halacha (that a sheini food can make a shlishi of chullin). How can we say that **R' Yose** is based on the view of **R' Akiva**!? **A:** This halacha of **R' Yose** was stated according to the shita of **R' Akiva**, but **R' Yose** himself doesn't agree with it.
  - **Q: R' Ashi** said to **R' Kahana**, we understand why **Rava** said that **R' Yose** doesn't hold like **R' Akiva**, because **R' Yose** says, the halacha that kodesh can become a shlishi is learned from a pasuk. That kodesh can become a revi'i is learned from a kal v'chomer. If he held of **R' Akiva**, he should be able to use the kal v'chomer to teach that there is a revi'i even by terumah, and a chamishi by kodesh! However, **Rava** also says that **R' Akiva** does not share **R' Yose's** view (that we make these kal v'chomers). How does **Rava** know that to be true? **A: R' Kahana** said, if **R' Akiva** agreed with these kal v'chomers, that would mean that he says there is a chamishi l'tumah by kodashim, and

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

we find no Tanna anywhere that says that. It must be that **R' Akiva** doesn't say that either.

- **Q:** Can we rely on this logic to be certain that **R' Akiva** doesn't share **R' Yose's** view!? **A:** **R' Ashi (or R' Kahana)** searched and found a Mishna, which **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** says must follow **R' Akiva**, that says that there is only a *revi'i* by *kodesh*, no *chamishi*.

### -----Daf ט"ט-----19-----

- A Mishna says, if a needle was found in the meat of an animal that was slaughtered as a *korbon*, the knife used and the hands of the Kohen are considered *tahor*, but the meat is considered *tamei*. If the needle is found in the excrement of the animal, all are *tahor*.
  - In regard to these halachos, **R' Akiva** said, we are fortunate that the **Rabanan** did not institute *tumah* of the hands in the *Beis Hamikdash*.
    - **Q:** Why didn't he say, we are fortunate that the **Rabanan** did not institute *tumah* of the hands *or of keilim* (the knife) in the *Beis Hamikdash*!? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, these halachos were said before the institution of the *gezeirah* which make *keilim* *tamei* in this case.
      - **Q:** **Rava** asked, the *gezeirah* on hands and on *keilim* were made on the same day!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the knife could not become *tamei* in this case. It cannot become *tamei* from the *tumah* meat because food can't make *keilim* *tamei*. It also cannot become *tamei* even if it touched the needle, because *keilim* can't make other *keilim* *tamei*.
  - **Q:** Why are we considering this needle to be *tamei*? It can't be because we don't know the status of the needle and therefore we assign it *tumah* status, because **R' Elazar and R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** each said a halacha: One said that we were not *goizer tumah* on saliva found in *Yerushalayim* with unknown status, the other said we were not *goizer tumah* on *keilim* found in *Yerushalayim* with unknown status!? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the case discussed is where one lost a needle that was *tamei meis*, and he then recognizes the lost needle as the one stuck into the meat. **A2:** **R' Yose the son of R' Avin** said, the case discussed is where the animal was muzzled from before it walked into *Yerushalayim*, which means the needle came from outside of *Yerushalayim*, where we are *goizer tumah* on *keilim* of unknown status.
    - **Q:** We already learned that we are not *goizer tumah* on saliva and *keilim* of unknown status in *Yerushalayim* from *Mishnayos*. Why did they have to teach us these halachos!? **A:** The *chiddush* regarding saliva is that we are not *goizer tumah* even if a *zav* was known to have passed by that area (the saliva of a *zav* is *tamei D'Oraisa*). The *chiddush* regarding *keilim* is to teach the correct interpretation of the Mishna. The words of the Mishna lend itself to a more expansive *gezeirah* and a less expansive *gezeirah*. The teaching tells us that the less expansive *gezeirah* is the proper understanding of the Mishna.
    - **Q:** According to **Rav** who says that the needle was touched by a *tamei meis*, since the needle is metal, it should have the status of the person who touched it (an *av hatumah*), and it should even have the ability to make people and *keilim* *tamei*!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the *Azarah* has the status of a *reshus harabim*, and a case of doubtful *tumah* (we are not sure whether the Kohen or the knife actually touched the needle) in the *reshus harabim* is always ruled leniently.
      - **Q:** **R' Ashi** seems to suggest that if this same situation occurred in the *reshus hayachid* it would be *tamei*. However, the halacha is, if a *safek* arises regarding an entity that cannot be asked about its status (e.g. the needle), the *safek* is treated leniently even in *reshus hayachid*!? **A:** This is a *safek* that only comes about through human intervention (the Kohen moves the knife and possibly touches the needle). **R' Yochanan** says that in such a case it is treated like the case of an entity with a *safek* that can be asked about its status, and in a *reshus hayachid* it would be ruled as *tamei*.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 20-----

