

וְאָמַר רַב: אִישׁתַּבֵּשׁ כֹּהֲנִי מִיָּדֵי
הוּא טַעֲמָא אֲלָא לְרַב, רַב "מִשְׁקֵי
בֵּית מִטְבַּחְיָא" תִּנְי, אֲבָל מִשְׁקֵי בֵּי
מִדְבַּחְיָא – מְטַמָּא.

גּוֹפֵא: רַב אָמַר: אִישׁתַּבֵּשׁ כֹּהֲנִי,
וְשִׁמּוּאֵל אָמַר: לֹא אִישׁתַּבֵּשׁ
כֹּהֲנִי.

רַב אָמַר: אִישׁתַּבֵּשׁ כֹּהֲנִי, רִבִּיעִי
בְּקֹדֶשׁ בְּעָא מִיַּיְהוּ, וְאָמַר לִיה
טְהוֹר.

וְשִׁמּוּאֵל אָמַר: לֹא אִישׁתַּבֵּשׁ כֹּהֲנִי,
חֲמִישִׁי בְּקֹדֶשׁ בְּעָא מִיַּיְהוּ וְאָמַר
לִיה טְהוֹר.

בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַב – הֵינּוּ דְכִתְיִב
"אַרְבַּעָה" לְחֶם וְנֹיֵד וְיִין וְשֶׁמֶן.
אֲלָא לְשִׁמּוּאֵל, חֲמִשָּׁה מָנָא לִיה?

מִ כְּתִיב "וְנִגַּע בְּכַנּוֹ", "וְנִגַּע בְּכַנּוֹ"
כְּתִיב – בְּמָה שֶׁנִּגַּע בְּכַנּוֹ.

And Rav said: The priests erred in this regard, as those substances are actually impure. This source indicates that along with the meat,ⁿ the stew, wine, and oil, which are liquids, also become ritually impure. The Gemara rejects this proof. **This difficulty is reasonable only according to Rav, and Rav teaches that the testimony of Yosei ben Yo'ezer was that the liquids of the slaughterhouse, blood and water associated with the slaughter of offerings, do not become ritually impure. However, Rav agrees that the liquids of the chamber of the altar, wine and oil that accompany the offering on the altar, can become impure.** The rabbinic decree that liquids can become impure is not in effect with regard to the liquids of the Temple slaughterhouse, but it is in effect with regard to the liquids offered on the altar. Therefore, the liquids listed by Haggai can become impure and transmit impurity by rabbinic law.

Apropos Rav's statement with regard to Haggai's exchange with the priests,ⁿ the Gemara discusses the matter itself. **Rav said: The priests erred, as they should have said the oil is rendered impure. And Shmuel said: The priests did not err.**

The Gemara elaborates: **Rav said that the priests erred, as Haggai raised the dilemma before them** whether or not consecrated items become impure with fourth-degree ritual impurity. The question in the verse pertains to the following case: One is carrying a dead creeping animal in the corner of his garment and bread comes into contact with it, conferring upon the bread first-degree ritual impurity status; and stew comes in contact with the bread, conferring upon the stew second-degree ritual impurity status; and wine comes in contact with the stew, conferring upon the wine third-degree ritual impurity status; and oil comes into contact with the wine. The question is: In that case, does the wine confer upon the oil fourth-degree ritual impurity? **And when the priests said to him that it is pure, they erred.** In fact, the oil is disqualified with fourth-degree ritual impurity, because it is a consecrated item.

And Shmuel said: The priests did not err, as Haggai raised the dilemma before them whether or not consecrated items become impure with fifth-degree ritual impurity. According to Shmuel's explanation, the case is as follows: The corner of the garment comes into contact with a dead creeping animal, conferring upon the garment first-degree ritual impurity status; bread comes into contact with the garment, conferring upon the bread second-degree ritual impurity status; stew comes in contact with the bread, conferring upon the stew third-degree ritual impurity status; and wine comes in contact with the stew, conferring upon the wine fourth-degree ritual impurity status; and oil comes into contact with the wine. In that case, does the wine confer upon the oil fifth-degree ritual impurity? **And the priests correctly said to him that the oil is pure.**

