



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Hair as a Shomer

The *Gemora* cites another version (of the disagreement between R’ Yochanan and Rish Lakish) regarding our *Mishna* as follows: The hide, gravy, sediment . . . (the bones) are to be included to convey food *tumah*. Regarding this Rish Lakish said: This was taught only with regard to a bone which is considered a *shomer* (a protection for the marrow which is inside of it), but a hair is not considered a *shomer*. Rabbi Yochanan, however, said: Even a hair is considered a *shomer*.

The *Gemora* asks: But can there be a *shomer* on top of another *shomer* (on top of the hide)?

The *Gemora* answers: The hair penetrates right through (the hide into the meat; it is therefore regarded as one *shomer*).

Rav Acha bar Yaakov asked: If so, how may we write *tefillin* (on hide)? Surely, it is necessary that the writing be perfect, and it is not so (for there are holes in the hide on account of the hair)!?

The *Gemora* answers that he must have overlooked the following statement of the Rabbis in the West (*Eretz Yisroel*): Any hole (in the hide) over which the ink can pass is not considered a hole.

Rabbi Yochanan challenged Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish from the following *Mishna*: If there was an olive’s volume of meat adhering to the hide, and a man touched a shred (of meat) hanging from it (which did not measure a *k’zayis*), or a hair that was (growing from) opposite it, he becomes *tamei*. It is, is it not, because it (the hair) is regarded as a *shomer*?

The *Gemora* answers: No, it is because it is regarded as a *yad*.

The *Gemora* asks: Of what use is a bristle?

The *Gemora* answers: It is as Rabbi Ila’i said elsewhere that it is referring to a bristle among many bristles, so here too, it refers to a hair among many hairs many hairs taken together can serve as a *yad* (for they are strong enough to hold the meat).

The *Gemora* asks: And where was this view of Rabbi Ila’i stated?

The *Gemora* answers: It was in connection with the following *Mishna*: The bristles of ears of grain bring in *tumah* and convey *tumah*, but are not included together (with the rest to make up the quantity necessary to convey *tumah*; this is because it is a *yad* and not a *shomer*). The *Gemora* had asked: Of what use is a bristle? Rabbi Ila’i replied: It refers to a bristle among many bristles. (119b – 120a)

Gravy

Rava explains that when the *Mishna* mentioned *gravy* it is referring to the fat.

Abaye said to him: But should it not by itself convey food *tumah*? Rather it must be referring to meat juice which had congealed.

The *Gemora* asks: But even if it had not congealed, it should also be reckoned with the meat, for Rish Lakish has said that the sap resting on top of vegetables is to be included with the vegetable to make up the date’s volume with regard to *Yom Kippur* (regarding the prohibition against eating).

The *Gemora* answers: There it is a question of satisfying one's hunger, and anything (*though not strictly food*) would satisfy it; here, however, it is a question of what can be included for *tumah*, and therefore, if the meat juice had congealed, it can be included, but if it had not congealed, it cannot be included. (120a)

Kippah

Rava explains that when the *Mishna* said '*kippah*,' it is the dregs of the meat (*the pieces that fall to the bottom of the pot*).

Abaye said to him: But should it not by itself convey food *tumah*?

Rather, Rav Pappa said: It must be referring to the spices. (120a)

Congeaed Liquids

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If a man (*through heat*) hardened the blood and ate it, or if he dissolved forbidden fat and swallowed it, he is still liable. Now, it is quite clear in the case where he hardened the blood and ate it, for since he hardened it he thereby made it significant (*as a foodstuff, and will be liable for 'eating' it*), but why should he be liable where he dissolved the fat and gulped it down? The Torah uses the term 'eating' in connection with it, and this is not eating!?

Rish Lakish said: The Torah says: *nefesh (soul)* to include one who drinks. [*Even when a person drinks fat, his 'soul' enjoys it and he is therefore liable.*]

The *Gemora* cites a similar ruling from a *braisa* with respect of *chametz (leavened bread)*: Where a man dissolved it and gulped it down, if it was leavened, he is liable to the penalty of *kares*, and if it was unleavened, he has not thereby fulfilled his obligation (*of eating matzah*) on *Pesach*. Now it is understandable to say that if it was unleavened he has not thereby fulfilled his obligation on *Pesach*, for the Torah says 'bread of affliction,' and this is not bread of affliction; but why does it say that if it was leavened he is liable to the penalty of

kares? Doesn't the Torah use the term 'eating' in connection with it?