- **Q:** The Mishna quoted above said that the needle makes the meat tamei. What liquid made the meat muchsafr l'kabel tumah? It can't be the blood of the animal, because we said earlier that **R' Yochanan** said that blood of korbonos are not machshir l'kabel tumah! It can't be from the water of the butcher area, because we said earlier that **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said that the liquids of the butcher area are not machshir l'kabel tumah! It can't be that we say the meat does not need to be muchshar based on the fact that it is kodashim, which makes it significant and gives it the ability to become tamei without becoming wet, because that significance is only enough to make the meat "passul" (becomes tamei itself, without the ability to pass tumah along)!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the case must be that the animal was brought into the Azarah when wet, and some of that water dripped onto the meat after the shechita.
- **Q:** The Mishna said, if the needle was found in the excrement, even the meat remains tahor. Why doesn't the excrement make the meat tamei? **A: R' Adda bar Ahava** said, the case is that the excrement is very thick and dry. **A2: R' Ashi** said, even if it is not dry it is considered disgusting and can't even become tamei itself, because it has gone through the cow's digestive system.
- A Braisa was taught to **R' Ashi**, that said: "If a sheretz makes liquid tamei, the liquid can then make keilim tamei, the keilim can then make food tamei, and the food can then make liquid tamei. This teaches that there are up to 3 levels of tumah from a sheretz."
  - **Q:** There are 4 levels listed, not just 3!? **A:** Remove the first mention of liquid.
    - **Q:** Why not remove the second mention of liquids? **A:** The first mention must follow a Tanna who holds that liquids can make keilim tamei. The only one who held that way was **R' Yehuda**, and he retracted that ruling.
- A Mishna says, if a sheretz enters the airspace of an earthenware oven which has bread inside, the oven becomes a rishon and the bread becomes a sheini.
  - **Q: R' Adda bar Ahava** asked, why don't we view the oven as being filled with tumah, thus making the bread a rishon as well? **A: Rava** said, a pasuk teaches us that keilim in the oven would not become tamei, which means that the bread must be a sheini (if the bread became a rishon, keilim in the oven should also become tamei as a rishon).
- **R' Chisda** posed a contradiction, and answered it. He asked, how can we say that **R' Yehoshua** allows terumah which is only safek tamei to be burned together with terumah that is certainly tamei, a Braisa says that **R' Yose** says no one would allow the burning of those together, because Eliyahu Hanavi may come and tell us that the terumah is truly tahor!? **R' Chisda** answered that **R' Shimon's** view is that **R' Yehoshua** allowed the joint burning of these items. **R' Yose** said that **R' Yehoshua** did not allow it. We find a Braisa where **R' Shimon and R' Yose** clearly disagree in this way.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says that **R' Yehoshua** allows it, and in our Mishna it is **R' Yose** who says that!? **A: R' Yose** is saying to **R' Meir**, even according to **R' Shimon** who says that **R' Yehoshua** is meikel, he still only allows *safek* tamei terumah to be burned with tamei terumah. He does not allow tahor terumah to be burned with tamei terumah.
- **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** posed a contradiction and answered it. He asked, how can we say that **R' Yehoshua** allows the burning of possible tumah with the burning of positive tumah? In a Mishna, **R' Yehoshua** says that a barrel of terumah wine which became possibly tamei may be left out although it is at risk of becoming certainly tamei. We see that **R' Yehoshua** allows the *indirect* causing of tumah to something which is already possibly tamei, but even then does not allow the *direct* causing of tumah!? He answers, our Mishna follows **R' Shimon's** view of **R' Yehoshua**, and the other Mishna follows **R' Yose's** view of **R' Yehoshua**.
- **R' Elazar** posed a contradiction and answered it. He asked, how can we say that **R' Yehoshua** only allows making a safek tamei item *indirectly* tamei? A Mishna (we have quoted previously) says that **R' Yehoshua** allows catching terumah wine in tamei keilim to prevent the wine from falling into tamei chullin. We see he allows making it tamei even *directly*!? **A:** He answers, **R' Yehoshua** allows it there to prevent the loss of the chullin wine.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, not allowing the burning of tahor and tamei terumah together on Erev Pesach also causes a financial loss of having to use more wood to create a second fire!? **A: Abaye** said, that is an

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

insignificant loss, and therefore it is not allowed. We find that **R' Yehoshua** makes this difference based on a substantial financial loss, because he says that one may not catch dripping oil of terumah in tamei keilim even if it is falling into tamei chullin. Presumably, the difference between this case and that of the wine is that tamei terumah oil can be used for burning, whereas tamei terumah wine has no use.

- **Q:** Wine of terumah also has a use when tamei, because it can be used to sprinkle a room for its fragrance!? **A:** We are dealing with new wine, which does not yet have the fragrance to be used for sprinkling.
  - **Q:** We can allow it to age!? **A:** We don't allow that because one may come to drink it in the meantime.
  - **Q:** The same concern should exist regarding oil!? **A:** He puts the oil in a disgusting keili, and there is therefore no risk of one drinking it.
  - **Q:** Why can't he do the same with the wine!? **A:** If wine is put in such a keili, it will lose its fragrance.
  - We find that whether we are concerned that keeping tamei terumah will lead to one accidentally eating or drinking it is a machlokes Tanna'im in a Braisa.
- **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, the machlokes between **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua** (whether one may catch the terumah wine in tamei keilim) is only where the amount of chullin is less than 100 times the amount of the terumah (which will cause all the chullin to become assur to be eaten). However, if the amount of chullin is 100 times the amount of the terumah, all would agree that we allow the terumah to fall into the chullin, rather than make it tamei directly.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK OHR L'ARBA'AH ASSAR!!!**