

הלך באחד מהן ועשה טהרות –

טהרות. He went in one of them, and touched.

OVERVIEW

The משנה teaches us, in a case where two people traveled over two separate roads, one of which contains a טומאה; the status of the טהרות that each of these individuals subsequently touched. תוספות explains why the משנה discusses the status of the טהרות which they touched, instead of discussing the status of these people themselves, whether they are טמא or טהור.



anticipates a question; what is the reason – תוספות

הא דנקט טהרות ולא קאמר אדם טהור –

That the משנה **mentions** that they touched טהרות and the issue is whether the טהרות become טמא; why did **he not say** that the **person** who walked one of the שבילין was טהור, and the question is whether he (or his friend) becomes טמא.

responds: תוספות

משום דלגברי אף על גב דמוקמינן לה בחזקת טהורים¹ –

Because concerning the men who walked on these שבילין, **even though we place them in their presumptive טהרה** state and we cannot consider them טמאים since they have a טהרה (they were both טהור before this ספק), nevertheless –

מצריכין להו טבילה והזאה² שלא יגעו שניהם בתרומה³ –

We require of them immersion in a מקוה **and sprinkling** from the חטאת of the טהרה (to purify them from a possible טומאה). This טבילה והזאה is required to remove the concern **that both of them should not touch** the same תרומה –

דאז התרומה טמאה ודאית⁴ והאוכל במיתה⁵ –

For then (if they both touched the same piece of תרומה and they did not have טבילה והזאה) **the תרומה is certainly טמא and whoever eats this תרומה** is liable for טמא (he [merely] transgresses a מ"ע [see יבמות עג, ב]). It is not clear why תוספות states 'מיתה בידי שמים' –

ואם נגעו שניהם באחד ונכנס למקדש חייב:

¹ See 'Thinking it over'.

² איסור can require this from them since it is not an undue hardship and it prevents an איסור.

³ If they have טבילה והזאה then there is no concern if they both touch the same תרומה or person.

⁴ One of these people is certainly טמא and this person certainly touched the תרומה. Therefore the תרומה is טמאה. See (however); 'Thinking it over' in the following בבב ד"ה בבת.

⁵ There is a חייב מיתה בידי שמים if a person eats תרומה when the person is טמא; not if a טהור eats תרומה (he [merely] transgresses a מ"ע [see יבמות עג, ב]). It is not clear why תוספות states 'מיתה בידי שמים'.

And similarly if they both touched another person (who was טהור), and he entered the המקדש he is liable for כרת or a קרבן. Therefore there is no point in discussing a case concerning the two טהורים who walked on these שבילין ב', for even though they may be not be considered טמאים, we would still require of them to have טבילה והזאה, because they can ultimately cause a ודאי טומאה (if they both touched the same תרומה or the same person)⁶. The גמרא is citing an example where there is a ספק טומאה (which will not necessary result in a ודאי טומאה), which cannot be rectified through טבילה, but rather must be destroyed if it is טמא, as in the case of touching separate טהרות.⁷

SUMMARY

The two people who walked on these שבילין ב' require טבילה והזאה to prevent any difficulties that may arise if they both touched the same person or תרומה.

THINKING IT OVER

תוספות states that the people who walked the שבילין ב' are טהור because we place them בחזקת טהורים.⁸ Seemingly they are טהור (even without the חזקת טהרה) since this is ספיקו טהור which is טומאה ברה"ר!⁹

⁶ Concerning these two people all would agree that (they are not טמא, but) require טבילה והזאה.

⁷ They touched these טהרות before they had the opportunity to undergo טבילה והזאה. These טהרות have no תקנה through טבילה והזאה, they are either טהור or must be burnt.

⁸ See footnote # 1.

⁹ See דבר שמואל (and צל"ח).