

עֲרֵה כְּרִשׁוֹת – The Temple courtyard is a public domain – **הַרְבִּים**: The Temple courtyard is considered a public domain for the purposes of ruling in cases of uncertainty with regard to impurity, as per the statement of Rav Ashi (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 20:3).

דָּבָר – שְׂאֵן בּוֹ דַּעַת לִישְׂאֵל: An inanimate object, which that does not have knowledge to be asked about a certain situation, or a person who lacks that knowledge, is presumed ritually pure in cases of uncertain impurity (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 16:2).

סִפְקַת טוּמְאָה הַבָּאָה בְּיַד אָדָם – אֲמָר רַב אֲשִׁי: The ruling in cases of uncertainty with regard to impurity transmitted by a person is the same as other cases of uncertain impurity, i.e., pure in a public domain and impure in a private domain. This is the case even if the uncertainty whether or not impurity was transmitted relates to an inanimate object, which does not have knowledge to be asked. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 16:6).

וְלֵרַב, דְּאָמַר: כְּגוֹן שְׂאֵבְדָה לּוֹ מַחֵט
טָמֵא מֵת וְהִכְרִיחַ בְּבֶשֶׂר, כִּיּוֹן דְּאָמַר
מַר: "בְּחַלְלֵי חֶרֶב" – חֶרֶב הָרִי הוּא
בְּחַלְלֵי אָדָם וְכֻלָּם נִמְי לִישְׂמָא!

And the Gemara suggests that according to Rav, who said this is referring to a case **where one lost a needle that became impure through contact with a person or vessel impure with ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, and he recognized the needle in the meat of the offering, the conclusion should be different. Since the Master said that the verse: "One who is slain with a sword"** (Numbers 19:16) teaches that the legal status of a metal sword is like that of **one who is slain** in terms of its degree of impurity, not only the meat, but **a person and vessels as well should become ritually impure** by touching the needle. Just as a sword that comes into contact with a corpse assumes its status as an ultimate primary source of ritual impurity, so too, any metal vessel that comes into contact with a person or vessel that is impure with impurity imparted by a corpse assumes its status as a primary source of ritual impurity.

אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: זֹאת אוֹמְרַת עֲרֵה
רְשׁוֹת הָרְבִים הִיא, וְהוּא לִיָּה סִפְקַ
טוּמְאָה בְּרִשׁוֹת הָרְבִים, וְכָל סִפְקַ
טוּמְאָה בְּרִשׁוֹת הָרְבִים – סִפְקִיקוּ
טָהוֹר.

Rav Ashi said: **That is to say that the Temple courtyard is a public domain^H** with regard to the *halakhot* of uncertain impurity. **And** therefore, the ruling in this case is that of **uncertainty with regard to impurity in a public domain**, as there is no proof that either the vessels or one's hands came into contact with the ritually impure needle. **And** the guiding principle in any case of **uncertainty with regard to impurity in a public domain** is that **its uncertainty is ruled to be ritually pure**. Therefore, the meat, which definitely came into contact with the needle, is impure, while everything else is ritually pure.

הָא בְּרִשׁוֹת הַיְחִיד – סִפְקִיקוּ טָמֵא
הוּא. מְבַדֵּי, הָאִי מַחֵט – דְּבַר שְׂאֵן
בּוֹ דַּעַת לִישְׂאֵל הוּא, וְכָל דְּבַר שְׂאֵן
בּוֹ דַּעַת לִישְׂאֵל בֵּין בְּרִשׁוֹת הָרְבִים
בֵּין בְּרִשׁוֹת הַיְחִיד סִפְקִיקוּ טָהוֹר!

The Gemara asks: One can learn by inference that if this uncertainty developed in the **private domain, its uncertainty is ruled to be ritually impure**. Why would that be the case? **Since this needle is an item that does not have knowledge to be asked,**^H as an inanimate object cannot be consulted with regard to how it became impure or whether it became impure at all, the following principle is in effect: With regard to **any item or person that does not have knowledge to be asked**, the person referring to one who lacks the competence to answer the question, **whether the uncertainty developed in the public domain or whether it was in the private domain, its uncertainty is ruled to be ritually pure**.

