

Ritual impurity of liquids – טומאת משקין: Liquids do not transmit impurity to other items by Torah law but by rabbinic decree, as is evident from the discussions in the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 7:1).

אי הכי, מאי מודה? הכי קאמר ליה רבי יוסי לרבי מאיר: אפילו לרבי יהושע דמיקל, בי מיקל – בתלויה וטמאה, אבל בטהורה וטמאה – לא.

The Gemara asks: If so, that Rabbi Meir's proof is based on the statement of Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest, why does the mishna mention that Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua? The Gemara explains that this is what Rabbi Yosei is saying to Rabbi Meir: Even according to Rabbi Yehoshua, who rules leniently in this case, when he rules leniently it is with regard to burning *teruma* in abeyance together with impure *teruma*; however, with regard to burning pure *teruma* and impure *teruma* together, no, he does not permit doing so.

אי הכי, אמאי אינה היא המדה? מדה ומדה היא!

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, that Rabbi Meir's proof is based on the statement of Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest, why did Rabbi Yosei say: That is not the inference from which it can be learned? On the contrary, it is a perfectly legitimate inference. According to Rabbi Meir, pure *teruma* is prohibited during the sixth hour by rabbinic law. Just as Rabbi Hanina holds that one may actively transmit impurity to an object that is impure by rabbinic law by burning it together with an object that is impure by Torah law, so too, according to Rabbi Meir one may transmit impurity to an item prohibited by rabbinic law by burning it together with an item that is impure by Torah law.

אמר רבי ירמיה: הכא בבשר שנטמא במשקין שנטמאו מחמת שרץ, ואודא רבי מאיר לטעמיה ורבי יוסי לטעמיה:

Rabbi Yirmeya said: Here, the mishna is referring to meat that became ritually impure through contact with a secondary source of impurity by means of liquids that became impure due to contact with a creeping animal and thereby assumed second-degree ritual impurity. And Rabbi Meir conforms to his standard line of reasoning, and Rabbi Yosei conforms to his standard line of reasoning.

רבי מאיר לטעמיה, דאמר: טומאת משקין לטמא אחרים – דרבנן,

Rabbi Meir conforms to his standard line of reasoning with regard to this issue, as he said: The ritual impurity of liquids<sup>h</sup> with regard to transmitting impurity to other objects is by rabbinic law. The meat that became impure through contact with a secondary source of impurity is in fact entirely pure by Torah law. Therefore, he learns from the mishna that it is permitted to burn pure and impure items together.

ורבי יוסי לטעמיה, דאמר: טומאת משקין לטמא אחרים – דאורייתא, דתנא:

And Rabbi Meir conforms to his standard line of reasoning, as he said: The ritual impurity of liquids with regard to transmitting impurity to other objects is by Torah law. Accordingly, the meat that Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest referred to in the mishna was impure by Torah law. Therefore, this case cannot serve as a precedent for the claim that it is permitted to burn pure and impure *teruma* together on Passover eve. As it was taught in a *baraita*:

Perek I

Daf 16 Amud a

Uncertainty whether or not a liquid has become ritually impure – ספק משקין ליטמא – In a case of an uncertainty whether a liquid itself has been rendered ritually impure, its presumptive status is impure. If the issue is whether the liquid has transmitted impurity to another object, it is pure, in accordance with the unattributed mishna in tractate *Teharat* (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 14:7).

ספק משקין ליטמא – טמא, לטמא אחרים – טהור, דרבי רבי מאיר; וכן היה רבי אלעזר אומר כדברי רבי יהודה אומר: לכל טמא.

If there is uncertainty whether or not a certain liquid has become ritually impure,<sup>h</sup> it is presumed impure. It is an uncertainty with regard to Torah law, and the *halakha* is stringent in such cases. However, if the uncertainty is with regard to rendering other items impure, they are pure, as liquids transmit impurity by rabbinic law, and the *halakha* is lenient with regard to uncertainties of that kind. These are the statements of Rabbi Meir, and Rabbi Elazar would say likewise in accordance with his statements. Rabbi Yehuda says: When there is uncertainty with regard to these liquids, the item is impure in all cases, even in terms of transmitting impurity to other items, as he maintains that the impurity of liquids is by Torah law.

