



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

MISHNAH. If a man was flaying cattle or wild animals, tahir or tamei,<sup>1</sup> small or large, in order to use the hide for a spread,<sup>2</sup> [the hide] is regarded as a connective [with the flesh] in respect of tumah, for the flesh to contract tumah or convey tumah, until so much [of the] hide has been flayed sufficient to grasp;<sup>3</sup> if [it was being flayed] for a flask,<sup>4</sup> until the breast has been flayed;<sup>5</sup> if it was being flayed from the feet upwards,<sup>6</sup> until the whole hide [has been flayed]. As for the skin that is on the neck, Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri does not regard it as a connective,<sup>7</sup> but the sages do regard it as a connective until the whole hide has been flayed.

GEMARA. What is the law when more than this<sup>8</sup> [has been flayed]? — Rav said: That which has already been flayed is tahir;<sup>9</sup> Rav Assi said: The handbreadth nearest to the flesh is tamei.<sup>10</sup>

An objection was raised: If a man had flayed this extent, henceforth whoever touches that which has already been

flayed is tahir. Presumably [this is so] even [if he touches] the handbreadth nearest to the flesh? — No, except for the handbreadth nearest to the flesh.

Come and hear: [Whoever touches] the skin opposite the flesh is tamei. [That is, presumably whoever touches] the skin opposite the flesh only is tamei, but [whosoever touches the skin in] the handbreadth nearest to the flesh is tahir! — This Tanna expresses the handbreadth nearest to the flesh by the term ‘the skin opposite the flesh’.

Come and hear: If a man flayed cattle or wild animals, tahir or tamei, small or large, in order to use the hide for a spread, [and he flayed] so much [of the hide] as sufficient to grasp, [it does not serve as a connective], and the handbreadth nearest to the flesh is tahir! — That refers to the first handbreadth.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Either the animal was tahir (i.e., of the species fit for food, and also slaughtered ritually), or the animal was tamei (i.e., a nonkosher animal); the Gemara will amend this understanding.

<sup>2</sup> For this purpose the hide was slit the whole length of the animal and flayed on both flanks, the result being one large sheet of hide.

<sup>3</sup> Until this much has been flayed that portion which has actually been flayed is not regarded as entirely disconnected from the flesh but rather as a ‘handle’ which conveys tumah to and from the flesh. Once this extent has been flayed the hide is regarded as disconnected and can no longer serve as a handle.

<sup>4</sup> For this purpose the hide was not slit lengthwise but was cut around the neck and flayed whole from the animal so as to form a receptacle to hold liquids.

<sup>5</sup> The breast is the most difficult part of the operation of flaying for the hide adheres fast there and, therefore, so long as the region of the

breast has not been flayed that which has already been flayed serves as a connective or ‘handle’ to the flesh.

<sup>6</sup> In this manner of flaying, the region around the breast is the last important section to be flayed, although there yet remains the skin around the neck to be flayed.

<sup>7</sup> It is negligible and soon falls away of itself by the weight of the rest of the hide, and therefore can no longer serve as a connective.

<sup>8</sup> Sc. as much as can be taken hold of; a handgrip.

<sup>9</sup> It does not convey tumah, but that which still adheres to the flesh serves as a ‘protection’ and conveys tumah to and from the flesh.

<sup>10</sup> The last handbreadth of the skin that had been flayed nearest to the flesh is tamei, i.e., it serves as a ‘handle’ to convey tumah to and from the flesh.

<sup>11</sup> Rav Assi admits that where only so much of the hide as can be taken hold of plus one handbreadth had been flayed the handbreadth



It was taught: How much is meant by 'so much as sufficient to grasp? — A handbreadth. But it was taught: Two handbreadths! — Abaye explained (The former Baraisa meant) a double handbreadth. And so it has been expressly taught: How much is 'so much as sufficient to grasp'. A double handbreadth.

We have learned elsewhere: If a man had begun to tear a garment<sup>12</sup> (which was tamei), so soon as the greater part of it is torn<sup>13</sup> the parts can no longer be deemed to be joined and it is tahor. Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: This [teaching] applies only to a garment which had been immersed that same day,<sup>14</sup> for since he did not shrink from immersing it, he likewise will not shrink from tearing the greater part of it; but it does not apply to a garment which had not been immersed that same day, for it is to be feared that he will not tear the greater part of it.