The Gemara analyzes this dispute: **Granted, according to the opinion of Rav, that is the reason that it is four items that are written in the dilemma raised in the verse: Bread, stew, wine, and oil, as the dilemma pertains to fourth-degree ritual impurity. However, according to Shmuel, from where does he learn that the dilemma involves five items?**

The Gemara explains Shmuel's opinion. **Is it written in the verse: And its corner touched the bread, indicating that the primary source of impurity that was in the corner of the garment touched the bread? It is actually written in the verse: "And it touched the corner of his garment," meaning the bread came into contact with that which touched the primary source of ritual impurity that was in the corner of his garment.** The bread came into contact with the corner of the garment, not with the primary source of impurity itself. Accordingly, the garment assumes first-degree ritual impurity status, which confers upon the bread second-degree ritual impurity status, which confers upon the stew third-degree ritual impurity status, which confers upon the wine fourth-degree ritual impurity status. Since the wine cannot confer fifth-degree ritual impurity status upon the oil, the oil remains pure.

NOTES

Consecrated meat – בֶּשַׂר קֹדֶשׁ: Rav Hai Gaon maintains that the prophet's question indeed referred to consecrated meat and not to a dead creeping animal. The question is whether or not consecrated meat can become ritually impure through contact with stew and oil that became impure from contact with another source.

Haggai's exchange with the priests – שְׁאֵלַת חַגִּי לְכֹהֲנִים: The verses clearly indicate that Haggai's question referred to the basic *halakha* by Torah law, as the verse introduces his question with the phrase: "Ask now the priests with regard to the Torah, saying" (Haggai 2:11). However, there are differences of opinion with regard to the content of the question. In the Jerusalem Talmud, tractate *Sota*, other opinions are cited apart from those mentioned here. For example, Rabbi Yohanan contends that this question was asked before the Sages issued their decree that a consecrated object can assume fourth-degree ritual impurity status. Therefore, the priests were correct when they answered that it was not impure. According to Rabbi Abba bar Kahana, the priests were experts on impurity imparted by moving certain impure objects, which is by Torah law, but not with regard to impurity conferred by indirect contact, which is by rabbinic law. Another opinion cited there is that the question was with regard to the possibility of fifth-degree ritual impurity for consecrated items.

NOTES

כְּאִילוֹ – As if they sacrificed offerings in a state of impurity – הקריבו בטומאה: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is similarly explained that Haggai wanted the priests to answer: Impure, so that he could respond: So is all the work of your hands.

HALAKHA

Consecrated liquids – משקי קדש: Yosei ben Yo'ezer's testimony with regard to the purity of liquids applies only to blood and water, the liquids of the Temple slaughterhouse, in accordance with Rav's interpretation of his statement (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:16).

תא שמע: ויאמר חגי אם יגע
טמא נפש בכל אלה היטמא
ויענו הכהנים ויאמרו יטמא.
בשולמא לשמואל – מדהכא
לא אישתבש – התם נמי לא
אישתבש. אלא לרב, מאי שנא
הכא דאישתבש ומאי שנא התם
דלא אישתבש?

אמר רב נחמן אמר רבה בר אבוח:
בקיאיין הן בטומאת מת, ואין
בקיאיין הן בטומאת שרץ.

רבנא אמר: התם רביעי, הכא
שלישי.

תא שמע: ויען חגי ויאמר כן
העם הזה וכן הגוי הזה לפני נאם
ה' וגו'. בשולמא לרב – היינו
דכתיב טמא, אלא לשמואל
אמאי טמא?

איתמוהי קא מתמה. והא וכן
כל מעשה ידיהם! בתיב! אמר מר
זוטרא ואיתימא רב אשי: מתוך
שקלקלו את מעשיהם – מעלה
עליהם הכתוב כאילו הקריבו
בטומאה.

גופא, רב תני "משקי בית
מטבחיא" ולוי תנא "משקי בי
מדבחיא".

ללוי, הניחא אי סבירא ליה
בשמואל, דאמר: דכן מלטמא
טומאת אחרים, אבל טומאת
עצמן יש להן – משפחת לה דנגעי
בולהו בראשון.

