



Food in Contact

The *Mishnah* (1:7) discusses the case of bread rolls that “bite” into each other, and a source of *tumah* touches one. This means that the rolls were connected, such that if they would be pulled apart, some of one roll would be pulled away with the other. The *Mishnah* rules that they are treated as one, such that all the rolls are *tameh* at the same level of *tumah* even if they are subsequently pulled apart. The next *Mishnah* (1:8) however discusses dough that was already *tameh* and then was connected to another one. When connected they share the same level of *tumah*. If however they are separated, the second dough is treated as if had only touched the first. For example, if the first was a *rishon le'tumah*, then the second would be a *sheini le'tumah* once it is separated.

When learning these two *Mishnayot* we see how important it is to be keenly aware of the language the *Mishnah* uses. The *Mishnah Achrona* notes that in the first *Mishnah* the two rolls became connected. The term *noshchot* implies that it happened on its own, for example, as the dough expanded in the oven. In the second *Mishnah* the term *hishich* is used, which suggests that they were actively and intentionally connected. What is the significance of the change in language?

The *Mishnah Achrona* explains that if they were deliberately connected, then they are considered one mass on a biblical level. If it happened on its own, then it is only one mass on a rabbinic level. Consequently, in the first *Mishnah* the rolls joined on their own. It was necessary to bring that case, since the *Mishnah* wanted to teach that even though the join was only rabbinic, if they joined prior to touching the source of *tumah*, they are still considered one mass. Consequently, even if they were separated, they are still all on the same level of *tumah* as if they each came into contact with the source of *tumah* directly.

In the second *Mishnah* it was necessary to teach that the dough was deliberately joined together. Despite being considered one mass on a biblical level, since they were joined only after they *tumah* touched one of the doughs, if they are subsequently separated, using our example above,

the second dough would be a *sheni le'tumah*. The *Tifferet Yisrael* (*Boaz* 1:14) adds that this is because they are only considered one mass at the time they are connected. He explains that this is much like the case of the *tameh mizron* (bed belt) that only when connected to the bed, does that bed share the same level of *tumah* as the *mizron* (*Keilim* 19:5).

The difficulty with this explanation is the last case in this *Mishnah*. The *Mishnah* teaches that if the first dough was *terumah* and was a *shlishi le'tumah* and then connected with other dough, the other dough would be *tahor*. The *Bartenura* explains that since a *shlishi le'tumah* cannot affect other *tumah* that it is contact with, even while connected the other dough remains *tahor*. If it is one mass, then the rest of the dough should be considered a *shlishi le'tumah* whilst connected.

The *Mishnah Achrona* adds that this last ruling contradicts another *Mishnah* in *Keilim* (18:7). The *Mishnah* rules that a *rishon le'tumah* bed leg that was attached to a bed, while attached, the entire bed is a *rishon le'tumah*. Note that a *rishon le'tumah* cannot make the rest of the bed *tumah* (a *sheini*). According to the reasoning above, the rest of the bed should remain *tahor*.

To understand the answer to the question we need to ask, why if the dough is only biting into each other, but not completely kneaded together, is it considered one mass? The *Mishnah Achrona* explains that if this was intentional, the owner must be happy with the result, and it is therefore considered connected (*chibbur*). In the case where the first dough was a *rishon* or *sheni*, the other dough is already *tameh* just from being in contact with the first one. Consequently, separating the dough after will not stop the other dough from being *tameh*. If however the original dough was a *shlishi*, then the other dough can still be salvaged by separating them. Consequently, the owner will want to separate them in order to recover the remaining *tahor* dough. That being the case, even whilst they are connected, in this specific case, it is considered as if they are already separated.

Revision Questions

טהרות א' – ב' – ה'

- What are the thirteen laws stated by *nivlat ohf tahor*? (א'–ב') (א' א')
- Explain the debate regarding what can “*metaher*” an *ohf tahor* that is a *treifah*. (א' א')
- Explain the debate regarding the *notza*. (ב' א')
- Explain what it means that the nails are “מְטַמְּאִין וּמְטַמְּאִין וּמְצַטְרְפִים” (ב' א')
- List the ways in which *nivlat ohf tameh* differs from *nivlat ohf tahor*. (ג' א')
- For which “*tumah*” can the hide of an animal combine with its flesh to complete the shiur? (List some other parts that share the same law.) (ד' א')
- What is law regarding the meat of a *tameh* animal that was slaughter by a *yisrael* for a *nochri*, while the animal is convulsing? (ד' א')
- Can food that is *rishon le'tumah* combine with food that is *sheni le'tumah* to make the minimum *shiur* to transmit *tumah*? (What is that *shiur*?) (ה' א')
- What is the law regarding a *ke'beitzah* of *sheni* that was mixed with a *ke'beitzah* of *sh'lishi* food? (ו' א')
- What is the law if that mixture was then split into two? (ו' א')
- How does the law change in the previous two questions if each part was initially two *beitzim* in size? (ו' א')
- What is the law if two piece of dough stuck together and then one came into contact with a *sheretz*? (ז' א')
- What is the law if they were then separated? (ז' א')
- How does the law change in the previous two questions if they became stuck together only after one touched a *sheretz*? (ח' א')
- In what case could a *sheretz* that touches *kodesh* bread cause all *kodesh* bread touching it (in a chain fashion) to be *tameh*? (ט' א')
- In what case would the law be the same for *trumah* bread? (ט' א')
- What is the law regarding a pot of cooking *trumah* vegetables where one (which is *tahor*) touches a leaf that hangs outside the pot? (ב' א')
- How does the law differ if the leaf was wet? (ב' א')
- How does the law differ if the person was *tameh met*? (ב' א')
- Describe the case of doubt involving a *tevul yom* that relates to the previous questions and what is the law in that case? (ב' א')
- Explain the debate regarding one that eats *tameh* food that is *rishon le'tumah*. (ב' ב')
- What is the law regarding what has the ability to attract and transmit *tumah* for food that is *rishon*? *Sheni*? *Sh'lishi*? (ג' ב')
- Describe the levels of *tumah* that apply to *trumah*. (ד' ב')
- Describe the levels of *tumah* that apply to *kodesh*. (ה' ב')

Local Shiurim

Melbourne, Australia

Sunday -Thursday

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
Melbourne, Australia

Friday & Shabbat

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
Melbourne, Australia

Efrat, Israel

Shiur in English

Sunday -Thursday

Rabbi Mordechai Scharf
9:00am
Kollel Magen Avraham
Reemon Neighbourhood

ONLINE SHIURIM

Yisrael Bankier
mishnahyomit.com/shiurim

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

Rabbi E. Kornfeld
Rabbi C. Brown
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm>

SHIUR ON KOL HALOSHON

Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss
In US dial: 718 906 6400
Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
13 June ג' תמוז	14 June ד' תמוז	15 June ה' תמוז	16 June ו' תמוז	17 June ז' תמוז	18 June ח' תמוז	19 June ט' תמוז
Taharot 2:6-7	Taharot 2:8-3:1	Taharot 3:2-3	Taharot 3:4-5	Taharot 3:6-7	Taharot 3:8-4:1	Taharot 4:2-3