רבי יוסי ורבי שמעון אומרים: לאוכלין – טמאין, לכלים – טהורין.

Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: In cases of uncertainty as to whether or not these liquids transmitted impurity to foods, the ruling is that the foods are impure, in accordance with the principle that when there is uncertainty in cases of Torah law, the *halakha* is stringent. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon maintain that liquids transmit impurity to food by Torah law. However, when there is uncertainty as to whether or not these liquids transmitted impurity to vessels, the *halakha* is lenient, and they are pure. Even Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon concede that liquids transmit impurity to vessels only by rabbinic law. This *baraita* clearly indicates that Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosei indeed dispute whether or not the impurity of liquids applies by Torah law.

*Eil kamtza* is kosher – אֵיל קַמְצָא דְכֶן – There are four types of grasshoppers that may be eaten according to the Torah: *Arbe, solam, hargol, and hagav*. Although the Torah provided indicators to identify the kosher species, the Sages maintain that these indicators apply only to certain kinds of grasshoppers. In practice one may eat only an insect with regard to which there is a tradition that its species is kosher. It was therefore necessary for Yosei ben Yo'ezer to testify that this particular grasshopper may be eaten.

Many researchers identify the *eil kamtza* as the slant-faced grasshopper known scientifically as *Acrida bicolor*. This grasshopper has antennae that are shaped like horns, hence its name, *eil kamtza*, which literally means grasshopper ram. There is a certain problem with this since the horns of a ram are generally curved while the horns of goats are straight, as are the antennae of the slant-faced grasshopper. It is possible that the term *ayil*, generally used to refer to a male sheep, may be used to refer to a male goat as well.



Slant-faced grasshopper



Alpine ibex, a species of wild goat

But isn't the *baraita* saying, in accordance with Rabbi Meir's statements, etc. – וְהָא כְדִבְרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר – Some commentaries suggest that Rabbi Elazar agrees with Rabbi Meir with regard to the accepted practice, but he does not agree with the principle that there is no impurity of liquids by Torah law. Rather, Rabbi Elazar maintains that although the impurity of liquids is by rabbinic decree, the Sages decreed impurity on liquids even in a case where their impurity is uncertain. This explanation accounts for the fact that the *Tosefta* was not formulated: These are the statements of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Elazar, but instead their opinions were listed separately (Rabbi David Pardo).

HALAKHA

The purity of liquids in the slaughterhouse – טְהוּרַת מִשְׁקֵי בַּיִת מִטְבַּחְיָא: The blood and water of the slaughterhouse in the Temple courtyard are entirely pure, i.e., they neither contract nor transfer ritual impurity, in accordance with the testimony of Yosei ben Yo'ezer (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:16).

וְסָבַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר מְשַׁקֵּין אֵית לְהוּ טוּמְאָה בְּעוֹלָם? וְהִתְנַיָּא, רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אוֹמֵר: אֵין טוּמְאָה לְמִשְׁקֵין כָּל עֵיקוֹר. תְּדַע, שְׁהָרִי הָעֵיד (יוֹסֵף) בֶּן יוֹעֶזֶר אִישׁ צְרִידָה עַל אֵיל קַמְצָא דְכֶן, וְעַל מִשְׁקֵין בֵּית מִטְבַּחְיָא דְכֶן.

With regard to the *Tosefta*, the Gemara asks: **And does Rabbi Elazar maintain that liquids have ritual impurity by Torah law at all? Wasn't it taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Elazar says: There is no impurity for liquids at all by Torah law. Know that this is so, as Yosei ben Yo'ezer<sup>p</sup> of Tzereida testified about the grasshopper called *eil kamtza* that it is kosher<sup>n</sup> and may be eaten; and he testified about liquids in the slaughterhouse in the Temple that they were ritually pure,<sup>n</sup> as there was no decree of impurity issued with regard to them.** The fact that these liquids are ritually pure indicates that by Torah law liquids cannot transmit impurity at all. Instead, that type of impurity is by rabbinic law, and rabbinic decrees of impurity were not in effect in the Temple.

