



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**

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

## ***Eighteen Measures***

The *Gemora* reverts to the statement mentioned above: the main text: Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: They enacted eighteen measures, and they differed on all eighteen measures.

The *Gemora* asks: But it was taught in a *braisa*: They agreed on these measures.?

The *Gemora* answers: On that day they differed, and on the morrow, they agreed. (15a)

## ***Shammai and Hillel***

The text stated above: Rav Huna said: In three places Shammai and Hillel differed: Shammai said: *Challah* (a portion of dough which is separated and then given to a Kohen; has halachos like *terumah*) is due from a *kav* (of flour); Hillel said: From two *kavs*: but the Sages ruled neither as the one nor as the other, but a *kav* and a half is liable to *challah*. [This is according to the *Yerushalmi* measurements. (1 *kav* is 4 *log*.) This works out to 1 ¼ *kav* (5 *log*) according to the larger measurements used in *Tzippori*.] When the measures were enlarged, they said: Five quarters of flour are liable to *challah*. Rabbi Yosi said: Exactly five are exempt; just over five are liable. [Rashi explains that R' Yosi required an additional 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a *beitzah* for each *beitzah*. A *log* is 6 *beitzah*. Thus, 1 ¼ *kav*, or 5 *log*, is 30 *beitzah*. Since each *beitzah* is 1/20<sup>th</sup> more than the normal measurement, he would require 31 ½ *beitzah*, which is 5.25 *log*, or 1.3125 *kav*.]

The *Gemora* cites the second dispute: Hillel said: A *hin* (three *kavin*; twelve *lugin*) full of drawn water renders a *mikvah* unfit, for one must state things in his teacher's phraseology (and that's why the measure 'hin' was mentioned, and not *kav* or *log*). Shammai maintained: nine *kavs*. But the Sages ruled neither as one nor as the other, until two weavers came from the Dung Gate of Jerusalem and

testified on the authority of Shemayah and Avtalyon that three *lugin* of drawn water render a *mikvah* unfit, and the Sages endorsed their words.

The *Gemora* cites the third dispute: [A woman who sees menstrual blood is rendered *tamei* (impure). Besides for reasons of family purity, the woman is also *tamei* regarding foods and objects that she has come in contact with. Nowadays, we are not careful with these types of *tumos* (with the obvious exception of family purity). The *Mishna* and *Gemora* will be discussing how far back retroactively we render those items *tamei*, if the woman experiences a discharge of blood.] Shammai says that we do not need to go back retroactively at all. The food and objects begin to be considered *tamei* from the moment she experiences a discharge of blood (and we do not assume that the uterine walls have prevented other blood from being discharged previously). Hillel disagrees, and says that the items are considered *tamei* retroactively until the last time the woman has examined herself, even if it was many days ago. The Sages felt that Shammai is too lenient, and Hillel is too stringent, and therefore say that the middle ground is correct. The most we can go back is twenty-four hours. If the last time the woman examined herself was many days ago, then we only suspect that the blood was discharged twenty-four hours ago. But if she examined herself within the last twenty-four hours (and found herself to be clean), then we do not assume that blood discharged before.

The *Gemora* asks: And are there no more? But there is this (regarding the sacrifices which are brought during the festival): Hillel maintains that (although one may offer a sacrifice during the festival) he may not perform *semichah* (leaning on the animal). [The reason for this prohibition is because leaning on the animal is deemed to be a *shevus* (similar to riding on an animal), a rabbinic injunction, and one cannot violate a rabbinical injunction on the festival.] Shammai holds that one cannot perform the *semichah* during the festival.



The *Gemora* answers: Rav Huna spoke only of those concerning which there is no dispute of great people in addition (*and Shammai and Hillel's predecessors also argued about this matter*).

The *Gemora* asks: But there is also this: If a man gathered grapes (*into baskets*) for the pressing (*and its juices make it wet*), Shammai says: They are susceptible to *tumah* (*although this juice should not render anything susceptible to tumah, for the owner had no desire for it, since it will go to waste when it flows onto the ground; Shammai, however, as a precautionary measure, compares this case with one where the juice was acceptable to the owner, such as a case where they were placed in a container, when it is agreed by all that the juice would certainly render food susceptible to tumah*), but Hillel says: They are not.

