



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

### Sotah Daf Chuf Tes

- The Braisa quoted earlier learned from sotah that a safek tumah in the reshus hayachid is only tamei if the thing involved in the safek is a person who can be asked regarding the situation. **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** learns this from a different source. He says, one pasuk says that korbbon meat that is tamei may not be eaten, which suggests that if it is a safek of tumah it may be eaten. Another pasuk says that only a tahor person may eat the meat, which suggests that if he is a safek tamei he may not eat the meat. He explains that the difference in the pesukim is that in the first case there is no person involved to ask, and in the second case there is. From here we see that if there is a person involved the safek is deemed tamei and if there is no person involved the safek is deemed tahor.
  - We need to learn this concept from both sotah and the case of **R' Gidal in the name of Rav**, because from **R' Gidal's** source we would apply the rule whether the safek takes place in the reshus hayachid or the reshus harabim, and from sotah we would say that it is only tamei when the tamei item *and* the item becoming tamei are both people. Therefore, both these sources are necessary.

BO BAYOM DARASH R' AKIVA V'CHOL KLI CHERES...

- **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** who doesn't have a basis in a pasuk to teach the halacha of a shlishi of tumah, how does he know that terumah can become a shlishi of tumah? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, he had no basis from a pasuk, but he learned the halacha based on a kal v'chomer. If a person who is a "tevul yom", who is mutar to eat maser sheini, is passul to eat terumah, then a sheini of tumah, which would be assur if it was maaser sheini, would surely make terumah assur as a shlishi!
  - **Q:** We can ask on the kal v'chomer, that maybe the case of tevul yom is more stringent in that the person is actually an av hatumah!? **A:** The kal v'chomer should be based on a tevul yom who had become tamei to a sheretz, where the tevul yom is therefore only a rishon, not an av.
    - **Q:** We can ask, that maybe this case is more stringent, because people and keilim have the ability to be an av hatumah, whereas food can never be an av hatumah, and maybe that is why it cannot make terumah passul!? **A:** That can't be correct, because an earthenware keili can never become an av hatumah, and yet it can make terumah passul.
      - **Q:** Maybe an earthenware keili is more stringent, because it can make something tamei just by having it enter its airspace, without actually coming into contact with the keili itself!? **A:** The case of tevul yom doesn't have that quality and yet it can make terumah passul. The common characteristic between the two is that they both are not problematic for maaser sheini and yet they make terumah passul, so certainly, a sheini l'tumah, which would be problematic for maaser sheini, should certainly make terumah passul.
      - **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** was concerned that a later generation would come along and say that tevul yom and an earthenware keili each have a stringency of their own, and that is why they can make terumah passul, but a sheini l'tumah cannot. He held this is not a refutation of the kal v'chomer, because he held that a kal v'chomer cannot be refuted with such a question.

- A Braisa says, **R' Yose** asked, how do we know that a revi'i of tumah makes kodesh passul? He says it is based on a kal v'chomer. If a mechusar kippurim, who is mutar to eat terumah, is passul to eat kodesh, then a shlishi of tumah, which would be passul as terumah, will certainly make revi'i of tumah in the case of kodesh. We learn that a shlishi of tumah makes kodesh passul from a pasuk, and we learn the concept of revi'i from a kal v'chomer.
  - **Q:** Where in the pasuk do we learn that a shilishi is tamei for purposes of kodesh? **A:** The pasuk says that the meat of kodesh that touches anything tamei may not be eaten. Now, the pasuk seems to be discussing where the meat touched something that itself was a sheini, and we see that if kodesh became a shlishi it may not be eaten. The concept that when kodesh becomes a revi'i it may not be eaten is then learned from the kal v'chomer.
  - **Q: R' Yochanan** said, I don't understand the reasoning of **R' Yose**, because he says that anything that can make terumah passul can make kodesh into a revi'i. However, we know that although a tevil yom can make terumah passul, it does not have the ability to make kodesh into a revi'i, as we see is the shitah of the **Rabanan** in a Braisa!? **A: R' Pappa** said, it may be that **R' Yose** holds like **Abba Shaul** in the Braisa, who argues with the **Rabanan**, and says that a tevil yom can make kodesh into a revi'i of tumah.
    - **Q:** It can't be that he holds like **Abba Shaul**, because if he did, he should learn a kal v'chomer that a shlishi create a revi'i from the case of food that was touched by a tevil yom! The tevil yom himself is mutar to eat maaser sheini, yet the food he touches can create a revi'i of tumah, so a shlishi, which is created by a sheini which itself would make maaser passul, can certainly make kodesh into a revi'i! You can't try and refute this kal v'chomer by saying that a tevil yom is different in that he is essentially an av hatumah, because this refutation stands when the kal v'chomer is made based on a mechusar kippurim as well, and yet the refutation was not asked there! The reason this kal v'chomer was not said must be because he holds like the **Rabanan**, who say that the food cannot make kodesh into a revi'i. And, as said originally, if he holds like the **Rabanan**, **R' Yochanan** found it difficult to understand his reasoning.