



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The signal used on erev Pesach to indicate the time of the chometz prohibition

Abba Shaul, quoted in a Beraisa, points to a different signal used to indicate the time of the different chometz prohibitions.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents different circumstances where two items may be destroyed together even though one causes one item to receive a higher degree of tum'ah. A dispute is recorded whether it is permitted to burn teruma which is tahor together with teruma which is tamei on erev Pesach.

3) **Clarifying R' Chanina Sgan HaKohanim's statement in the Mishnah**

The Gemara notes that in the case described by R' Chanina, Sgan HaKohanim, there is no additional tum'ah that is being imparted to the second piece.

The Gemara concludes that R' Chanina, Sgan HaKohanim, is teaching that it is permitted to burn a third degree tum'ah with a first degree tum'ah, even though it causes the third degree tum'ah to become a Rabbinic second degree tum'ah.

4) **Clarifying R' Akiva's statement in the Mishnah**

The Gemara notes that R' Akiva seemingly teaches the same principle taught by R' Chanina, Sgan HaKohanim.

R' Yehudah explains that R' Akiva is discussing a metal lamp, and it is taught that it is permitted to burn third degree tamei oil in a metal lamp that is a first degree tum'ah, even though this causes the oil to become infused with second degree tum'ah.

Rava explains why the language of the Mishnah led R' Yehudah to this explanation.

Rava demonstrates from R' Akiva's ruling that he maintains the liquids can infuse other things with tum'ah, even Biblically.

5) **Clarifying R' Meir's statement in the Mishnah**

The Gemara begins to examine which teaching led R' Meir to his conclusion. ■

Gemara GEM

Who was R' Chanina, Sgan Hakohanim?

ר' חנינא סגן הכהנים

As we begin the famous sugya named after R' חנינא, it would be worthwhile to point out a few interesting facts known about him. Firstly, as the title given to him implies, he was a סגן or assistant to the Kohein Gadol in the time of the Beis HaMikdash. This put him in a unique position of being able to testify that **מימיהם של כהנים** i.e. it never happened... As opposed to other kohanim who only spent two weeks of the year in the Beis HaMikdash, and even less doing the actual avodah, the sgan was always in close proximity to the Avodah. Several testimonies in the same vein are brought in his name in **עדות** (Chapter 2), and also in **יומא** (21b) about the fire which burned on the altar. The Gemara in **Ta'anis** (13a) brings in the name of R' Chanina that even **טבילת מצוה** is prohibited on Tisha B'Av because it is worth pushing it off out of mourning for the Beis HaMikdash. From this it would appear that R' Chanina lived through the Churban. However there seems to be a contradiction to this from **Shulchan Aruch** (O.C. #580) where it gives the date of his death as 25 Sivan, together with **ר' ישמעאל** and **ר' שמעון בן גמליאל**, both of whom were amongst the **עשרה הרוגי מלכות** who were

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the dispute regarding the capacity of one food to transmit tumah to another?

2. In what way are the halachos of tumas meis different for metal?

3. How did R' Yehudah know that R' Akiva was referring to a metal lamp?

4. How did Rava demonstrate that R' Akiva holds the liquids can transmit tumah to other things even Biblically?

HALACHAH Highlight

May a Cohen visit a museum? Metal implements and their level of Tum'ah

חרב הרי הוא כחלל

The sword is like the corpse (regarding its level of tum'ah)

Rashi explains this to mean that a metal implement that touches a dead body acquires the same degree of tumah as the body itself, i.e. **אבי אבות הטומאה**. (There are different degrees of tumah. The most potent level of tumah is, e.g. a corpse. A corpse which touches a vessel will transfer its tumah to the vessel (or person) rendering them an **אב הטומאה**. An **אב הטומאה** will make a rishon latumah, a rishon will transfer to a sheni, and a sheini to a shlishi. A metal implement is an exception to this rule. When it comes into contact with either an **אבי אבות הטומאה** or an **אב הטומאה**, it acquires the same degree of tumah as its source.)

Rambam¹ rules that this exception to the rule of the transferal of tumah is not across the board. It only applies to tumah contracted through direct contact with the source (טומאת מגע). However this law does not apply to tumah transferred through indirect contact (טומאת אהל) (that the corpse will transfer tumah to that which is found with items under the same roof) and tumah transferred through carrying (טומאת משא) (one who lifts the body, even without touching it, becomes tamei).

Distinctive INSIGHT

Causing teruma to be tamei—An inquiry

הוסיף רבי עקיבא ואמר מימיהם של כהנים לא נמנעו מלהדליק את השמן שנפסל בטבול יום בנר שנטמא בטמא מת

Rashi, in his commentary to Chullin 2b, teaches that the source from where we know that it is prohibited to cause ritual impurity to holy items such as teruma and meat and blood from the korbanos is from the verse (Bamidbar 18:8): **משמרת תרומותי**.

In his Kovetz Shiurim, R' Elchonon Wasserman proposes an

inquiry regarding this halacha. What is the reason we are prohibited to apply tumah to teruma? Is it because this would cause the teruma to be ruined (it can no longer be eaten if it is tamei; it can only be ignited, assuming it is combustible)? Or, is the reason we cannot apply tumah to teruma not a function of it becoming ruined, but simply a rule that something holy cannot be subjected to tumah?

In our Mishnah, the halachos revolve around the care necessary not to apply additional tumah to teruma, although it is already tamei. According to the second approach we presented, this is a reasonable concern.

We do not want to apply additional levels of tumah to teruma. However, if it merely a rule not to ruin something which has kedushah, this teruma is already ruined. Why should we have to be concerned not to ruin it further?

Rambam (הלכות פסולי המוקדים) seems to suggest that the reason the Torah directs us to guard teruma is "in order not to ruin them—פוסלו—שהרי פוסלו". This indicates that the problem is not merely in applying tum'ah to teruma, but in the fact that the teruma becomes ruined as a result. ■

(Gem...Continued from page 1)

killed by the Romans well before the Churban. It is however possible to reconcile our Gemara with the Shulchan Aruch (who is quoting the Seder Olam) if we suggest that although all three passed away on the same date it was not in the same year. ■

Tosfos² argues that this law would also apply to **טומאת אהל**. Thus someone who is under the same roof as the metal implement will become tamei

This has practical relevance in regard to a kohen. Is it permissible for him to visit a museum that has metal implements which were used in battle and came into direct contact with dead bodies?

Rema⁴ and other poskim⁵ state that the custom is to be lenient. ■

1. הרמב"ם בטומאת מת פ"ה ה"ט וי"ג. וכן מדויק בפיהמ"ש בריש אוהלות
2. תוס' בחולין דף ע"ב א' וכן בנזיר נ"ד ב', וכ"ד הראב"ד בטו"מ פ"ה והר"ש בריש אוהלות
3. ולדעת הרמב"ן עה"ת (במדבר ט: ט"ז) חרב כחלל למשא ולא לאוהל. וע' בכ"ז בתפא"י בריש אוהלות ועע"ש שיש גם מחלוקת ראשונים בשאר כלים שאינם מתכת ואינם חרס האם דינם כחלל. וגם נחלקו הראשונים אם יש דין הזאת ג' זו' בדין דחרב
4. ביר"ד סימן שס"ט בסופו
5. שכן גם משמע שם בגר"א. וכ"כ שם הערוך השולחן ■