



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

Said Rish Lakish in Bar Kappara's name: our Mishnah treats of an av hatumah according to Scripture and a velad hatumah according to Scripture; and what does 'from their words' mean? From the words of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua.¹ Which [teaching of] Rabbi Yehoshua? Shall we say, the following [teaching of] Rabbi Yehoshua? For we learned: In the case of a cask of terumah wherein a doubt of tumah is born,² — Rabbi Eliezer said: If it is lying in an exposed place it must be laid in a hidden place, and if it was uncovered, it must be covered.³ Rabbi Yehoshua said: If it is lying in a hidden place, one may lay it in an exposed place, and if it is covered it may be uncovered!⁴ - How compare: there it is mere indirect action, whereas

here it is [defiling] with [one's own] hands? — Rather it is this [ruling of] Rabbi Yehoshua. For we learned: If a cask of [wine of tabor] terumah in the upper part is broken,⁵ while [in] the lower part there is tamei chullin. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua agree that if a reviiis of it can be saved in purity, one must save it. But if not, Rabbi Eliezer ruled: Let it descend and become tamei, yet let him not make it tamei with [his own] hands: Rabbi Yehoshua said: He may even make it tamei with his own hands.⁶ If so, [instead of] this [phrase] 'from their words,' he should state, 'from his words'? — This is what he means: From the controversy of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua we learn [etc.]' — This may be proved too, because he states [further]: Rabbi

¹ Thus Rabbi Meir does not refer to the Mishnah at all but to the rulings of some other Sages. Strictly speaking therefore this Mishnah is irrelevant in its present position, but it is included because the subject of burning tamei together with tabor is dealt with there.

² E.g., if there is a doubt whether a tamei person touched it.

³ In spite of the doubt one must still protect it from certain tumah. Their dispute centers on a verse that states *vaani hineh nasati lecho es mishmeres terumosai*, Behold! I have given you the safeguard of My Terumos. Rabbi Eliezer maintains that the plural tense of *Terumos* indicates that there are two categories of terumah that must be safeguarded. There is terumah that is *tabor* that must be safeguarded from becoming *tamei*, and there is terumah that is questionable if contracted tumah that must be safeguarded. If the terumah that is in question was in an exposed area, one should place it in a safe area, and if it was uncovered, one should cover it. Rabbi Yehoshua, however, maintains that although the word *terumosai* is read in the plural tense, the word is written without the letter *vav* after the letter *mem*, thus it is written in the singular tense. According to Rabbi Yehoshua, only one category of terumah, the terumah this is certainly *tabor* must be safeguarded, but terumah that is possibly *tamei* need not be safeguarded.

⁴ I.e., since a doubt has arisen you are no longer bound to protect it and may even place it where the risk of contamination is greater than at present. Thus Rabbi Yehoshua holds that since it is only fit for lighting one may cause it to become tamei, and this furnishes the basis for Rabbi Meir's analogy.

⁵ And its contents are running down into the lower part of the vat.

⁶ If the tabor terumah runs into the chullin, it becomes tamei too, and then the mixture is forbidden to Kohanim and lay Israelite alike, unless there is one hundred times as much chullin as terumah. In the present case only tamei vessels are ready at hand to catch the terumah, which would save the chullin below. Both agree that if there is time to go, procure tabor vessels and save at least a reviiis of the terumah, this must be done, though in the meantime some terumah will descend and render all the chullin forbidden. But where there is no time to save even a reviiis, we have a controversy. Rabbi Eliezer holds that even so it must be permitted to descend, though it will thereby become tamei in any case, rather than that we should deliberately make it tamei by catching it in tamei vessels. But Rabbi Yehoshua maintains that since it will all become tamei in any case, we may make it tamei ourselves, in order to save the chullin below. Rabbi Meir's ruling in the Mishnah is based on Rabbi Yehoshua's.

Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua agree [etc.].⁷ This proves it. And thus said Rav Nachman in Rabbah bar Avuha's name [too]: our Mishnah refers to an av hatumah according to Scripture and a velad hatumah according to Scripture, and what does 'from their words' mean? From the words of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua.

Rava raised an objection to Rav Nachman: Rabbi Yosi said [to Rabbi Meir]: The conclusion is not similar to the premise. For when our Masters testified, about what did they testify? If about flesh which was made tamei through a velad hatumah, that we burn it together with flesh which was made tamei through an av hatumah, [then] this is tamei and that is tamei! If about oil which was rendered unfit by a tevil yom, that it is lit in a lamp which was made tamei by one tamei through the dead, one is unfit and the other is tamei. So we too admit in the case of terumah which was made tamei through a velad hatumah, that we may burn it together with terumah which was made tamei by an av hatumah. But how can we burn that which is in suspense together with that which is tamei? Perhaps Eliyahu will come and declare it [the former] tahor!⁸ Bais Shammai maintains that *piggul* (a sacrifice that one performed its service with the intention of consuming its parts after the time frame allocated by the Torah, and the sacrifice is rendered invalid and its parts are required to be burned) *nossar* (meat of a sacrifice that was left over beyond its allocated time which must be burned), and *tamei* parts of sacrifices (which also are required to be

burned) cannot be burned together.⁹ Bais Hillel, however, maintains that since *piggul* and *nossar* are *tamei* rabbinically, they can be burned together.¹⁰ Now if you think that Rabbi Meir argues from the words of Rabbi Yehoshua, why does Rabbi Yosi answer him from [the view] of Rabbi Chanina, the Segan of the Kohanim? — Said Rav Nachman to him: Rabbi Yosi did not comprehend his [Rabbi Meir's] reasoning, for he thought [that] Rabbi Meir was arguing from Rabbi Chanina, the Segan of the Kohanim, thereupon he said to him, I state [this law by deduction] from Rabbi Yehoshua. — But he answered him: Even on Rabbi Yehoshua's [view] this is no true analogy, for Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua admit that one must burn this separately and that separately. Yet why is this not a [true] analogy. Surely it is a perfect analogy?¹¹ — There it is different, because there is a loss of chullin.¹² To this Rabbi Yirmiyah demurred: [Surely] in our Mishnah too there is the loss of wood? — Said a certain old man to him: They cared about a substantial loss, but they did not care about a slight loss. (15a – 15b)

Rav Assi said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: The controversy is [only] in respect of the sixth [hour], but in the seventh all agree that we burn them [together].¹³ Rabbi Zeira said to Rav Assi: Shall we [then] say that Rabbi Yochanan holds that our Mishnah treats an av hatumah according to Scripture and a velad hatumah by Rabbinical law, and that what 'from their words' means is from the words of Rabbi Chanina, the Segan of the Kohanim?¹⁴ — Yes, he replied.¹⁵

⁷ This would be irrelevant if he had not already referred to them.

⁸ How then may we make them tamei with our hands by burning them together?

⁹ The reason for this is that Bais Shammai maintains that although *piggul* and *nossar* are rabbinically *tamei*, they are considered *tahor* biblically, and they cannot be burned together with meat that became biblically *tamei*.

¹⁰ This last portion of the Baraisa dealing with *piggul*, etc., is irrelevant, and is quoted merely in order to complete the Baraisa.

¹¹ For the wine in the cask is quite tahor, yet since it is destined to be lost we may deliberately make it tamei.

¹² If the terumah is not deliberately made tamei and allowed to flow into the lower part of the vat.

¹³ Since they are then Scripturally forbidden, even the tahor terumah is certainly the same as tamei.

¹⁴ Thus: just as that which is only Rabbinically tamei may be burnt together with what is Scripturally tamei, so in the sixth hour, the terumah of chametz is then only Rabbinically forbidden, and may be burnt with tamei terumah which is Scripturally forbidden. This seems to be Rabbeinu Chananel's interpretation. See Rashi for a different explanation.