מִשּׁוּם דְּהוּי סִפְקַ טוּמְאָה הַבָּאָה בְּיַד
אָדָם, וְאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: סִפְקַ טוּמְאָה
הַבָּאָה בְּיַד אָדָם

The Gemara responds: Although a needle does not have knowledge to be asked, it is nevertheless impure **due to the fact that its uncertainty is uncertainty with regard to impurity that comes about by means of a person**. The knife did not come into contact with the needle on its own; rather, a person was holding the knife. **And Rabbi Yohanan stated another principle: In a case of uncertainty with regard to impurity that comes about by means of a person,**^H

Perek I

Daf 20 Amud a

נִשְׂאֵלִין עֲלֶיהָ, אֶפְּלוּ בְּכָלִי הַמּוֹנֵחַ
עַל גְּבִי קֶרֶקַע – כְּדָבָר שֵׁישׁ בּוֹ דַּעַת
לִישְׂאֵל.

its owners will have no choice but to **consult a Sage about it^H** to determine whether or not it is ritually pure, as **even with regard to a vessel that is placed upon the ground**, which is certainly not capable of providing an answer if asked, its legal status is **like that of an item that has knowledge to be asked**. The fact that the knife is an inanimate object is not reason enough to rule it ritually pure. It was therefore necessary to say that the knife is ritually pure because the Temple courtyard is a public domain. If it was a private domain, the knife would be deemed impure.

וְהַבֶּשֶׂר טָמֵא. הָאִי בֶּשֶׂר דְּאִיתְכַּבְּשׁוּ
בְּמַאי?

It was taught that if an impure needle were found in an animal, **the meat is ritually impure**. The Gemara asks: **With what liquid was this meat rendered susceptible to impurity?** A food can become impure only if it were rendered susceptible to impurity through contact with a liquid; how, then, could the sacrificial meat become impure immediately after the animal was slaughtered?

NOTES

Uncertainty with regard to impurity and consultation – סִפְקַ טוּמְאָה וְשְׂאֵלָה: The Sages derived the *halakhot* of uncertainty with regard to impurity from the *sota*, a woman suspected by her husband of adultery. The ruling in the Torah in the case of uncertainty whether or not a *sota* is ritually impure is stringent. The Sages derived from the *sota* that the ruling is stringent in cases of uncertainty with regard to impurity. However, the *sota* is also the source for the lenient ruling in cases of uncertainty with regard to impurity, as the uncertainty with regard to the *sota* developed in the private domain, where no one else was present. Likewise, a *sota* can be asked whether or not she committed adultery, rendering her impure, from which it can be derived that in a case where the uncertainty involves an inanimate object or an incompetent person, who cannot be asked, the ruling is lenient.

Esteem for sacred objects – היבת הקודש – The idea is that consecrated items are more susceptible to ritual impurity due to their heightened sanctity. The more sacred an object, the more degrees of impurity apply to it. Accordingly, non-sacred items can assume no more than second-degree ritual impurity status, *teruma* can assume third-degree ritual impurity status, while consecrated items can assume fourth-degree ritual impurity status. The Sages extended this susceptibility even to certain non-food items, e.g., incense and coals, as well as to objects that were not rendered susceptible to impurity through contact with liquids. Reish Lakish's question was whether the legal status of an object that became impure due to this consideration is that of an object actually impure by rabbinic law, to the extent that it transmits impurity to other items, or whether it is merely disqualified, in which case it can become impure itself but cannot transmit impurity to other items.

A mass from meal-offerings – צריד של מנחות – *Tosafot* explain that this phrase refers to a meal-offering, part of which is wet and part of which is dry. Others maintain that it refers to the coarse bran sifted from the flour of the meal-offering in the preparation of fine flour (Rabbeinu Hananel; *Arukh*).

HALAKHA

A mass from meal-offerings – צריד של מנחות – If a mass from a meal-offering became impure, it can assume first- and second-degree ritual impurity status by rabbinic law, as stated in the Gemara in tractate *Menahot* (*Kesef Mishne*; *Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 8:3).

Needle in a cow – מתט שבפרה – If a cow passed through a river and was slaughtered while still wet, and an impure needle was found in the meat, the meat is ritually impure. If the needle was found in the secretions of the animal's stomach, the meat remains pure, even if the secretions were soft, in accordance with the proofs in the Gemara and the statement of Rav Ashi (*Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:17).

אי נמא דאיתכשר בדם – והא אמר רבי הייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן: מנין לדם קדשים שאינו מכשיר – שנאמר: "לא תאכלנו על הארץ תשפכנו כמים" דם שנשפך כמים – מכשיר, ושאינו נשפך כמים – אינו מכשיר.

ואלא דאיתכשר במשקי בית מטבחיא – והא אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: משקי בית מטבחיא לא דיין שהן דגון אלא שאין מכשירין.

ואלא דאיתכשר בהיבת הקודש – אימור דמהניא ליה היבת הקודש לאיפסולי גופיה, למימנא ביה ראשון ושני נמי?

