



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

Chullin, Terumah and Kodesh

Rabbi Yonasan said in the name of Rebbe that if someone eats *terumah* that was a *shelishi* (*third degree of tumah*), he cannot eat *terumah*, but he can touch *terumah*.

The *Gemora* notes why it was necessary to teach Ulla’s ruling (*one that eats chullin guarded as terumah which is impure at the third level may not eat terumah*), and that of Rabbi Yonasan: For if we would only have Ulla’s statement above, I might have thought that the ruling applied only to the case of *chullin* guarded as *terumah*, but in the case of real *terumah*, I might have thought that he is even forbidden to touch it; it is therefore necessary to have Rabbi Yonasan’s ruling. And if we would have only Rabbi Yonasan’s statement, I would have thought that the ruling applied only to the case of real *terumah*, but in the case of *chullin* guarded as *terumah*, I might have thought that he is even permitted to eat it; therefore both rulings are necessary.

Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa was sitting before Rav Nachman and said: He who eats *chullin* guarded as *kodesh* which was *tamei* in the third degree is *tahor*, and he may eat consecrated food, for the only thing which will render consecrated food *tamei* in the fourth degree is real *kodesh* food (*which was tamei in the third degree*).

Rami bar Chama challenged this from the *Mishna* cited above: Rabbi Yehoshua says that one who eats such food (*that is tamei in the third degree*) is *tamei* at the second degree as far as eating *kodesh*, but not as far as eating *terumah*. And this applies only to *chullin* which was guarded as *terumah*. Now, why should this be so? This food (*which is tamei in the third degree*) is not real *kodesh* food!?

He replied. Leave the question of *terumah*, since what is considered *tahor* for *terumah* may yet be considered *tamei* for *kodesh*. [*The standards are not the same. So when we are discussing kodesh, we may assume that the food is in fact a sheini, and subsequently, it will make the ‘eater’ a sheini as well; however, if it was merely guarded as kodesh, we can assume that it is a shlishi, and will not be able to render the eater tamei.*]

The *Gemora* cites the following *Mishna* as a source for this: The clothing of an *am haaretz* (*one who is not particular in regards to the laws of tumah and tahara*) is regarded as *tumas midras* (*objects that become tamei when a zav, zavah or niddah place their weight on them – they are classified as an av hatumah and have the ability to contaminate people or utensils*) for the *perushim* (*people that are meticulous about eating their chulin in a state of taharah*). The clothing of the *perushim* is regarded as *tumas midras* for those that are

eating *terumah*. The clothing of those eating *terumah* is regarded as *tumas madras* for those that are eating *kodashim*. [It emerges that the guarding for *terumah* is not sufficient for those who eat *kodesh*.]

Rava said: Are you comparing the *tumah* of *midras* to other cases of *tumah*? But the law as to the *tumah* of *midras* is *different*, for there exists a legitimate concern that his wife, while she was a *niddah* (during a *menstruous condition*) sat upon these clothes (as this is *extremely common to happen*); with regard to produce, however, the concern does not apply (for it is not so common for the produce to become *tamei*).

Rabbi Yitzchak, however, says that the concern applies to the case of produce as well.

Rabbi Yirmiyah of Difti asked: And do we say this by produce (that *terumah* is regarded as *tamei* with respect to *kodesh*)? Surely it was taught in a *Mishna*: If (the wine-pressing and olive-pressing season has passed, and) an *am ha'aretz* said to the *Kohen*, "I have set apart a quarter-log of oil (consisting of *terumah*) to be *kodesh*," he is deemed trustworthy even in regards to the *terumah* (although regarding *terumah* alone, he is deemed untrustworthy), and the *terumah* does not render the *kodesh* to become *tamei*! Now, if that which is considered *tahor* for *terumah* may yet be considered *tamei* for *kodesh* (and it applies to produce as well), shouldn't the *terumah* (wine in this barrel) render the *kodesh* wine *tamei*?

