



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

Chagigah Daf Chuf

- If one is “masiach daas” (diverts his attention) for even a moment, from guarding things that he is keeping in a state of tahara, we consider them as tamei.
 - **R' Yonason ben Elazar** said, if one's cape fell off and he asked his friend to pick it up and give it to him, it is considered to be tamei (he is considered to have been masiach daas).
 - **R' Yonason ben Amram** said, if one meant to take his weekday clothes, and mistakenly took his Shabbos clothes and put them on, they are considered to be tamei.
 - **R' Elazar bar Tzadok** said, it once happened that 2 women who were “chaveiros” (were very careful regarding tumah) mistakenly exchanged clothing in the bathhouse, and **R' Akiva** said that their clothing was considered to be tamei.
 - **Q: R' Hoshaya** asked, do you mean to say that if one intended to take wheat bread from a basket and mistakenly took barley bread, that the bread would be tamei (which would seem to be the result based on these last two statements)? That can't be right, because a Braisa says that if one guards a barrel thinking it is full of wine, and ultimately finds out that it was oil, we do not consider it to be tamei!
 - **Q:** Do you mean to say that it does not become tamei? The end of that Mishna says that the person may not eat the oil. If it doesn't become tamei, then why can't it be eaten!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, the Mishna is discussing where the person watched it to prevent it from becoming tamei (which is a state in which it can give off further tumah), but not to prevent it from becoming passul (which is the state where it itself is tamei, but cannot pass along tumah to anything else). That is the reason that it may not be eaten.
 - We find this concept in a Braisa that a person will at times guard something from becoming tamei, but not from becoming passul.
 - Q2:** Also, we have 2 stories where a woman told **R' Yishmael** that she had made a “begeg” without any opportunities for it to become tamei, but without intention to keep them tahor. In each case **R' Yishmael** questioned them and they ultimately realized that the begadim had become tamei. **R' Yishmael** said, we see that the **Chachomim** were very correct when they required that one must intend to guard something from tumah in order for it to be considered tahor. Based on this, why in the 3 halachos stated above are the items tamei? Even though there was a mistake regarding what the item being watched was, or even though someone else picked up the cape, since the item was being watched the entire time, it should remain tahor!? Now, we can understand why in the case of **R' Elazar bar Tzadok** the clothing is tamei, because we say that when each woman realized they had someone else's clothing, they assumed that the other person must be someone who is not careful with tumah, and they therefore did not pay attention to the clothing to make sure they remained tahor. We can also understand the case of **R' Yonason ben Amram**, because people usually keep their Shabbos clothing to a higher degree of tahara, and therefore a weekday use will make such clothing to be treated as tamei. However, why is the cape in the case of **R' Yonason ben Elazar** tamei just because someone else watched it for him after it fell? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we have a chazaka that a person does not watch something that is in someone else's hand to prevent it from becoming tamei.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that if an employer gives his workers tahor items to carry for him, even if he is far away from them, they remain tahor. If, however, he tells

them to travel somewhere with the items, and that he will join them later on in the travel, they become tamei as soon as he disappears from sight. According to **R' Yochanan**, they should become tamei in the first case as well!? **A: R' Yitzchak Nafcha** said, the first case is where he made his workers go to the mikvah, so that he knows they are tahor.

- **Q:** If that is the case of the Mishna, why are the items tamei in the second case? **A:** They allow other people to touch the items, and the other people may be tamei. In the first case, they are afraid that their boss will see them do this, so they will not allow other people to touch the items. In the second case, they don't have that fear, and that is why the items are considered to be tamei.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EIN DORSHIN

PEREK CHOMER BAKODESH -- PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- The following is a list of ways in which kodesh is treated more stringently than terumah: one may toivel a smaller keili within a larger keili for terumah purposes, but not for kodesh; the outside of a keili and the "tzevita" are considered as separate keilim for purposes of terumah, but not for kodesh; one who is carrying a medras may also carry terumah, but not kodesh; the garments of people who eat terumah are considered as tamei medras for those who eat kodesh; when toiveling a garment, even loosely tied knots are considered a chatzitza for purposes of kodesh, but not for terumah; a keili that was completed while tahor must still be toiveled before being used for kodesh, but not for terumah; a keili is considered to combine all the kodesh that is within it as one, which would not be the case for terumah; kodesh has a level of revi'i for tumah, whereas terumah only has the level of shlishi; with regard to terumah, if one hand of a person becomes tamei, the other is still considered to be tahor, whereas regarding kodesh, if one hand becomes tamei, both hands need tevila, because one hand makes the other tamei for kodesh, but not for terumah; one may eat dry terumah food with tamei hands, but may not do so with dry kodesh foods; and an onein and a mechusar kippurim (one who was tamei, went to the mikvah, had the sun set, and now just needs to bring a korbon to complete his tahara process) must go to the mikvah before eating kodesh, but need not do so before eating terumah.