תיפשוט דבעי ריש לקיש: צריד של מנחות, מונין בו ראשון ושני או לא?

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: כגון שהיתה פרה של זבחי שלמים, והעבירה בנהר ושחטה, ועדיין משקה טופח עליה.

"נמצאת בפרש הכל טהור." וניהדר פרש וניטמיה לבשר! אמר רב אדא בר אבהו: בפרש עבה. רב אשי אמר: אפילו תימא בפרש רכה, משום דהוי משקה סרוח.

תני תנא קמיה דרב ששת: שרץ מטמא את המשקין, ומשקין מטמאין את הכלי, וכלי מטמא את האוכלין, והאוכלין מטמאין את המשקין, ולמדנו שלש טומאות בשרץ. הני ארבעה הן! גזו משקין דרישא.

If we say that it was rendered susceptible to impurity by the blood that flowed when it was slaughtered, didn't Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba say that Rabbi Yohanan said: From where is it derived with regard to blood of consecrated offerings that it does not render produce susceptible to impurity? 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 is poured out when it is slaughtered and not received in a vessel like sacrificial blood, assumes the legal status of water and renders food susceptible to ritual impurity. **Blood that is not poured out like water**, but is received in a vessel to be sprinkled on the altar, does not render food susceptible to impurity.

Rather, say that this meat was rendered susceptible to ritual impurity by the other liquids of the slaughterhouse, e.g., the water that was kept near the altar for washing the offerings. But didn't Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, say with regard to the liquids of the slaughterhouse: Not only are they ritually pure, as noted in the testimony of Yosei ben Yo'ezer, but they do not even render meat susceptible to impurity?

Rather, say that the meat is rendered susceptible to ritual impurity by the esteem for sacred objects.^N According to this principle, certain items that cannot become impure by Torah law become susceptible to impurity by rabbinic law due to their extreme sanctity. The Gemara rejects that possibility: Say that the esteem for sacred objects is effective to disqualify the meat itself despite the fact that it was not rendered susceptible to receive impurity, but does it also transmit impurity to the extent that one counts first- and second-degree impurity from contact with that meat? Can impurity based on the esteem for sacred objects be transmitted to other objects like standard impurity?

If so, resolve from here that which Reish Lakish raised as a dilemma: With regard to a mass from meal-offerings,^{NH} does one count first- and second-degree impurity from contact with it or not? Due to the esteem for sacred objects, the offering itself can become impure without having been rendered susceptible through contact with liquid; however, the dilemma is whether or not it transmits impurity to other objects.

The Gemara responds: Perhaps the dilemma with regard to the status of ritual impurity due to esteem for sacred objects has not in fact been resolved. In the case of meat, Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: It is referring to a case where the meat was from a cow brought as a peace-offering sacrifice, whose hide and meat belong to its owner, and the owner led it through the river to clean it, and he slaughtered it while liquid was still moist upon it. While the animal was being flayed, water fell on the meat, rendering it susceptible to impurity.

We learned in a mishna cited above: If the needle was found in the secretions of the animal's stomach,^H everything, meat, knife, and hands, is pure. The Gemara raises a difficulty: And let these secretions, which are liquid, return and transmit impurity to the meat itself. Like any other liquid, the secretions assume first-degree ritual impurity by rabbinic decree. Rav Adda bar Ahava said: It is referring to thick, solid secretions, which are not liquid. Rav Ashi said: Even if you say that it is referring to soft secretions, it does not transfer impurity because it is an offensive liquid, which does not transmit impurity.

The *tanna* who recited *mishnayot* and *baraitot* in the study hall taught a *baraita* before Rav Sheshet. Based on the verses, it is possible to create the following scenario: The carcass of a creeping animal transmits impurity to liquids, the liquids transmit impurity to a vessel, the vessel transmits impurity to foods, and the foods transmit impurity to liquids. And we have thereby learned that there are three successive levels of impurity with regard to a dead creeping animal. The Gemara notes: These are four levels, not three. The Gemara answers: Cut the liquids of the first clause, so that the *baraita* reads: The carcass of a creeping animal transmits impurity to a vessel and the vessel to foods, etc.

אֲדַרְבָּהּ, גֵּזוּ מִשְׁקִין דְּסִיפָא! לֹא אִשְׁכַּחַן תְּנָא דְאִמְרַן מִשְׁקִין מִטְמְאִין כְּלֵי אֶלְיָא רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, וְהֵדְר בֵּיהּ. וְסִימְנִיךְ נְוִייתָא.

