



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Chagigah, Daf ט׳ – Daf ל׳

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

-----Daf ט׳---17-----

### MISHNA

- **B”S** say, one may bring a Shelamim on Yom Tov, but may not perform semicha on it, and one may not bring an Olah. **B”H** say one may bring Shelamims or Olos, and he may perform semicha on them.
- When Shavuos falls out on a Friday, **B”S** say the Day of Shechting is on Sunday (the korbanos yachid for the Yom Tov are brought then, because they can't be brought on Yom Tov or on Shabbos). **B”H** say there is no special Day of Shechting, because the korbanos are brought on Yom Tov itself.
  - However, **B”H** agree, that if Shavuos falls on a Shabbos, that the Day of Shechting is on Sunday (the korbanos can't be brought on Shabbos). On that Sunday, the Kohen Gadol does not wear his fancy Yom Tov clothing, and eulogies and fasts are permitted to take place on that day, to combat the view of the Tzidukim, who say that Shavuos is always on a Sunday.

### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshiya** said, one may bring his Shavuos korbon for 7 days (the day of Shavuos and for the six days after). We learn this from the fact that the Torah says “B’Chag Hamatzos, U’V’Chag Hashavuos”. Just like this may be done for 7 days on Pesach, it may be done for 7 days on Shavuos.
  - **Q:** The pasuk also says “U’V’Chag HaSuccos”, and should therefore teach that the korbon of Shavuos can be brought for 8 days, as the korbon of Succos may be brought for 8 days!? **A:** The 8<sup>th</sup> day of Succos is a separate and distinct Yom Tov, and therefore the korbon of Succos cannot be brought on that day (so it too may only be brought for 7 days).
  - **Q:** A Mishna clearly says that the korbon of Succos may even be brought on the 8<sup>th</sup> day, so we should learn out that the korbon of Shavuos may also be brought for 8 days!? **A:** When faced with 2 ways to learn (7 days from Pesach or 8 days from Succos), we must choose the more conservative approach (“tafasta merubah lo tafasta”).
  - **Q:** If so, why did the Torah write “Chag HaSuccos” in the pasuk? **A:** It was written to compare Succos to Pesach. Just like one must stay overnight in Yerushalayim on Pesach, based on the pasuk of “u’fanisa baboker v’halachta l’ohalecha”, one must also stay in Yerushalayim overnight on Succos as well.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that **B”H** say, when Shavuos falls on Friday there is no Day of Shechting on Sunday. Presumably, this means there is no opportunity to bring the korbanos after Yom Tov at all, because there is no make-up dates for bringing the korbanos of Shavuos!? **A:** **B”H** mean that there is no need for the Day of Shechting, because they can be brought on Yom Tov itself. However, if they were not brought on Yom Tov, it may be that they can be brought for the 6 days after Yom Tov.
    - **Q:** If that is what **B”H** is teaching in the Mishna, that the korbanos may be brought on Yom Tov, that is something that **B”H** and **B”S** argue about earlier in the Mishna, and there would be no reason to repeat it at this point in the Mishna!? **A:** Both cases are needed. If we would only say that they argue when Yom Tov is on a regular weekday (other than Friday), we would say that there **B”S** say to wait until the next day, but when Yom Tov is on Friday, where the korbanos could not be brought on the next day, maybe he would agree with **B”H** that they may be brought on Yom Tov itself. If we would just say the machlokes in the case where Yom Tov falls on Friday, we would say that **B”H** only allow it to be brought on Yom Tov in that case, because they cannot be brought the next day. However, when it falls on a regular weekday, we would say that they agree with **B”S** that the korbanos should be brought after Yom Tov. This is why it was necessary to say the machlokes in both cases.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that if one does not bring his korban on Shavuos, he can no longer bring it. This seems to say that the korbanos may only be brought on Shavuos!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that if the korbanos were not brought during the make-up days, they may no longer be brought.
- **Q: Rabbah bar Shmuel** taught, we count days to reach Rosh Chodesh, and we count days to reach Shavuos, and the kedusha lasts for the same amount of time as the units counted (i.e. one day). We should say that just as for Rosh Chodesh the kedusha lasts one day, the same is true for Shavuos, that since we count days to reach Shavuos, the kedusha for the korban lasts the same amount of time as the unit counted, which is for one day!? **A: Rava** said, we also count weeks to reach Shavuos, so the kedusha lasts as long as the unit counted, which is a week. Also, the Yom Tov is called “Chag Shavuos” – the Yom Tov of the weeks.
- **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** taught in a Braisa that the source for make-up days for the korbanos of Shavuos is from the pasuk in the parsha of Shavuos that says “Ukrasem...Uvikutzrichem”. This teaches that there is a time when reaping may be done, but some of the halachos of Yom Tov still apply. This can’t be talking about Yom Tov itself, because reaping is assur on Yom Tov. This must be talking about after Yom Tov, and this teaches that one may bring the korbanos after Yom Tov.
  - Both sources are needed. If we would just have the source of **R’ Elazar in the name of R’ Oshiya**, we would say that just like by Pesach the make-up days are assur to do work (it is Chol Hamoed), the same is with the make-up days of Shavuos. That is why we need the source of **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** to teach that this is not so. Also, if we only had the source of **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov**, we would not know how many days the make-up period continues on for. That is why we need the source of **R’ Elazar in the name of R’ Oshiya**, to teach that it is a 7 day period.
- **Reish Lakish** said that the source for make-up days for the korbanos of Shavuos is from the pasuk that says “V’chag hakatzir”. What is the Yom Tov where reaping is done? That is the Yom Tov of Shavuos. This teaches that there is a time when reaping may be done, but some of the halachos of Yom Tov still apply. This can’t be talking about Yom Tov itself, because reaping is assur on Yom Tov. This must be talking about after Yom Tov, and this teaches that one may bring the korbanos after Yom Tov.
  - **Q: R’ Yochanan** asked, based on this way of darshening, we should say that the pasuk that says “Chag ha’asif” refers to the Yom Tov of gathering, which is Succos. Now, it can’t refer to Yom Tov itself, because doing work is assur on Yom Tov. It also can’t be referring to Chol Hamoed, because work is assur on Chol Hamoed as well. The pasuk must be simply referring to the Yom Tov that is at the time of gathering. So too regarding Shavuos, we will say that the pasuk refers to the Yom Tov that happens at the time of the harvesting, and does not teach regarding any make-up period.