The *Gemora* answers: Leave that one out, for eventually Hillel agreed to Shammai. (15a)

## **Land of the Nations**

The *braisa* had stated: Yosi ben Yoezer of Tzereidah and Yosi ben Yochanan of Jerusalem decreed *tumah* on the land of the nations and on glassware.

The *Gemora* asks: But the Rabbis of the 'eighty years' decreed this? For Rav Kahana said: When Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi fell sick, they (*the Rabbis*) sent (*word*) to him: Our teacher, tell us the two or three things which you stated in the name of your father. He sent back: Thus did my father say: One hundred and eighty years before the destruction of the Temple the wicked empire (*Rome*) spread over Israel. Eighty years before the destruction of the Temple, *tumah* was imposed in respect of the land of the nations and glassware. Forty years before the destruction of the Temple, the Sanhedrin went into exile and took its seat in the Chanuyos (*a place on the Temple Mount*).

The *Gemora* asks: In respect to what law is this stated?

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Avdimi says: To teach that they did not adjudicate in laws of penalties.

The *Gemora* asks: 'The laws of penalties,' can you think so! [*These laws can be judged anywhere – as long as the judges are ordained!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rather say that they did not adjudicate in capital cases. [*We see from the braisa that Yosi ben Yoezer of*

*Tzereidah and Yosi ben Yochanan of Jerusalem were not those who decreed tumah on the land of the nations and on glassware!?*]

The *Gemora* notes: And should you answer that they (Yosi ben Yoezer of Tzereidah and Yosi ben Yochanan of Jerusalem) lived during these eighty years as well; surely it was taught in a *braisa*: Hillel (the elder) and Shimon (his son), (Rabban) Gamliel (the Elder) and Shimon held office as Nasi during one hundred years of the Temple's existence; whereas Yosi ben Yoezer of Tzereidah and Yosi ben Yochanan of Jerusalem were much earlier!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, say they came and decreed in respect to a clod (*of earth that came from the land of the nations*), that it (*the terumah*) be burnt (*if it came into contact with it*), but nothing at all in respect to the airspace; while the Rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed in respect to the airspace that it (*the terumah*) be suspended (*it cannot be eaten, but it cannot be burned either*).

The *Gemora* asks: Shall we say that the original decree was for burning? Surely Ilfa said: The original decree concerning hands was for burning, but not concerning anything else (*which initially was suspended, and then burning was decreed*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, say that they came and decreed in respect to a clod (*of earth that came from the land of the nations*), that it (*the terumah*) be suspended, and nothing at all in respect to the airspace; and then the Rabbis of these eighty years came and decreed in respect to a clod that it be burnt and in respect to the airspace that it be suspended.

The *Gemora* asks: Yet still, that (*the earth from the land of the nations is tamei*) was decreed in Usha (*which was after the destruction of the second Temple*)? For we learned in a *Mishna*: *Terumah* is burned on account of six doubtful cases (*of tumah*): (1) The doubt of *beis haperas* (*a field in which a grave had been plowed over; which we rule to be tamei*); (2) The doubt of earth which comes from the land of the nations; (3) The doubt attached to the garments of an *am ha'aretz*; (4) the doubt of vessels which are found; (5) doubtful saliva; and (6) the doubtful human urine near cattle urine. On account of their definite contact, which is doubtful *tumah*, the *terumah* is burned. Rabbi Yosi said: It is burned even on account of their doubtful contact in a private domain. The Sages, however, maintain: If there is doubtful contact in a private domain, we suspend it; in public ground, it (*the terumah*) is *tahor*. And Ulla observed that these six cases of doubt were enacted at Usha!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, say that they (*Yosi ben Yoezer of Tzereidah and Yosi ben Yochanan of Jerusalem*) came and decreed



that the *terumah* is suspended in respect of a clod (*from the land of the nations*), and nothing at all in respect of airspace; then the Rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed that the *terumah* is suspended in both cases; then they came at Usha and decreed burning in respect of a clod, and as to the airspace, they left it in status quo. (15a – 15b)

## Glassware

The *Gemora* asks: Why did the Rabbis impose *tumah* upon glassware?

Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rish Lakish: Since it is manufactured from sand, the Rabbis declared it the same as earthenware.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let them be incapable of purification in a *mikvah*? Why then did we learn in a *Mishna* that the following interpose in utensils: pitch and musk in the case of glass vessels?

The *Gemora* answers: The circumstances here are where the glass vessels were perforated, and molten lead was poured into them, and it is following the opinion of Rabbi Meir, for he maintains that everything depends on the part that supports it (*and the perforated glass vessel is supported by the lead, i.e., it can be used only through the lead; therefore, according to R' Meir, it is a metal, which can be purified in a mikvah, and not a glass vessel*), for it was taught in a *braisa*: If glass vessels are perforated and molten lead is poured into them, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Rabbi Meir declares them *tamei*, while the Sages declare them *tahor*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let them not become *tamei* through their outer surface (just as earthenware); why did we learn in a *Mishna*: Earthenware vessels and natron vessels are alike in regard to their *tumah*: they become *tamei* and render other objects *tamei* through their airspace; they become *tamei* through a cavity on their outside, but they cannot become *tamei* through their outer surface, and their breaking renders them *tahor*. It may be inferred from here that only earthenware and natron vessels are alike in regard to their *tumah*, but not other things (such as glassware)!? [*This Mishna proves that glassware does not become tamei through its outer surface!*?] (15b – 16a)

The *Gemora* noted that both Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yochanan, and the Sages of 80 years before the destruction of the second Beis Hamikdosh, were both alleged to have decreed *tum'ah* on foreign soil, and that glass vessels be susceptible to *tum'ah*. To explain this contradiction, the *Gemora* explained that Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yochanan decreed that *terumah* that touched foreign soil be considered uncertainly *tamei*. That is, they may not be eaten, but they are not burned. Later, the Sages of 80 years before the destruction extended this decree to the airspace above foreign soil. The *Ba'alei Tosafos* point out that this does not resolve the issue of when glass vessels were declared susceptible to *tum'ah*.

The *Ba'alei Tosafos* suggest that initially, glass vessels were considered susceptible to *tum'ah* to the extent that *terumah* that touched them would be considered uncertainly *tamei*, and would neither be eaten nor burned. Later, the Sages of 80 years before the destruction gave glass vessels virtually equal status with other vessels, and *terumah* that touched a glass vessel after it became *tamei* would be burned. Although the *Gemora* later says that *tamei* glass vessels do not cause *terumah* that touched them to be burned, *Tosafos* explains that this refers only to their susceptibility to *tum'ah* that touches the outside of the vessel. The susceptibility of glass vessels to *tum'ah* is derived from earthenware vessels, and earthenware vessels themselves cannot become *tamei* if a *tamei* object touches the outside of such a vessel. In this sense, glass vessels are more stringent, since they in some ways resemble metal. However, since the susceptibility to *tum'ah* on the outside of the vessel is not derived from earthenware vessels, but rather from metal, the Sages saw fit to make a glass vessel that became *tamei* from its outside only *tamei* to the extent that *terumah* that touched it would not be eaten. If the vessel became *tamei* in any other way, however, the *terumah* that touched the vessel would indeed be burned, as per the decree of the Sages of 80 before the destruction.

The *Ba'alei Tosafos* conclude by citing an alternate text of the *Gemora* which could also resolve their initial question: after asking how Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yochanan established the two decrees when the later sages were also said to have established them, the *Gemora* explains, “originally, they made the decree, but it was not accepted. The Rabbanan of 80 years (before the destruction) came and made the decree, and it was accepted.” The *Gemora* proceeds to ask the question of Ilfa, that the initial decree could not have been that *terumah* that touched such an object be burned. However, since the *Gemora* said that *terumah* that touched a *tamei* glass vessel would *not* be burned, this answer is sufficient regarding the issue of glass vessels. Ilfa's question is thus only relevant to the issue of foreign soil, as the *Gemora* proceeds to

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### Land of the Nations

explain, while the question of glass vessels is already considered resolved by this point in the *Gemora*.