תַּנְן הֵתָם: שְׂרָץ שְׁנַמְצָא בְּתַנּוּר – הַפֶּת שֶׁבְּתוֹכוֹ שְׁנִיָּה, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַתַּנּוּר תַּחֲלָה.

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַב אֲדָא בְּרַחֲמֵי רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: וְנִיחָיו לְהָאִי תַנּוּר כְּמֵאן דְּמְלִי טוּמְאָה דְּמִי, וְתִיחָיו הָאִי פֶת רַאשׁוֹנָה!

אָמַר לֵיהּ: לֹא סָלְקָא דְעֵתְךָ, דְתִנְיָא: יְכוּל יְהוּ בְּלֵי הַכְּלִים מִטְמְאִין מֵאִוִּיר כְּלֵי חָרָס –

The Gemara asks: **On the contrary, cut the liquids of the latter clause,**ⁿ which states that foods transmit impurity to liquids. The Gemara explains: **The only *tanna* that we find who said that liquids transmit impurity to a vessel is Rabbi Yehuda.** And even he retracted this statement. **And your mnemonic** to remember the order of the transfer of impurity in this *baraita* is a **brewing vat**, as the order is similar to the production of beer. First one brings the vessel, then one places barley, the food, in it, and then the water. That is the order of the transmission of impurity in the *baraita*.

We learned in a mishna there: With regard to the carcass of a creeping animal that was found in an oven, the bread inside it is impure with second-degree ritual impurity.^h This is due to the fact that the oven is impure with first-degree impurity and transmits impurity to the bread.

Rav Adda bar Ahava said to Rava: **And let us view that oven as one filled with impurity,**ⁿ as an earthenware vessel is rendered impure by a creeping animal in the airspace of the oven even without making contact with it. **And consequently this bread should be impure with the first-degree of impurity.** The oven should be considered as if it were filled with carcasses of creeping animals and the bread should assume first-degree impurity status as though it became impure directly from a creeping animal.

He said to him: **This suggestion cannot enter your mind, as it was taught in a *baraita*:** I might have thought that all the vessels found in an earthenware oven become impure from the airspace of an impure earthenware vessel.

NOTES

Cut the liquids of the latter clause – גֵּזוּ מִשְׁקִין דְּסִיפָא: This is a reasonable question, as it makes more sense from a stylistic perspective to delete the end of a statement than to delete the beginning or body of a statement.

That oven as one filled with impurity – וְנִיחָיו לְהָאִי תַנּוּר כְּמֵאן: This is a fundamental question with regard to the *halakhot* of ritual impurity transmitted by a dead creeping animal. Although the final conclusion is known, a thorough analysis is required to ascertain the reasoning behind this *halakha*. See the introduction of the Rambam to the order of *Teharot* in his Commentary on the Mishna.

HALAKHA

Bread inside an oven that became impure – פֶּת בְּתַנּוּר – שְׁנַמְצָא: If a dead creeping animal fell into the airspace of an earthenware oven and rendered it impure, the oven assumes first-degree impurity status, while the bread inside the oven assumes second-degree impurity status (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 11:2).

Perek I
Daf 20 Amud b

תְּלַמּוּד לֹוֹמַר: "כֹּל אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹכוֹ יִטְמָא" וְסִמְיָךְ לֵיהּ: "מִכֹּל הָאֲבָלִים – אוֹכֵל מִטְמָא מֵאִוִּיר כְּלֵי חָרָס, וְאִין כְּלֵי הַכְּלִים מִטְמְאִין מֵאִוִּיר כְּלֵי חָרָס.

Therefore, the verse states with regard to creeping animals: "And every earthenware vessel into which any of them falls, whatever is in it shall be impure, and you shall break it" (Leviticus 11:33). **And juxtaposed to it is the verse:** "From all food in it which may be eaten, upon which water comes, shall be impure" (Leviticus 11:34). This indicates that **food is rendered impure by the airspace of an earthenware vessel,**^h but not all vessels are rendered impure by the airspace of an earthenware vessel.^h This *baraita* proves that the earthenware vessel itself is not considered to be filled with carcasses of creeping animals, and therefore it does not render everything inside it impure with first-degree impurity. Were the earthenware vessel indeed considered as if it were filled with impurity, vessels inside it would also assume first-degree ritual impurity.

רַב חֲסִידָא רְמִי פִּיִּסְתָּא אֶפְיִסְתָּא וּמְשַׁנֵּי: מִי אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ שְׂתִיחָן כְּאַחַת.