הִנְחָא לְשִׁמוּאֵל, דְאָמַר: דְכֶן מְלִטְמָא טוּמְאָת אַחֲרִים, אָבַל טוּמְאָת עֲצָמֵן יֵשׁ לָהֶן – שְׁפִיר. אֶלָּא לְרַב, דְאָמַר דְכֶן מִמֶּשׁ – מָאִי אֵיכָא לְמִימַר?

The Gemara adds: **This works out well according to the opinion of Shmuel, who said that in this context the term ritually pure means that they do not transmit impurity to other items; however, they themselves can become impure.** If that is Rabbi Elazar's opinion, he indeed holds in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Meir that liquids transmit impurity by rabbinic law but themselves become impure by Torah law, as stated in the *baraita* above. **However, according to Rav, who said that Yosei ben Yo'ezer holds that the liquids are actually ritually pure and they themselves cannot be rendered impure, what can be said?** According to Rav, Rabbi Elazar maintains that there is no impurity at all by Torah law with regard to liquids. In what sense does he hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said that liquids themselves can become impure by Torah law?

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: אַחְדָּא.

**Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said:** When the *baraita* said that Rabbi Elazar agreed with Rabbi Meir, it was with regard to one of Rabbi Meir's opinions. Rabbi Elazar agrees with Rabbi Meir that in a case where there is uncertainty with regard to rendering other items impure, they are pure, as liquids transmit impurity by rabbinic law. However, Rabbi Elazar maintains that the impurity of liquids themselves is also not by Torah law, and therefore in a case of uncertainty with regard to impurity of the liquids themselves, the ruling is that they are pure.

וְהָא כְדִבְרֵי רַבִּי קְאָמַר דְנִפְיֵשִׁי, וְעוֹד: וְהָא 'וְכֶן' קְתַנְיָא קְשִׁיָּא.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **But isn't the *baraita* saying:** And Rabbi Elazar would say in accordance with Rabbi Meir's statements,<sup>n</sup> in the plural, indicating that the points of agreement are many? **And furthermore, the *baraita* is teaching: Likewise.** This term also indicates that Rabbi Elazar agrees completely with Rabbi Meir. Since no resolution was found for this contradiction, the Gemara concludes that it is indeed difficult to understand the *baraita* according to Rav.

גּוֹפָא, רַב אָמַר: דְכֶן מִמֶּשׁ, וְשִׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: דְכֶן מְלִטְמָא טוּמְאָת אַחֲרִים, אָבַל טוּמְאָת עֲצָמֵן – יֵשׁ לָהֶן. רַב אָמַר: דְכֶן מִמֶּשׁ, קְסָבַר: טוּמְאָת מִשְׁקֵין דְרַבְּנָן, וְכִי גִזְרוּ רַבְּנָן – בְּמִשְׁקֵין דְעֻלְמָא, וּבְמִשְׁקֵין בֵּית מִטְבַּחְיָא לָא גִזְרוּ.

After citing the testimony of Yosei ben Yo'ezer and the associated amoraic dispute, the Gemara analyzes the matter itself. **Rav said:** Yosei ben Yo'ezer said that the liquids in the Temple are actually ritually pure and neither become impure nor transmit impurity. **And Shmuel said** that the liquids are ritually pure in the sense that they do not transmit impurity to other items; however, they themselves can become impure. The Gemara elaborates: **Rav said that liquids are actually pure, as he maintains that the ritual impurity of liquids is by rabbinic law, and when the Sages issued this decree they did so only with regard to ordinary liquids.** However, with regard to the liquids of the slaughterhouse in the Temple, they did not issue the decree.

PERSONALITIES

Yosei ben Yo'ezer – יוֹסֵי בֶן יוֹעֶזֶר: Yosei ben Yo'ezer of Tzereida is one of the earliest known Sages. These early Sages were not called Rabbi or Rabban, and it was stated in that regard: Greater than a title is their name. Yosei ben Yo'ezer and his colleague Yosei ben Yohanan of Jerusalem studied under Antigonus of Sokho. They were the first group of pairs (see tractate *Avot*, ch. 1), with Yosei ben Yo'ezer serving as the *Nasi* of the Sanhedrin. These were also the first Sages between whom there is a recorded dispute, which laid the groundwork for disagreements between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel in subsequent generations.