### -----Daf פ” 18-----

- We have seen in the previous Gemara that **R’ Yochanan and Reish Lakish** both hold that no work may be done on Chol Hamoed. From where do we learn this Halacha?
  - A Braisa says, **R’ Yoshiya** says, the pasuk of “Es Chag Hamatzos tishmor shivas yamim” teaches that melacha may not be done on Chol Hamoed. **R’ Yonason** says, we learn it from a kal v’chomer – if the first and 7<sup>th</sup> days of Pesach, which are not preceded and followed by days of kedusha, are assur to do melacha, then surely the days of Chol Hamoed, which are preceded and followed by days of kedusha, should be assur to do melacha.
    - **Q:** Based on the kal v’chomer, every weekday should be assur to do melacha, because the weekdays are preceded and followed by Shabbos – a day of kedusha!? **A:** Weekdays are different than Chol Hamoed, because there is no Korban Mussaf on a weekday.
      - **Q:** Rosh Chodesh should be assur to do melacha, because there is a korban mussaf!? **A:** Rosh Chodesh is not referred to as a “mikra kodesh”, whereas Chol Hamoed is, which is why it would be assur to do melacha on Chol Hamoed.
  - A Braisa says, **R’ Yose Haglili** darshens the pasuk of “Kol mileches avodah lo sa’asu...shivas yamim” to teach that melacha is assur on Chol Hamoed. **R’ Akiva** says, the pasuk says “mikra’ei kodesh”, which

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

refers to Chol Hamoed (because the first and 8<sup>th</sup> days of Succos are referred to as Shabbason). This teaches that melacha is assur on Chol Hamoed.