Rav Hisda raised a contradiction between one statement with regard to **Passover** and another statement with regard to **Passover**, and he resolved this contradiction himself. The Gemara elaborates: **Did Rabbi Yehoshua actually say that both of them may be burned as one, *teruma*** whose purity is uncertain, and definitely impure *teruma*, on Passover eve?

וְרַמִּינְהוּ, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי: אִין הַגְּזוּן דְּזִמְהָ לְרִאָאָה, כְּשֶׁהָעִידוֹ רְבוּתֵינוּ עַל מַה הָעִידוֹ – אִם עַל הַבֶּשֶׂר שְׁנַמְצָא בְּלֹד הַטְּוּמָאָה שְׁשׂוּרְפִין אוֹתוֹ עִם הַבֶּשֶׂר שְׁנַמְצָא בְּאֵב הַטְּוּמָאָה – זֶה טְמֵא וְזֶה טְמֵא.

And he raised a contradiction from the *Tosefta*, as **Rabbi Yosei said:** The inferred conclusion of burning pure and impure leaven together is not similar to the case from which you cited proof. **When Rabbi Meir said that the Sages, Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest and Rabbi Akiva, testified, about what did they testify?** If you assert that Rabbi Meir said with regard to meat that became ritually impure through contact with a secondary source of impurity, that one may burn it together with meat that became impure through contact with a primary source of impurity, that is a case where both **this meat is impure and that meat is impure**, albeit not at the same level of impurity.

HALAKHA

Food in the airspace of an earthenware vessel – אוֹכֵל – בְּאִוִּיר כְּלֵי חָרָס: Any food in the airspace of a ritually impure earthenware vessel is rendered impure by the vessel (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Kelim* 13:2).

Vessels in the airspace of the earthenware vessel – כְּלִים – בְּאִוִּיר כְּלֵי חָרָס: Vessels inside a ritually impure earthenware vessel are not rendered impure, even if they were in the airspace of the earthenware vessel together with the source of impurity (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Kelim* 13:3).

In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua – אֱלִיבָא – דְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: Disputes with regard to the opinion of a given *tanna* are found not only between *amora'im*, but even between *tanna'im* themselves, as there are often conflicting traditions concerning the statement of a certain Sage from the previous generation. In cases of this type, each *tanna* taught his students the dispute in the manner that he understood it. It is therefore possible that two different *baraitot* or *mishnayot* will cite conflicting statements by the same Sage. Generally, the Gemara seeks to resolve contradictions logically by pointing to contextual differences between the two cases. However, if there is a source indicating that there was a dispute with regard to the opinion of a Sage on this matter, this contradiction might be left unresolved. Instead, the Gemara assigns each source to one of the later Sages who quoted his teacher or his teacher's teacher.

אם על השמן שנגפסל בטבול יום, שמדליקין אותו בנר שנטמא בטמא מת – זה פסול וזה טמא. אף אנו מודים בתרומה שנטמאת בולד הטומאה ששורפין אותה עם התרומה שנטמאת באב הטומאה, אבל היאך נשורף אפילו תלויה עם הטמאה, שטמא יבא אליהו ויטהרם?

Rabbi Yosei continues: If you say that Rabbi Meir is referring to the statement of Rabbi Akiva, with regard to oil that was disqualified by one who immersed himself during that day, that one may kindle it in a lamp that became ritually impure with first-degree impurity through contact with one who became ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse, that is a case where this substance is disqualified and that object is impure. We also concede with regard to *teruma* that became impure from a secondary source of impurity, that one may burn it with *teruma* that became ritually impure from a primary source of impurity, even though the first *teruma* will assume a greater degree of impurity. However, how will we burn *teruma* in abeyance, i.e., *teruma* whose impure status is uncertain, together with ritually impure *teruma*? Perhaps Elijah the Prophet will come and establish prophetically that the *teruma* is not ritually impure, and render it ritually pure.

ומשני: הא – רבי שמעון ואליבא דרבי יהושע, הא – רבי יוסי ואליבא דרבי יהושע.

And Rav Hisda himself resolved the contradiction: This statement that was taught in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua, that one burns *teruma* in abeyance together with ritually impure *teruma*, is the ruling of Rabbi Shimon and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, whereas that statement, that one may not burn them together, is the ruling of Rabbi Yosei and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua.^N

דתניא: ארבעה עשר שחל להיות בשבת מבערין את הכל מלפני השבת, ושורפין תרומות טמאות תלויות וטהורות, דברי רבי מאיר. רבי יוסי אומר: טהורה בפני עצמה, ותלויה בפני עצמה, וטמאה בפני עצמה.

