

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

MISHNAH: In the following cases the skin is considered flesh:¹ the skin of a human, the skin of the domestic pig, Rabbi Yehudah says: even the skin of the wild pig, the skin of the hump of a tender camel, the skin of the head of a tender calf, the skin around the hooves, the skin of the pudendum,² the skin of a fetus, the skin beneath the fat tail, the skin of the anakah, the koach, the letaah and the chomet,³ Rabbi Yehudah says: The letaah is like the chuldah.⁴ If any of these skins was tanned or trampled upon as much as [was usual] for tanning, it becomes tahor, except for the skin of a human. Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri says: the eight sheratzim [reptiles] have [real] hides.⁵

GEMARA: Ulla said: According to Biblical law the skin of a human⁶ is tahor, but for what reason did they say it was tamei? As a precautionary measure lest a man make rugs out of the skin of his father and mother.

Others refer this [dictum of Ulla's] to the later clause of our Mishnah, viz., If any of these [skins] was tanned or trampled upon as much as [was usual] for tanning, it becomes tahor, except the skin of a human. Ulla said: According to Biblical law, if the skin of a man was tanned, it thereby becomes tahor, but for what reason did they say it remained tamei? As a precautionary measure lest a man make rugs out of the skin of his father and mother.

Now those who refer this [dictum of Ulla's] to the first clause will certainly refer it to the later cause,⁷ but those who refer it to the later clause [maintain that] in the first the tumah is by Biblical law.

The Mishnah had stated: The skin of the domestic pig etc. What is the issue between them? One⁸ is of the opinion that this⁹ is hard and only the other¹⁰ soft, whereas the other¹¹ maintains that this, too, is soft.

¹ The skins enumerated are thin and tender, and therefore with regard to the laws of uncleanness are regarded as flesh.

² I.e., the genital area of a female animal.

³ The Torah enumerated the eight unclean reptiles. In the case of these four mentioned, their skin is soft and is counted as the flesh.

⁴ Whose skin is hard and therefore not tumah.

⁵ The skins of these eight reptiles are quite separate from the flesh and cannot convey tumah.

⁶ Taken from a corpse. Human skin might have been preserved for sentimental reasons, or perhaps on grounds of utility.

⁷ For since the skin was tanned and its character thus altered, there would be no other reason why it should remain tamei, except this precautionary measure stated by Ulla.

⁸ The first Tanna.

⁹ The skin of a wild pig.

¹⁰ The skin of the domestic pig.

¹¹ Rabbi Yehudah.

The Mishnah had stated: The skin of the hump of a tender camel. How long is the camel regarded as tender? — Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: As long as it has not borne a burden.

Rabbi Yirmiyah inquired: What is the law [with regard to its skin] if it had reached the age for bearing burdens but had not actually borne any? Abaye inquired: What if it had actually borne burdens although it had not reached the age for it? — These questions remain unresolved.

Rish Lakish was once sitting and raised the question: How long is the camel considered tender? — Rabbi Yishmael ben Abba answered: So said Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: As long as it has not borne a burden. Whereupon he [Rish Lakish] said: Sit down opposite me.¹²

Rabbi Zeira was once sitting and raised the question: How long is the camel considered tender? — Ravin bar Chinena answered him: So said Ulla in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: As long as it has not borne a burden. He [Ravin] then repeated it over again, whereupon the other [Rabbi Zeira] said to him: It is the only thing you knew, and you have already told us it!

Come and see the difference between the imperious men of Eretz Yisroel and the pious men of Babylon!¹³

¹² As a token of his gratitude and as a mark of respect.

¹³ Rish Lakish who was of the powerful and imperious men of Eretz Yisroel treated his informant with courtesy and respect, whereas Rabbi Zeira, a Babylonian who was renowned for his piety treated his informant with disrespect and insult.

¹⁴ So that if it had passed its first year or if it had ceased to suckle within its first year it was no more tender.

¹⁵ Even though it had passed its first year.

¹⁶ That it must be in its first year and also continue to suckle.

The Mishnah had stated: The skin of the head [of a young calf]. How long is the calf considered tender? — Ulla said: Throughout its first year. Rabbi Yochanan said: As long as it suckles.

The question was raised: Did Ulla mean ‘throughout its first year,’ provided it still suckled,¹⁴ whereupon Rabbi Yochanan said to him: As long as it suckles;¹⁵ or Ulla meant ‘throughout its first year,’ whether it still was suckling or not, whereupon Rabbi Yochanan said to him: Throughout its first year and provided it was still suckling?’ — Come and hear: Rabbi Yochanan said: As long as it suckles. — Now if it were the case [that Rabbi Yochanan required both]¹⁶ he should have said, provided it still suckles. This proves it.

Rish Lakish inquired of Rabbi Yochanan: Can the skin of the head of a tender calf convey tumah or not? — He replied: It cannot. — But, said the other, you, our teacher have taught us: In the following cases the skin is considered as flesh: . . . the skin of the head of a tender calf. — He replied: Do not weary me [with your arguments], for I taught that [Mishnah] as the opinion of an individual.¹⁷ For it was taught: If a man slaughtered an olah purposing to burn an olive's bulk of its skin from under the fat tail at the improper place,¹⁸ the sacrifice is invalid, and he is not liable to the punishment of kares,

¹⁷ It accords with the individual opinion of Elozar ben Yehudah.