Rish Lakish said: The Torah says: *nefesh (soul)* to include one who drinks.

The *Gemora* notes: And the same has been taught in respect of the carcass of a kosher bird: If one melted (*the fat of a dead kosher bird*) with fire, it remains *tamei (for it is still fit for human consumption)*; but if he melted it in the sun, it remains *tahor (for it becomes putrid, and is now unfit for human consumption)*. And the question was asked: Is not the expression 'eating' written in connection with it? And Rish Lakish said: The Torah says: *nefesh (soul)* to include one who drinks.

The *Gemora* notes why it was necessary to teach this *halachah* with regard to each of these cases.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: It is written (*regarding sheratzim - creeping things*): The contaminated ones. This signifies that the juice and the gravy and the sediment of these are forbidden. The *Gemora* asks: Surely it could have been derived from the above cases?

The *Gemora* answers: It is necessary, for had not the Torah stated it expressly, I would have said that it is enough if the derived law is as strict as that from which it is derived from, and just as there (*by chametz, cheilev and neveilah*), a minimum of an olive's volume is essential (*to be liable*), so here a minimum of an olive's volume is essential (*and in truth, the minimum is even a lentil*).

The *Gemora* asks: The Torah then could have stated it with regard to *sheratzim*, and the other cases would have been derived from there?

The *Gemora* answers: Such a derivation could be refuted as follows: It is so with the case of *sheratzim* since they convey *tumah* no matter what their size.

The *Gemora* cites another *braisa*: The liquids that exuded from produce of *tevel* (*untithed produce*), or from *chadash* (*the new crop of grain, which cannot be eaten until the korban omer is brought on the second day of Pesach*), or from consecrated produced or from *Shemittah* produce, or from the produce of *kilayim* (*the prohibition against planting together different species of vegetables, fruit or seeds; kilayim of a vineyard is forbidden for all benefit*) are like the produce themselves. From where is this derived? It cannot be derived from the other cases, for it will be refuted as follows: It is so with the others since each is an automatic prohibition (*as opposed to a prohibition which is brought about by man*). So we may derive prohibitions that come about automatically, but from where would we know it in respect of prohibitions that do not come about automatically?

The *Gemora* answers: We could derive it from the law of the *bikkurim* (*the first ripe fruits of any of the seven species with which the Torah praises Eretz Yisroel, which had to be brought to the Beis Hamikdosh in Yerushalayim*).

The *Gemora* asks: And from where do we know it with regard to *bikkurim*?

The *Gemora* answers: It is from the following teaching of Rabbi Yosi: It is written: *The fruit* - that is to say, you shall bring fruit but not liquids. And from where do we know that where a man brought grapes and pressed them into wine that they are acceptable as *bikkurim*? The verse therefore says: *You shall bring*. [Once we know that the liquid by *bikkurim* is like the solid, we can learn it to *hekdesh* as well.]

The *Gemora* asks: But the derivation can be refuted as follows: It is so with *bikkurim* since they require the recital (*of verses*) and also placing down (*next to the Altar*)!?

Rather, it must be derived from *terumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: And from where do we know it with regard to *terumah* itself?

The *Gemora* answered: It is because it has been likened to *bikkurim*, for a master has said: *And the terumah of your hand refers to bikkurim*.

But, the *Gemora* asks: It can be refuted as follows: It is so with regard to *terumah* since on account of it, people incur the penalty of death (*in the hands of Heaven*), and the penalty of the added fifth!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be derived from the two, from *terumah* and *bikkurim*.

The *Gemora* asks: But it can be refuted as follows: It is so with regard to *terumah* and *bikkurim* since on account of them, people incur the penalty of death and the penalty of the added fifth!?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be derived either from *terumah* and one of the other cases (*chametz or neveilah*) or from *bikkurim* and one of the other cases. (120a – 120b)

DAILY MASHAL

Inherited Longevity

Rabbi Yitzchak of Kaliv zt"l explained: Why don't people rush to repent? Because they're sure of their lives and believe that they have many more years. Particularly if a person sees his parents living long, he's sure that he's inherited longevity. The prohibition to cook a kid in its mother's milk concerns an instance where the mother still lives because concerning the milk of a slaughtered animal there's no prohibition from the Torah (Chulin 113b). In other words, the poor kid died while its mother was alive. About such the Torah said, "The first fruit of your land you shall bring to the house of Hashem your L-rd" – bring your first years to Hashem's house and repent without delay. The proof is "You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk" – longevity is not inherited (*Chemdah Genuzah*, p. 139).