

דף יומי • בכורות • דף כ"ג

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by wrapping up the previous discussion on how to eat terumah loaves that fell into water according to Rabbi Eliezer, exploring creative halachic solutions like baking them as dry nikudin wafers or kneading them with fruit juice to avoid susceptibility to tumah. From there, the Gemara launches into a deep yeshivish shakla v'tarya regarding the mechanics of bitul (nullification) and whether a nullified source of tumah can "reawaken" when it meets its own kind, or if it still retains enough presence to impart tumah through carrying (massa) even if contact (maga) is ruled out.

This leads the Gemara into a classic machlokes between Bar Padda and Rabbi Yochanan regarding the threshold of decay at which nevelah (a carcass) loses its severe tumah. We analyze their different interpretations of the pasuk "you may give it to the stranger," debating whether a carcass must be fit for a ger toshav to defile, or if it remains tamei as long as it is fit for a dog, which has major implications for a fetus nullified in a discharged mass of blood.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 23A

QUESTION

לרבי אליעזר מה תהא עליהון?

The Gemara asks: According to Rabbi Eliezer, what will be with them—how may one eat these loaves of terumah that fell into the water?

ANSWER

יאכלו נקודין, או קליות, או ילושו במי פירות, או תתחלק לעיסות, ובלבד שלא יהא כביצה במקום אחד.

The Gemara answers: They may be eaten as dry, punctured wafers called **nikudin**, or as **parched ears** of grain, or they may be **kneaded with fruit juice** which does not make them susceptible to tumah, or the dough may be **divided into** small batches, provided that there is not an egg-bulk of dough **in one place** so that it cannot contract tumah.

EXPLANATION

ואמר עולא: מה טעם?

And Ulla said: What is the reason that we are so strict with the mixture of fish brine and water?

EXPLANATION

גזירה שמה יביא קב חולין טמאים במקום אחר וקב ועוד ממין זה, סבר איבטלינהו ברובא, וכיון דאיכא האי משהו — מצא מין את מינו וניעור.

It is a Rabbinic decree, lest he bring a kav of impure chullin from another place, and also take a kav and a bit more from this mixture which contains a trace of impurity, and he will think, "I will nullify them—the impure chullin—with the majority of pure liquid in this mixture." But since there is this tiny bit of impurity already in the mixture, the newly added impurity finds its own kind and is reawakened, and the whole mixture becomes tamei.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה: אם טומאה עוררת טומאה, טהרה עוררת טומאה?

Abaye said to him, to Rav Dimi: If we say that impurity reawakens impurity, as in the case of the kav of impure chullin, does purity reawaken impurity? In the case of the fish brine, the water in the pot is pure, so how could it reawaken the impurity of the brine?

OBJECTION

איתיביה: אפר פשר שנתערב באפר מקלה, הולכין אחר הרוב לטמא, ואי רופא אפר מקלה הוא — לא מטמא.

Abaye challenged him from a Mishnah: If valid ash of the Parah Adumah became mixed with ordinary wood ash, we follow the majority to determine whether it can impart tumah, and if the majority is ordinary wood ash, it does not impart tumah.

OBJECTION

ואי אמרת: טומאה כמאן דאיתיה דמי, נהי דבמגע לא מטמא — לטמא במשא!

And if you say that the nullified impurity is considered as if it is still fully present, granted that through contact it does not impart tumah because one might only be touching the wood ash, but let it impart tumah through carrying, since he is carrying the entire mixture including the Parah Adumah ash!

ANSWER

הא איתמר עלה, אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: טהור מלטמא במגע, אבל מטמא במשא.

Rav Dimi replied: But it was stated regarding this Mishnah that Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Chanina said: It is pure from imparting tumah through contact, but it does impart tumah through carrying.

OBJECTION

והאמר רב חסדא: נבילה בטילה בשחוטה, שאי אפשר לנבילה שתיעשה שחוטה.