¹⁸ An intention, expressed during the slaughtering of a sacrifice, of performing a subsequent service improperly, can only invalidate the sacrifice if the proposed service relates to matters which are usually so served and performed. E.g., an intention, expressed during the slaughtering of the sacrifice, of eating at the improper time or place, such parts which are

but [if he purposed to burn it] at the improper time, it would be piggul, and he would be liable to the punishment of kares. Elozar ben Yehudah of Avlom stated in the name of Rabbi Yaakov, similarly Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah of Kefar Ikkum stated in the name of Rabbi Shimon: [If a man while slaughtering an olah intended to burn] either the skin around the hooves, or the skin of the head of a tender calf, or the skin from under the fat tail, or any of the skins¹⁹ enumerated by the Sages in connection with the law of tumah viz., in the following cases the skin is accounted as flesh, meaning to include the skin of the pudendum — at the improper place the sacrifice is invalid, and he is not liable to the punishment of kares; but at the improper time, it would be piggul, and he would be liable to the punishment of kares.

The Mishnah had stated: The skin around the hooves. What is the meaning of around the hooves? — Rav said: It means actually around the hooves. Rabbi Chanina said: It means the limb which is usually sold with the head.

The Mishnah had stated: The skin of the hanakah. Our Rabbis taught: 'The contaminated ones' includes their skins, which are to be regarded as their flesh. I might

not usually eaten, as the hide, does not invalidate the sacrifice. It is evident, therefore, that the skin from under the fat tail is regarded as edible inasmuch as the sacrifice is rendered invalid by the wrongful intention with regard to it.

¹⁹ This Tanna — Elozar ben Yehudah — is of the opinion that all the skins mentioned in our Mishnah are edible and therefore regarded as flesh, whereas the first Tanna (with whom Rabbi Yochanan is in agreement) considers only the skin under the fat tail as edible.

then say that this is so with regard to them all, the verse therefore states: these.

The Gemara asks: But doesn't the expression 'these' refer to all [reptiles mentioned]?

Rav said: The phrase: according to its kind interrupts the subject matter.

The Gemara asks: And why isn't the tinschemes also reckoned?

Rav Shmuel bar Yitzchak said: Rav is himself a Tanna and he [in his Mishnah] includes the tinschemes.

The Gemara asks: But why doesn't our Tanna [of our present Mishnah] include the tinschemes?

Rav Sheishes the son of Rav Idi said: Our Tanna agrees with Rabbi Yehudah that it depends upon the feel [of the skin],²⁰ but he differs with him about the feel of the [skin of the] letaah.²¹

The Mishnah had stated: If any of these skins was tanned etc. Only if trampled upon does it [become tahor], but if not trampled upon it does not [become tahor]; but Rabbi Chiya has taught [to the contrary], viz.,

²⁰ The Tanna of our Mishnah and Rabbi Yehudah (also mentioned in our Mishnah) do not form their views by the interpretation of the aforementioned verses but from practical observation. It depends entirely upon the feel of the skin. If the skin of the reptile feels soft and fleshy it is regarded as flesh, but if hard and scaly it is not regarded as flesh.

²¹ The skin of the letaah according to Rabbi Yehudah feels hard but according to the first Tanna it has the feel of flesh.

If a man patched up his basket with the ear of a donkey it becomes tahor!²² — If he patched up something with it, then it becomes tahor even though it had not been trampled upon; but if he had not patched up anything with it, then if trampled upon it does [become tahor], but if not trampled upon it does not [become tahor]. How much [trampling] would be sufficient for tanning? — Rav Huna said in the name of Rabbi Yannai: [The equivalent of a] four mils [distance]. Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rish Lakish: For kneading,²³ for prayer,²⁴ and for washing the hands,²⁵ the standard is four mils. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: It was Aivu who reported this and he mentioned four things, one of which was the trampling for tanning. Rabbi Yosi bar Rabbi Chanina said: This teaching applies only to the distance ahead of him, but [as for going] back he need not turn back even one mil. Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: From this [can be inferred that] a distance of one mil he need not turn back, but a distance of less than a mil he must turn back.

Our Rabbis taught: If a [Roman] legion which passes from place to place enters a house, the house is tamei, for there is not a legion that does not carry with it several scalps. And be not surprised at this; for Rabbi Yishmael's scalp was placed upon the head of kings.

DAILY MASHAL

How Rabbi Yishmael Became Impure for Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel

The Munkaczer Rebbe zt”l states that it is apparently a wonder as to how Rabbi Yishmael, the *kohen gadol*, made himself impure for his friend Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel when, as stated in the *kinos* (liturgical poems) about the ten holy *Tanaim* slain by the regime, he lifted Rabban Shimon’s head and mourned for him. However, there’s really no question. First of all, everyone becomes impure for a *nasi* – the leader of the generation (see *Shulchan ‘Aruch*, Y.D. 374:11). Secondly, we should assume that the emperor killed them inside a building and not outdoors. As such, Rabbi Yishmael already became impure because of the *ohel* and he added no impurity when he touched Rabban Shimon’s head (*Kuntres ‘al HaTzadikim*, p. 28).

²² The donkey's ear becomes tahor as soon as it serves as skin even though it has not been treated in any way for tanning and not even trampled upon.

²³ A person who undertakes, for reward, to knead the dough of an owner in conditions of taharah, and the owner's vessels are tumah, must go even a distance of four miles, if that is the nearest mikvah, in order to immerse the vessels, but no further.

²⁴ A person who is on the road and wishes to rest for the night, and knows of a Synagogue not more than four mils away, must continue his journey till he reaches that Synagogue in order to pray there.

²⁵ Before meals. If a person knows that he can obtain water a distance of four mils away, he must wait until he reaches it before making a meal.