The Gemara cites proof from the subsequent verse. **Come and hear:** "And Haggai said: **If one who is impure with impurity imparted by a corpse touches any of these, shall he be impure? And the priests answered and said: He shall be impure**" (Haggai 2:13). **Granted**, according to Shmuel, from the fact that here, with regard to a dead creeping animal, the priests **did not err**, as Shmuel maintains that the dilemma was with regard to fifth-degree ritual impurity, **there too they did not err. However**, according to Rav, **what is different here**, concerning the impurity of a creeping animal, such that the priests **erred, and what is different there**, with regard to impurity imparted by a corpse, such that they did not err?

Rav Nahman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: The priests of Haggai's era were experts with regard to the severe ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, as they knew that the impurity of a dead body confers upon a consecrated item fourth-degree ritual impurity status. However, they were not experts with regard to the lesser impurity of a creeping animal.

Ravina said that the distinction between the cases is different. **There**, the first dilemma addressed fourth-degree ritual impurity, whereas **here**, the dilemma addressed third-degree ritual impurity. Haggai's second dilemma does not begin with contact with an item that came into contact with a corpse; rather, it begins with contact with the corpse itself. Since a corpse is the ultimate primary source of impurity, the fourth item is impure with third-degree ritual impurity. The priests knew that *halakha*.

Come and hear a resolution to this matter from the next verse: "And Haggai answered and said: **So is this people, and so is this nation before me, said God; and so is all the work of their hands; and that which they offer there is impure**" (Haggai 2:14). **Granted**, according to the opinion of Rav that the priests erred, **that is the reason that it is written:** "That which they offer there is impure," as the priests' lack of familiarity with the *halakhot* of impurity increase the likelihood that all of their Temple service is ritually impure. **However**, according to Shmuel, **why** does the verse say that their offerings are ritually impure?

The Gemara answers: According to Shmuel, this is not a statement. Rather, the verse is a rhetorical question expressing **bewilderment:** Is all the Temple service of the priests really impure? Apparently, they are familiar with the *halakhot* of impurity. The Gemara raises a difficulty: **But isn't it written** in that verse: "And so is all the work of their hands," which is a statement, not a question? **Mar Zutra, and some say it was Rav Ashi, said: Since they corrupted their deeds** by sinning in general, **the verse ascribes to them wrongdoing as if they sacrificed offerings in a state of impurity.**^N

Apropos the two versions of Yosei ben Yo'ezer's testimony that the liquids in the Temple are ritually pure, the Gemara addresses **the matter itself. Rav teaches** that Yosei ben Yo'ezer spoke of **the liquids of the slaughterhouse**, blood and water, **and Levi taught** that this *halakha* applies to **the liquids of the altar**, which include the wine of libations and oil of meal-offerings in addition to blood and water.^H

The Gemara comments: **According** to the opinion of Levi, **this works out well if he holds in accordance with** the opinion of Shmuel, **who said** that Yosei ben Yo'ezer testified that the liquids are **ritually pure** in the sense that they do not **transmit impurity to other items but they themselves can become impure**. In that case, **you can find** a scenario for Haggai's second question; **all** the substances mentioned **made contact** with an object with first-degree ritual impurity status. Levi can explain that the prophet's dilemma is not in a case where the different items came into contact with each other, as he is of the opinion that liquids do not transmit impurity. Rather, the stew, wine, and oil each came in contact with an object with first-degree impurity, in accordance with Shmuel's opinion that consecrated liquids themselves can become impure. Accordingly, the priests answered that these objects are impure.

אָלָא אִי סָבֵר לִיהַּ כְּרַב דְּאָמַר: דְּכֵן מִמָּשׁ, הִיכִי מְשַׁבַּחַת לָהּ? עַל כְּרַחֲךָ כְּשִׁמוּאֵל סְבִירָא לִיהַּ.

However, if Levi holds in accordance with the opinion of Rav that the liquids are actually ritually pure, under what circumstances can a scenario in which wine and oil, liquids offered on the altar, can become ritually impure be found? Rather, perforce you must say that he holds in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel with regard to the meaning of the term pure in this context.