Thereupon Rabbah said: There are two objections to this argument. In the first place [it certainly cannot apply to a garment which had been immersed that same day], for people might say that immersion during the day is sufficient [to render an article tahor];<sup>15</sup> secondly, the same is to be feared in the case of the olah bird, according to the view of Rabbi Elozar son of Rabbi Shimon, namely that he will not divide the greater part of both pipes [of the throat]!<sup>16</sup> — Rav Yosef replied to him: As for your objection 'people might say

nearest to the flesh is not deemed a 'handle' for the amount flayed is too little to be made use of as a handle.

<sup>12</sup> In order to render it tahor by making it unfit for its former use.

<sup>13</sup> The original garment is now deemed to be destroyed and with it the tumah it bore, even though each part of the garment is of a substantial size.

<sup>14</sup> Ordinarily the garment by evening would be tahor, but this man desiring to use it immediately with tahor things sets about to tear it. Now since he has actually immersed it in the waters of a mikvah, an act which certainly does not improve the garment, he will have no hesitation in tearing the greater part of the garment.

<sup>15</sup> For those who saw the immersion of the article by day and later see it used that same day with tahor things, will be led to believe that immersion by itself renders an article tahor without the additional necessity of waiting until sunset of that day, for they might not be aware of the fact that the garment had been torn.

that immersion during the day is sufficient', [my answer is,] the tearing explains the position;<sup>17</sup> and as for your objection 'The same is to be feared in the case of an olah bird according to the view of Rabbi Elozar son of Rabbi Shimon', [my answer is,] Kohanim are most careful.<sup>18</sup>

Come and hear: If a man was flaying cattle or wild animals, tahor or tamei, small or large, in order to use the hide for a spread, [the hide] is regarded as a connective [with the flesh] in respect of tumah, for the flesh to contract tumah or convey tumah, until so much [of the] hide has been flayed sufficient to grasp, etc. Now if more than this had been flayed, it would be tahor, would it not? But why? Should we not apprehend that he will have flayed only so much as can be grasped, in which case [by touching the hide] he is [as it were] touching tumah, and yet we declare him to be tahor?

The Gemara answers: If it were a case of Biblical tumah this would indeed be so; but here we really speak of Rabbinical tumah.<sup>19</sup>

The Gemara asks: This is well in the case of an tamei person [flaying] a tahor animal, but in the case of a tahor person [flaying] a tamei animal, surely the tumah (of neveilah) is Biblical!

The Gemara answers: It refers to a tereifah animal.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> In sacrificing the olah bird the head had to be nipped off by the officiating Kohen, but not severed entirely; and according to the interpretation of Rabbi Elozar ben Rabbi Shimon, it means that he must divide the greater portion of each pipe and no more. Now is there not a similar apprehension in this case that the Kohen will not divide the greater portion of the pipes?

<sup>17</sup> The onlookers will know that it is the tearing of the garment that renders it tahor and not the immersion by itself.

<sup>18</sup> And do exactly what is required by law, neither more nor less.

<sup>19</sup> I.e., the ruling with regard to a tamei person flaying a tahor animal as stated in our Mishnah, refers to a person that was rendered tamei by enactment of the Rabbis and the animal spoken of was a consecrated animal. Accordingly we do not impose any further preventive measures by reason of such remote apprehensions.

<sup>20</sup> The reference in our Mishnah with regard to a tamei animal, really means an animal which was slaughtered and found to be tereifah.

The Gemara asks: And can a tereifah animal generate tumah?

The Gemara answers: Yes, as stated by Shmuel's father. For Shmuel's father stated: A tereifah animal that was slaughtered renders holy things tamei.<sup>21</sup>

Come and hear: Rabbi Dustai ben Yehudah says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: If a man was skinning sheratzim (reptiles), the skin is regarded as a connective until the whole has been removed. Now it follows, does it not, that in the case of a camel it is not regarded as a connective?<sup>22</sup>

The Gemara answers: Draw not the inference that in the case of a camel it is not regarded as a connective, but rather that in the case of a camel the skin that is on the neck is not regarded as a connective, and this accords with the opinion of Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri.<sup>23</sup>

Rav Huna said in the name of Rabbi Shimon son of Rabbi Yosi: This [teaching]<sup>24</sup> applies only to the case where he did not leave [untorn] a portion sufficient for an apron, but if he left [untorn] a portion sufficient for an apron, it [the garment] is deemed to be joined.

