

39.1.4

5b (כיצד זיה שעתה) → 7a (הנח מעת לעת דרבנן)

I Analysis of ב משנה – example/application of שעתה דייה

- a *Question*: why did the example include, seemingly superfluously – her sitting in bed?
 b *Answer*: teaches that only if she has ווסת is bed itself טהור (only she is affected) → if she has מעת לעת, bed is also טמא
 i *Supporting*: זעירי, who ruled that if she has טומאת מעל"ע, it is מושב ומשכב such that they are מטמא אדם → מטמא בגדים
 ii *Challenge*: the bed has no לישראל, דעת לישראל, therefore ספק should be טהור
 1 *Answer* (זעירי): case is where her friends were carrying her in the bed → bed is now יד חברותיה and דעת לישראל
 2 *Furthermore*: once ר' יוחנן ruled that any טומאה with human involvement is considered לישראל – even a vessel sitting on the ground, in our case, we no longer need to posit that she is being carried
 (a) *Challenge* (to ר"י): if either his טלית or food nearby was טמא (and other טהור) and food was in his proximity when he was wrapping himself in טלית – ספק if he touched or not – טהור; if touching was inevitable – טמא
 (i) *Defense*: that case was in רה"ר – where ספק is טמא (even though considered דעת, as is the טלית)
 3 *Challenge* (to זעירי): ברייתא – when a woman has טומאת מעל"ע, her משכב ומושב are treated like מגע (that which she touched)
 (a) *Assumption*: infer that just as מגעה is not מטמא אדם, so too משכב ומושב are not מטמא אדם
 (b) *Challenge* (רבא): ר"ח from כ"ח covered by צ"פ;
 (i) *If*: כ"ח המוקף צ"פ is protected in אהל המת, but not from טומאת מעל"ע (of woman without ווסת who sees דם)
 (ii) *Then*: certainly beds (etc.) which are not protected in אהל המת are affected by טומאת מעל"ע
 1. *Block*: we have the ברייתא which equates משכב ומושב to מגעה!
 2. *Answer*: "מגעה" means (a person) who touched her, not status of something she touched
 a. *And*: if she touches someone, that person is טמא and is מטמא בגדים; so too with משכב ומושב
 (iii) *Support* (for רבא): ברייתא distinguishing between דם רואה and כתם
 1. *צ"פ*: retroactive טומאה (מעל"ע) – affecting משכב ומושב, food and liquid and כ"ח even if covered by צ"פ
 a. *But*: she doesn't affect her calendar, nor is she מטמא her בועל retroactively
 i. *Dissent*: ר"ע – she is מטמא her בועל
 b. *And*: she only begins counting days from when she sees
 2. *כתם*: retroactive טומאה (מעל"ע) – affecting משכב ומושב, food and liquid and כ"ח even if covered by צ"פ
 a. *And*: her calendar is affected, and she is מטמא her בועל
 b. *Yet*: she only begins counting from the point when she saw
 3. *In both cases*: the טומאה is considered ספק (no eating תרומה, but not burnt – "תולין")
 (iv) *Question*: if רבא knew the ברייתא, why not just invoke it; if not, from where did he get the ק"ו (from כ"ח)?
 1. *Answer*: he was familiar – but ברייתא is insufficient, as it may be read as מטמא "either אדם or בגדים" – but not both (מטמא בגדים who is then אדם) – therefore, he needed to present his own formulation

II הונא's caveat on retroactive טומאה – only affects קדשים, not תרומה

- a *Challenge*: if, so why not listed among מעלות of קודש פ"ג (חגיגה ג)?
 b *Answer*: those listed have real concern for טומאה, unlike here
 i *Challenge*: ברייתא (above) – she is מטמא food and drinks
 1 *Assumption*: includes תרומה as well as קדשים
 2 *Correction*: refers only to קדשים
 ii *Challenge*: ר' יהודה (ז: א) – when תרומה finish eating כהנות, they should check (implication – תרומה would be retroactively טמא)
 1 *Per*: ר"ח – purpose is to allow her to eat remaining crumbs (but not to affect למפרע תרומה)
 2 *טמא ודאי*: טמא ודאי reads "לשרוף" – meaning, if she checks within ווסת (then, if טמאה, burn תרומה as ודאי)
 iii *Challenge*: רבי ruled like ר"א (who allows שעתה דייה for the four women, per ג: א), after he recalled – can rely on ר"א for שעה"ד
 1 *And*: we commented – that he remembered that הלכה was never decided, yet ר"א was opposed by רבים
 2 *If*: we assume that תרומה was also under the decree of מעל"ע, we understand how רבי could address a case
 (a) *But*: there were no קדשים in רבי's time – how could he have ruled about מעל"ע טומאה?
 3 *Defense*: just as עולא testified that גליל in חברים (well after חורבן – 3rd c.) were careful about יין ושמן – per טהרת הקודש
 (a) *Similarly*: they maintained טהרת הקודש for their חולין

