

## והלך באחד מהם ועשה טהרות<sup>1</sup> –

**And he went on one of them and touched טהרות**

### OVERVIEW

The משנה (which the גמרא cites here) states a case where there were two roads, of which one was טמא, and two people traveled, each on one of these roads, and afterwards they touched טהרות, and discusses the status of the טהרות. Our תוספות explains why the משנה did not discuss the status of the people (whether they are טהור or טמא) instead of the status of the טהרות.

להכי נקט ועשה טהרות דלענין האדם אנו מזיקים שניהם לטבול ולהזות<sup>2</sup> -

The reason the משנה mentions, 'and he touched טהרות', is because regarding the person there is a different solution, for the ב"ד requires both of them to immerse in a מקוה and be sprinkled with the חטאת מי to purify them from their טומאה. The reason for this stringency is -

פן יבואו לידי טומאה ודאי אם יגעו שניהם בככר אחד -

Lest it will result in a certain טומאה, if for instance they will both touch the same loaf of bread. The loaf will be certainly טמא, for one of these two are certainly טמא -

לכך אומר להו זילו טבילו<sup>3</sup> דהא נהרא קמייכו -

Therefore in order to prevent this טומאה ודאי from happening, the ב"ד says to the two of them, 'go be טובל [and additionally since he is מספק there is no reason not to be טובל] for the river is before you'; there is no need to perpetuate the טומאה which can turn into a טומאה ודאי. However regarding the טהרות there is no option of טבילה; if they are טמא they need to be burnt.

ועוד דמשום דבעי למתני סיפא<sup>5</sup> הזה<sup>6</sup> וטבל טהור<sup>7</sup> הלך בשני ועשה טהרות הרי אלו טהורות -

And furthermore because the משנה wanted that the case in the סיפא (משנה ג') [רישא] should be like the case of the (ב' שבילין of משנה ה', משנה ה')

<sup>1</sup> (קרבנות or purified items may refer to either תרומה or קדשים (the meat of טהרות).

<sup>2</sup> However there is no recourse for טהרות which become טמא; they need to be burnt.

<sup>3</sup> The פורת יוסף amends this to read, ועוד דהא, טבילו ועוד.

<sup>4</sup> See footnote # 14.

<sup>5</sup> The סיפא כרישא amends this to read, הזה, כרישא.

<sup>6</sup> The beginning of the משנה there is: הלך באחד מהם ועשה טהרות ונאכלו; and then 'וכו' as שני שבילים, אחד טמא ואחד טהור, הלך באחד מהם ועשה טהרות ונאכלו; however after he touched the first טהרות, they were eaten, so we do not discuss their status for they no longer exist. The issue is regarding the second set of טהרות.

<sup>7</sup> The רש"י amends this to read, וטהר; as it is written in the משנה there.

is: 'he was sprinkled with the חטאת, and immersed himself in a מקוה and became טהור (he is now טהור even if he initially took the טמא road), then he went in the second path and touched other טהרות, these second טהרות are טהורות,<sup>8</sup> the משנה continues -

ואם קיימות הראשונים אלו ואלו תלויות<sup>9</sup> -

And if the first טהרות that he touched, still exist (they were not eaten), both the first and second טהרות are 'hanging';<sup>10</sup> they are טמאין מספק -

ואם לא טהר בינתים<sup>11</sup> הראשונות תלויות<sup>12</sup> והשניות ישרפו:<sup>13</sup>

And if he did not immerse himself between the first and second touching the first טהרות are תלויות and the second טהרות need to be burnt.<sup>14</sup>

## SUMMARY

The משנה discusses the טהרות instead of the person because the טהרות do not have the option of טבילה, or because the previous משנה was discussing the טהרות.

## THINKING IT OVER

Why is it that (in the first case) where נאכלו הראשונות the שניות are טהור (even though there is the possibility that the second road was טמא),<sup>15</sup> and in the other two cases the ראשונות are תלויות (even though there is the possibility that the first road was טהור)?<sup>16</sup>

<sup>8</sup> We assume that the first road was טמא and therefore the first טהרות (which exist no more) became טמא, and the second road (and therefore the second טהרות) is טהור. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>9</sup> We are now discussing both sets of טהרות where one of them is certainly טמא (for one of the roads was certainly טמא), therefore they are both מספק (since we do not know which road is טמא).

<sup>10</sup> We do not burn them immediately; we wait until they spoil first and then burn them.

<sup>11</sup> Therefore after he went on both roads he is certainly טמא.

<sup>12</sup> Perhaps the first road was טמא so the first טהרות are מספק.

<sup>13</sup> At this point he is certainly טמא (see footnote # 11), therefore the second טהרות are ודאי טמא and need to be burnt.

<sup>14</sup> This משנה ג' (and its corollary עיי"ש משנה ד') is discussing the טהרות specifically (for there is a difference whether the first טהרות still exist), not the person directly, therefore the following משנה ה' also chooses to discuss the טהרות instead of the person.

<sup>15</sup> See footnote # 8.

<sup>16</sup> See משניות טהרות there in תפא"י (אות כז, כז) and מלאכת שלמה.