

## פרק תשיעי – העור והרווב Introduction to

Back in the fourth chapter (ד:), we introduced issues of **טומאת אוכלים**, the topic was “interrupted” with all the concerns of **אותרו ואת בנו**, **כסוי הדם**, **אותרו ואת בנו** and **בשר בחלב**, each of which was introduced by an incidental mention in a prior chapter (e.g. **אותרו ואת בנו** was mentioned in ד:ה **כסוי הדם**, like **אותרו ואת בנו**, with **שחיטה שאינה ראויה** etc.– and now the **משנה** “returns” to the topic at hand and completes its survey of **טומאת אוכלין**

30.9.1

117b (משנה א) → 118b (כך אין מקבלין הכשר אלא עד שיתלשו)

1. וכל אשר יפל מנגלתם עליו יטמא תנור וכיריים יתץ טמאים הם וטמאים יהיו **לכם**: ויקרא יא, לה  
 2. וכי יפל מנגלתם על כל זרע זרוע אשר יזרע טהור הוא: ויקרא יא, לו  
 3. וכי יתן מים על זרע ונפל מנגלתם עליו טמא הוא **לכם**: ויקרא יא, לח  
 4. וכי ימות מן הבמה אשר היא **לכם** לאכלה הנגע בנגלתה יטמא עד הערב: ויקרא יא,לט

- I נבילה and for טומאת אוכלין for שערור difference between משנה א'
- a טומאת אוכלים (specific parts explained in גמרא) even inedible parts of animal count towards כביצה for טומאת אוכלין
- i But not: for not for נבילות טומאת
- ii Parallel: if a ישראל slaughters a טמא for a non-Jew, it obtains טומאת אוכלים while convulsing (מפרכס), but not טומאת נבילות until it dies or is decapitated
- iii Observation: טומאת אוכלים is more easily generated than נבילות טומאת
- b מקדש חייב (if he has contact and then enters) – ר' יהודה אלל (explained later)
- II Side-door #1: שומרים (peels etc.)
- a טומאה חמורה (e.g. נבלה) but not טומאת אוכלים (i.e. טומאה קלה) are considered part of the essence for שומרים ברייתא
- i Source for טומאה קלה of ברייתא: טומאה קלה v. 2 indicates the food is as planted – in its husk
- ii Source for טומאה חמורה: ברייתא v. 4 – נבלתה – טמא, per “טמא”  
 1 However: touching skin which has meat behind it is טמא, per “טמא”  
 2 Explanation (רבא): ברייתא is deficient  
 (a) Excluded: skin which has less than כזית of meat behind it and the skin completes the כזית  
 (b) However: if there is a full כזית of meat behind it, טמא it isn't even a לטומאה – יד from קמ"ל – טמא that it is מוצרץ but isn't טמא
- b א: א: עוקצין א: א: יד (handle/access point) but not a שומר of the food is vulnerable to טומאה, generates טומאה but isn't טמא
- i And: a שומר, even if not a יד, is טמא, טמא others and is מצטרף (to create a minimal שערור for טמא – כביצה)
- ii And: if it is neither יד nor שומר - does none of these
- iii Sources for זרות: to extend reach of receiving טומאה – v. 3 (לכם); to extend generation of טומאה – v. 4 (לכם)
- 1 generating and receiving טומאה is understood via ק"ו reasoning from יד; v. 2 (שומר) is mentioned לצרף
- 2 Challenge: perhaps יד only extends to receive, not generate; שומר also generates but there is no צירוף  
 (a) Answer: generating טומאה is more obvious than receiving it
- 3 Challenge: perhaps יד only extends to generate, not receive; שומר also generates but there is no צירוף  
 (a) Answer: there is a 2<sup>nd</sup> mention of יד – v. 1  
 (b) Question: which of these three is the “extra” mention?  
 (i) If: the תורה only mentioned יד in re: seeds (v. 3), wouldn't have extended to תנור or נבלה, as זרעים are more susceptible to טומאה (can even become טמא from הטומאה)  
 (ii) And if: the תורה only mentioned יד in re: תנור, since טמא – א - טמא, → not seeds nor נבלה  
 (iii) And if: only mentioned נבלה (v. 4) טמא, טומאת אדם & טומאה comes from it → not seeds nor תנור  
 (iv) Therefore: 1 alone wouldn't have been enough; perhaps 2 could've informed the third:  
 1. Omit זרעים: couldn't have inferred; as זרעים require לטומאה  
 a. Challenge: seeds w/o הכשר: תנור which is unfinished (no טומאה either)  
 b. Rather: זרעים are only טמא by touch unlike תנור (air) and נבלה (משא)  
 2. Omit תנור: couldn't have inferred; as the others are food  
 3. Omit נבלה: could have inferred → יד of נבלה is superfluous  
 a. If: not needed for itself, can be “pushed” to יד as a general concept  
 b. Therefore: we have יד for both receiving and generating טומאה → שומר is לצרף  
 c. Block: יד דנבלה is needed; else we would have applied דיו to our ק"ו and restricted יד דנבלה from generating טומאה to a person (טומאת אדם)

