



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Bulls and the Goats

Rabbi Elozar inquired: What if the bulls and the goats that are burned were carried out of the Courtyard and then brought back in? Do we say that since they went out, the people who carried them out are *tamei*, or perhaps, since they returned, they have returned (*and retroactively, those people are now tahor – for it is not regarded as if the carcasses were taken out to be burned*)?

Rabbi Abba bar Mammal said that this can be resolved from our *Mishna*, which states: They would carry them on staves. When those in front had passed outside of the wall of the Courtyard while those in the rear had not yet gone out, those in front cause their garments to become *tamei*, while those in the rear do not cause their garments to become *tamei*, until they go out. Now, if you should think that as soon as they go out, the people who carried them out are *tamei* (*and remain tamei – even if it is carried back inside*), then let those who are still inside also become *tamei*!?

Ravina said that this is not logical, for surely – in order to become *tamei*, we require the fulfillment of the verse: *and after that he may come into the camp*, which cannot be done in this case (*for he never left the camp*)!?

Rabbi Elozar’s inquiry must pertain to a case where another group (*standing outside the Courtyard*) seized it

with crooked sticks (*attempting to drag it back outside of the Courtyard*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The bulls which are burned, the *parah adumah* and the goat that is sent to *Azazel* (*on Yom Kippur*): he who sends it (*to Azazel*), he who burns them (*the bulls and parah*), and he who carries them out (*the bulls are taken out of the Courtyard to be burned*), become *tamei* and cause their garments to become *tamei*. They (*the carcasses*) themselves, however, do not cause garments to become *tamei*, but they can cause foods and liquids (*which touch them*) to become *tamei*; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. But the Sages maintain: The *parah adumah* and the bulls cause foods and liquids (*which touch them*) to become *tamei*; whereas the goat that is sent to *Azazel* does not bring about *tumah*, for it is alive, and a living thing does not cause foods and liquids to become *tamei*.

The *Gemora* asks: Rabbi Meir’s reasoning is understood according to the teaching of the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael, for they taught: *Upon any edible seed*. Just as seeds, which will not ultimately contaminate with stringent *tumah* (*for only an av hatumah can transmit tumah to people and utensils, and a seed cannot become an av hatumah*), require a *hechsher* (*preparation*) for *tumah* (*by first becoming wet with any of the seven liquids*), so all foods which will not ultimately contaminate with stringent *tumah* require a *hechsher*. Thus the carcass of a kosher bird is excluded, for it will eventually

contaminate with stringent *tumah*, and therefore it does not require a *hechsher*. [This is why the goat sent to Azazel can bring about *tumah*.] But as for the Sages - if they accept the teaching of the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael, even the goat that is sent away too should be able to contaminate foods, and if they reject it, how do they know that the *parah adumah* and the bulls contaminate foods?

When Rav Dimi came from Bavel, he said: In the West they said: They need a *hechsher* for *tumah* from another place. [This means that it is not its own source of *tumah*, but rather, it needs to acquire its source of *tumah* from someplace else. They, nevertheless, need to become susceptible to *tumah*, and therefore, any live animal would not be able to cause foods and liquids to become *tamei*.] (105a)

Rabbi Elozar inquired: Can the bulls which are burned and the goats which are burned contaminate foodstuffs and liquids within [the Temple court] as outside? When it lacks going out, is it as though it lacks an action, or not? After he asked, he answered it: That which lacks going out is as though it lacked an action.

Rabbi Abba bar Shmuel inquired of Rabbi Chiya bar Abba: According to Rabbi Meir, can as much as an olive of the *neveilah* of a *tahor* bird contaminate?¹ When it is lying on the ground, there is no question.² When one has it in his

¹ Foodstuffs and liquids. — There is no question according to the view of the Rabbis, as they maintain that before anything can contaminate it must conform to the general laws which govern it, and as much as an olive of this *neveilah* can contaminate only when it is in a man's throat. R' Meir, however, holds that whatever can eventually contaminate with a stringent *tumah* need not be fit for *tumah*. Hence on his view the question arises.

² It certainly does not contaminate, for it may never reach the stage of stringent *tumah*, as perhaps none will take it in his mouth.

mouth, there is no question.³ The question arises when one is holding it in his hand. [Do we say:] Since it was not yet taken [to his mouth], it is as though it lacked an action, or not?

[After he asked, he resolved it]: The fact that it was not yet taken [to his mouth] is not as though it lacked an action.

He refuted him: Thirteen laws were stated on the *neveilah* of a *tahor* bird, and this is one of them: It needs intention⁴ and it does not need preparation,⁵ and as much as an egg of it contaminates foodstuffs.⁶ Surely this is in accordance with Rabbi Meir?

The Gemora answers: No: it agrees with the Rabbis.

He countered: But the first clause teaches: 'it needs intention and it does not need preparation, and whom do you know to hold thus? Rabbi Meir. And since the first clause agrees with Rabbi Meir, the second clause agrees with Rabbi Meir?

The Gemora answers: Why say like that? Each is governed by its own conditions.

The Gemora asks: But the final clause teaches: Its slaughter and its *melikah* purify (the dead bird) that is a *teriefah* of its *tumah*, and now, whom do you know to hold

³ It certainly does contaminate, for it has already reached that stage.

⁴ Before it can contaminate foodstuffs, one must intend to eat it.

⁵ By being moistened by water.

⁶ Now, if it is on the ground, it certainly does need qualification, since one may never eat it. On the other hand, if it is in one's mouth, it does not need intention. Hence it must mean that he is holding it in his hand, and yet only as much as an egg contaminates, but not as much as an olive.

this view? Rabbi Meir. Then the first and the last clauses agree with Rabbi Meir, while the middle clause agrees with the Rabbis?

The Gemora answers: Yes; the first and the last clauses agree with Rabbi Meir, while the middle clause agrees with the Rabbis.

Rav Hamnuna said to Rabbi Zeira: Do not sit down until you have told me this law: according to Rabbi Meir's view, do we distinguish first and second [degrees of tumah] in the nevelah of a tahor bird, or do we not distinguish first and second [degrees]?

He said to him: Where a thing contaminates a human being by touch, we distinguish first and second [degrees] in it; where it does not contaminate a human being by touch, we do not distinguish first and second [degrees] in it.

Rabbi Zeira inquired of Rabbi Ammi bar Chiya — others say, Rabbi Avin bar Kahana: As to what was taught: When foodstuffs are joined by means of a liquid, they are united in respect of a light tumah, but are not united in respect of stringent tumah; do we distinguish first and second [degrees] in their case, or do we not distinguish first and second [degrees] in their case?

He said to him: Where a thing contaminates a human being, we distinguish first and second [degrees] in it; where it does not contaminate a human being, we do not distinguish first and second [degrees] in it.

The Mishnah had stated: When both go out. How do we know it? — Because our Rabbis taught: Elsewhere outside three camps is said, whereas here outside one camp [is prescribed]? It is to teach you: immediately it has gone forth from the first camp, it contaminates garments. And

how do we know it in the case of that itself? — Because our Rabbis taught . . . Even the whole bull shall he carry forth outside the camp: [that means,] outside the three camps. You say, outside the three camps; yet perhaps it is not so, but rather, outside one camp? — When it says in connection with the congregational bull, outside the camp, which is superfluous, since it states, as he burned the first bull, that prescribes a second camp. When further 'outside the camp' is stated in connection with the ashes, which is superfluous. since it is already stated, where the ashes are poured out it shall be burned, it prescribes a third camp.

Now, how does Rabbi Shimon employ this 'outside the camp'? — He requires it for what was taught: Rabbi Eliezer said: 'Outside the camp' is stated here, and 'outside the camp' is stated elsewhere: as here it means outside the three camps, so there it means outside the three camps; and as there it means on the east of Jerusalem, so here too it means on the east of Jerusalem.