וְלִשְׁמוּאֵל, הִנִּיחָא אִי סָבֵר לָהּ כְּרַב, דְּתַנִּי מִשְׁקֵי בֵּית מִטְבַּחְיָא, אֲבָל מִשְׁקֵי בֵּי מִדְּבַחְיָא אַחֲרֵינִי נִמְי מִיטְמָאוּ – רַבִּיעֵי הוּא דְּלֵא עֲבִיד חֲמִישִׁי, הָא שְׁלִישִׁי – עֲבִיד רַבִּיעֵי.

The Gemara continues: And according to Shmuel, this works out well if he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rav, who taught that the decree to which Yosei ben Yo'ezer testified was issued with regard to the liquids of the slaughterhouse, but the other liquids of the altar transmit impurity as well. If that is Shmuel's opinion he can explain Haggai's dilemma, as it is only an item with fourth-degree impurity status that does not render another item impure with fifth-degree ritual impurity. However, an item with third-degree impurity status renders another item impure with fourth-degree ritual impurity.

אָלָא, אִי סָבֵר לִיהַּ כְּלֹוִי, דְּתַנִּי מִשְׁקֵי בֵּי מִדְּבַחְיָא – מֵאִי אִירִיא רַבִּיעֵי דְּלֵא עֲבִיד חֲמִישִׁי? אֲפִילוּ שְׁנֵי וְשְׁלִישִׁי נִמְי לֵא עֲבִיד! עַל כְּרַחֲךָ כְּרַב סְבִירָא לִיהַּ.

However, if he holds in accordance with the opinion of Levi, who taught that the liquids of the altar, including wine and oil, do not transmit impurity, why does Haggai specifically state that a liquid with fourth-degree impurity status does not render another liquid impure with fifth-degree ritual impurity? Even if these liquids had first or second degree ritual impurity status, they do not render another item impure with second- and third-degree ritual impurity, as Levi maintains that consecrated liquids do not transmit impurity at all. Rather, perforce he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rav with regard to the object of Yosei ben Yo'ezer's decree.

תַּנְיָא בְּוֹתִיָּה דְּרַב, תַּנְיָא בְּוֹתִיָּה דְּלֹוִי. תַּנְיָא בְּוֹתִיָּה דְּלֹוִי: הָדָם וְהַיַּיִן וְהַשֶּׁמֶן וְהַמַּיִם, מִשְׁקֵי בֵּי מִדְּבַחְיָא, שְׁנֵי טְמָאוּ בְּפָנִים וְהוֹצִיאָן לְחוּץ – טְהוֹרִין. נְטִמָּאוּ בְּחוּץ וְהִכְנִסָן בְּפָנִים – טְמָאִין.

The Gemara cites a source in support of each version, as it was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rav, and it was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Levi. The Gemara elaborates: It was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Levi: With regard to the blood, the wine, the oil, and the water, in the case of all liquids of the altar that became ritually impure inside the Temple and one took them outside, they are pure in the sense that they do not transmit impurity to other objects. This is because when they were within the Temple confines that more stringent form of impurity did not take effect. However, if they became impure outside the Temple and one took them inside the Temple, they are impure even in terms of transmitting impurity to other items, as they too retain their prior level of impurity.

אִינִי? וְהָאָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֹוִי: מִשְׁקֵי בֵּי מִדְּבַחְיָא, לֵא אָמְרוּ דְּכֵן אָלָא בְּמִקְוָם. מֵאִי לֹאוּ – לְמַעוּטֵי נְטִמָּאוּ בְּפָנִים וְהוֹצִיאָן לְחוּץ! לֵא, לְמַעוּטֵי נְטִמָּאוּ בְּחוּץ וְהִכְנִסָן בְּפָנִים.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: Is that so? Didn't Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say: With regard to the liquids of the altar, the Sages said they are ritually pure only in their place. What, does this statement not come to exclude liquids that became impure inside the Temple and one took them outside, as in that case once they left the Temple they would be retroactively impure in terms of transmitting impurity? This contradicts the Gemara's previous assertion. The Gemara responds: No, the statement comes to exclude liquids that became impure outside the Temple and one brought them inside.

