



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

A Utensil Combining its Contents

When Rav Kahana went to *Eretz Yisroel*, he found the sons of Rabbi Chiya who were asking about a case of one who split an *isaron* measure of flour of a *minchah* in half, and then placed the two halves in a utensil. If a *tevul yom* – one who went to the mikvah today, touches one half, is the other half impure? Although the *Mishna* says that a utensil combines all of its contents when they are *kodesh* – sanctified items, perhaps this is only when the two parts are touching. Rav Kahana told them that since the *Mishna* does not say that the utensil attaches but that it combines, it implies that it does so even when the pieces aren't connected.

They then asked whether it would be impure if the *tevul yom* touched an extra half *isaron* that was between the two pieces. Rav Kahana answered that the utensil combines only what needs the utensil, but not the extra half *isaron*.

Finally, they asked whether a *tevul yom* would make the *minchah* impure by simply placing his hand between the halves, but not touching them or the utensil. Rav Kahana said that only an earthenware vessel can become impure through contact with its airspace, but all other items must be touched to become impure.

Rav Kahana then asked them whether one can take a *komeitz* from one half on the two halves. Is the combination through a utensil from the Torah, and therefore effective for the taking of the *komeitz* on both halves, or is it only Rabbinic, and therefore only relevant for impurity? They answered that they had not heard about this case, but the *Mishna* says

that if two *minchah* offerings were mixed together, it is only valid if one can take a *komeitz* from each separately. If he can take the *komeitz* separately, it must be detached from the rest of the *minchah*, but it is still valid.

Rav Kahana deflected this, saying that perhaps the *Mishna* is referring to a case where the *komeitz* is attached to the rest of the *minchah* like teeth of a comb. Therefore, the *komeitz* is attached to the rest of its *minchah*, but not to the other *minchah*.

The *Gemora* asks what the conclusion was to Rav Kahana's question. Rava attempts to resolve it from a *braisa*. The *braisa* says that the verse which says that the *Kohen* must raise the *komeitz* “*mimenu*” – “from it” teaches that it must be separated from something attached to it, as opposed to splitting the *minchah* in two vessels, and then taking a *komeitz* from one. The *braisa* implies that splitting the *komeitz* in one vessel would be valid.

Abaye deflects this, saying that perhaps the two vessels in the *braisa* are like a small vessel inside a wider one. Although the two parts of the *minchah* are attached on top, outside the airspace of the vessels, it is not valid, since the walls of the inner vessel separate them. The implication of the *braisa* is that if this were in one vessel with a similar construction, i.e., where the inner part was lower than the outer part, it would be valid, since the parts of the *minchah* would be attached in the airspace of the outer wall. However, in the case where the two parts of the *minchah* do not touch at all, we still have no resolution.

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked about half a *minchah* which became impure because it was in the same utensil as the other half when it became impure. If this half was connected by water to another half that was outside the vessel, is the outer half also impure? Although the other half is outside the vessel, is it impure because it is attached by water? If it is considered attached, is this true even if the impurity touched it? Does the vessel combine the pieces to transfer impurity which began outside of it or not? The *Gemora* leaves these questions unresolved. (23b – 24a)

Saturation of Impurity

Rava asked about a case of an *isaron* that was split in half. A *tevul yom* touched half, and they were then put together in a vessel, where a *tevul yom* then touched the same half. Is something impure considered saturated with impurity or not? If it is saturated, the second time a *tevul yom* touches it has no effect, neither on it, nor on the other half, but if it is not saturated, the second half will become impure.

Abaye questioned how Rava could think that something becomes saturated with impurity. Abaye cites a *Mishna* says that a cloth that became impure due to *midras* – *an impure zav sitting on it*, which was made into a curtain, is purified from *midras*, since it is not used for sitting anymore, but it is still impure as something that *touched a midras*. Rabbi Yosi says that only if a *zav* also touched it is still impure at that level, but not as something that touched a *midras*, since it did not touch any *other midras* (besides itself). Rabbi Yosi presumably says that the impurity due to the *zav* touching it is even in a case where the *zav* touched it after it became a *midras*, implying that it did not become saturated with impurity when it became a *midras*.

Rava deflected this, suggesting that Rabbi Yosi only is discussing a case where the *zav* touched it first, and it then became a *midras*. Since *midras* is more severe, that impurity can take effect on something impure due to a *zav* touching, but perhaps in Rava's case, the second touching of *tevul yom*,

which is no less severe than the first touching, does not take effect, since it is saturated already.