¹⁵ According to this interpretation, Rabbi Meir permits one to burn *tahor* chametz of terumah along with the *tamei* from the

It was stated likewise: Rabbi Yochanan said: Our Mishnah refers to an av hatumah according to Scripture and a derivative tumah by Rabbinical law, and what does 'from their words' mean? From the words of Rabbi Chanina, the Segan of the Kohanim; and the controversy is [only] in respect of the sixth [hour], but in the seventh all agree that we burn them together.

Shall we say that we can support him: Bais Shammai maintains that *piggul*, *nossar*, and *tamei* parts of sacrifices (which also are required to be burned) cannot be burned together. Bais Hillel, however, maintains that they can be burned together.¹⁶ — There it is different, because they possess tumah by Rabbinical law. For we learned: Piggul and nossar make the hands *tamei*.¹⁷ Shall we say that this supports him: Bread that became moldy and cannot be eaten by a human but can still be eaten by a dog is subject

sixth hour and on, even if the *tahor* is rabbinically prohibited. This is because according to Rabbi Meir, one can make terumah that is prohibited *tamei* just like one can make *tamei* terumah that is already *tamei*. Furthermore, according to Rabbi Chanina's testimony that one can add tumah to something that was rabbinically *tamei*, Rabbi Meir teaches that we can burn *tahor* chametz of terumah along with the *tamei* during the sixth hour of the fourteenth of Nissan, when chametz is only rabbinically prohibited. One cannot justify burning them together before the sixth hour when the chametz is still permitted.

¹⁶ This dispute between Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel is cited by Rabbi Yosi, and it appears that Rabbi Yosi was inferring from the words of Bais Hillel who maintains that they can be burned together that *piggul* and *nossar* which are biblically prohibited can be burned together with something that is *tamei*. Something that is rabbinically prohibited, however, like *tahor* chametz of terumah in the sixth hour, cannot be burned together with *tamei*. This would indicate that Rabbi Yosi agrees with Rabbi Meir that during the seventh hour when chametz is biblically forbidden, *tahor* chametz of terumah can be burned together with *tamei*.

¹⁷ The reason *piggul* and *nossar* can be burned together with *tamei* is because this burning only adds to their tumah. Concerning chametz of terumah that is *tahor*, however, Rabbi Yosi may prohibit one to burn it with the *tamei* even during the seventh hour when it is biblically prohibited.

to tumah as a food in the measurement of the volume of an egg, and if the bread is terumah, although it is *tahor*, it can be burned together with the *tamei* on the eve of Pesach.¹⁸ — [No]: there it is different because it is merely dust.¹⁹ If so,²⁰ what does [they] admit mean?²¹ — Rabbi Yosi says thus to Rabbi Meir: Even according to Rabbi Yehoshua, who is lenient, he is lenient only in connection with doubtful and *tamei* [terumah], but not in the case of *tahor* and *tamei*. If so, why is it not a true analogy? Surely it is a perfect analogy?²² — Said Rabbi Yirmiyah: Here we are dealing with a case where meat was made *tamei* by a derived tumah refers to meat that was made *tamei* through a liquid that had become *tamei* through a *sheretz*. Rabbi Meir followed his reasoning and Rabbi Yosi followed his reasoning. Rabbi Meir followed his reasoning for he said that the ability of *tamei* liquids to make other things *tamei* is rabbinic in nature.²³ Rabbi Yosi followed his

¹⁸ The reason one can make it *tamei* with his own hands is because it is not fit for human consumption. The Gemara assumed that this ruling is proof to Rabbi Yosi, because according to Rabbi Meir, one can burn even chametz of terumah that is *tahor* that is edible together with *tamei*. Rabbi Yosi agrees that terumah that is *tahor* that cannot be eaten can be burned on the eve of Pesach with the *tamei*. The same should thus be true regarding edible terumah that is *tahor* that it can be burned with *tamei* in the seventh hour when it is biblically prohibited.

