



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) R' Yehudah's position regarding the tumah of liquids (cont.)

R' Nachman's unsuccessful attempt to identify R' Yehudah's position regarding the tumah of liquids is completed.

2) Clarifying the opinions of R' Yosi and R' Shimon

R' Yosi and R' Shimon ruled in an earlier-cited Baraisa that foods that may have touched tamei liquids are deemed tmei'im, but utensils that may have touched tamei liquids are deemed tehorim.

Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of Reish Lakish links R' Yosi's drosha with a similar drosha made by R' Akiva, his rebbi.

The Gemara proceeds to explain the drosha made by R' Yosi which teaches that liquids impart tumah only to foods.

The Gemara then explains the drosha made by R' Akiva which teaches that foods have the capacity to make liquids tamei.

Ravina said to R' Ashi that R' Yosi does not agree with R' Akiva's halachah, nor does R' Akiva agree with R' Yosi's halachah.

R' Ashi responded that R' Yosi merely follows R' Akiva's type of drosha even though he does not agree with him.

R' Ashi relates to R' Kahana that it is understandable that R' Yosi does not agree with R' Akiva, as can be demonstrated from a Baraisa. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the halachic status of purification water drunk by a cow?
2. Explain לא מצינו טומאה שעושה כיוצא בה
3. How does R' Akiva prove from the word יטמא that food can make liquids t'mei'im
4. What is the similarity between R' Akiva's drasha and R' Yosi's drasha?

Gemara GEM

Spiritual impurities of food and of liquids

הוא טמא ואין עושה טומאה כיוצא בו. — חד במשקין הבאים מחמת שרץ וכד במשקין הבאין מחמת כלי

Food that has become tamei from a sheretz cannot transfer this tumah to another particle of food. This same halachah is true with liquids. The Gemara cites a verse to teach us these halachos, because we might not have otherwise understood that these halachos apply in all cases.

Rashi explains that although the words "טמא הוא" (Vayikra 11:38) are written about food, the fact that the Torah reveals this rule about food would lead us to apply it to liquids, as well. Pnei Yehoshua points out that Rashi does not mean that we would have automatically applied all rules of ritual impurity which we find applicable to food to liquids as well. After all, our Gemara explicitly teaches that we need an extra verse to learn that these halachos apply to liquids. What Rashi means is that we know that whether tumah originates with a sheretz or whether it originates with a utensil, in either case, the halachos result in the same rule regarding food. No matter what the source of the tumah, once a food becomes tamei, it cannot impart this same tumah upon another food particle. Now that we have a second verse from which we learn that liquids are also susceptible to tumah, we can apply the principle we found regarding food to liquids, and we say that whether the source of tumah is from a sheretz, or whether it is from a utensil, the liquid cannot transfer this same tumah that it has contracted to other liquids.

The fact is that without a verse, we would have simply thought that this restriction is only true in a case of tumah which originates with a utensil, for it is not a severe case of tumah. However, the tumah of a sheretz, which is a ראשון לטומאה, might have been reasonable to consider as being more strict, and that food or liquid could transfer its applied tumah further, even to other food or liquid respectively. Nevertheless, this is the lesson of the verse, and, in fact, we do not allow the tumah to transfer on the same level, regardless. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Saying a berachah near a foul substance

רב אשי אמר לעולם בטלו במעיה לגמרי משום דהוה ליה משקה סרוח

R' Ashi says actually the water is completely nullified in (the cow's) intestines (and is precluded from tumah) because it is a putrid beverage.

Rashi explains that this digested beverage completely loses its halachic status as a beverage¹. The first answer of the Gemara presents a very different perspective. It states that this consumed liquid retains its halachic status as a beverage and only loses its status as **מי חטאת** (water used for the purification of people who are **מת טמאי**). R' Ashi however, would admit that despite this liquid's being defined as a non-beverage, it would still not be classified as tzoah (excrement).

An interesting halachic application of the above dispute would occur in the case when a person would want to say a berachah in close proximity to regurgitated food. Provided the status of the regurgitated food would not be defined as tzoah, it would be permissible to say the berachah.

The Mishna Brura² quotes R' Akiva Eiger who permits the reciting of berachos nearby regurgitated food even if it is disgusting. The Mishna Berura³ adds that water which is putrid to the degree that people will be dis-

tressed by its smell, should be removed before one says a berachah. Accordingly, if the regurgitated food would prompt the same reaction, it too should be removed⁴. ■

1. וכן משמע במנחות ס"ט א' שחיטין ושעורין שבגללי בהמה, לקטן לאכילה מטמא טומאת אוכלין. ודו"ק. וע' ש"ך סימן פ"ג ס"ק ל', ופר"ח שם, וע"ע בשו"ת אג"מ ח"א סימן קמ"ז ועי"ש לגבי חמץ שנבלע בבעל חי בפסח, ובמ"ב סימן תמ"ח ס"ק ל"ג.

2. המ"ב בסימן ע"ו ס"ק כ' בשם רע"א בשם נזירת שמשון

3. בסימן פ"ו ס"ק א'

4. וכ"כ מעין זה בספר פס"ת סימן קפ"ה הערה 20 (ולא הביא מקור לכך שכשמסריח ביותר צריך להרחיק ומסתמא ר"ל כנ"ל. ■

Gemara GEM

The airspace of an earthenware jug

וכל כלי חרש אשר יפל מהם אל תוכו וגו'
"And any earthenware utensil into whose interior one of them will fall, everything in it shall become impure—and you shall break it." Vayikra 11:33

An earthenware vessel does not become impure except through its interior space.

When an item which is ritually impure is lowered into the airspace of an earthenware container, the utensil immediately contracts that impurity,

even without coming in direct contact with the source. However, if an item of impurity touches the outside of an earthenware jug, the utensil remains pure. Why is this?

The Admo"r MiKotzk explains that material from which ceramic or earthenware is made has no intrinsic value. It is simply dirt. The only aspect of this item which is significant is that this material has been fashioned into being a utensil which can contain something else. Consequently, when an item of impurity touches the outside of such a vessel, it is as if nothing has happened, for the outside of this container is insignificant.

It is only the inside of such a utensil that is meaningful.

Vessels made of metal, however, have value due to the nature of the material itself. They can, in fact, become impure even when a source of impurity touches the outside of the container.

Man is a creature which is made from the dust of the earth. He is compared to the earthenware which breaks. Accordingly, we can conclude that the only value of man is when he fashions himself into a vessel which is ready and willing to contain Torah. ■