The Gemara cites the source of this tannaitic dispute with regard to Rabbi Yehoshua's opinion. As it was taught in a *baraita*: If the fourteenth of Nisan occurs on Shabbat, one may not remove the leaven on Passover eve in the usual manner, and therefore one removes everything before Shabbat, and he burns all *teruma* together, impure *teruma*, *teruma* in abeyance, and pure *teruma*. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: One burns pure *teruma* by itself, *teruma* in abeyance by itself, and impure *teruma* by itself.

אמר רבי שמעון: לא נחלקו רבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע על הטהורה ועל הטמאה שאין שורפין, על התלויה ועל הטהורה – ששורפין, על מה נחלקו – על התלויה ועל הטמאה, שרבי אליעזר אומר: תשרף זו בעצמה זו בעצמה, ורבי יהושע אומר: שתייהן כאחת.

Rabbi Shimon said: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua did not disagree about ritually pure *teruma* and about impure *teruma*. They agree that one may not burn them together. And neither did they disagree about *teruma* in abeyance and about pure *teruma*. They agree that one may burn them together. Since the *teruma* is not definitely impure, he does not appear to be directly impurifying the *teruma*. With regard to what did they disagree? They disagree with regard to burning *teruma* in abeyance and impure *teruma* together, as Rabbi Eliezer says: This *teruma* should be burned by itself and that *teruma* by itself. Since this case involves *teruma* that is definitely impure, if the *teruma* in abeyance is actually pure, by burning them together he will have rendered it impure. And Rabbi Yehoshua says: One may burn both of them as one.

והא מתניתין רבי יוסי היא! הכי קאמר רבי יוסי לרבי מאיר: אפילו רבי שמעון ואליבא דרבי יהושע, דמיקל – כי מיקל בתלויה וטמאה, אבל בטהורה וטמאה – לא.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: Isn't the *mishna* in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei? How can Rabbi Yosei's statement be attributed to Rabbi Shimon? The Gemara answers: This is what Rabbi Yosei is saying to Rabbi Meir: Even according to Rabbi Shimon in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, who is lenient, where he rules leniently it is only with regard to burning *teruma* in abeyance and impure *teruma* together. However, with regard to ritually pure *teruma* and impure *teruma* together, no, even he does not permit burning them together.

רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא רמי תרומה אפיסקא ומשני: מי אמר רבי יהושע שתייהן כאחת,

Similarly, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, raised a contradiction between the previous statement with regard to *teruma* and a *halakha* of Passover, and he resolved it himself. The Gemara clarifies: Did Rabbi Yehoshua actually say that both *teruma* in abeyance and impure *teruma* may be burned together?

A barrel... that broke – שְׁנֵי שְׂבָרָה – חֲבִית: With regard to a barrel of ritually pure *teruma* wine that broke in the upper press while there was impure, non-sacred wine in the lower press, if one can rescue a quarter-log of wine while maintaining its purity, he should do so. If he is unable to do so, he may rescue it all, even if he renders it impure in the process. However, this applies only to a barrel of wine, which will cause the owner considerable financial loss. In contrast, a barrel of oil should be left to descend and contract impurity by itself, as the owner will not thereby incur significant financial loss (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im*, *Hilkhot Terumot* 12:4–5).

וּרְמִינָהּ: חֲבִית שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה שֶׁנִּלְדָּה בָּהּ סִפְקָ טוּמְאָה, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: אִם הִיְתָה מוֹנַחַת בְּמִקּוֹם הַתּוֹרְפָה – יִנְחָנָה בְּמִקּוֹם הַמּוֹצֵנֶה, וְאִם הִיְתָה מְגוּלָּה – יִכְסֶנָּה. רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אוֹמֵר: אִם הִיְתָה מוֹנַחַת בְּמִקּוֹם הַמּוֹצֵנֶה – יִנְחָנָה בְּמִקּוֹם הַתּוֹרְפָה, וְאִם הִיְתָה מְכֻסָּה – יִגְלָנָה.

גְּרָמָא – אִין, בִּידִים – לֹא! וּמִשְׁנֵי: הָא – רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אֱלִיבָא דְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, הָא – רַבִּי יוֹסִי אֱלִיבָא דְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ.

And he raised a contradiction from a mishna: In the case of a barrel of *teruma* produce with regard to which uncertainty developed about its impurity, Rabbi Eliezer says: If the barrel was resting in a vulnerable place, where it may come into contact with impurity, one should place it in a concealed place, and if it was exposed he should cover it. Rabbi Yehoshua says: If it was placed in a concealed place he may place it in a vulnerable place. And if it was covered he may expose it.