Based on the midrash, it is known that Yosei ben Yo'ezer lived

during the period of the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes. His nephew, Yakum of Tzerorot, was one of the heads of a group of extreme Hellenistic Jews; some suggest that he is the Alcimus mentioned in the book of Maccabees. According to the midrash, Yosei ben Yo'ezer was killed during the persecutions of that era, and the Sages eulogized him with the statement: The men of *eshkolot* ceased. That term is explained as an acronym for *ish shehakol bo*, literally: A man in whom there is everything. After Yosei ben Yo'ezer there were no more men who possessed outstanding character traits, great Torah knowledge, fear of transgression, and kindness.

Did Shmuel say, etc. – מי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל וְכוּ' – Why is this question asked specifically of Shmuel? Shouldn't it be inquired of Rabbi Meir himself, who maintains that the liquids transmit impurity by rabbinic law? Some commentaries suggest that perhaps Rabbi Meir stated his position only with regard to non-sacred liquids, but with regard to consecrated liquids he concedes that anything that can become impure also transmits impurity by Torah law. Consequently, the verse cited as proof in the Gemara does not contradict his opinion (Rashash).

This is called impure, etc. – הָאֵי אִיקְרִי טָמֵא וְכוּ' – Some commentaries add that the Torah invariably characterizes the impurity of liquids as disqualified, rather than impure, which indicates that liquids do not transmit impurity to other objects (Rabbi David Pardo).

וּשְׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: דְּכֵן מְלֻטְמָא טוּמְאַת אַחֲרִים, אֲבָל טוּמְאַת עֲצָמֵן – יֵשׁ לָהֶן. קִסְבֵּר: טוּמְאַת מִשְׁקִין עֲצָמֵן דְּאוּרִייתָא, לְטָמֵא אַחֲרִים – דְּרַבְנֵן. וְכִי גִזֵּר רַבֵּנֵן – בְּמִשְׁקִין דְּעֵלְמָא, בְּמִשְׁקִין בֵּית מִטְבַּחְיָא – לֹא גִזֵּר. וְכִי לֹא גִזֵּר רַבֵּנֵן – לְטָמוּי אַחֲרִים, אֲבָל טוּמְאַת עֲצָמֵן – יֵשׁ לָהֶן.

אָמַר לִיָּה רַב הוּנָא בְּרַחֲמֵי לְבָרִיָּה: כִּי עָיִלְתָּ לְקַמְיָה דְּרַב פֶּפְאָה, רְמִי לִיָּה: מִי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל דְּכֵן מְלֻטְמָא טוּמְאַת אַחֲרִים, אֲבָל טוּמְאַת עֲצָמֵן – יֵשׁ לָהֶן, קָרִי בָּאָן: 'וְהַבֶּשֶׂר אֲשֶׁר יִגַע בְּכָל טָמֵא לֹא יֵאָכֵל!'

אָמַר רַב שֵׁישָׁא בְרִיָּה דְּרַב אִידִי: מִיָּדֵי דְהַהוּ אַרְבֵּיעֵי בְּקֻדְשׁ. מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אֲשֵׁי: וְרִבֵּיעֵי בְּקֻדְשׁ – לֹא אִיקְרִי טָמֵא, הָאֵי – אִיקְרִי טָמֵא! קִשְׂיָא.

תָּא שְׁמַע: 'וְכָל מִשְׁקָה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁתָּה בְּכָל בְּלִי יִטְמָא!' מֵאֵי יִטְמָא – הַבְּשִׂיר.

הַבְּשִׂיר? מְרִישָׁא דְקָרָא שְׁמַעְתָּ לִיָּה 'מִכָּל הָאֲכָל אֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל וְגו''! תַּד בְּתַלְוִשִׁין וְחַד בְּמַחְוֶרִין.

וְצְרִיכֵי, דְאֵי אֲשַׁמְעִינָן בְּתַלְוִשִׁין – מִשּׁוֹם דְּאֲחַשְׁבִּינְהוּ, אֲבָל מְחֻוֶּרִין – אֵימָא לֹא.

