



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

Pesachim Daf Yud Ches

- **Q:** Did **R' Yehuda** retract his ruling (that liquids can make other items tamei D'Oraisa) only regarding keilim, or did he even retract it regarding making other food tamei as well, meaning that he now holds like **R' Meir**? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, we can bring a proof for a Mishna. The Mishna says, if a cow drank from the "mei chatas" (the parah adumah water used to sprinkle on people who are tamei meis), and is then slaughtered, the meat is tamei (the halacha is that anything that touches the mei chatas becomes tamei, and the cow's innards have touched the mei chatas after death). **R' Yehuda** says, once it enters the innards of the cow it no longer has the halacha of mei chatas and therefore does not make the meat tamei. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, if **R' Yehuda** holds that liquids do give off tumah to other foods D'Oraisa, then even if the water in the cow is not considered to be mei chatas, at the very least it should be considered water that touched the mei chatas (which is therefore tamei) and should pass along tumah to the meat of the cow! We see from here that he must hold like **R' Meir**, that D'Oraisa, liquids pass along no tumah.
 - In the Mishna **R' Yehuda** may mean that the cow does not become tamei from the stronger tumah of mei chatas. But, maybe he does say that the meat would get the more lenient tumah from the water which has touched the mei chatas!?
 - **R' Ashi** says that **R' Yehuda** may hold that liquids make food tamei even D'Oraisa. However, with regard to the case of the Mishna, he will say that the water does not have that capacity, because the water becomes disgusting by entering the cow and therefore loses its status as water altogether.
- We said earlier that **R' Yose** and **R' Shimon** say that liquids can make food tamei D'Oraisa, but can make keilim tamei only D'Rabanan.
 - **Rabbah bar Channa in the name of Reish Lakish** said, this shitah of **R' Yose** was said in accordance with the shitah of his rebbi **R' Akiva**. **R' Akiva** said that the pasuk says "yitmah" which can be read as "yitamei". This teaches that a sheini food (the pasuk discusses food that was in a keili that itself became tamei from a sheretz, thereby making the food a sheini) can make a shlishi even by chullin. **R' Yose** uses that same drasha for the word "yitmah" that is said regarding liquids, and learns that the liquids can make food tamei as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe it means that the liquids can make other liquids tamei!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, we learn from a word in the pasuk that food cannot make other food tamei. Similarly, liquids would not be able to make other liquids tamei. **A2:** **Ravina** said, the pasuk says the word "yitma" twice, the first to teach that food can make liquids tamei, the second must be to teach that liquids can make foods tamei. If it taught that liquids can only make liquids tamei, the pasuk should only say "yitmah" once!
 - **Q:** Maybe the second "yitmah" teaches that liquids can make keilim tamei? **A:** A kal v'chomer would teach that that is not the case. If a keili, which can make liquids tamei, cannot make other keilim tamei, then liquids, which cannot make other liquids tamei, surely cannot make keilim tamei.
 - **Q:** Maybe liquids which became tamei from keilim can't make keilim tamei, but liquids that became tamei from a sheretz can make keilim tamei? **A:** We only know that liquids become tamei from a sheretz through a kal v'chomer (if liquids become tamei from keilim, for sure they become tamei from a sheretz). If so, the concept of "dayo" teaches that we cannot derive a din which is stronger than the source. Meaning that liquids can only be metameh things that keilim can make tamei,

and since a keili can't make another keili tamei, liquids (even having become tamei from a sheretz) can't make keilim tamei.

- **R' Akiva** said that the word "yitmah", read as "yitamei", written by tamei foods teaches that it can make liquids tamei.
 - **Q:** Maybe it teaches that the food can make keilim tamei? **A:** We learn a kal v'chomer. If liquids, which can make food tamei, can't make keilim tamei, certainly food, which cannot make other food tamei, cannot make keilim tamei. The word "yitmah" must teach that the food can make liquids tamei, because we find that liquids are more easily made tamei.
 - The fact that food can make liquids tamei is not a chumra of foods, it is a chumra of the liquids, because they are more easily made tamei, in that they do not have to become muchshar l'kabel tumah.
 - The word "yitmah" as written, teaches that food cannot make other foods tamei, and liquids cannot make other liquids tamei.
 - **Q:** This concept is learned from another pasuk that says "tamei hu" (this food is tamei but it cannot make other foods tamei)!? **A:** Both pesukim are needed: one to teach that liquids that became tamei from a sheretz cannot make other liquids tamei (even though they have a more stringent source of tumah) and one to teach that liquids that became tamei from keilim also cannot make other liquids tamei (although this could have been learned via a kal v'chomer, sometimes a pasuk teaches something directly that could otherwise have been learned via a kal v'chomer).
- **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, we find that **Rava** says (and proves) that **R' Yose** does not share **R' Akiva's** shita in this halacha (that a sheini food can make a shlishi of chullin). How can we say that **R' Yose** is based on the view of **R' Akiva**? **A:** This halacha of **R' Yose** was stated according to the shita of **R' Akiva**, but **R' Yose** himself doesn't agree with it.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** said to **R' Kahana**, we understand why **Rava** said that **R' Yose** doesn't hold like **R' Akiva**, because **R' Yose** says, the halacha that kodesh can become a shlishi is learned from a pasuk. That kodesh can become a revi'i is learned from a kal v'chomer. If he held of **R' Akiva**, he should be able to use the kal v'chomer to teach that there is a revi'i even by terumah, and a chamishi by kodesh! However, **Rava** also says that **R' Akiva** does not share **R' Yose's** view (that we make these kal v'chomers). How does **Rava** know that to be true? **A: R' Kahana** said, if **R' Akiva** agreed with these kal v'chomers, that would mean that he says there is a chamishi l'tumah by kodashim, and we find no Tanna anywhere that says that. It must be that **R' Akiva** doesn't say that either.
 - **Q:** Can we rely on this logic to be certain that **R' Akiva** doesn't share **R' Yose's** view!? **A: R' Ashi (or R' Kahana)** searched and found a Mishna, which **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** says must follow **R' Akiva**, that says that there is only a revi'i by kodesh, no chamishi.