וְהָא "בְּמִקְוָם" קָאָמַר! הִכִּי קָאָמַר: לֵא אָמְרוּ דְּכֵן – אָלָא שְׁנֵי טְמָאוּ בְּמִקְוָם.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: Didn't Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say: In their place, indicating that these liquids are pure in terms of transmitting impurity only if they remain inside the Temple? The Gemara answers that this is what Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi is saying: The Sages said they are pure only with regard to those liquids that became impure in their place, not with regard to those that became impure elsewhere and were brought into the Temple. In any case, the language of the *baraita* clearly indicates that the legal status of wine and oil is like that of other sacred liquids, in accordance with the opinion of Levi.

תַּנְיָא בְּוֹתִיָּה דְּרַב: הָדָם וְהַמַּיִם, מִשְׁקֵי בֵּית מִטְבַּחְיָא, שְׁנֵי טְמָאוּ בֵּין בְּכֵלִים בֵּין בְּקֶרֶקַע – טְהוֹרִין.

And it was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rav: The blood and the water, the liquids of the slaughterhouse, that became ritually impure, whether they were in vessels or on the ground, are pure.

NOTES

Deriving from a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai – למוד מהלכה: The authority of a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai is equivalent to one explicitly written in the Torah. A law of this type might even supersede the plain meaning of a verse, or it can instruct as to the manner in which a mitzva in the Torah is to be performed. However, one of the main differences between *halakhot* written in the Torah and those that are transmitted to Moses from Sinai is that written *halakhot* can serve as paradigms for other *halakhot*, whereas *halakhot* transmitted to Moses from Sinai cannot serve that purpose, as each *halakha* of this type is unique.

What difference is there to me if the liquids are in vessels and what difference is there to me if the liquids are in the ground – מה לי בכלים מה לי בקרקע: According to Rabbeinu Hananel's version of the text, the difficulty raised by the Gemara does not remain difficult. Instead, the ensuing statement of Rav Pappa answers the question about the difference between water in vessels and water in the ground: By Torah law, a quarter-log of water in the ground cannot become impure, as it has the legal status of a ritual bath. Other commentaries explain that this case involves less than a quarter-log of water. Although this amount of water does not have the capacity to purify as a ritual bath by Torah law, there is a tradition transmitted to Moses from Sinai that it does not become ritually impure in the Temple (Rabbi Meir Arak).

It is difficult – קשיא: Some commentaries explain this as follows: Although according to Rabbi Shimon, and perhaps Rabbi Elazar as well, Yosei ben Yo'ezer's statement is not a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. It is still possible that Rabbi Yehuda agrees that there is indeed a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai that liquids in the Temple are ritually pure, despite the fact that Rabbi Yehuda maintains that in general, liquids can become impure by Torah law (Rabbi David Pardo).

HALAKHA

לא שנו אלא – Taught this only with regard to water – מי: With regard to the *halakhot* of ritual purity and impurity, the distinction between liquids in vessels and liquids in the ground applies only to water. This ruling is in accordance with Rav Pappa's statement (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 15:5).

(רבן) שמעון אומר: בכלים – טמאין, בקרקע – טהורין.

אמר רב פפא: אפילו למאן דאמר טומאת משקין דאורייתא – משקי בית מטבחיא הלכתא גמירי לה. אמר ליה רב הונא בריה דרב נתן לרב פפא: ואלא הא דאמר רבי אליעזר: אין טומאת למשקין כל עיקר, תדע, שהרי העיד (יוסף) בן יועזר איש צרידה על משקי בית מטבחיא דבן.

ואי הלכתא גמירי לה – מי גמרינן מינה?

אמר ליה רבינא לרב אשי: והא רבי שמעון, דאמר טומאת משקין דאורייתא, דתנא רבי יוסי ורבי שמעון אומרים: לכלים – טהורין, לאוכלין – טמאין.

והכא קאמר (רבן) שמעון: בכלים – טמאין, בקרקע – טהורין, ואי הלכתא היא – מה לי בכלים מה לי בקרקע? קשיא.

אמר רב פפא: הא דאמרת בקרקע טהורין – לא שנו אלא מים, אבל דם לא.

ומים נמי, לא אמרן אלא דהוי רביעית, דחזי להטביל ביה מחטין וצינורות, אבל לא הוי רביעית – טמאין.

אמר מר: "רבי יהודה אומר: לכל טמא". למימרא דסבר רבי יהודה טומאת משקין לטמא טומאת כלים דאורייתא?