Abaye asked: But didn't Rav Chisda say: Nevelah is nullified in a majority of kosher slaughtered meat, because it is impossible for nevelah to become kosher slaughtered meat, and therefore they are considered different kinds?

OBJECTION

נהי דבמגע לא מטמא, לטמא במשא!

Now, granted that through contact it does not impart tumah, but let it impart tumah through carrying, if we say that nullified tumah is still considered present!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אתון בדרב חסדא מתניתו לה, אנו בדרב חייה מתנינן לה.

Rav Dimi said to him: You learn it according to the statement of Rav Chisda, but we learn it according to the Braisa of Rabbi Chiyya.

ANSWER

תַּנִּי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: נִבְיֵלָה וְשִׁחוּטָה בְּטִילוֹת זֶה בְּזֶה, וְאִיתָמַר עָלֶיהָ, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסִי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: טָהוֹר מִלְּטֻמָּא בְּמַגֵּעַ, אֲבָל מִטֻּמָּא בְּמַשָּׂא.

For Rabbi Chiyya taught: Nevelah and kosher slaughtered meat are nullified in one another because they are considered the same kind, and it was stated regarding this Braisa that Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Chanina said: It is pure from imparting tumah through contact, but it does impart tumah through carrying.

OBJECTION

וְהָא דְתַנּוּ: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אוֹמֵר: בְּהֵמָה גִּטָּה שֶׁשֶּׁפַּעָה חֲרַרְתָּ דָם — הֲרִי זֶה תִּקְבֵּר, וְנִפְטָרָה מִן הַכּוֹרֶה.

Abaye raised another kasha: But that which we learned in a Mishnah: Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says: A large animal that discharged a mass of blood—this mass must be buried, and the mother is exempt from the law of the firstborn because we assume it was a fetus.

OBJECTION

וְתַנִּי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: אֵינָהּ מְטַמְּאָה לֹא בְּמַגֵּעַ וְלֹא בְּמַשָּׂא.

And Rabbi Chiyya taught in a Braisa regarding this: This mass does not impart tumah, neither through contact nor through carrying.

OBJECTION

אֲמַאי? דְּנָהִי בְּמַגֵּעַ לֹא מְטַמְּא, תִּטַּמָּא בְּמַשָּׂא!

But why? Granted that through contact it does not impart tumah, let it at least impart tumah through carrying, since there is a fetus nullified inside the blood!

OBJECTION

אִישְׁתִּיק.

Rav Dimi was silent and had no answer.

QUESTION

דְּלָמָא, וְדַאי שְׂאֵנִי הָכָא, דְּהוּא לֵה טוּמְאָה סְרוּחָה.

The Gemara asks: Perhaps it is certainly different here, as it is a decayed impurity, and decayed nevelah does not impart tumah at all?

EXPLANATION

הַנִּיחָא לְבַר פָּדָא, דְּאָמַר: טוּמְאָה חֲמוּרָה עַד לִגְר, וְטוּמְאָה קֻלָּה עַד לְכֻלָּב, הָא לֹא חֲזִיָּא לִגְר.

The Gemara notes: This works out well according to Bar Padda, who said: Severe impurity, like nevelah, remains tamei until it is unfit for a ger toshav to eat, and light impurity remains tamei until it is unfit for a dog. And this mass of blood is not fit for a ger toshav, so it loses its tumah.

QUESTION

אָלֵא לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן דָּאָמַר:

But according to Rabbi Yochanan, who said that even severe impurity remains tamei until it is unfit for a dog, what can be said?

עמוד ב' DAF 23B

OBJECTION

אַחַת זֶה וְאַחַת זֶה עַד לְכָלֵּב,

The Baraisa states that **both this** form of impurity **and that** form of impurity continue to defile **until** they are no longer fit **for a dog** to eat.

OBJECTION

הָא חֲזִיא לְכָלֵּב!

But **this** congealed mass of blood is still **fit for a dog**! Why then does Rabbi Yirmeya say it is tahor?

