



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

Chagigah Daf Yud Tes

- A Braisa says, if one who washes his hands intends for them to become tahor, they become tahor. If not, they remain tamei. Similarly, if one toivels his hands and intends for them to become tahor, they become tahor. If not, they remain tamei.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that whether he had intent to make them tahor or not, his hands become tahor!? **A: R' Nachman** said, the first Braisa is discussing washing one's hands for maaser. The second Braisa is discussing washing for chullin.
 - We learn from a Mishna that one need not intend for chullin. The Mishna says that if a wave of 40 se'ah detached from the sea and fell onto a person or keilim, they become tahor. The Mishna teaches that a person is like keilim – just like keilim don't need intention to become tahor, the same is true for people.
 - **Q:** It may be that the Mishna is discussing where the person is sitting and waiting for the wave to detach so that he can use it to become tahor, and it is a case where he did intend!? From there we would learn that one must intend for keilim as well!? The chiddush of the Mishna would be that we are not goizer against toiveling in a wave out of concern that it may lead one to toivel in rainwater rushing off a steep slope (which would be an invalid tevilah). Or, the chiddush may be that we are not goizer that this will lead one to be toivel keilim in the arch of the wave, which a Braisa says is not allowed. If so, where do we see that no intent is needed when washing hands for chullin? **A:** We learn it from a Mishna that says, that if fruit falls into a stream and one stuck his tamei hands into the water to get the fruit, his hands become tahor, even though he did not intend for them to become tahor.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked **R' Nachman**, our Mishna says, if one was toivel his hands with intention to do so for chullin, it does not help for maaser. This suggests that the tevilah for chullin must be done with intent!? **A:** The Mishna means, that even if he happened to intend for chullin, still it does not help for maaser.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, the Mishna then says, if one toiveled without any intent it does not help. This seems to say that it does not help even for chullin!? **A:** It means that it does not help for maaser, but it does help for chullin. **Rabbah** later found a Braisa that clearly says like this as well.
- **R' Elazar** said, if one was toivel with intent to be toivel, but without specific intent as to what he was being toivel for, he may decide what he was toivel for even after he exits the mikvah, and it helps for that level.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one is leaving the mikvah but still has one foot in the mikvah, then he may still change his intent for the tevila to a more stringent form of tahara. However, once his foot leaves, he may no longer do so. This suggests that once he leaves he may no longer intend for anything!? **A:** Once he leaves he may no longer change an initial intent. However, if there was no initial intent, he may still intend for something at that point.
 - This Braisa must follow **R' Yehuda** who says that when a mikvah has exactly 40 se'ah and 2 people went in to be toivel, if the second person was toivel when the first person still had one foot in the mikvah, he is tahor (the water on the

first person is still considered to be connected to the mikvah, and it therefore is still considered to have 40 se'ah). The same logic applies to the Braisa stated above.

- **Q: Ulla** asked **R' Yochanan**, according to **R' Yehuda**, when a person has his foot in the mikvah, may one toivel a small needle in the water that has pooled onto the person's head? Does **R' Yehuda** only hold of "gud achis" (the water extends down) and the needle is therefore not considered to be toiveled in the mikvah, or does he even hold of "gud asik" (the water extends up) and it is considered to be toiveled in the mikvah? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says that if there are 3 holes of water on a slope, with the upper and lower ones containing 20 se'ah each and the middle one containing 40 se'ah, and a strong rain comes in a way that water is now connecting all 3 holes, **R' Yehuda** said that **R' Meir** said that one can even be toivel things in the upper hole. We see from here that he even holds of gud asik.
 - **Q: Ulla** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** specifically said that he argues on **R' Meir**!? **A:** He told him, if there is such a Braisa, then clearly he does not hold of gud asik.

HATOIVEL L'CHULLIN V'HUCHZAK L'CHULLIN...

- **Q:** This part of the Mishna clearly follows the **Rabanan**, who say that maaser is on a higher level, and a tevila for chullin will not help for maaser. However, the latter part of the Mishna that discusses the clothing of the different people does not make a differentiation between chullin and maaser, which would follow **R' Meir**. Are we to say that the beginning of the Mishna follows the **Rabanan** and the latter part follows **R' Meir**? **A:** Yes, the beginning follows the **Rabanan** and the latter part follows **R' Meir**.
 - **R' Acha bar Ada** had a version of the Mishna which differentiated between chullin and maaser even in the latter part of the Mishna. Based on that version, the entire Mishna can be said to follow the **Rabanan**.
- **R' Mari** said, we can learn from our Mishna that chullin that was made with the stringencies of tahara of kodesh is on the same level as kodesh, because if it is a different level, the Mishna should have made a separate level for it.
 - **Q:** What is the proof? No matter what such chullin is considered (kodesh, terumah, or chullin), it is already addressed in the Mishna, so there is no need to make a separate category!? **A:** The proof is from the end of the Mishna which says that **Yochanan ben Gudgeda** would keep his chullin with the stringencies of kodesh, and yet his napkin was considered as tamei medras for one who was to handle the chatas water. The Mishna suggests that it would not be considered tamei for one who was dealing with actual kodesh. We see that chullin kept as kodesh and true kodesh, are considered to be on the same level.