The Gemara infers from this mishna: In any case, passive causation of *teruma* whose impurity is uncertain to become definitely impure, yes, it is permitted. However, to actively render *teruma* impure with one's hands, no, it is prohibited. This ruling contradicts the previous *halakha* that one may burn *teruma* in abeyance and impure *teruma* together. And Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, resolved this apparent contradiction himself: This statement, that one is permitted to burn *teruma* in abeyance together with ritually impure *teruma*, is the ruling of Rabbi Shimon in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, whereas that statement, that one may cause this impurity only passively, is the ruling of Rabbi Yosei in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua.

Similarly, Rabbi Elazar raised a contradiction between one *halakha* with regard to *teruma* and another *halakha* with regard to *teruma*, and resolved the contradiction himself. The Gemara explains: Did Rabbi Yehoshua actually say that passive causation of *teruma* whose impurity is uncertain to become definitely impure, yes, it is permitted; however, to actively render *teruma* impure with his hands, no, it is prohibited?

רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר רְמִי תְרוּמָה אֶתְרוּמָה וּמִשְׁנֵי; מִי אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: גְּרָמָא – אִין, בִּידִים – לֹא.

וּרְמִינָהּ: חֲבִית שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה שֶׁנִּשְׁבְּרָה בְּגַת הָעֲלִיוֹנָה וְתַחְתֵּיהָ חוֹלִין טְמֵאִין –

And he raised a contradiction against this from a mishna: With regard to a barrel of *teruma* wine that broke^h in the upper area in a winepress, where grapes are pressed, and there is impure, non-sacred wine in the lower area of the press, where the wine flows from the upper area, if the *teruma* wine would flow into the non-sacred wine, the *teruma* wine would be rendered ritually impure. The result would be significant financial loss, as the legal status of all the wine in the lower press would be that of impure *teruma*, which is prohibited even for priests to drink.

מוֹדָה רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר (לְרַבִּי) יְהוֹשֻׁעַ שְׂאֵם יָכוֹל לְהַצִּיל מִמֶּנָּה רְבִיעִית בְּטָהֳרָה – יִצִּיל. וְאִם לֹא, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: תֵּרַד וְתִטְמָא, וְאֵל טְמֵאָנָה בִּיד.

Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua that if one is able to rescue even a quarter-log from the barrel that broke and keep the wine in a state of ritual purity, by receiving the *teruma* wine in a vessel before it becomes impure, he should rescue it. And if one cannot receive the wine in a pure vessel, as only impure vessels are available, so that if he uses them to receive the wine or to seal the upper press he will render the *teruma* impure, Rabbi Eliezer says: The *teruma* wine should be allowed to descend and become impure on its own, but one should not actively render it impure with his hand.

רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אוֹמֵר: טְמֵאָנָה בִּיד!

Rabbi Yehoshua says: One may even actively render it impure with his hand, by stopping the pipe connecting between the upper and lower presses with an impure vessel or by receiving the wine in impure vessels. Evidently, Rabbi Yehoshua allows one even to actively impurify pure *teruma*.

וּמִשְׁנֵי: שְׂאֵם הֵתָם דְּאִיבָא הִפְסַד חוֹלִין.

And Rabbi Elazar resolved this contradiction himself: There, with regard to the broken barrel, it is different, as, in that case, there is the potential loss of non-sacred produce, when the *teruma* wine descends to the lower press. The non-sacred wine will become prohibited due to the mixture with impure *teruma*.

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּא: מִתְנִיתִין נְמִי אִיבָא הִפְסַד עֲצִים! אָמַר לִיה אַבְיִי: לְהִפְסַד מְרוּבָה – חֲשִׁשׁוּ, לְהִפְסַד מוּעָט – לֹא חֲשִׁשׁוּ.

Rava strongly objects to this claim: In the mishna too there is a loss of wood, as one requires additional wood to kindle a second fire and burn the impure *teruma* separately. Abaye said to him: With regard to this and similar issues, the Sages were concerned about a great loss. However, they were not concerned about the minimal loss of several pieces of wood.

One drinks from wine valued at a *log* for a *sela* – שותין מלוג – בסלע: Some commentaries explain that a person may spend up to a *sela* on wine for drinking without being labeled a spend-thrift. Likewise, one may appropriately spend up to two *sela* on wine for sprinkling (Rashash).