REFUTATION

קָשִׁיא.

The Gemara admits: This is indeed **difficult** for Rabbi Yirmeya.

STATEMENT

גּוֹפֵא, בַּר פְּדָא אָמַר: טוּמְאָה חֲמוּרָה עַד לְגֵר, וְטוּמְאָה קְלָה עַד לְכָלֵּב.

Returning to **the matter itself** that was mentioned above, **Bar Padda says**: An item with **severe impurity**, such as a carcass, defiles **until** it is no longer fit **for a resident stranger**, a ger toshav, to eat; **but** an item with **light impurity**, such as food impurity, defiles **until** it is no longer fit **for a dog**.

STATEMENT

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אַחַת זֶה וְאַחַת זֶה עַד לְכָלֵּב.

And Rabbi Yochanan says: **Both this** severe impurity **and that** light impurity continue to defile **until** they are no longer fit **for a dog**.

QUESTION

מֵאִי טַעְמָא דְּבַר פְּדָא?

What is the reason of Bar Padda for his ruling?

ANSWER

דְּכָתִיב: "לֹא תֹאכְלוּ כָּל נֶבֶלָה לְגֵר וְגוֹ",

As it is written in the Torah: "You shall not eat of any carcass; you may give it to the stranger who is within your gates, that he may eat it." This teaches us that

ANSWER

הָרְאוּיָהּ לַגֵּר קְרוּיָה "נִבְיֵלָה", וְשֶׁאֵינָהּ רְאוּיָה לַגֵּר אֵינָהּ קְרוּיָה "נִבְיֵלָה".

that which is **fit for the stranger** is called "a carcass" and defiles, and that which is **not fit for the stranger** is not called "a carcass" and is tahor.

QUESTION

וְאֵי־דָּה?

And the other Sage, Rabbi Yochanan, how does he explain this verse?

ANSWER

לְמַעוּטֵי הַיָּכָא דְּהֶסְרִיחָהּ מֵעֵיקְרָא.

He says it comes **to exclude** a carcass **where it was decayed from the outset**, while the animal was still alive. Such a carcass never had the status of a carcass to begin with.

QUESTION

וְאֵי־דָּה?

And the other Sage, Bar Padda, how does he respond to this?

ANSWER

הֶסְרִיחָהּ מֵעֵיקְרָא לֹא צָרִיכָא קְרָא לְמַעוּטֵי, עֲפָרָא בָּעָלְמָא הוּא.

He argues that a carcass that was **decayed from the outset** does not need a verse to exclude it, because it is merely dust and obviously cannot defile.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

תָּנוּ: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אוֹמֵר: בְּהֵמָה גֹּסֶה שֶׁשֹּׁפָעָה חֲרֵרֶת דָּם, הֲרִי זֶה תִּקְבֵּר, וְנִפְטָרֶת מִן הַבְּכוּרָה.

We learned in our Mishnah: Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says: A large animal that discharged a mass of blood, behold this mass **must be buried**, and the mother is exempt from the law of the firstborn in the future.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

וְתַנִּי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: אֵינָהּ מְטַמְּאָה לֹא בְּמַגֵּעַ וְלֹא בְּמִשָּׂא.

And Rabbi Chiyya taught in a Baraisa: This mass of blood does not defile, neither through contact nor through carrying.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מִשּׁוּם בִּיטוּל בְּרוּב נִגְעוּ בָּהּ.

And Rabbi Yochanan says: It is because of nullification in the majority that they touched upon it, meaning the Sages ruled it is tahor because the blood of the embryo is nullified by the majority of permitted blood in the mass.

QUESTION

מאי איריך משום ביטול ברוב? תיפוק לי דלא איתתחזי כלל!

The Gemara asks: **Why specifically** explain that it is tahor **because of nullification in the majority**? Let it be derived that it is tahor **because it was never fit** for consumption at all!

