

28 Tammuz 5773  
July 6, 2013



Pesachim Daf 16

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***Impurity of liquids***

The Gemora cites the braisa with a dispute of Tanaim about the impurity of liquids. Rabbi Meir says that if there is a doubt about whether a liquid is impure, we consider the liquid itself impure (since its impurity is from the Torah), but not regarding its making something else impure (since it only Rabbinically makes something impure), and Rabbi Elazar also rules like him. Rabbi Yehuda says it is considered impure for all purposes. Rabbi Yossi and Rabbi Shimon say that it is impure regarding food that it contacts, but pure regarding any utensils it contacts.

The braisa implies that Rabbi Elazar agrees with Rabbi Meir that liquids can become impure.

The Gemora challenges this from another braisa in which Rabbi Elazar says that liquids are never impure from the Torah.

He supports this from the testimony of Yossi ben Yoezer from Tzraida that the ayil kamtza grasshopper is kosher, and liquids in the butcher area of the Bais Hamikdash are always pure, implying that impurity of liquids is only Rabbinic.

The Gemora says that we can resolve this according to Shmuel who says that the testimony was only

regarding making something else impure, as this is consistent with Rabbi Meir, but according to Rav, who says that the testimony means they are totally pure, we have a contradiction.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak resolve this by saying that the braisa only means that Rabbi Elazar agrees with Rabbi Meir about making something else impure.

The Gemora challenges this from the language the of the braisa, which says that Rabbi Elazar *also* agreed with Rabbi Meir's *statements*, implying that he is totally consistent, with more than one statement.

The Gemora leaves this an unresolved difficulty. (15b – 16a)

### ***Can liquids become impure?***

The Gemora returns to discuss Rav and Shmuel's dispute about the testimony about liquids, explaining what it is based on. Rav says that the concept of impurity for liquids is purely Rabbinic, and the Sages didn't apply any impurity to the liquids in the Bais Hamikdash. Shmuel says that impurity of liquids is from the Torah, but something becoming impure from them is only Rabbinic, and the Sages didn't apply this to the liquids in the Bais Hamikdash.



Rav Huna bar Chinena told his son that when he comes in front of Rav Pappa, he should ask him how Shmuel can say that liquids are impure but don't make something else impure, as the verse says that "the meat [of a sacrifice] that touches anything impure may not be eaten," implying that if something is impure, it makes anything it contacts impure.

Rav Shisha berai deRav Idi answers that just as a fourth level impurity is impure, but doesn't make anything impure, so can liquids be impure but not make anything impure.

Rav Ashi challenges this answer, as fourth level impurity is considered invalid, but not "impure," and therefore isn't included in the rule of the verse, as opposed to an impure liquid, which is "impure," and should be included in the rule of the verse.

The Gemora leaves this an unresolved difficulty.

The Gemora challenges Rav from the verse which states that "any liquid which is drunk, [which is] in any [impure] utensil, should become impure," indicating that liquids can become impure.

Rav answers that the verse only means that liquids make food susceptible to impurity. The verse must be read along with the verse before it, which says that food in an impure utensil is impure, and it is saying "[if the food came in contact with] any liquid which is drunk [which is in any] utensil, [the food] should become impure."

The Gemora challenges this, since we already know this from the first verse, which describes the food as food which had water on it.

The Gemora answers that the first verse to liquids which are still in the ground, while the second one refers to detached liquids. We would not know either one from the other, since attached liquids have the advantage of being in their natural state, and detached ones have the advantage of being taken for use.

The Gemora challenges Rav from the verse which says that a spring or pit containing water is pure, implying that other water or liquids are impure.

Rav answers that this verse means that *one who enters these waters becomes pure*.

The Gemora challenges the earlier statement that detached liquids make food susceptible to impurity from Rabbi Yossi beRabbi Chanina who says that liquids in the butcher area of the Bais Hamikdash are not just pure, but don't even make food susceptible to impurity.

The Gemora answers by saying that Rabbi Yossi beRabbi Chanina was only referring to the blood of sacrifices.

The Gemora explains this based on Rabbi Chiya bar Aba who cites Rabbi Yochanan saying this from the verse which states that one should not eat blood, but instead spill it on the ground like water. This teaches that only blood which is spilled on the ground is equivalent to water, which makes food susceptible to



impurity, excluding the blood of sacrifices, which is caught in a utensil and applied to the altar.