וְאֵי תִנָּא מְחֻוֶּרִין – מִשּׁוֹם דְּקִיָּמִי בְּדוּכְתִינְהוּ חֲשִׁיבִי, אֲבָל תַּלְוִשִׁין – אֵימָא לֹא, צְרִיכֵי.

And the Gemara elaborates on the opinion of Shmuel: **Shmuel said** that the liquids are **ritually pure** in the sense that they do not **transmit impurity to other items**; however, **they themselves can become impure**, as Shmuel maintains that the **ritual impurity of liquids themselves is by Torah law**, whereas their capacity to **transmit impurity to other objects is by rabbinic law**. And when the Sages issued this decree, they did so only with regard to **ordinary liquids**. However, with regard to **the liquids of the slaughterhouse in the Temple they did not issue the decree**. And when Shmuel said that **the Sages did not issue their decree** with regard to the liquids of the slaughterhouse, he meant that they did not do so with regard to their capacity to **transmit impurity to other items**; however, as far as **their own impurity** is concerned, **they become impure like other liquids**.

Rav Huna bar Hinnana said to his son: **When you enter before Rav Pappa, raise the following contradiction before him: Did Shmuel actually say<sup>n</sup> that the liquids are ritually pure in the sense that they do not transmit impurity to other items but they themselves are susceptible to impurity?** Is there anything that by Torah law can itself become impure but does not transmit impurity to other items? **Read here** a verse that clearly states that any item that is itself impure, including liquids, transmits impurity to other items: **“And the flesh that touches anything impure shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt in fire”** (Leviticus 7:19).

Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, said: The legal status of liquids is **just as it is in the case of fourth-degree ritual impurity in a consecrated item**, with regard to which everyone agrees that it becomes impure but does not transmit impurity to other items. **Rav Ashi strongly objects to this contention**: How is it possible to compare these two cases? **Fourth-degree impurity in a consecrated item is not called impure**; it is disqualified. However, **this liquid is called impure**.<sup>n</sup> Therefore, the two *halakhot* are not comparable. No resolution is found for this contradiction, and the Gemara concludes that it is indeed **difficult**.

The Gemara cites several sources to decide the dispute between the *tanna'im* and between Rav and Shmuel with regard to whether or not the impurity of liquids is by Torah law. **Come and hear: “And all drink that may be drunk in any vessel shall be impure”** (Leviticus 11:34). This verse clearly indicates that liquids can become impure. The Gemara rejects this contention: **What is the meaning of the term: Shall be impure, in this context?** It means that the liquid **renders produce susceptible** to ritual impurity.

The Gemara retorts: Does it in fact mean that the liquid **renders produce susceptible** to ritual impurity? That cannot be as you already learned that **from the beginning of this verse: “From all food that may be eaten, on which water has come shall be impure”** (Leviticus 11:34). The Gemara answers: Nevertheless, the second part of the verse is also necessary: **One part of the verse, the latter part, is referring to water detached from its source, in vessels, and one part, the former part, is referring to water still attached to its source in the ground.**

And both derivations are necessary, as neither *halakha* could have been derived from the other. **As, had the Torah taught us only about the halakha of water detached from its source, one might have thought that this water renders food susceptible to ritual impurity due to the fact that he ascribed significance to the water by drawing it from its source. However, with regard to water still attached to its source, say that it does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity.**

And had the Torah taught only the *halakha* of water still attached to its source, one might have thought that **due to the fact that it stands in its place this water is significant; however, with regard to water detached from its source, say no, it does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity, as it is disconnected from its source. It was therefore necessary for the Torah to mention both cases.**

Susceptibility to impurity with liquids in the slaughterhouse – הַכֶּשֶׁת בְּמִשְׁקֵי בַיִת מִטְבַּחְיָא – Unlike other liquids, the liquids of the Temple slaughterhouse do not render foods susceptible to impurity, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:16).