ANSWER

הא נמי איתתחזי מעיקרא אגב אימיה.

The Gemara answers: **This too was fit at the outset by virtue of its mother**, for if the mother had been slaughtered before this mass was discharged, it would have been edible as part of the mother.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

תנן הֵתֵם: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יִצְחָק אָמַר: צִיר טָהוֹר שֶׁנָּפַל לְתוֹכוֹ מַיִם כֹּל שֶׁהוּא — טָמֵא.

We learned in a Mishnah elsewhere: Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says: Pure fish brine into which any amount of water fell is rendered **impure**, because we assume the am ha'aretz who owned it had already diluted it with water.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רב נחמן אמר רבה בר אבוח: זאת אומרת נחשדו עמי הארץ לערב מחצה בציר.

Rav Nachman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: That is to say that the amei ha'aretz are suspected of mixing **half** a portion of **water in the brine**. Therefore, when any more water falls in, the water becomes the majority and revives the impurity.

QUESTION

ולמה לי מחצה? אפילו בציר ממחצה נמי!

The Gemara asks: **And why do I need** to say they are suspected of mixing in exactly **half**? Even if they mixed in **less than half**, it would **also** become tamei!

EXPLANATION

והני משהו — הוה ליה פלגא, ופלגא לא בטיל.

For with **this tiny bit** of water that fell in now, **it becomes half** of the mixture, and **half is not nullified** by the other half!

ANSWER

אימא: עד מחצה.

The Gemara answers: **Say** instead that they are suspected of mixing in water **up to half**, meaning slightly less than half.

ANSWER

איבעצית אימא: טומאת עם הארץ דרבנן, טומאת משקין דרבנן.

If you want, say instead: The impurity of an am ha'aretz is Rabbinic, and the impurity of liquids is also Rabbinic.

EXPLANATION

ברובא גזרו רבנן, בפלגא ופלגא לא גזרו בה רבנן.

Therefore, where there is a majority of water, the Rabbis decreed impurity, but where it is half and half, the Rabbis did not decree impurity.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

מתני' רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: הלוקח בהמה מניקה מן הגוי — אין חוששין שמא בנה של אחרת יהיה.

MISHNAH: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: One who buys a nursing animal from a non-Jew, we do not fear that perhaps the offspring was the young of another animal, and we may assume she has already given birth.

MISHNAH

נכנס לתוך עדרו וראה את המבכירות מניקות, ושאינן מבכירות מניקות — אין חוששין שמא בנה של זו בא לו אצל זו, או שמא בנה של זו בא לו אצל זו.

If he enters into his flock and sees the first-time mothers nursing, and those that are not first-time mothers nursing, we do not fear that perhaps the offspring of this one came to that one, or perhaps the offspring of that one came to this one.

GEMARA גְּמָרָא

STATEMENT

גמ' אמר רב נחמן משמיה דרב: הלכתא בכוליה פירקין, פר מלוגתא.

GEMARA: Rav Nachman said in the name of Rav: The halacha is in accordance with the anonymous Tanna throughout our entire chapter, except where there is a dispute recorded in the Mishnah.

OBJECTION

אמר רב ששת: אמינא כי ניים ושכב רב אמר להא שמעתא!

Rav Sheshet said: I say that when Rav was dozing and sleeping he said this halacha! For it makes no sense.

QUESTION

אהייא? אילימא ארישא — (מפליגי) [מיפלג פליגי] רבי ישמעאל ורבי עקיבא!

To which Mishnah is he referring? If we say he is referring to the first Mishnah of the chapter, behold Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva disagree there, so there is no anonymous ruling!

EXPLANATION

אָלֵא אַדְרָבִי אֶלְיָעֶזֶר בֶּן יִצְחָק — מִשְׁנֵת רַבִּי אֶלְיָעֶזֶר בֶּן יִצְחָק "קַב וְנָקִי".

