



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

Rav Ashi said to Rav Kahana: It is understandable that Rabbi Yosi does not hold in accordance with Rabbi Akiva, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi said: How do we know that a *revi'i* (fourth degree of tumah) by *kodesh* is *pasul*? (The term “*tamei*” describes something that it itself is contaminated and it can transmit tumah to another item; “*pasul*” means that it itself is *cer* item.) He answers that this is derived through *taminated*, but it cannot transmit tumah to another a *kal vachomer*: We find by a *mechusar kippurim* (one who is lacking atonement) that he is permitted to eat *terumah*, nevertheless, he is forbidden from eating *kodesh* (this indicates that we are stricter in respect to *kodesh* than we are *in regards to terumah*); so a *shlishi*, which is *pasul* by *terumah*, should certainly have the ability to render a *revi'i* by *kodesh*.

The Gemora explains: A *shlishi* by *kodesh* is derived through the following Scriptural verse: *And any kodoshim meat that touches anything tamei shall not be eaten.* Since we are speaking about a case where the meat touched something which is a *sheini*, and the Torah states that the meat cannot be eaten. Evidently *kodoshim* meat can become a *shlishi*. And we can derive that a *revi'i* by *kodesh* is unfit from the *kal vachomer* mentioned above.

Now, if you should think that he holds as Rabbi Akiva, let him also state a *revi'i* in the case of *terumah* and a *chamishi* (fifth degree) in the case of *kodesh*? But how do we know that Rabbi Akiva does not agree with Rabbi Yosi?

Rav Kahana said to him: It is because a *Tanna* could not completely refrain from teaching that there is a *revi'i* in the case of *terumah* and a *chamishi* in the case of *kodesh*, and we would say that it agrees with Rabbi Akiva.

Rav Ashi asks: And shall we stand and rely upon this (as proof that R' Akiva does not hold of this)?

Rav Ashi, and others say, Rav Kahana, went out, searched, and found the following *Mishna* (proving that R' Akiva does not hold that *terumah* is subject to a fourth level of tumah, and that *kodesh* is not subject to a fifth level of tumah): A utensil combines all of its contents together for *kodesh* (if one piece becomes *tamei*, they all become *tamei* even if they are not touching each other), but not for *terumah*. *Tumah* of *kodesh* extends to a fourth level (*revi'i*), while that of *terumah* extends only to a third level (*shlishi*). And Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This *Mishna* was taught as a result of Rabbi Akiva's testimony, for we learned in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Akiva added the fine flour of *kodesh*, the

incense, the frankincense and the coals to the rule that if a *tevul yom* (one who has immersed in a *mikvah* but still has *tumah* on him until nightfall) touched part of it, it renders all of it unfit. Evidently, there is a fourth (*in kodesh*), but not a fifth; a third (*in the case of terumah*), but not a fourth.

The *Gemora* notes that this proves that he holds that the power of combining is Rabbinical. Now he differs from Rabbi Chanin who maintained that the power of combining is Biblical, for it is written [Bamidbar 17:14]: *One gold ladle of ten shekels, filled with incense*. By the fact that the Torah said “one ladle,” and not “a ladle,” this teaches us that all the incense of *kodesh* was regarded as one. [Since the verse is referring to *kodesh*, the rule is restricted to *kodesh* and not to *terumah*.]

We learned in a *Mishna* elsewhere: [R' Chanina Sgan HaKohanim testified] concerning a (*tamei*) needle which is found in the flesh (*of a sacrifice*), that the knife (*which was used to cut the flesh*) and the hands (*of the Kohen*) are *tahor*, while the flesh is *tamei*; if found in the excrements, it is all *tahor*.

Rabbi Akiva said: We have been fortunate in that there is no *tumah* of the hands in the Temple.

The *Gemora* asks: Then let him say that there is no *tumah* of the hands or of vessels in the Temple?

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav, or as others stated, Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina: [The decree of] hands (*that they are Rabbinically tamei*) was taught before the enactment concerning vessels (*and*

when this testimony was given, the latter was not yet in existence at all).

Rava asked: Surely both were enacted on that very same day, for we learned in a *Mishna*: The following render *terumah* unfit: a holy Scroll (*containing Scriptural text*); one's hands (*that were not washed*); a *tevul yom*, and food or utensils which were defiled by a liquid.

Rather, said Rava: Leave the *tumah* of the knife, for even in the case of *chullin* it would not be *tamei*, for what did this knife touch that it should be *tamei*? Shall we say that it touched the flesh, surely food cannot contaminate vessels; and if it touched the needle, surely one vessel cannot defile another one?

The *Gemora* asks: What is the condition of this needle? Shall we say that it is a doubtful needle (*if it is tamei or not, and the Rabbis declared that it must be treated as being tamei*); surely it was stated: Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina (*taught a rule*): One said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful saliva in Yerushalayim (*if saliva is found, and we do not know whose it is, though it might be that of a zav or a zavah, which by Biblical law is an av hatumah and contaminates human beings and vessels*), while the other one said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful vessels (*including needles*) in Yerushalayim (*so how, here, when it was found in a sacrifice in the Temple, can it be regarded as tamei*)?

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: It is referring to a case where one lost a needle that became *tamei* through a person contaminated by a corpse (*which*



renders the needle an *av hatumah*), and he recognized it in the flesh (of the sacrifice).

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Avin said: It is referring to a case where the cow was muzzled and came from outside Yerushalayim. [*It therefore must have swallowed it outside, where a doubtfully unclean vessel is tamei, and it remains so even when it enters Yerushalayim.*]

It was stated above: Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina (*taught a rule*): One said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful saliva in Yerushalayim (*if saliva is found, and we do not know whose it is, though it might be that of a zav or a zavah, which by Biblical law is an av hatumah and contaminates human beings and vessels*), while the other one said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful vessels (*including needles*) in Yerushalayim.

The *Gemora* asks: But we have learned (*in a Mishna about*) saliva, and we have learned (*in a Mishna about*) vessels (*so what was the necessity of these statements*)?

The *Gemora* cites the source: We have learned (*about*) saliva, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: All saliva found in Yerushalayim is *tahor*, except that of the upper marketplace (*which was frequented by the zavim, and avoided by others, in order not to contaminate other people*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is necessary to state that this is so (*the saliva is tahor*), even though a *zav* was known to have passed there (*and this would not have been known from the Mishna alone*).

The *Gemora* cites the source: We have learned (*about*) vessels, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: All vessels which are found in Yerushalayim on the way down to the ritual bathhouse are *tamei*. It may be inferred from there that those found elsewhere are *tahor*!?

The *Gemora* counters: Then according to your reasoning, consider the second clause: those found on the way up (*from the bathhouse*) are *tahor*. It may be inferred from here that those found elsewhere are *tamei*!? [*It is self-contradictory!?*] Rather, the first clause is precise, whereas the second is not precise, and it is to exclude the narrow alleyways (*near the mikvah*). [*These were used indifferently for both going down and going up; therefore, vessels found there were declared tamei, since they were certainly tamei in the first place, and our only doubt is whether they were lost on the way to the mikvah or on the way from the mikvah. But vessels found in the rest of Yerushalayim, where it is not known whether they have been tamei at all, are tahor.*]