Susceptibility to impurity with the blood of consecrated offerings – הַכֶּשֶׁת בְּדָם קִדְּשִׁים – The blood of offerings does not render food susceptible to become impure, as its legal status is not that of a liquid at all in this regard (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:16 and *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 1:10).

תָּא שְׂמַע: "אֵךְ מִעֵין וּבוֹר מְקִיָּה מִים יְהִי טְהוֹר!" מֵאֵי "יְהִי טְהוֹר" – מִטּוֹמְאָתוֹ.

The Gemara cites another proof. **Come and hear:** "However, a spring or a cistern, a gathering of water shall be pure, but he who touches their carcass shall be impure" (Leviticus 11:36). It can be inferred from this verse that all water can be rendered impure, with the exception of spring water and water in a cistern, which are in the ground. The Gemara rejects this contention: **What is the meaning of the phrase: "Shall be pure"?** This phrase means that one who immerses in this water is purified **from his ritual impurity**, and does not refer to the impurity of liquids at all.

וְתַלְוִשִׁין מִי מִכְשִׁירִין? וְהָאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: מִשְׁקִין בַּיִת מִטְבַּחְיָא, לֹא דִינִין שְׁהוּן דְּכֹן – אֵלָא שְׂאִין מִכְשִׁירִין!

The Gemara stated that both water detached from its source and water still **attached** to its source render food susceptible to ritual impurity. The Gemara asks: **And does water detached from its source render food susceptible to contract impurity? Didn't Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina, say:** With regard to the liquids of the slaughterhouse in the Temple, **not only are they pure, but neither do they render produce susceptible to ritual impurity?**<sup>H</sup> Apparently, water detached from its source does not render food susceptible to impurity by Torah law. The fact that the Sages suspend the capacity of certain liquids to render produce susceptible to impurity indicates that the fact that water removed from its source renders food susceptible to impurity must be by rabbinic decree. Otherwise, that capability could not have been suspended in the Temple.

תִּירְגְּמָא עַל דָּם. דְּאָמַר רַבִּי חֵיִיָּא בְּרַבִּי אָבָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מִנֵּין לְדָם קִדְּשִׁים שְׂאִינוּ מִכְשִׁיר – שְׁנַאָמַר: "עַל הָאָרֶץ תִּשְׁפָּכֶנּוּ בְּמַיִם" דָּם שְׁנַשְׁפָּךְ בְּמַיִם – מִכְשִׁיר.

The Gemara rejects this contention: **Explain this statement as referring to blood.** Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Ḥanina was not referring to all liquids in the Temple, but only to blood. **As Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said:** From where is it derived with regard to blood of consecrated offerings that it does not render produce susceptible to impurity?<sup>H</sup> **As it is stated:** "You shall surely not eat the blood; you shall pour it upon the earth like water" (Deuteronomy 12:16). The Sages derived from this verse: **Blood that is poured like water**, i.e., blood from a non-sacred domesticated animal that pours out when it is slaughtered and is not received in a vessel as sacrificial blood assumes the legal status of water and renders produce susceptible to ritual impurity.

## Perek I

## Daf 16 Amud b

דָּם שְׂאִינוּ נִשְׁפָּךְ בְּמַיִם – אֵינוּ מִכְשִׁיר. מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב שְׂמוּאֵל בְּרַב אָמִי: הֲרִי דָם הַתְּמַצִּית, דְּנִשְׁפָּךְ בְּמַיִם וְאֵינוּ מִכְשִׁיר!

Conversely, **blood that is not poured out like water** but is received in a vessel to be sprinkled on the altar **does not render produce susceptible to contract impurity.**<sup>N</sup> **Rav Shmuel bar Ami strongly objects to this:** There is the blood squeezed from an animal<sup>H</sup> after slaughter once the initial spurt of blood has concluded, **which is poured like water**, as it is unfit for sprinkling upon the altar. **And nevertheless, this blood does not render produce susceptible to impurity.**

אָמַר לִיה רַבִּי זֵירָא: הִנֵּחַ לְדָם הַתְּמַצִּית, דְּאִפְּלוּ בְּחֻלְיִין נִמְי לֹא מִכְשִׁיר.