- d. *Rather*: נבלה *יד* is needed; שומר of נבלה isn't needed
- e. *Therefore*: שומר of נבלה can't be there for צירוף (which doesn't work for נבלה, per ruling above regarding skin with less than בשר (כזית בשר); nor for generating or receiving טומאה (inferred from *יד* via ק"ו); must be used for דעלמא *יד*
- i. *Hence*: we have an extra "יד" → שומר is needed only for צירוף
4. *Challenge*: why not have it used for שומר דעלמא → שומר להכניס and for צירוף, but no להכניס *יד*
- (v) *Answer1*: *יד* is originally written in context of הכנסה → all is covered
1. *Therefore*: שומר of נבלה is extra, and is written in spite of it being able to be inferred via ק"ו
- a. *Challenge*: why not use this answer (...מילתא דאתיא בק"ו...) for regular שומרים - that they are written to extend receiving טומאה, even though they could be inferred via ק"ו
- b. *Answer*: when we can explain differently, we do (מילתא דאתיא is a "last resort")
- (vi) *Answer2* (ר' חביבא): שומר of נבלה is acting like a *יד*, we extend it to *יד* (since not needed for itself)
- 4 *Challenge* (דב יהודה בר ישמעאל): עוקצין ב:ג: – פיטם of a pomegranate is מצטרף, but not the bud (נץ)
- (a) *Explanation*: this is not how pomegranates are planted, yet פיטם is considered a שומר
- 5 *Additional challenge*: our משנה, allowing bones etc. to be מצטרף to ט"א – what is the source?
- (a) *Rather*: v. 2 lists זרע three times
- (i) *One*: for שומר of seeds
- (ii) *One*: for שומר of fruit
- (iii) *One*: for שומר of eggs, meat and fish
- III Dispute יוחנן רב/ר' about the extension of *יד* for הכשר טומאה
- a *דב* *יד* "works" for טומאה, but not for הכשר (i.e. if *יד* gets wet, food is not yet טומאה)
- b *יד* works for both
- i *Explanation*: may be a dispute about interpretation of text (vv. 1-3)
- 1 *Or*: may be a dispute in classification of הכשר
- (a) *Textual interpretation*: is a text applied two passages back or only one?
- (i) *One*: v. 3 (הכשר) only extends back to v. 2 (object itself), not v. 1 (יד)
- (ii) *Two*: v. 3 (הכשר) extends back to v. 1 (יד)
- (b) *Classification*: is הכשר the beginning of the טומאה process (in which case, a *יד* works) or not (doesn't work)
- ii *Supporting* *ברייתא* for יוחנן ר' position:
- 1 *ברייתא*: just as *יד* is effective for טומאה, it is effective for הכשר
- (a) *And*: just as food cannot become טמא until it is uprooted, similarly it cannot become טומאה until it is uprooted from the ground