

7 Iyar 5783  
April 28, 2023



Sotah Daf 30

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 Sheini Cannot Render A Shlishi With Respect Of Chullin***

Rav Assi, or according to others, it was Rabbah bar Rav Assi, said in the name of Rav: Rabbi Meir, Rabbi Yosi, Rabbi Yehoshua, Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Eliezer all hold that a *sheini* cannot render a *shlishi* with respect of *chullin*.

Rabbi Meir holds like this, for we learned in the following *Mishnah*: Anything that requires immersion in water (*a mikvah*) under Rabbinical Law, can render *kodesh tamei* (*it will be tamei and it can transmit tumah to other items*) and *terumah passul* (*it will become disqualified, but it cannot transmit tumah to other items*), but it is permissible regarding *chullin* and *ma’aser sheini*; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The *Chachamim* say: He (*one who is Rabbinically tamei*) is forbidden to eat *ma’aser sheini*. [*Both Rabbi Meir and the Chachamim agree that if he would touch ma’aser sheini, it may be eaten. It emerges that both Rabbi Meir and the Chachamim hold that a sheini cannot render a shlishi with respect of chullin.*]

That Rabbi Yosi holds like this can be proven from the *kal vachomer* mentioned above. For if *chullin* could become a *shlishi*, then *terumah* should be able to become a *revi’i* and *kodoshim* could be *tamei* as a *chamishi* (*a fifth level of tumah*). [*His kal vachomer was derived from a tevul yom that terumah can become tamei in one degree more than chullin; if chullin can become a shlishi, then terumah can become a revi’i. His other kal vachomer was derived from a mechusar kippurim that kodoshim can become tamei in one degree more than terumah; if terumah can become a revi’i, then kodoshim can become a chamishi.*]

Rabbi Yehoshua holds like this, for we learned in the following *Mishnah*: Rabbi Eliezer said: One who eats food

that is a *rishon* (*first degree of tumah*) becomes a *rishon* himself. One who eats food that is a *sheini* becomes a *sheini* himself. One who eats food that is a *shlishi* becomes a *shlishi* himself. Rabbi Yehoshua said: One who eats food that is either a *rishon* or that is a *sheini* becomes a *sheini* himself. One who eats food that is a *shlishi* becomes a *sheini* with respect of *kodoshim* (*he can render kodoshim into a shlishi through contact*), but he does not become a *sheini* with respect of *terumah*. This (*that if one eats chullin food that is a shlishi*) is referring to a case where he ate *chullin* that was prepared in the purity of *terumah* (*for a Kohen would sometimes eat their chullin in this manner in order that they should become accustomed to eating terumah with the proper purity*). [*Ordinary chullin cannot be a shlishi; that is why the case is explained in this manner.*] It is only in this case that the *chullin* can become a *shlishi*, for he evidently holds that a *sheini* cannot render a *shlishi* with respect of *chullin*.

That Rabbi Elozar holds like this can be proven from the following *Baraisa*: Rabbi Elozar said: The following three are all the same: Any *rishon*, whether it is *kodesh*, *terumah* or *chullin*, can render two further degrees of *tumah* (*whatever it comes into contact with will be rendered a sheini, and the sheini can render another item a shlishi*) and one degree of unfitness with respect to *kodesh* (*if the shlishi comes into contact with another item, it is rendered a revi’i; it is referred to as “passul,” for it cannot transmit any further tumah*). It (*the rishon*) can render one further degree of *tumah* and one degree of unfitness with respect to *terumah* (*for terumah cannot become tamei beyond a shlishi*). It can render one item unfit with respect to *chullin*. [*It is evident that he holds that chullin cannot be rendered into a shlishi.*]

Rabbi Eliezer holds like this, for we learned in the following *Mishnah*: Rabbi Eliezer said: *Challah* (a portion of dough which is separated and then given to a Kohen; has halachos like *terumah*) can be taken from a *tahor* dough for a *tamei* dough. [Rabbi Eliezer maintains that when dough was contaminated intentionally, one is obligated to knead another dough and separate *challah* from it for the *tamei* one. The issue at hand is how to ensure that the two doughs are near each other (as is required when separating *challah* from one dough for another) without the dough which is *tahor* becoming *tamei*.] What is the case? If he has a dough which is *tahor* and one which is *tamei*, he should take a quantity sufficient for *challah* (for the *tamei* one; i.e. one twenty-fourth of the entire mixture) from the *tahor* dough from which its *challah* had not yet been removed (and he puts it near the *tamei* dough), and then he takes another piece of *tahor* dough, which is less than the size of an egg (and therefore cannot transmit *tumah* to the *tahor* piece) and places it in between the *tamei* dough and the *tahor* one (so that now they are all connected) in order that he will be taking *challah* from dough which is near the entire mixture. The *Chachamim*, however, forbid this. A *Baraisa* was taught stating that even a piece the size of an egg may be used (to connect the two pieces of dough). They are assuming that the dough is *tamei* as a *rishon*, and the *chullin* dough which necessitates the separating of *challah* from it, is not treated as *challah* (but rather, like ordinary *chullin*). [Now, according to the *Baraisa*, which states that a piece larger than an egg may be used to connect the two pieces, it should emerge that the *tamei* piece should render the middle dough into a *sheini* and subsequently, the *tahor* dough should be rendered a *shlishi*; since Rabbi Eliezer permits this procedure, he evidently holds that a *sheini* cannot render a *shlishi* with respect of *chullin*.]

The *Gemora* comments that it would seem that Rabbi Eliezer holds that a *sheini* cannot render a *shlishi* with respect of *chullin*, but the *Chachamim* maintain that *chullin* may be rendered into a *shlishi* (and that is why they prohibit this procedure).

Rav Mari the son of Rav Kahana said that they both would hold that a *sheini* cannot render a *shlishi* with respect of *chullin*. Their dispute is regarding the status of *chullin* dough which necessitates the separating of *challah* from it. The *Chachamim* hold that it is treated as *challah* (and therefore can be rendered a *shlishi*), and Rabbi Eliezer maintains that it is like ordinary *chullin*.

Alternatively, we can say that they both hold that the *chullin* dough is treated as *chullin*, and they also agree that a *sheini* cannot render a *shlishi* with respect of *chullin*. The following is what they differ about: Rabbi Eliezer holds that it is permitted to cause *chullin* to become *tamei* in *Eretz Yisroel* (in order to separate *challah* for the *tamei* dough), and the *Chachamim* maintain that this is prohibited. (30a – 30b)

#### **Shabbos Techum**

[The *Mishnah* had stated: On that same day, Rabbi Akiva expounded the following verse (dealing with the cities and a certain amount of land surrounding it given to the *Leviim*) [Bamidbar 35:5]: And you shall measure from outside the city on the eastern side two thousand amos Another verse states [ibid. v.4]: From the wall of the city and outward; one thousand amos all around it. It is impossible to say that they were given only one thousand amos since it is also stated, two thousand amos. And it is impossible to say that they were given two thousand amos since it has already stated, a thousand amos. How can this be? The thousand amos are vacant land, and the two thousand amos are the *Shabbos* limit (they cannot go beyond that point). Rabbi Eliezer the son of Rabbi Yosi HaGlili says: The thousand amos are vacant land, and the two thousand amos are fields and vineyards. [In total they received two thousand amos; they were only able to cultivate one thousand amos as fields and vineyards.]

Regarding what do they argue? The *Gemora* explains that they argue about the following: Rabbi Akiva maintains that the *halachos* of *techumin* (not walking beyond the two thousand amos limit on *Shabbos*) are Biblical (and here is the source), whereas Rabbi Yosi HaGlili holds that it is only Rabbinical in nature. (30b)

### **Terumah becoming a Shlishi**

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: On that same day Rabbi Akiva expounded: At the time that the Jews ascended from the Sea, they desired to utter a song. And how did they recite the song? It was like an adult who reads the Hallel for a congregation and they respond after him with the chapter headings. (*If one does not know how to recite Hallel by himself, it is preferable to have a male adult recite Hallel for him and he should respond after him the refrain of Hallelukah after the completion of every phrase.*) Accordingly, Moshe said, "I will sing to Hashem," and they responded, "I will sing to Hashem"; Moshe said, "For He is exalted above the arrogant," and they responded, "I will sing to Hashem." Rabbi Eliezer son of Rabbi Yosi HaGlili said: It was like a minor who reads the Hallel for a congregation and they repeat after him all that he says. Accordingly, Moshe said, "I will sing to Hashem," and they responded, "I will sing to Hashem"; Moshe said: "For He is exalted above the arrogant," and they responded, "For He is exalted above the arrogant." Rabbi Nechemia said: It was like a schoolteacher who divides the *Shema* in the Synagogue, where he begins first and they respond after him.

The *Gemora* asks: On what point do they differ? [*It is written: Then Moshe and the children of Israel chose to sing this song to Hashem, and they spoke, saying.*] Rabbi Akiva holds that the word "saying" refers to the first clause (*I will sing to Hashem, and that is what the Jews said repeatedly*). Rabbi Eliezer son of Rabbi Yosi HaGlili holds that "saying" refers to every clause. Rabbi Nechemia holds that "and they spoke" indicates that they sang all together, and "saying" shows that Moshe began first.

The *Gemora* cites another *Baraisa*: Rabbi Yosi HaGlili expounded: At the time that the Jews ascended from the Sea, they desired to utter a song. And how did they recite the song? The infant lay upon its mother's knees and the suckling nursed at its mother's breasts. When they saw the *Shechinah*, the infant raised its neck and the suckling released the breast from its mouth, and they exclaimed: This

is my God and I will glorify Him. Rabbi Meir used to say: From where do we know that even the fetuses in their mothers' wombs uttered a song at the Sea? For it is written: *In assemblages bless God, Hashem, from the source of Israel (the source refers to the womb)*. (30b – 31a)

### **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

#### **Song by the sea**

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: On that same day Rabbi Akiva expounded: At the time that the Jews ascended from the Sea, they desired to utter a song. And how did they recite the song? It was like an adult who reads the Hallel for a congregation and they respond after him with the chapter headings. (*If one does not know how to recite Hallel by himself, it is preferable to have a male adult recite Hallel for him and he should respond after him the refrain of Hallelukah after the completion of every phrase.*) Accordingly, Moshe said, "I will sing to Hashem," and they responded, "I will sing to Hashem"; Moshe said, "For He is exalted above the arrogant," and they responded, "I will sing to Hashem." Rabbi Eliezer son of Rabbi Yosi HaGlili said: It was like a minor who reads the Hallel for a congregation and they repeat after him all that he says. Accordingly, Moshe said, "I will sing to Hashem," and they responded, "I will sing to Hashem"; Moshe said: "For He is exalted above the arrogant," and they responded, "For He is exalted above the arrogant." Rabbi Nechemia said: It was like a schoolteacher who divides the *Shema* in the Synagogue, where he begins first and they respond after him.

The Maharsha explains the opinion of Rabbi Yosi HaGlili: Although *Klal Yisroel* would have discharged their obligation by merely saying the chapter headings, for who is greater than Moshe! If an adult recites it for them, they would certainly fulfill their obligation. Nevertheless, the reason they wanted to recite it themselves was because there was an element of publicizing the miracle, and that they wanted to actively participate in.

Reb Chatzkel Abramsky in the Chazon Yechezkel on the Tosefta explains differently. He says that when the listeners are not obligated in the recital, they can not be *yotze* with the recital of the leader. That would only be effective if they would be obligated to recite it as well. *Klal Yisroel* were not required to utter a song at that time, and therefore, when they did recite it, they sang it themselves.

Reb Dovid Goldberg asks: Why weren't they obligated to praise and thank Hashem at that time? We have learned in Pesachim (117a) that the *Chachamim* said: The prophets among them instituted that Hallel should be recited for every season, on every special occasion and for every crisis that might come upon them, and when they are redeemed from it, they recite it over their redemption. If so, they certainly would be obligated to recite Hallel after being saved by the Sea!

He answers that it is evident from the *Gemora* in Pesachim that they did recite Hallel immediately after ascending from the Sea. Afterwards, they desired to recite even more, and that wasn't an obligation.

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### *Humility*

The Gemara tells us that even the fetuses in their mothers' wombs sang the *Shira* by the crossing of the Red Sea.

The *Orach Yesharim* notes that in a nation of 600,000 families, it is impossible that there wouldn't be one woman who would be in labor in the course of the night which would prevent them from being able to cross through the Red Sea. It was an additional miracle that this did not in fact happen.

The *Shem Mishmuel* expounds further that with every individual divining the same Song, it must have been on the level of prophecy. However even prophecy is received through the vision of the prophet which is unique to each individual, so this experience was beyond prophecy, and it was the *Shechinah* speaking through their throats. This is the

highest form of prophecy that was experienced by no other prophets except for Moshe himself. Since they were contributing nothing to the expression, and were only mouthpieces for the *Shechinah* this explains how fetuses who do not yet have any speech capabilities were also able to participate.

Why did they merit this level of prophecy? The Jews were ostensibly trapped in a dire situation, surrounded on all sides by danger. Under those levels of stress, it would have been understandable if there had been different factions, each with their own desperate plan of survival. Instead every single person humbled themselves to negate their own worries and followed the direction of Moshe, the servant of Hashem. It was due to this that they merited to experience the level of prophecy that was otherwise only experienced by Moshe.