- iv *Challenge*: story with שפחה ר"ג – she was baking “תרומה-loaves” and washing her hands and doing בדיקה between each loaf
- 1 *At*: last בדיקה, she found דם
 - 2 *When*: she asked ר"ג, he declared all of them to be טמאות, but when she notified him that she was בודק between each, he declared all טהור except for the last one
 - (a) *Point*: here we have an example of מעל"ע involving טומאת
 - (b) *Defense*: referent is תרומת לחמי תודה (1 of each 10 תודה-loaves, given to כהן, per ויקרא ז:יד)
 - (i) *Challenge*: how would she have תרומת לחמי תודה? They are designated at תנופה in עזרה
 - (ii) *Answer*: she may designate them at kneading, per:
 1. *Answer*: if לחמי תודה are baked as 4 loaves – valid
 2. *Challenge*: we require 40!
 - a. *Answer*: that is the ideal; but 4 (one of each kind) is valid
 3. *Challenge*: תרומת לחמי תודה must be taken from them – and cannot be a slice, per “אחד” (ibid)
 - a. *Answer*: could be designated at kneading (i.e. 8 loaves; 1 large and 1 at 1/9 its size of each type)
- v *Challenge*: another story with שפחה ר"ג – was capping barrels of wine, washing hands and doing בדיקה between each הבית
- 1 *At*: last בדיקה, she found דם
 - 2 *When*: she asked ר"ג, he declared all of them to be טמאות, but when she notified him that she was בודק between each, he declared all טהור except for the last one
 - (a) *Point*: if this rule applies to both קודש and תרומה, we understand why she asked twice
 - (b) *But*: if it only applies to קודש, why ask the same question twice?
 - (i) *Answer*: they were two different שפחות
- c *Alternate version (of הונא ר"ג's ruling)*: מעל"ע applies to both תרומה and קודש
- i *Source*: since it isn't listed in פ"ג as a מעלה of קודש over תרומה
 - 1 *Challenge (ר"ג)*: we have the statement “only for קודש, not for תרומה”
 - 2 *Answer (from ר' שמואל ב"ר יצחק)*: refers to ... חולין שנעשו על טהרת... – only if done קודש על טהרת, not תרומה על טהרת
- d *Challenge*: חלה גב – if the dough got טמא before kneading, it should be completed בטומאה; if after – complete בטהרה
- i *Before*: complete בטומאה, as there is no prohibition to cause טומאה to חולין in א"י
 - ii *After*: must be done בטהרה, as there is a prohibition to cause טומאה to חלה/תרומה in א"י
 - 1 *And*: חולין which are טבולין לחלה have the status of חלה
 - 2 *Yet*: this חלה is “in limbo” – not eaten (ספק טמא) yet not burnt (may not be טמא)
 - iii *Definition (of ספק טומאה)*: אביי ורבא – needn't be 50/50 ספק, as per 2 roads (1 טהור, 1 טמא and he took one...)
 - 1 *In that case*: even regular חולין are טמא
 - 2 *But in this case, even*: case of “leaning”
 - (a) *Per*: גב – if אביי and רבא were offloading or loading a donkey
 - (i) *If*: the load was heavy, the טהור becomes טמא
 - (ii) *If*: the load was light, the טהור remains so
 1. *But*: in all cases, they are טהור for purposes of חולין, but are טמאים for תרומה (מדרבנן)
- iv *Challenge (to principle that חלה כחלה)*: ברייתא – a woman who is a טבולת יום may knead dough and separate חלה and leave it in a basket and then bring it close and declare it to be חלה
- 1 *Rationale*: it is שלישי, which is טהור if חולין
 - 2 *But*: if we hold that חלה חולין הטבולין לחלה are like חלה, her חלה should be טמא
 - (a) *Answer (אביי)*: only in cases where there is certain טומאה for חולין did they extend גזירה לחלה to גזירה
 - (i) *And*: a טבולת יום is not מטמא חולין → no גזירה affecting לחלה חולין הטבולין
 - (b) *Challenge*: מעל"ע in נדה which is מטמא חולין yet they weren't גוזר on חלה חולין הטבולין לחלה
 - (i) *Per*: ר' שמואל ב"ר יצחק (above) – doesn't apply to תרומה חולין
 - (c) *Answer*: in that case, there is no תרומה mixed in; here, תרומה is mixed in
 - (d) *Alternative answer*: מעל"ע is all מדרבנן – they treated it more leniently