**Rabbi Zeira said to him:** Leave aside the blood squeezed after the initial spurt, which is an exceptional case, **as even from non-sacred animals it does not render produce susceptible to ritual impurity either.** With regard to the *halakha* that blood renders produce susceptible to ritual impurity, the legal status of blood squeezed after the initial spurt is not that of blood at all.

קִבְּלָהּ מִינֵיהּ רַב שְׂמוּאֵל בְּרַב אָמִי. דְּאָמַר רַחֲמָנָא: "וְרַק חֲזֹק לְבַלְתִּי אֶכֶל הַדָּם בִּי הַדָּם הוּא הַנֶּפֶשׁ", דָּם שְׁהַנֶּפֶשׁ יוֹצֵאָהּ בּוֹ – קָרוּי דָּם, דָּם שְׂאִין הַנֶּפֶשׁ יוֹצֵאָהּ בּוֹ – אֵינוּ קָרוּי דָּם.

The Gemara comments: **Rav Shmuel bar Ami accepted this statement from Rabbi Zeira and cited a verse that supports it.** **As the Merciful One states:** "Only be strong not to eat the blood; for the blood is the soul" (Deuteronomy 12:23). This verse indicates: **Blood** with regard to which the soul leaves the body when it is spilled is called **blood**; however, **blood** with regard to which the soul does not leave the body when it is spilled, but which is squeezed out afterward, **is not called blood.**

## NOTES

Blood that...does not render produce susceptible to impurity – דָּם...שְׂאִינוּ מִכְשִׁיר – The *halakha* that liquid renders produce susceptible to impurity is stated explicitly in the Torah with regard to water. The Sages applied this *halakha* to other liquids by means of a verbal analogy. In all, seven liquids render produce susceptible to ritual impurity: Wine, honey, oil, milk, dew, blood, and water. There are exceptions with regard to each of these liquids, because the *halakha* is based on the Torah edict derived through the verbal analogy and not on a logical rationale.

## HALAKHA

Blood squeezed from an animal – דָּם הַתְּמַצִּית – An animal's blood that is squeezed out after the initial spurt of blood has concluded and the animal has died does not render food susceptible to impurity (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:3).

NOTES

The atonement of the frontplate – ריצוי ציץ: The Torah states that the frontplate atones for Israel's sins related to consecrated items, as cited here and below. The Sages debate the identity of the transgressions atoned for by the frontplate. A similar discussion pertains to the transgressions atoned for by the periodic sin-offerings, i.e., the goat sacrificed on the New Moon and the goats sacrificed on the Festivals, which also atone for the ritual impurity of the Temple and its offerings.



Frontplate

As impurity was exempted from its general prohibition on behalf of the community – שהותרה מכללה – בצעבור: A prohibition for which there are exceptions, e.g., at certain times or in certain places, is characterized as exempted from its general prohibition. The legal status of this type of prohibition is deemed as less severe than that of an unequivocal prohibition. In this case, the fact that certain offerings may be sacrificed in a state of impurity when most or all of the community or the sacred vestments are ritually impure indicates that ritual impurity in this case is less severe than the prohibitions of *piggul* and *notar*.

תא שמע: דם שנטמא וזרקו, בשוגג – הורצה, במזיד – לא הורצה! מדרבנן, ודלא כרבבי יוסי בן יועזר איש צרידה.

תא שמע: על מה הציץ מרצה – על הדם ועל הבשר ועל החלב, שנטמא בין בשוגג בין במזיד, בין באונס בין ברצון, בין ביחיד בין בצבור!

מדרבנן, ודלא (ביוסף) בן יועזר איש צרידה.

תא שמע: "ונשא אהרן את עון הקדשים"

וכי איזה עון הוא נושא? אם עון פיגול – הרי כבר נאמר: "לא ירצה", אם עון נותר – הרי כבר נאמר: "לא יחשב".

הא אינו נושא אלא עון טומאת שהותרה מכללה בצעבור. מאי לאו – טומאת דם? אמר רב פפא: לא, טומאת קמחים.