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “Sheishes yamim tochal matzos uvayom hashvi’i atzeres LaShem”. This teaches that just as the 7<sup>th</sup> day is “atzeres” (which refers to being assur to do melacha) so too are the first 6 days. This teaches that melacha is assur on Chol Hamoed. We may think to say that Chol Hamoed should be assur to do melacha to the same degree as the 7<sup>th</sup> day. The pasuk therefore says “**HA**shvi’i”, to teach that only certain melachos are assur on Chol Hamoed, and the **Chachomim** teach us what is assur and what is mutar.

### UMUTARIN B’HESPED V’TAANIS SHELO LEKAYEIM ES DIVREI...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Tarfon** did not allow a hesped for Alexa because it was the Yom Tov of Shavuot. Now, this can’t mean the actual Yom Tov, because that would be clear that no hesped could be made. It must be that it was the “Day of Shechting” after the Yom Tov, and we see that he did not allow a hesped!? **A:** This Braisa is discussing where Yom Tov fell during the week, and the Mishna is discussing where Yom Tov was on Shabbos (so the Day of Shechting was on Sunday, which is the only time we have to be concerned about the Tzedukim).

### MISHNA

- One must wash his hands with a keili for chullin food, maaser food, and for terumah food. However, for kodesh food (korbanos) one must toivel his hands. Before handling the chatas water (parah adumah water), if one’s hands became tamei, we consider his entire body as being tamei, and he must be toivel.
- If one went to the mikveh with the intent to allow himself to eat chullin, that does not help to allow him to eat maaser. If one went to the mikveh with the intent to allow himself to eat maaser, that does not help to allow him to eat terumah. If one went to the mikveh with the intent to allow himself to eat terumah, that does not help to allow him to eat kodesh. If one went to the mikveh with the intent to allow himself to eat kodesh, that does not help to allow him to handle the chatas water.
  - The general rule is, being toivel for a more stringent thing does help for a more lenient thing.
- If one was toivel with no intent, it is as if he was not toivel at all.
- The clothing of an ahm haaretz is considered as tamei medras for those who only eat their chulin in a state of tahara (perushin). The clothing of the perushin are considered as tamei medras for those who eat terumah. The clothing of those who eat terumah are considered as tamei medras for those who eat kodashim. The clothing of those who eat kodashim are considered as tamei medras for those handling the chatas water.
  - **Yosef ben Yoezer** was the Chassid of the Kohanim, and yet his napkin was considered as tamei medras for those who ate kodesh.
  - **Yochanan ben Gudgida** would eat his chullin with the level of purity as if they were kodesh his entire life, and yet his napkin was considered to be tamei medras for those who handled the chatas water.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** A Mishna says that the handling of terumah and bikkurim need hand washing first, but not maaser, and certainly not chullin!? Regarding maaser we can say that our Mishna follows the **Rabanan** of another Mishna who hold that even a Rabbinic tumah requires hand washing for maaser, whereas the Mishna in Bikkurim follows **R’ Meir** who says that no hand washing is needed for maaser. However, how will we explain the seeming contradiction regarding the need to wash hands for chullin? **A:** Our Mishna is discussing one who will eat chullin (and therefore hand washing is required), and the Mishna in Bikkurim is discussing simply touching the chullin (which does not require washing of the hands).
  - **Q: R’ Simi bar Ashi** asked, **R’ Meir** does not seem to make a difference between touching and eating!? **A:** Both Mishnayos discuss eating chullin. Our Mishna, which requires washing, is discussing eating bread. The Mishna in Bikkurim which does not require washing, discusses eating fruit.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 19-----

- 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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

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

- 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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Q2:** Also, we have 2 stories where a woman told **R' Yishmael** that she had made a “beged” 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 korban to complete his tahara process) must go to the mikvah before eating kodesh, but need not do so before eating terumah.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf כ"א-----21-----

## GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that for kodesh we do not allow one keili to be toiveled while it is in another keili? **A: R' Eila** said, we are concerned that the weight of the inside keili against the outside keili will act as a chatzitza, and will prevent a proper tevila.
  - **Q:** The Mishna later said that when toiveling clothing for kodesh, one must first untie, then dry, then toivel, whereas for terumah it may be toiveled while tied. The reason for that is out of concern for chatzitza. Now, if this later part of the Mishna teaches that there is a greater concern for chatzitza for kodesh, why would the first part of the Mishna teach the same thing!? **A:** Both these parts of the Mishna are discussing concerns for chatzitza, and both are needed. If we would only say the first case, we would think that there is only a concern in that case, because of the weight of the keili, but there is no concern in the later case. If we would only say the later case, we would say that only in that case is there a problem, because the knots are tight and cause a chatzitza, but when one keili is in another, the water makes the inner one float up and off the outer one. The Mishna therefore teaches that there is a chatzitza concern for kodesh in both of these cases.
  - **R' Eila** is consistent with what he says elsewhere. We find that **R' Eila in the name of R' Chanina bar Pappa** said that the Mishna lists 10 stringencies of kodesh over terumah. The first 5 stringencies apply to kodesh and to chullin that was prepared with tahara standards of kodesh, and the last 5 only apply to actual kodesh. The reason for this difference is that the first 5 are based on a D'Oraisa concern, whereas the last 5 are based on a D'Rabanan. Now, from the fact that he counts them as 10, when in fact our Mishna mentions 11, means that he counts the 2 that are based on chatzitza as one, thus bringing the total to 10.
  - **Rava** argued on **R' Eila** and said that since the later part of the Mishna is based on a chatzitza concern, the first part of the Mishna cannot be based on that same concern. Rather, he said that the reason a keili may not be toiveled for kodesh while in another keili is a gezeira that one may come to toivel a needle in a keili whose opening is smaller than the outer circumference of the tube used as the opening to a leather bottle, in which case the water going into the bottle is not considered to be part of the mikvah, and the needle would therefore not be considered to be toiveled. A Mishna teaches that this size is the size needed for the hole between a passul mikvah and a kosher mikvah to do "hashaka" and thereby make the passul mikvah valid.
    - **Rava** is consistent with the statement of **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha**, who said that the Mishna lists 11 stringencies of kodesh over terumah. The first 6 stringencies apply to kodesh and to chullin that was prepared with the tahara standards of kodesh, and the last 5 only apply to actual kodesh. Now, the fact that he counts them as 11 means that he holds that each stringency is based on a different reason.
    - The practical difference between **Rava** and **R' Eila** would be whether one could be toivel a keili in a basket. The concern for chatzitza would exist, but the concern that it may lead one to toivel small keilim in a keili with a very narrow opening does not exist. In fact, we find that **Rava** clearly allows one to be toivel keilim in a basket.
    - The Gemara says, the only time that the narrow opening of the bottle prevents the inside keili from becoming tahor is if the outside keili is not in need of a tevila. However, if the outside keili is also tamei, then since the water going through the narrow opening helps to make the inside of that keili tahor, it also helps for the inside keili.
    - We find that the machlokes between **Rava** and **R' Eila** is a machlokes Tanna'im in a Braisa, because the Braisa brings a machlokes where the T"K says that a basket may be used for toiveling keilim even for kodesh (like **Rava** says) and **Abba Shaul** says that it may only be used for terumah, and not for kodesh (like **R' Eila** would say).

