



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

### Chagigah Daf Chuf Gimmel

HANOSEI ES HAMEDRAS NOSEI ES HATERUMAH...

- **Q:** Why can't one carry something which is tamei medras at the same time that he carries kodesh? **A:** It is because of a story that was related by **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel**, in which a person was carrying a barrel of kodesh wine, and his sandal strap ripped. He placed the sandal (which was tamei medras) on the barrel and it fell into the airspace of the barrel, thereby making the entire barrel tamei medras. At that time, the **Rabanan** instituted that one who is carrying something which is tamei medras may not also carry kodesh.
  - **Q:** Why wasn't the gezeirah instituted for one carrying terumah as well? **A:** The Mishna follows **R' Chananya ben Akavya**, who says elsewhere (regarding a gezeirah made for transporting the parah adumah ashes) that the gezeirah was only made in the exact circumstances that caused the gezeirah to be made altogether. Similarly, in this case the gezeirah was only made in the case of kodesh, because that was the circumstances of the story that brought about the whole gezeirah.
  - **Q:** Was a gezeirah also instituted to prohibit carrying a tahor sandal while carrying kodesh? **Q2:** Was the gezeirah only instituted when carrying an open barrel or even a closed barrel? **Q3:** If one carried medras while carrying kodesh, does the gezeirah make it that the kodesh becomes automatically tamei even if it does not touch? **A:** Regarding the last question, **R' Eila** said that if one does carry them together the kodesh becomes tamei, and **R' Zeira** said that it would remain tahor.

KEILIM HANIGMARIM B'TAHARA...

- **Q:** Who is the one that completed the keili? If it was a chaver, then why would the keili need to be toiveled? If it was an ahm haaretz, then how could the Mishna refer to it as a keili that was completed "b'tahara"? **A: Rabbah bar Shila in the name of R' Masna in the name of Shmuel** said, the keili was completed by a chaver. The reason it must be toiveled is that we are concerned that an ahm haaretz may have spit onto it, which would require it to be toiveled.
  - **Q:** When are we concerned that he spit on it? If he spit on it before it was completed, it is not yet a keili and can't become tamei!? If it was once the keili was completed, certainly the chaver would make sure that such a thing would not happen!? **A:** We are concerned that he spit on it before it became a completed keili, but the spit remained moist (and therefore capable of making something tamei) until after it became a completed keili.
- The Mishna seems to suggest that the completed keili would need tevila, but would not need "haarev shemesh" (it only says that it needs tevila). This would not follow the view of **R' Eliezer** of a Mishna regarding the keili used for the parah aduma process. The tzedukim would say that anything that was tamei and underwent a tevila may not be used for the process unless it first had haarev shemesh. To counter that view, the **Rabanan** instituted that the keilim and the Kohen involved in the process should be made tamei, should undergo a tevila, and should be used in the process before they had haarev shemesh. Regarding the tube used to hold the ashes, **R' Eliezer** says it must undergo tevila since it is a new keili that is being used for kodesh, and can then be immediately used for the para adumah process. Now, if a new keili used for kodesh never needs haarev shemesh, how is the immediate use of this tube showing that we are countering to the view of the tzedukim? It must be that **R' Eliezer** holds that typically such new keilim need tevila and haarev shemesh. Based on this view, our Mishna must not follow **R' Eliezer**.

- **Rav** said, it may be that our Mishna can even follow **R' Eliezer**, and regarding the keili made for the parah adumah process, the **Rabanan** instituted that the tube should become tamei as if from a sheretz, which typically does need haarev shemesh. That is how we counter the view of the tzeddukim when it is used immediately after tevila.
  - **Q:** If it is treated as a keili that became tamei from a sheretz, it should not make a person tamei, and yet we have learned that the one who cuts or toivels the tube must toivel himself afterward as well!? **A:** The **Rabanan** instituted that the tube should become tamei as if from a meis, but not in the way that it requires sprinkling on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> day, rather as if it is tamei from a meis and is already holding by the 7<sup>th</sup> day, after having been sprinkled (so it only needs tevila and haarev shemesh, but can still make people tamei).
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that there are no new halachos of tumah for the parah adumah, but this would seem to be a new Halacha!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the Braisa means that the **Rabanan** did not say that something that is not fit to become tamei should become tamei (e.g. that a shovel should become tamei as medras, because only something that is meant for sitting upon becomes tamei medras). However, the Braisa does not mean that they would not assign tumah to something (e.g. the tube) that is actually susceptible to that type of tumah (the tumas meis).

#### HAKLI METZAREF MAH SHEBITOCHO LEKODESH...

- **R' Chanin** said that we learn this (that the items in a keili combine for purposes of kodashim) from a pasuk.
  - **Q:** **R' Kahana** asked, we find a Mishna where **R' Shimon ben Beseira** said this combination rule for the parah adumah ashes. Now, that is clearly only D'Rabanan, because the pasuk used by **R' Chanin** only discusses items brought onto the Mizbe'ach. The Mishna continues that **R' Akiva** "adds" that the combination rule applies to flour of kodesh, to the ketores, to the levonah and to the coals. Now, the word "adds" suggests that **R' Akiva** is saying that these items are also D'Rabanan, like the item of **R' Shimon ben Beseira**. This is not like **R' Chanin** said!? **A:** **Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara** said, it may be that **R' Akiva** agrees with **R' Chanin**, and he is only adding that the leftover flour (that is eaten by the Kohen), which is not subject to the D'Oraisa combination, is subject to a gezeira D'Rabanan that they too combine. The D'Oraisa only covers things that must be placed into a keili, and the leftover flour need not be placed into a keili.
    - **Q:** How would that explain what **R' Akiva** "adds" about the ketores and levonah? These things need to be in a keili and should therefore be covered by the D'Oraisa!? **A:** **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, the case of **R' Akiva** is where one placed the items onto a flat piece of leather. In that case it does not combine D'Oraisa, because there is no receptacle. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that it combines in that case as well.
  - **R' Chanin** argues on **R' Chiya bar Abba**, who clearly says that our Mishna's Halacha that the keili combines the items for purposes of kodesh is only D'Rabanan.