Rabban Shimon says: If the liquids were in vessels, they are ritually impure; however, if they were in the ground, they are ritually pure, as explained below.

Rav Pappa said: Even according to the one who says that in general the ritual impurity of liquids is by Torah law, the purity of the liquids of the Temple slaughterhouse is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, which the Sages learned through tradition. Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan, said to Rav Pappa: But with regard to that which Rabbi Eliezer said: There is no impurity for liquids at all by Torah law, know that this is so, as Yosei ben Yo'ezer of Tzereida testified about liquids in the slaughterhouse in the Temple that they were ritually pure. This statement indicates that liquids become impure only by rabbinic decree, a decree that is not in effect in the Temple.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan, continued: And if they learned the ritual purity of liquids of the slaughterhouse as a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai through tradition, do we derive other *halakhot* from it?^N There is a principle that one cannot derive halakhic principles from *halakhot* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. How, then, could Rabbi Eliezer cite this *halakha* as a proof for his opinion?

Furthermore, Ravina said to Rav Ashi, also in rejection of Rav Pappa's statement: Isn't it Rabbi Shimon, who said that in general the ritual impurity of liquids is by Torah law? As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: With regard to vessels that came into contact with impure liquid, the vessels are pure, as by Torah law liquids do not transmit impurity to vessels. However, with regard to foods that came into contact with impure liquid, the foods are impure, as by Torah law liquids transmit impurity to foods.

Ravina continues: And yet here, with regard to the liquids in the Temple, Rabban Shimon said: Liquids in vessels are ritually impure, and liquids in the ground are pure. And if you say that the purity of the liquids of the Temple slaughterhouse is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, what difference is there to me if the liquids are in vessels and what difference is there to me if the liquids are in the ground?^N If there is an accepted halakhic tradition that ritual impurity does not apply to these liquids, there should be no difference whether the liquid is in vessels or in the ground. The Gemara comments: Indeed, it is difficult^N according to Rav Pappa's opinion.

Rav Pappa said: That which you said, that the liquids in the Temple are ritually pure when in the ground, the Sages taught this *halakha* only with regard to water,^H but with regard to blood, no, it does not apply. According to Rabbi Shimon, blood can become impure even in the ground.

And even with regard to water, we said that it is ritually pure only when it is a quarter-log, which is a suitable measure in which to immerse needles and hooks. By Torah law, a quarter-log of water collected in one place can serve as a ritual bath in which one can immerse objects that can be completely immersed in that amount of water. Because it has the status of a ritual bath, it too does not become ritually impure. Although the Sages decreed that one should not immerse vessels in a quarter-log of water, the water is pure by Torah law. Therefore, the Sages did not extend their decree to this measure of water inside the Temple. However, if the water is less than a quarter-log, it is ritually impure even in the ground, as that water cannot be used as a ritual bath.

The Master said in the *baraita* cited above, with regard to uncertainty about contact with impure liquids, that Rabbi Yehuda says: They are impure in all cases. The Gemara asks: Is that to say that Rabbi Yehuda maintains that the impurity of liquids in terms of their capability to transmit impurity to vessels is by Torah law?

כלים שיש להן – interior – With regard to concave vessels, i.e., ones that can hold liquids, if they became ritually impure on their exterior, their interior remains pure. If their interior becomes impure, the entire vessel is impure. If the vessel became impure due to contact with a creeping animal, the whole vessel is impure, whether it contracted impurity on its interior or its exterior. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna, as it is a general rule that when Rabbi Yehuda says: In what case is this statement said, he is explaining the previous opinion rather than disputing it, and his explanation is accepted as *halakha* (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Kelim* 28:1).

והתנן: כל הכלים שיש להן אחרים ותוך, כגון הכרים והקסות והשקין והמרצופין, נטמא תוכו – נטמא גבו, נטמא – גבו – לא נטמא תוכו.

אמר רבי יהודה במה דברים אמורים – שנטמאו מחמת משקין, אבל נטמאו מחמת שרץ – נטמא תוכו נטמא גבו, נטמא גבו נטמא תוכו.

ואי סלקא דעתך טומאת משקין לטמא כלים דאורייתא, מה לי נטמא מחמת משקין, מה לי נטמא מחמת שרץ? אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: תזר בו רבי יהודה.

