



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

Pesachim Daf Yud Zayin

- **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 5th 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 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 unwatched 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.