He replied: Are you asking from a case where the *tumah* is together with the *tahor* in one vessel? But in such cases the law is different, for since he is believed with

regard to the *kodesh* portion, he is believed with regard to the *terumah* portion as well.

Rav Huna bar Nassan asked (on Rabbi Yitzchak) from the following *braisa*: *Chullin* food which is *tamei* in the second degree renders (through contact) *chullin* liquids *tamei* (in the first degree), and invalidates *terumah* (which means that it becomes *tamei*, but it cannot transmit *tumah* to other items). If the *chullin* is *tamei* in the third degree, it renders *kodesh* liquids *tamei* (in the first degree), and invalidates *kodesh* food. This applies to *chullin* food guarded as *kodesh*. [We see that *chullin*, in the third degree of *tumah*, which was guarded as *kodesh*, may invalidate *kodesh* – rendering it into a fourth degree of *tumah*!?!]

The *Gemora* answers that this is a subject of a *Tannaic* dispute, for it was taught in a *braisa*: *Chullin* food guarded as *kodesh* food is treated as *chullin* food (and does not become *tamei* like *kodesh*). Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Tzadok says: It is treated as *terumah*, that is, two levels are *tamei* (first and the second), and one level of invalidation (as a third degree; however, it cannot render *kodesh* as a fourth degree of *tumah* – like Rabbi Yitzchak). (35a – 35b)

Blood of a Slaughtered Animal

Rabbi Shimon had said that slaughtered animals become susceptible to *tumah* due to the *shechitah* (even if blood did not flow; normally, an item needs to become wet with one of the seven liquids in order to become *tamei*; R' Shimon holds that the *shechitah* accomplishes the same thing).

Rav Assi said that Rabbi Shimon was of the opinion that only the *shechitah* renders an animal susceptible to *tumah*, but not the blood (*and in a case where there was no shechitah, and blood came into contact with meat, it cannot be rendered tamei*).

The *Gemora* notes that the wording of the *Mishna* does not support Rav Assi, but perhaps the following *braisa* does: Rabbi Shimon said to them: Is it the blood that renders the animal susceptible to *tumah*? Surely it is the slaughtering! [*Evidently, the blood does not render it susceptible for tumah!*]

The *Gemora* rejects the proof by explaining what he said as follows: Is it only the blood which renders the animal susceptible to *tumah*? Surely the slaughtering also renders it susceptible to *tumah*!

The *Gemora* attempts to bring a proof from the following *Mishna*: Rabbi Shimon says: The blood of a dead animal does not render food susceptible to *tumah*. Now, can we not infer from this that the blood of a slaughtered animal will render the food susceptible to *tumah*?

The *Gemora* rejects this proof by saying that the inference to be drawn is that the blood of a slain animal will render food susceptible to *tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Then what is the law with regard to the blood of a slaughtered animal? If it does not render food susceptible to *tumah*, then Rabbi Shimon should rather have stated his view with regard to the blood of a slaughtered animal (*that it does not render food susceptible to tumah*), and certainly (*without any need*

to be mentioned) the blood of a dead animal (*would not render food susceptible to tumah*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: It was necessary for him to state his opinion with regard to the blood of a dead animal, for one might have argued: What is the difference whether he killed it or the Angel of Death killed it? [*The blood of both should render food susceptible to tumah!*] It was therefore necessary to state it.

The *Gemora* asks – according to Rav Assi – why does Rabbi Shimon maintain that the blood from a slain animal will render food susceptible to *tumah*, but the blood of a slaughtered animal will not? If it is because it is written: *And the blood of the slain it drinks*; then the same should apply by the blood of a slaughtered animal, for it is written: *You shall spill it on the earth like water?*

The *Gemora* answers: The latter verse is stated in order to permit for benefit the blood of consecrated animals which were rendered unfit for sacrifice, for one might have argued: Just as it is forbidden for shearing and working, so too its blood should need to be buried; the Torah teaches us that it is permitted. (35b – 36a)