תא שמע: "הן ישא איש בשר קדש בכנף בגדו ונגע בכנפו אל הלחם ואל הנזיד ואל היין ואל שמן ואל כל מאכל היקדש ויענו הכהנים ויאמרו לא" (יקדש)

The Gemara cites an additional proof that the impurity of liquids is by Torah law. **Come and hear:** With regard to **blood that became ritually impure, and a priest sprinkled it** on the altar, the following distinction applies: If he did so **unwittingly**, the offering is accepted. If he sprinkled the blood **intentionally**, the offering is not accepted. Apparently, blood becomes ritually impure by Torah law, even if it does not transmit impurity to other items. The Gemara rejects this contention: This impurity is **by rabbinic law, and this ruling is not in accordance with Rav's** explanation of the opinion of **Rabbi Yosei ben Yo'ezer of Tzereida**, as he maintains that sacrificial blood does not become impure at all.

The Gemara cites a proof from another mishna. **Come and hear: For what does the frontplate** of the High Priest atone<sup>n</sup> and thereby allow the blood of the offering to be sprinkled? It atones **for the blood, and for the meat, and for the fat that became impure, whether one caused it to become impure unwittingly or intentionally, whether due to circumstances beyond his control or willfully, and whether it is the offering of an individual or that of a community.** Apparently, the blood of an offering can become impure.

The Gemara rejects this proof: The mishna is referring to blood that is impure **by rabbinic law, and here too, it is not in accordance with the opinion of Yosei ben Yo'ezer of Tzereida**, who says that consecrated blood does not become impure at all.

The Gemara cites an additional proof: **Come and hear** another verse written about the frontplate: "And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, **and Aaron shall bear the sin committed with the consecrated objects**, which the children of Israel shall hallow, even all their sacred gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before God" (Exodus 28:38).

And the Sages expounded: **Which sin does it bear?** If you say it atones for the sin of *piggul*, an offering disqualified by the intention to sacrifice or eat the offering after the permitted time, **it is already stated:** "And if it is eaten at all on the third day, it is *piggul*; **it shall not be accepted**" (Leviticus 19:7). If you say it atones for *notar*, i.e., meat of an offering left after the time that one was permitted to eat it, **it is already stated:** "And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings is eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, **neither shall it be credited** to he who offered it" (Leviticus 7:18).

Evidently, the frontplate bears **only the sin of impurity** in the offering of an individual, as in some circumstances, impurity was **exempted from its general prohibition on behalf of the community.**<sup>n</sup> It was permitted to sacrifice communal offerings in the Temple in a state of impurity. **What, does this not apply to impure blood** as well? Apparently, blood can also become impure. **Rav Pappa said: No**, the reference is not to impure blood but to **the impurity of handfuls** of flour separated by the priest from a meal-offering. The handful of flour renders the meal-offering permitted to be eaten by the priests, parallel to the blood of an animal offering.

The Gemara cites an additional proof. **Come and hear** that which was said to the prophet Haggai: "Thus said the Lord of Hosts: Ask now the priests with regard to the Torah, saying: **If a person bears hallowed flesh<sup>n</sup> in the corner of his garment, and with his garment he touches bread, or stew, or wine, or oil, or any food, shall it be sacred? And the priests answered and said: No**" (Haggai 2:11–12). This question is asked with regard to the flesh of a creeping animal and whether or not the substances that come into contact with it become impure.

NOTES

If a person bears hallowed flesh – הן ישא איש בשר קדש: These verses from the book of Haggai describe halakhic questions that the prophet Haggai asked the priests of his time. The Gemara provides several explanations for these inquiries. Some commentaries suggest that these questions are a metaphor for prophecy, while others say that Haggai was actually testing the priests' knowledge of the *halakhot*. According to the Gemara's explanation that the questions referred to matters of ritual purity and impurity, the verses should be explained as follows: The hallowed flesh

here is not actually consecrated meat but a dead creeping animal, as the term hallowed is sometimes used in reference to anything that must be avoided and not touched (see Deuteronomy 22:9). The person in this example is carrying the dead creeping animal in his garment, not in his hand, as he does not want to become impure by touching it. This explanation is based on the *halakha* in tractate *Eiruvim* that a priest who finds a dead creeping animal in the Temple should remove it in his belt from the holy area (*Arukh*).