¹⁹ The Gemara rejects this proof because if the food is not fit for human consumption, then it is not even considered food, and it is equivalent to mere dirt, whereas chametz of terumah still has sanctity but is just forbidden to eat.

²⁰ That Rabbi Meir learns from Rabbi Chanina.

²¹ Surely Rabbi Yosi's argument that Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua admit etc., is irrelevant, seeing that Rabbi Meir is not concerned with them at all?

²² For in the sixth hour the leaven is Rabbinically forbidden, and on Rabbi Yochanan's view, there is no difference according to Rabbi Yosi between what is *tamei* and what is forbidden for any other reason (since he maintains that in the seventh hour Rabbi Yosi agrees that they may be burnt together because both are then Scripturally forbidden) and the same principle should apply equally to Rabbi Meir.

²³ Since Rabbi Chanina's testimony was said with regard to burning this meat with biblically *tamei* meat, Rabbi Meir inferred that one can burn *tahor* chametz of terumah along with

reasoning that the ability of *tamei* liquids to make other things *tamei* is biblical in nature.²⁴ For it was taught: Doubtful [cases of tumah with] fluids, in respect of becoming *tamei* themselves, are *tamei*; in respect of rendering others *tamei*, they are *tahor*; this is Rabbi Meir's view, and thus did Rabbi Elozar too rule as his words. Rabbi Yehudah said: It is *tamei* in respect of everything. Rabbi Yosi and Rabbi Shimon maintain: In respect of eatables, they are *tamei*; in respect of utensils they are *tahor*. But does Rabbi Elozar hold that liquid is at all susceptible to tumah, surely it was taught: Rabbi Elozar said: Liquids have no tumah at all [by Scriptural law]; the proof is that Yosi ben Yoezer of Tzereidah testified that the ayal species of locust is *tahor* [fit for food], and that the fluids in the [Temple] slaughter-house are *tahor*.²⁵ Now, there is no difficulty according to Shmuel's interpretation that they are *tahor* [only] in so far that they cannot render other [objects] *tamei*, but that nevertheless they are *tamei* in themselves, then it is well; but according to Rav who maintained that they are literally *tahor*, what can be said? — Said Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak: [He refers] to one [ruling only]. But he states: as his words', implying that they are many; moreover, he teaches, 'and thus [etc.]'? That is [indeed] a difficulty. (15b – 16a)

DAILY MASHAL

Lowly Like Dirt

The Gemara states that moldy bread is compared to mere dirt. There is a fascinating discussion regarding *kares*, excision, whether it is really possible for a soul to get cut off from Hashem. Given the fact that Hashem created

the *tamei* even during the sixth hour on the fourteenth of Nissan, when the *tahor* terumah is rabbinically forbidden.

²⁴ When Rabbi Chanina testified regarding burning meat together with *tamei* meat, he was teaching us that one can add tumah to something that was already biblically *tamei*. During the seventh hour of the eve of Pesach, when chametz is biblically prohibited, one can burn the chametz of *tahor*

everything in existence how is it possible that something ceases to exist?

Leaving this discussion aside momentarily, there is certainly a practical lesson from this Gemara. When one has sinned, instead of continuing to defy his creator, which is akin to chametz, the rising of the dough, one should make himself like dirt, as Hashem rests His Presence on those who are humble and downtrodden.

The same idea can be applied to *kares*. The Gemara teaches that regarding one who is arrogant, Hashem declares, "he and I cannot dwell together." Certainly one who insists on remaining arrogant will be liable *kares*, i.e. he cannot reside together with Hashem, which is defined by Hashem not resting His Presence on him. Once a person recognizes his unworthiness, he is akin to dirt, and Hashem will rest His Presence on him.

terumah along with the *tamei*. During the sixth hour of Pesach eve however, when chametz is only rabbinically prohibited, one cannot burn the *tahor* along with the *tamei*.

²⁵ Even by Rabbinical law. This postulates that the general tumah of liquids is Rabbinical only, and it was therefore not imposed in the Temple, so as not to defile the flesh of sacrifices.