It should be poured out all at once – תשפך חבל – The *Arukh* cites a version that reads: *Hevel*, with the letter *heh*, instead of: *Haval*, with a *het*, i.e., the wine should be poured out immediately, without delay.

ומנא תימרא דלהפסד מרובה חששו וילהפסד מועט לא חששו – דתנאי: חבית של שמן תרומה שנשברה בגת העליונה, ובתחתונה חולין טמאין – מודה רבי אליעזר לרבי יהושע שאם יכול להציל ממנה רביעית בטירה – יציל, ואם לאו – תרד ותטמא ואל יטמאנה ביד.

מאי שנא שמן – דראוי להדליק, וזן נמי ראוי לזילוף!

וכי תימא זילוף לאו מילתא היא – והאמר שמואל משום רבי חייה: שותין מלוג בסלע, ומזלפין מלוג בשתיים! בחדש.

והא ראוי לישנו! אתי ביה לידי תקלה. שמן נמי אתי ביה לידי תקלה!

דרמי ליה בכלי מאוס. וזן נמי רמי ליה בכלי מאוס! לזילוף קא בעי ליה, בכלי מאוס רמי ליה?!

ותקלה עצמה תנאי היא, דתנאי: חבית של יין של תרומה שנשמאת, בית שמאי אומרים: תשפך חבל, ובית הלל אומרים: תעשה זילוף.

אמר רבי ישמעאל ברבי יוסי: אני אכריע, בשדה – תשפך חבל, בבית – תעשה זילוף. איכא דאמרי: בחדש – תשפך חבל, ביטן – תעשה זילוף. אמרו לו:

And from where do you say that the Sages were concerned about a great loss and they were not concerned about a minimal loss? As it was taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a barrel of *teruma* oil that broke in the upper area of the olive press, and in the lower area of the press there is impure, non-sacred produce, Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua that if one can rescue even a quarter-*log* of the oil in a state of purity from the barrel, he should rescue it. And if one cannot receive the oil in a pure vessel, the *teruma* wine should be allowed to descend and become impure on its own, but one should not actively render it impure with his hand.

The Gemara answers: What is different about oil that, as opposed to wine, everyone agrees may not be actively rendered impure? If you say the reason is that even if the *teruma* falls into the lower press and is intermingled with impure *teruma*, it is still suitable for lighting and not entirely lost, if so, wine is also fit for sprinkling in one's house to provide a pleasant fragrance. Impure *teruma* wine could be used for that purpose.

And lest you say that sprinkling wine is not a significant matter, and would be tantamount to destroying the *teruma*, didn't Shmuel say in the name of Rabbi Hiyya: One drinks from wine valued at a *log* for a *sela*,^N and one sprinkles from wine valued at a *log* for two *sela*. Apparently, sprinkling is a more significant use than drinking. The Gemara answers: The *baraita* is referring to new wine still in the press, which does not have a strong fragrance and cannot be used for sprinkling.

The Gemara raises an objection: But isn't the wine fit to be aged, at which point it could be used for sprinkling, and would not be entirely lost. The Gemara answers: One may thereby come to encounter a stumbling block, as he might, with the passage of time, forget that it is ritually impure and come to drink it. The Gemara asks: If so, with regard to oil too, one may thereby come to encounter a stumbling block, in the same way.

The Gemara answers: The Gemara answers: Ritually impure *teruma* oil is permitted because he places it in a repulsive vessel,^H so that people will be disinclined to consume it and will use it only for lighting. The Gemara suggests: With regard to wine, too, he can place it in a repulsive vessel. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: That is not possible. Is it reasonable that one who wants the wine for sprinkling will place it in a repulsive vessel? One sprinkles wine to add a pleasant odor, which would not be the case if the wine has been left in a disgusting vessel.

The Gemara comments: And concern for a stumbling block by keeping prohibited items is itself subject to a dispute between *tanna'im*. As it was taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a barrel of *teruma* wine that became ritually impure, Beit Shammai say: It should be poured out all at once,^N and Beit Hillel say: One should wait until it ages, at which stage it may be used for spraying.

Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, said: I will decide this dispute. If the barrel was in a field, it should be poured out all at once, lest the ritual impurity of the barrel be forgotten by the time it is brought inside the house. However, if the barrel was in the house, where it could be used immediately, it may be used for sprinkling. Some say that Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, decided: In the case of new wine, it should be poured out all at once; but in the case of old wine, it should be used for spraying. They said to him:

HALAKHA

שמן תרומה שנטמא – vessel so that no one will come to consume it unwittingly (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumat* 12:12).
Teruma oil that became impure should be placed in a repulsive