Abaye then questioned Rava from the latter part of the *Mishna*, which says that Rabbi Yosi agrees in a case where there were two cloths on top of each other, and the *zav* sat on the top one, that the bottom one is both a *midras*, since the *zav* sat on it (indirectly), and impure since it touched a *midras* (the upper cloth). This implies that although the touching of *midras* did not occur before the status of *midras*, it still takes effect.

Rava deflected this, saying that this case is two impurities that take effect simultaneously, while his question was a case of sequential contacts of impurity. (24a – 24b)

Three Halves?

Rava discusses a case of one who split an *isaron* in half, lost one half, replaced it with another half, found the first half, and then placed all three in one vessel. The first half is associated with the lost half, and also with the replacement, since they were part of one *minchah* at a certain point in time. However, the lost and replaced halves are not related at all, since they were never all part of a *minchah* at the same time. Abaye says that they are all related, since they are all associated with the same *minchah*. Therefore, Rava says:

1. If the lost half became impure, only it and the first half are impure.
2. If the replaced half became impure, only it and the first half are impure.
3. If the first half became impure, all are impure.

Abaye says that if any half becomes impure, they all become impure.

Rava also applies this to the *komeitz* of the *minchah*:

1. If a *komeitz* was taken from the lost half, only its remainder and the first half can be eaten.
2. If a *komeitz* was taken from the replaced half, only its remainder and the first half can be eaten.
3. If a *komeitz* was taken from the first half, only its remainder is eaten, since the *komeitz* can only make one other half permitted, and we cannot know which one.

Abaye says that in all cases, only the remainder of the *komeitz* can be eaten, since they are all one part of a *minchah*, and we cannot know which other half was permitted.

Rav Pappa challenged this line of reasoning, since it should then follow that even the *komeitz's* remainder should not be eaten, since a third of the *komeitz* is for an invalid half of *isaron*.

Rav Yitzchak the son of Rav Mesharshia challenged this line of reasoning, since it should then follow that the *komeitz* should not be offered, since the third of it which is for the invalid half is not sanctified. Rav Ashi answered these challenges by saying that the *komeitz* is taken based on the intent of the *Kohen*, who intends for it to apply to one *isaron*, whichever halves make it up. (24b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Why Tevul Yom?

The *Gemora* discusses cases where a *tevul yom* touches part of a *minchah* in a utensil, making the other part also impure. Rashi explains that the *Gemora* specifically chose the case of a *tevul yom*, since anyone else would make the vessel itself impure, and therefore make its contents impure. Only a *tevul yom*, who does not make a vessel impure, illustrates the concept of the vessel combining its contents.

One or Two Vessels?

Abaye and Rava discuss a case of a *minchah* in two vessels. The *braisa* says that one may not take a *komeitz* from a *minchah* which is in two vessels. Abaye assumed this meant a case where the two parts of the *minchah* were not touching, implying that one *may* take *komeitz* from a *minchah* in one vessel, even if it is split into two separate parts. Rava deflected this, saying that the *braisa* is discussing a case where one smaller vessel – half a *kav* – is inside a larger one – a *kav*. If it would be a similar case in one vessel, like the feeding bowl of chickens, it would be valid.

Rashi explains that the case of half a *kav* in a *kav* is one where the two vessels are the same depth, but one is wider. Therefore, within the whole airspace of the vessel, there is a separation between the two parts. Although above the airspace they may be connected, this is not sufficient. The case of the chicken feeding bowl is one where the inner vessel is shallower than the outer one. Therefore, the parts connect within the airspace of the top one, making them one.

The Rambam explains that the first case is one where the inner vessel is shallower, but since the separation is from the bottom of the vessel, it is considered separate. The second case is one where the separation is above the bottom of the vessel. Since the parts are connected at the bottom, it is valid.

DAILY MASHAL

The Wood Above the Fire

“On the wood that is on the fire” (Vayikra 1:8, etc.). Could it be that the wood was above the fire? Here it is hinted that the fire that came down in the days of Moshe and Shlomo did not leave the altar (Zevachim 61b). It turns out, then, that the wood always came above the fire (*Oznayim LaTorah*, Vayikra 1:8).