## 31.3.3; 21b (משנה א2) → 23b (לא גזרו בה רבנן)

. לא תאכלו כל נְבַלָה **לַגַּר** אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁעָרֶידְ תִּתְנָנָה וַאָכָלָה אוֹ מָכֹר לְנָבֶרִי כִּי עַם קְדוֹשׁ אַתָּה לַילְוָק אֱלֹהֶידְ לֹא תְבַשֶּׁל גָּדִי בַּחֲלֵב אָמוֹ: *דברים יד, כא* 

- I בכורה if a cow expels a clump of blood, it must be buried and she is now exempt from בכורה
  - a אייא that clump has no שומאת מגע ומשא only buried to publicize that the mother is now פטורה מן הבכורה
    - i שמא reason it is not טמא (since it is, after all, a "proper בטל ברוב דם ("וולד). reason it is not
      - 1 Consistency: טהור [חכמים (here) א שליא (re: שליא) (re: שליא) have identical position
  - b tangent: אהלות ז:ד miscarriages are not מטמא until they come out (no "פתיחת קבר"); however, they must have at least a rounded head the size of a פקעת ר' הונא (פקעת saked him to clarify warp or woof? responds:
    - i dispute: שתי ר"מ (warp); ערב ר' יהודה (woof)
    - ii dissent: פיקה must see טפיפיות (seeing פיקה within פיקה, like when a mule kneels to urinate).
    - iii ב הונא heard about 2 פיקה, one warp the other woof, but didn't know how to apply them
      - 1 ר' יוחנן who heard of 3 those two and פיקה of sack-makers and didn't know how to apply
      - 2 ארב explained (in של שתי: explained (in של ארב): a human miscarriage של שתי; chunk of ערב; chunk of ערב, chunk of של שתי: earth is the size of large פיקה of sackmakers, like the seal of מרצופין)
  - c "backdoor" discussion: ר"ל (quoting ר'י יהודה נשיאה) if someone buys fish-oil from ע"ה, he can submerge (the vessel with oil) in מקוה and it is "either way":
    - i if: it is mainly water, the השקה with מקוה-water purifies the ציר
    - ii if: it is mainly ציר, that is not something which is vulnerable to טומאה
      - and: the small amount of אמא water in the ציר is nullified to the ציר
    - iii ציר this allowance is only to use ציר to dip his bread; but to use for cooking טמא
      - 1 reason: the "submerged" טמא waters are revived by the waters they encounter in the pot
      - 2 יומאה does not revivify; who challenged nullified סומאה does not revivify
      - 3 retort: תרומות if a סאה of תרומה שמאה fell into 100 סאים of חולין טהורין
        - (a) א"ז. let the one be taken out (for חרומה) and let it rot, assigning the one taken out to be the one that fell
        - (b) מי פירות. let the one be taken out and eaten as crumbs or toasted, or be kneaded into מי פירות, or be divided up among doughs n- as long as there isn't בביצה in one place
          - (i) comment: מיא would obligate that those 100 חולין be eaten as crumbs, toasted etc.
          - (ii) אינלא. reason so that he won't bring חולין טמאים from elsewhere and another קב+ from here, thinking that that nullifies it; but due to the מצא מא"מ וניעור), we have הטומאה, we have מומאה
      - 4 Block (אביי): just because טומאה can "reawaken" טומאה, does not mean that טומאה would do that to טומאה
      - 5 Further challenge (מבה : ברה ט:ז if ash of פרה gets mixed with regular ash still מטמא
        - (a) But if: the majority is אפר מקלה (not אפר פרה) follow טומאה and no טומאה
        - (b) Explanation: if we should consider "nullified" מממא במשא to still be extant, should be ממגע (if not מגע)
          - (i) Answer: יוסי בר חנינא indeed maintains that in such a case, the mix carries טומאת משא
      - 6 Further challenge: מ"ח's ruling שחוטה to בטל si (but not vice-versa), as שחוטה can never become שחוטה
        - (a) Response: we learn that as being יומאת משא ז'ר' מייא rules that there's still יוסי בר חנינא
      - 7 Challenge (אביי): our מיאה משנה 'ז's note that the blood-bloc has מיר טומאת משא or בטל ברוב בטל ברוב
        - (a) (no answer): but we suggest perhaps it is not מטמא as it is fetid
          - (i) Answer: that is only valid for בר פדא who interprets v. 1 as נבלה is no longer מטמא after not ראוי לגר is no longer מטמא is no longer נפסל מאכילת כלב 1. But: for קשיא טומאה to cease מפסל מאכילת כלב to be קשיא
  - d Revisiting בר פרא/ר' יוחנן: based on interpretations of v. 1
    - i אר בר פרא only if it is fit for גר is it called בלה לגר בר פרא st is it called
      - 1 בלה that is only excluding a case where the נבלה was *never* fit for human consumption
      - 2 בר פרא if it was never fit for consumption, no פסוק needed it is like dirt
        - (a) Challenge: our חררת דם has no טומאה, per יוחנן, due to רוב דם over וולד
          - (i) But: if מטמא agrees that סרוחה מעיקרא is not מטמא, he should have used that reason
          - (ii) *Answer*: this one was originally fit for consumption as part of the mother
  - e אי"ה. מכשירין ו:ג arules that אנ"ה rules that טמא bought from טמא but he soaked it in water (that we assume to be טמא) and the water was nullified against טמא if any water fell on it it becomes טמא
    - - 1 Rejection: perhaps ד"ג meant that they will mix up to a bit less than half
      - 2 Or: since מומאת ע"ה as is דרבנן, as is טומאת שרים they weren't רוב unless there was a רוב