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf כב--22-----

- **Q:** We discussed 2 reasons why one may not toivel a keili within another keili for kodesh – a concern for chatzitza or a concern for an outer keili with a very narrow opening. Why is it that we don't have those concerns when it comes to terumah, and we allow a keili to be toiveled within another keili? **A:** The people being toivel keilim for terumah are all well versed in the laws of taharah and would not be toivel in a way that would create an actual chatzitza or in an outer keili with a very narrow opening.
  - **Q:** If we are dealing with such people, there should be no concern when toiveling for kodesh either!? **A:** We are concerned that an ahm haaretz may see them toiveling a keili within a keili for kodesh, and may imitate that process when he is preparing for kodesh, not being careful to ascertain that there is no actual chatzitza or narrow opening.
    - **Q:** Why don't we have this same concern regarding terumah? **A:** A Kohen who is not an ahm haaretz does not accept terumah from an ahm haaretz, so we are not concerned that the Kohen will receive these improperly toiveled keilim with terumah.
    - **Q:** Why don't we also not accept kodesh from an ahm haaretz (and thereby alleviate this concern)? **A:** If we don't accept kodesh from them, it would cause them to hate us.
    - **Q:** Why are we not concerned with this hatred regarding terumah? **A:** They can give their terumah to a Kohen who is an ahm haaretz like them, so they will not care if we don't accept from them. However, there were no amei haaretz who were in charge of kodesh, and if we don't accept it from them, they will have no one to give their kodesh to.
    - The view that we are concerned that the ahm haaretz may foster a hatred toward us is the view of **R' Yose** from a Braisa. **R' Yose** says, that we accept wine for korbanos from all people, including an ahm haaretz, to prevent them from forming a hatred and going to build their own mizbe'ach to bring korbanos.
      - **R' Pappa** said, the fact that we accept testimony from an ahm haaretz, follows the view of **R' Yose**.
  - **Q:** Why are we not concerned that if we allow one to toivel a keili within a keili for purposes of terumah, an ahm haaretz may imitate that (and not realize that there is a true chatzitza or a very narrow opening), and a chaver may end up borrowing that keili from an ahm haaretz for terumah!? We find that a chaver may, and would, borrow keilim from an ahm haaretz!? **A:** A chaver will always toivel a keili that he borrows from an ahm haaretz, so there is no concern.
    - **Q:** This seems to suggest that a chaver must always toivel the keili of an ahm haaretz, even if the ahm haaretz said that he had already toiveled it. However, a Braisa says that an ahm haaretz is believed regarding tevila for tumas meis!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the Braisa is discussing the tevila of his body. The Gemara that says he is not believed is discussing his keilim. **A2: Rava** said, both cases discuss the tevila of keilim. The Braisa is discussing a case where the ahm haaretz said that he has never toiveled one keili within another keili (and he is therefore believed to say that it was toiveled properly), and the Gemara is discussing where he says that he has toiveled a keili within another keili, but has made sure that the opening is sufficiently wide (we do not treat him as being sufficiently knowledgeable to make that statement).
      - **Q:** We find that an ahm haaretz is not believed to have properly kept the days necessary to precede the sprinkling of the parah adumah on him, to make him tahor from tumas meis. If so, how can we say that he is believed regarding toiveling himself? **A:** **Abaye** said, it is precisely because he is not believed regarding the preceding days, that allows us to believe him regarding the tevila of his body (he is extra careful so that he should not have to repeat the whole process).

## ACHORAYIM V'TOCH

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean with this stringency? **A:** A Mishna says that if tamei water touches the outside of a keili, only the outside becomes tamei, but the rim, the ear, the handle and the inside all remain tahor. However, if the inside becomes tamei, the entire keili becomes tamei. This Halacha is only regarding keilim for

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

terumah. With regard to keilim for kodesh, even if only the outside touched tamei liquids, the entire keili becomes tamei.

U'BEIS HATZVITA...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, this refers to the place on the keili with which one hands it to another with. **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said that it refers to a special compartment in the keili which was used to hold dips.
- **R' Bibi** taught a Braisa in front of **R' Nachman** that said, all keilim have no distinction regarding the outside and inside, whether the keili is used for kodesh of the Beis Hamikdash or for “kodesh of the borders”. **R' Nachman** asked, what is meant by “kodesh of the borders”? It can't refer to terumah, because our Mishna said that keilim for terumah do have a distinction between the inside and outside. It must refer to keilim for chullin that was made with the level of taharah of kodesh. This is like the statement made by **Rabbah bar Avuha**, who said that the first 6 chumros of our Mishna apply equally to kodesh and to chullin that was made with the level of taharah of kodesh.

### -----Daf לז---23-----

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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

immediately used for the parah 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 tzedukim 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.