Rather, you will say he is referring to the ruling of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov. But we already know that the Mishnah of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov is small in quantity but clean and accurate, and the halacha always follows him!

EXPLANATION

אָלֵא אַדְרָבִי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל מִפְּלֵג פְּלִיג בְּבִרְיֵיתָא!

Rather, you will say he is referring to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel in our Mishnah. But there is a dispute in a Baraisa against his view!

EXPLANATION

אָלֵא אַדְרָבִי יוֹסִי בֶּן הַמְּשֻׁלָּם — הָא אָמַר רַב חֲדָא זִימְנָא, דָּאָמַר רַב: הֲלִכְתָּא פְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי בֶּן הַמְּשֻׁלָּם!

Rather, you will say he is referring to Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam. But behold, Rav already said this once explicitly, as Rav said: The halacha is like Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam!

EXPLANATION

אָלֵא אֲשַׁעֲרָא בַּעַל מוֹם מִיפְּלֵג פְּלִיגִי עַקְבִּיָּא בֶּן מַהֲלָלֵאל וְרַבְּנֵי!

Rather, you will say he is referring to the hair of a blemished firstborn. But there Akavya ben Mahalalel and the Rabbis disagree!

RESOLUTION

לְעוֹלָם אַדְרָבִי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל, וְהָא קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן: דְּבִרְיֵיתָא לָא פְּלוּגְתָּא הִיא.

The Gemara answers: Actually, Rav was referring to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, and this is what he comes to teach us: that a dispute in a Baraisa is not considered a dispute to prevent us from following the Mishnah's ruling.

STATEMENT

וְכִיּוֹן דָּאָמַר רַב: הֲלִכְתָּא בְּכוּלָּיָהּ פִּירְקִין בַּר מְפִלּוּגְתָּא,

And since Rav said: The halacha is in accordance with our entire chapter except where there is a dispute,

SUMMARY

The daf establishes that while nullified tumah might not defile through direct contact, the Sages debate whether it still defiles through carrying, analyzing cases of Parah Adumah ash mixed with wood ash, and nevelah mixed with kosher meat. We then focus on the fundamental machlokes between Bar Padda and Rabbi Yochanan: Bar Padda holds that severe tumah like nevelah is purified once it is unfit for a ger toshav, whereas Rabbi Yochanan rules that it remains tamei until it is completely unfit for a dog. The Gemara concludes by analyzing how each Tanna and Amora accounts for a fetus nullified within a discharged mass of blood, utilizing the principles of bitul and the physical state of the decayed tissue.

The Gemara is bothered by how we treat a mixture where a small amount of tumah has been nullified in a majority of tahor. We see a fascinating machlokes between Bar Padda and Rabbi Yochanan about when a carcass, a nevelah, loses its status of tumah. Bar Padda teaches that once it is no longer fit for a human being, a ger toshav, to eat, it is no longer called nevelah; it loses its power to defile. Rabbi Yochanan is more stringent, holding that as long as it is fit for a dog, it still retains its status of tumah. But even Rabbi Yochanan agrees that once it is completely decayed and unfit even for a dog, it is considered "afra b'alma", mere dust, and its spiritual impurity is totally gone.

Think about the deep yesod the Torah is teaching us here. Tumah, which represents spiritual deadness and negativity, only has power when it has some form of vitality, some "food" to sustain it. The moment it becomes completely ruined, when it is no longer fit even for a dog, it loses all its power and becomes completely tahor. The same is true in our own avodas Hashem. The yetzer hara and the negative influences around us only have power over us when we feed them, when we give them a little bit of attention or importance. If we treat those negative thoughts and temptations as "afra b'alma", if we completely ignore them and make them totally worthless in our eyes, they lose all their power to drag us down.

When a negative thought, a feeling of discouragement, or a temptation enters your mind today, do not argue with it or give it weight. Treat it like decayed dust that is unfit even for a dog; completely ignore it and redirect your mind immediately to a word of Torah or a holy thought.