רבינא אמר: לעולם לא הדר. הא – במשקין הבאין מחמת ידים, הא – במשקין הבאין מחמת שרץ.

אי הכי, אדתני "במה דברים אמורים שנטמאו מחמת משקין", ליפלוג וליתני בדידה: במה דברים אמורים – במשקין הבאין מחמת ידים, אבל במשקין הבאין מחמת שרץ – נטמא תוכו נטמא גבו, נטמא גבו נטמא תוכו! אלא מתוורתא כדשנינן מעיקרא: חזר בו רבי יהודה.

איבעיא להו: מכלים הוא דהדר ביה, אבל באוכלין כרבי יוסי ורבי שמעון סבירא ליה. או דילמא: לגמרי הדר ביה, כרבי מאיר?

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: תא שמע, פרה ששתתה מי חטאת – בשרה טמא, רבי יהודה אומר:

But didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to all vessels that have an exterior that can be used and an interior^H that serves as a receptacle, such as cushions, blankets, sacks, and leather grain sacks, if the interior of one of these vessels became ritually impure, its exterior is impure as well. However, if its exterior became impure, its interior is not impure, because the primary use of these vessels is as a receptacle.

Rabbi Yehuda said: In what case is this statement said? It is in a case where the vessels became impure due to contact with impure liquids. However, if they became impure due to contact with a creeping animal, then if the interior became impure the exterior is impure, and likewise, if the exterior became impure the interior is also impure.

The Gemara explains the difficulty posed by Rabbi Yehuda's statement in this mishna: And if it enters your mind that the ritual impurity of liquids with regard to their capacity to transmit impurity to vessels is by Torah law, what difference is there to me if the vessel is rendered impure due to liquids, and what difference is there to me if the vessel is rendered impure due to a creeping animal? Rather, Rabbi Yehuda maintains that the impurity of liquids is by rabbinic law, and the Sages distinguished between the impurity of the exterior and interior of a vessel to distinguish between impurity by Torah law and impurity by rabbinic law and prevent the burning of *teruma* that is impure with impurity by rabbinic law. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Rabbi Yehuda retracted his previous statement in the *baraita* and accepted the ruling that the impurity of liquids is only by rabbinic decree.

Ravina said: Actually, it is possible that Rabbi Yehuda did not retract his previous statement, as this case, where he distinguishes between impurity on the interior and the exterior of vessels, was stated with regard to liquids that come to a state of impurity due to contact with impure hands that did not undergo ritual washing. Unwashed hands are impure by rabbinic decree, and therefore the impurity of such liquid is likewise rabbinic. Conversely, that case, where the impurity of liquids is by Torah law, was stated with regard to liquids that come to a state of impurity due to contact with a creeping animal. As that impurity is by Torah law, no distinction is made between the interior and exterior of vessels.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, instead of teaching: In what case is this statement said? In a case where the vessels were rendered impure due to contact with liquids, as opposed to the other case in which the vessels became impure due to contact with creeping animals, let him distinguish and teach the distinction within the case itself: In what case is this statement said? It is in a case where these vessels became impure by contact with liquids that come to a state of impurity due to contact with impure hands. However, in a case where these vessels became impure by contact with liquids that come to a state of impurity due to contact with a creeping animal, if the interior became impure, the exterior is impure, and if the exterior became impure, the interior is likewise impure. Rather, the Gemara rejects Ravina's explanation and states that it is clear as we initially answered, that Rabbi Yehuda retracted his previous ruling.

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Was it only from his ruling with regard to liquids that transmitted ritual impurity to vessels by Torah law that Rabbi Yehuda retracted his opinion, but with regard to foods he still holds in accordance with the opinions of Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon, that liquids transmit impurity to foods by Torah law? Or perhaps he completely retracted his previous opinion, and Rabbi Yehuda in fact holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who rules that there is no Torah basis for the impurity of liquids.

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from a mishna: With regard to a cow that drank purification waters^{N4H3} in which the ashes of the red heifer were mixed and which were to be sprinkled on one who was ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, and the cow was slaughtered before it digested the water, its flesh is impure due to contact with this water. Pure items that come in contact with the purification waters become impure, as derived from a verse. Rabbi Yehuda says: