



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

Rami bar Chama asked Rav Chisda: What if it (chatas blood) spurted on to a tamei garment?¹

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua observed: Since he asks thus, you may infer that he holds that if it had a period of fitness and was disqualified, its blood does not necessitate laundering. [Nevertheless his question is:] is that only when they come consecutively, but not when they come simultaneously; or perhaps there is no difference?

He [Rav Chisda] replied: This is a dispute between Rabbi Elozar and the Rabbis, in accordance with Rabbah's view, and as explained by Abaye. For it was taught: Rabbi Elozar said: If the water of purification became tamei, it purifies [a tamei person], for indeed, we sprinkle [the water of purification] upon a niddah (who became tamei through corpse tumah).²

Now Rabbah observed: Rabbi Elozar said this in accordance with the thesis of Rabbi Akiva, his teacher, who maintained that when the vessel [containing the water of purification] is carried over a tamei place, it is as though it rested there. For we learned: If a man stood on the outer side of an oven, and a reptile was in the oven, and he put forth his hand to the window, took a flask, and carried it across the oven,³ Rabbi Akiva declares it tamei, while the Rabbis declare it tahor. Now, they disagree in this: Rabbi Akiva holds that it is as resting,⁴ while the Rabbis hold that it is not as resting [thereon]. But Abaye raised an objection: [It was taught:] Rabbi Akiva admits that in the case of sprinkling, if one carried it over a tamei earthenware vessel or over a tamei couch or seat, it is tahor,⁵ for nothing defiles above as below⁶ except as much as an olive

¹ Whereby the blood became tamei, and so disqualified for sprinkling. Do we regard it as though it became tamei before it touched the garment, and hence does not necessitate laundering; or perhaps the defilement of the blood and the obligation to launder the garment came simultaneously?

² If a niddah was tamei through corpse tumah, thereby becoming doubly tamei, both as a niddah and as one tamei by the dead, we sprinkle her with the water of purification, while she is still a niddah, and the subsequent immersion counts for both forms of tumah, since we do not find Scripture ordering her first to perform immersion as a niddah and then to be sprinkled and repeat her immersion on account of her tumah through the dead. Now, as the water of purification touches her, it is tamei itself through contact with a niddah, and yet it purifies her. Now the analogy is apparently faulty, for here the

defilement of the water and its sprinkling upon the woman are simultaneous, whereas Rabbi Elozar speaks of a case where the water was tamei first. Rabbah proceeds to explain why Rabbi Elozar regards it nevertheless as a true analogy.

³ An oven stood near a wall, in which was a window with a flask containing water of purification; inside the oven lay a reptile, which made it tamei. A man, standing on the outer side of the oven, took the flask from the window, and in taking it to himself naturally carried it above the oven, through the air-space.

⁴ On the oven, and is therefore tamei by it.

⁵ If the water of purification was sprinkled upon a tamei person, and in its passage passed over tamei vessels etc., it remains tahor.

⁶ Nothing defiles anything above, passing through its air-space, as when it is below, actually touching it.

of a corpse and other things which defile through roof-tumah,⁷ which includes a stone afflicted with tzaraas!⁸

Rather said Abaye: All agree that it is not as though it resting on it, but here they differ in this: Rabbi Akiva holds that we enact a preventive measure, lest it rest in it; while the Rabbis hold that we do not enact a preventive measure. But Rabbi Akiva admits in the case of sprinkling, for since it has gone out (of his hand), it has gone out.

Now, wherein do Rabbi Elozar and the Rabbis disagree? — Said Abaye: They disagree as to whether we draw an analogy between pre-existing tumah and contemporary tumah: one master (R' Elozar) holds that we draw an analogy,⁹ and the other master holds that we do not draw an analogy.¹⁰

Rava said: All hold that we do not draw an analogy; but here they disagree in this: Rabbi Elozar holds that sprinkling requires a [minimum] standard, and sprinklings combine; while the Rabbis hold that sprinkling does not require a [minimum] standard.¹¹

⁷ Everything in a room containing a corpse, or as much as an olive of a corpse, is tamei through being under the same covering as the corpse.

⁸ All things, both animate and inanimate, afflicted with tzaraas, defile through roof-tumah. — Now, an oven tamei through a reptile does not defile through roof-tumah. Hence this contradicts Rabbah's statement that Rabbi Akiva holds there too that the air-space above an article defiles the water of purification just as though it touched it.

⁹ He draws an analogy with niddah, where the tumah is contemporary, i.e., simultaneous.

¹⁰ Therefore if water of purification was tamei before, it does not purify. — Similarly, when blood of an animal chatas spurts on to an tamei garment, Rabbi Elozar will rule that it must be regarded as tamei (hence disqualified for sprinkling) even before it spurts, and therefore the garment need not be

The blood of a disqualified chatas etc. that spattered on a garment – it does not require laundering).

Our Rabbis taught: [And when there is sprinkled] of its blood [that means,] of the blood of a fit [sacrifice], but not of the blood of a disqualified [one]. Rabbi Akiva said: If it had a period of fitness and was [subsequently] disqualified, its blood necessitates laundering; if it did not have a period of validity, its blood does not necessitate laundering. Whereas Rabbi Shimon maintained: In both cases its blood does not necessitate laundering. What is Rabbi Shimon's reason? — 'It' is written, and 'from its blood' is written: one [excludes] where it had a period of fitness, and the other excludes where it did not have a period of fitness. And Rabbi Akiva? — 'It' excludes terumah.¹² Rabbi Shimon, however, is consistent with his view, for he maintained: Kodashim kalim do not necessitate purging and rinsing, and certainly terumah!

MISHNAH: If [blood] spurted [direct] from the [animal's] throat on to a garment, it does not necessitate laundering; from the horn or from the base [of the altar], it does not necessitate laundering. If it poured out on to the floor and

laundered. The Rabbis, however, who reject this view, will rule that it must be laundered. This then is the answer to Rami bar Chama's question, sc. that it is dependent on Tannaim.

¹¹ Now, the first sprinkling does not contain the minimum standard, and so does not count as sprinkling; nevertheless it is tamei when it falls on the niddah. Hence at the next sprinkling, which is to combine with the first, the first is already tamei. Therefore it is a case of previous tumah, and is completely analogous to sprinkling with tamei water of purification. The Rabbis, however, maintain that sprinkling does not require a minimum standard, and so the first counts as sprinkling; hence tumah and sprinkling are simultaneous, and no inference can be drawn in respect of previous tumah.

¹² If terumah is boiled in a pot, it does not need purging and rinsing.

[the Kohen] collected it, it (the garment) does not need laundering. Only blood which was received in a vessel and is fit for sprinkling necessitates laundering.

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: You might think that, if [the blood] spurted from the throat on to the garment, it necessitates laundering; therefore it states: and when there is sprinkled [etc.]: I commanded you [to launder the garment] only when [the blood] is fit for sprinkling. Another [Braisia] taught: You might think that, if it spurted from the horn or from the base, it requires laundering, therefore it states: and when there shall be sprinkled: that excludes this [blood], which was already sprinkled.

The Mishna had stated: If it poured out on to the floor etc.

Why do I need this too? — He states the reason: What is the reason that If it poured out on to the floor and [the Kohen] collected it, it does not need laundering? — Because only blood which was received in a vessel and is fit for sprinkling necessitates laundering.

The Mishna had stated: Fit for sprinkling.

What does this exclude? — It excludes the case where one received less than is required for sprinkling in one vessel and less than is required for sprinkling in another vessel. For it was taught: Rabbi Chalafta bar Shaul said: If he sanctified less than is required for sprinkling (of the purification waters) in one vessel, and less than is required for sprinkling in another vessel, he has not sanctified it. Now it was asked: How is it with blood? Is it a Halachah l'Moshe Mi'Sinai and we cannot learn from such a law, or perhaps, what is the reason there? Because it is written:

And a tahor person shall take [hyssop,] and dip it in the water; so here too it is written: And [the Kohen] shall dip [his finger] in the blood? — Come and hear, for Rabbi Zerika said in Rabbi Elozar's name: In the case of blood too he does not sanctify it.

Rava said: It was taught: *And [the Kohen] shall dip*: but not wipe; *in the blood*: there must be sufficient blood for dipping from the beginning; *and sprinkle from the blood*: from the blood specified in this passage. Now, it is necessary to write both 'and he shall dip' and 'from the blood'. For if the Merciful One wrote 'and he shall dip' [only], I would say, even where there is insufficient for dipping in the first place; therefore the Merciful One wrote 'in the blood'. And if the Merciful One wrote 'in the blood' [only], I would say that he may even wipe it; therefore the Merciful One wrote, 'and he shall dip'.

What does 'from the blood specified in this passage' exclude? — Rava said: It excludes the [blood] remaining on his finger. This supports Rabbi Elozar. For Rabbi Elozar said: The [blood] remaining on his finger is unfit.

Ravin son of Rav Adda said to Rava: Your disciple said in Rav Amram's name: It was taught: If [the Kohen] was sprinkling, and [the blood of] the sprinkling spurted out of his hand, [and this happened] before he had sprinkled, it needs laundering; after he had sprinkled, it does not need laundering. Surely this is what he means: [If it happened] before he finished sprinkling, it needs laundering; after he finished sprinkling, it does not need laundering.¹³ — No: this is what he means: before the sprinkling had left his

¹³ That implies that if blood which remained on his finger after one of the sprinklings spurted on to a garment, it must be laundered. As a corollary, that remaining blood must be fit for

sprinkling, for only such necessitates laundering. Hence this contradicts Rabbi Elozar.

hand, it necessitates laundering; after it had gone forth from his hand, it does not need laundering.¹⁴

Abaye raised an objection to him (from the following Mishna dealing with the red heifer): When he finished sprinkling, he wipes his hand on the body of the heifer. Thus, only if he finished, but not if he had not finished!

Rava said to him: When he finished, he wiped his hand on the body of the heifer; before he finished, he simply wiped his finger.

The Gemora asks: Now, when he finishes, it is well: he wipes his hand on the body of the heifer, as it is said: And he shall burn the cow before his eyes, [her skin, and her flesh, and her blood . . . shall be burnt]. But on what does he wipe his finger?

Abaye said: On the edge of the bowl, as it is written: Golden bowls.

MISHNAH: If [the blood] spurted on to the hide, before it was stripped, it need not be laundered; [if it spurted] after it was stripped, it must be laundered; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Elozar said: [it need not be laundered] even [if it spurted] after it was stripped.

Only the place of the blood needs laundering. And whatever is eligible to contract tumah, and is fit for laundering, whether a garment, a sack, or a hide, must be laundered. The laundering must be in a holy place; the breaking of an earthenware vessel must be in a holy place; and the purging and rinsing of a copper vessel must be in a holy place. In this,

the chatas is more stringent than [other] kodshei kodashim.

DAILY MASHAL

A Reprimand for the High Holy Days

The *Alte* of Slabodka zt"l wrote to his son, Rabbi Eliezer Yehudah Finkel, the *Rosh Yeshivah* of Mir, that though the sun is strong in the afternoon, the Torah calls this time *bein ha'arbayim* ("between the evenings") – it's not so simple to distinguish between day and night! If this applies to sensory perception, how much more so is it difficult to distinguish between good and evil!

¹⁴ I.e., he had dipped his finger into the blood: now, if this blood spurted off his finger before he had sprinkled it, it necessitates

laundering; if after, it does not, precisely because it is then the residue of the blood.