Rav Shmuel bar Ami challenges this, as this would still leave blood which oozes out after the slaughter of a sacrifice, which isn't valid for the altar, and therefore is spilled, and should make food susceptible.

Rabbi Zaira answered that such blood, even from a regular animal, isn't considered blood which makes food susceptible.

Rav Shmuel bar Ami learned from him that the reason is the verse which says that the blood is the soul, indicating that only the blood which exits when the soul leaves (i.e., at slaughter) is considered blood.

The Gemora challenges Rav from a braisa which says if blood of a sacrifice became impure and one applied it, it is valid if he did it unintentionally, indicating that the blood can become impure.

Rav deflects this by saying that he braisa means that the blood became impure Rabbinically, and disputes Yossi ben Yoezer, who says that the Sages didn't apply Rabbinic impurity in the Bais Hamikdash.

The Gemora challenges Rav from a braisa which says that the tzitz – head plate of the kohen gadol atones on blood, meat, or fats of a sacrifice which became impure, implying that a sacrifice's blood can become impure.

Rav deflects this also by saying that the braisa is referring to Rabbinic impurity, disputing Yossi ben Yoezer.

The Gemora challenges Rav from a braisa which discusses what the tzitz atones for. It cannot atone for sacrifices which became invalid through a plan to eat at the wrong time or place, since the verses state that these will not be accepted or considered valid. Rather, it must atone for impurity of sacrifices, which is less severe, as it is suspended when the community is impure.

The Gemora assumes that this refers to impure blood, challenging Rav. Rav Pappa deflects this by saying the braisa is referring to impure *kometz* – *handful* of flour offering.

The Gemora challenges Rav from the verse where Chagai asks the kohanim whether food or oil which touched wine which touched a food which touched bread which touched a dead rodent is impure, and they said it was not, and Rav says that they were mistaken, since the food is impure.

The Gemora answers that Rav learns the Yossi ben Yoezer only referred to the liquids of *matbechaya* – *the butcher area* (i.e., blood and water), but not to the liquids of *madbechaya* – *the altar* (i.e., wine and oil), so Chagai's case is indeed impure. (16a – 17a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Spilled like water*

The Gemora cites Rabbi Yochanan who says that only blood which is spilled on the floor like water is considered a liquid which makes food susceptible to impurity. Tosfos (16b dam) cites Rabbi Yaakov from Orleans who asks why this doesn't also exclude the



blood of birds and beasts, which isn't spilled like water, but must be covered.

He answers that being spilled like water means that it need not be received in a utensil, like the blood of a sacrifice. Although a bird's or beast's blood must be covered, and therefore isn't exactly like water, it is spilled and therefore is a liquid like animal blood.

### ***Atoning for impure meat***

The Gemora cites a braisa which says that the *tzitz* atones for impure meat. Rashi explains that this doesn't mean that one may eat the meat, as the *tzitz* does not remove the prohibition of eating impure meat of a sacrifice. Rather, this braisa follows Rabbi Yehoshua, who says that if the meat isn't present, one cannot apply the blood. If the meat became impure, the *tzitz* atones on its impurity, making it valid to apply the blood.

Tosfos (16b al habasar) cites the Gemora later in Pesachim (78a) which says that this atonement is also relevant for Rabbi Eliezer, who says that one can apply the blood even if the meat isn't present. The atonement of the *tzitz* for impure meat makes it valid to become *pigul* and to remove the prohibition of *me'ila* – misuse.

## **DAILY MASHAL**

### ***The Tzitz Atones***

The Gemara states that the *tzitz* would atone for the sins regarding offerings in the Bais HaMikdash.

What was the significance of the *tzitz* that it atoned for these sins? The *tzitz* was placed on the forehead of the Kohen Gadol, and the head is the source of the intellect.

We find that a *Korban Olah* was brought for the sin of arrogance, where one conjures up thoughts of grandeur and selfishness. One who offered a sacrifice demonstrated humility of spirit, and if there was a deficiency in the sacrifice, this was reflected in his lack of sincerity or in his desire to gain atonement.

The Kohen Gadol, who represented the Jewish Nation, would don the Holy Vestments, and these vestments contained the power to compensate for the lack of desire and intent in the person offering the sacrifice. Thus, the *tzitz*, worn on the forehead of the Kohen Gadol, would compensate for the lack of sincerity and intent on the part of the one offering a sacrifice that was brought for arrogance or selfishness.