## Airspace

The Sages decreed that the airspace in lands outside of Eretz Yisrael be considered *tamei* to the extent that *terumah* that passed through that land should not be eaten.

The *Ba'alei Tosafos* cite a *Mishna* (Ohalos 2:3) that states unequivocally that the "lands of the nations" can only transfer *tum'ah* by touch and by being carried, but not by the air above them. Thus, it seems clear that foreign airspace is *not tamei*.

*Tosafos* offers 3 answers to this contradiction: 1) the *Mishna* in question refers only to foreign soil brought into the Holy Land. The airspace above *this* soil is not *tamei*. However, the airspace above foreign lands themselves is *tamei*. 2) That *Mishna* follows the opinion that a gentile's corpse cannot transfer *tum'ah* through the airspace above it. According to that opinion, there is no reason to give the airspace in foreign lands a *tamei* status. However, according to the opinion that holds that a gentile's corpse *does* transmit *tum'ah* through the air above it, there would be such a decree on foreign airspace, and our *Gemora* follows that opinion. 3) The *Mishna* in question was written after the period of Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yochanan, but before the Sages of 80 years before the destruction who extended the decree on foreign soil to include airspace.

However, *Tosafos* ask another question. The *Gemora* (Nazir 54b) asks, "foreign lands: did they decree (*tum'ah*) because of the air or because of the soil?" The implication seems to be that the *Gemora* entertains the possibility that the airspace of foreign lands has no *tum'ah* whatsoever.

*Tosafos* answer that the *Gemora's* question there is whether the airspace *by itself* can be considered *tamei*. Normally, the *tum'ah* of a corpse travels straight upwards from the corpse. However, if a roof of at least 1x1 *tefach* exists at least 1 *tefach* above the corpse, the *tum'ah* fills the area between the roof and the ground, and does not travel higher than the roof. Thus, if *terumah* were to enter a foreign land without ever being in an area with uninterrupted access to the ground, even if the airspace above the soil were to become *tamei* due to the soil, the *terumah* would be protected. Thus, theoretically, if the *tum'ah* of foreign airspace exists only because of the soil underneath, *terumah* carried in a chest would not become *tamei*. The *Gemora's* question in Nazir, explains *Tosafos*, is whether the

airspace of foreign lands is *tamei* because of the soil underneath, in which case *terumah* carried in a chest would be protected from the *tum'ah*, or if the airspace is *tamei* independent of the soil. If so, since the *terumah* still touches the air of the foreign lands when being carried in a chest, it would still become *tamei*.

It seems that Rashi understood this explanation as well, for in our *Gemora* (s.v. *Ve'a'avira*), he explains that the decree of *tum'ah* on foreign airspace applies to "*terumah* that enters the airspace *without anything separating between it* (and the soil), such as a chest with a hole in the bottom..."

## DAILY MASHAL

### Why They Preferred the Weavers' Testimony

The *Gemora* says that Hillel said that a *hin* disqualifies a *mikveh*; Shammai said nine *kabin*; and two weavers from the Dung Gate testified that merely three *lugim* disqualify and the halachah was so ruled.

Rabbi Yaakov Shor, the *Rav* of Kitov and editor of *Sefer Ha'Itim*, states in his preface (p. V) that he has an interesting explanation for the essence of the story. It seems that Shemayah and Avtalyon said that "three measures" disqualify a *mikveh*. Hillel understood that they meant three *kabin* – a *hin* – and Shammai understood that they meant three *hin* (nine *kabin*). The weavers testified that they explicitly heard "three *lugim*" and therefore their testimony was preferred over that of Hillel and Shammai (see further *ibid* for the explanation of the *Gemora*). He concludes that though his explanation is a *chidush*, it's no worse than the weavers from the Dung Gate, with whom the *chachamim* agreed...