<sup>21</sup> A consecrated animal which was slaughtered and found to be tereifah renders tumah.

<sup>22</sup> As soon as the extent of a handgrip of the hide has been played. And there is no mention of any apprehension lest on account of this ruling, people might be led to believe that even when less than a handgrip had been played the hide is not to be regarded as a connective. This then conflicts with Rav Nachman's statement.

<sup>23</sup> This refers to the case where the man who flays the camel requires the hide for a flask, or where he flays it from the feet upwards; in either case, according to Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri, once the whole hide, with the exception of that which is on the neck, has been played, it can no longer be regarded as a connective, in contrast to the case of reptiles, for with reptiles even the skin around the neck is regarded as a connective. There is indeed here no ground at all to apply a preventive measure in apprehension lest he who flays the camel will not remove all the hide with the exception only of that which remains on the neck, in which case the hide would be a connective, for the standard has been clearly stated, namely, whether or not anything more than the skin of the neck remains, and this standard is a matter which is clearly

Rish Lakish said: This [teaching]<sup>25</sup> applies only to a garment, but in the case of leather, [what is left] is firm.<sup>26</sup> But Rabbi Yochanan said: Even in the case of leather, [what is left] is not firm.

Rabbi Yochanan raised an objection against Rish Lakish [from the following Mishnah]: If a hide had contracted midras<sup>27</sup> tumah, and a man had the intention to use it for straps and sandals, so soon as he puts the knife into it, it becomes tahor;<sup>28</sup> these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. But the Sages say: Not until he has reduced its size to less than five handbreadths. It follows, however, that if he had reduced its size [to less than five handbreadths] it would be tahor; but why? Surely, we should say, [what is left] is firm!

The Gemara answers: When do we say, [what is left] is firm, only in the case where the hide was cut with a straight cut, but here we must suppose that it was trimmed on all sides.<sup>29</sup>

Rabbi Yirmiyah raised an objection: If a man was flaying cattle or wild animals, tahor or tamei, small or large, in order to use the hide for a spread, [the hide] is regarded as a connective [with the flesh] in respect of tumah, for the flesh to contract

noticeable and ascertainable. On the other hand, the standard 'as much as can be grasped' is not so clearly defined and ascertainable; similarly, the difference between tearing the greater part of a garment and only half of it is also a matter not clearly discernible, accordingly in the latter two cases there is ground for a restrictive measure.

<sup>24</sup> That a garment is rendered tahor by tearing the greater part of it.

<sup>25</sup> That where there was not left untorn a portion sufficient for an apron the garment is rendered tahor.

<sup>26</sup> No matter how little it is, for it can be sewn together and used again for its original purpose.

<sup>27</sup> The degree of tumah arising when a certain tamei person sits or treads upon or leans with the body against an object, provided such object is fit and generally used for one of the above purposes.

<sup>28</sup> By putting the knife to it he has annulled it from its original use even though there are as yet substantial pieces left each five handbreadths square, this being the minimum size for leather to contract midras tumah

<sup>29</sup> Since there are irregular cuts on all sides, even if it is sewn together it will not hold firm.

tumah or convey tumah, until so much [of the] hide has been flayed sufficient to grasp, etc. Now if more than this had been flayed it would be tahor, would it not? But why? Surely we should say [that the residue of the hide that is attached to the carcass] is firm!

Rabbi Avin explained it, [that with regard to the hide,] each portion flayed is considered as fallen away.<sup>30</sup>

Rav Yosef raised an objection: As for the skin that is on the neck, Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri does not regard it as a connective.<sup>31</sup> But why? Surely it holds firm!<sup>32</sup>

Thereupon Abaye said to him: But read the next line: but the Sages do regard it as a connective until the whole hide has been flayed.<sup>33</sup> In fact, said Abaye, the point at issue between them<sup>34</sup> is concerning a protection that will soon fall away of its own accord:<sup>35</sup> one maintains that it is still a protection,<sup>36</sup> the other<sup>37</sup> that it is no protection.

Rabbi Yirmiyah raised an objection: If an oven<sup>38</sup> had become tamei how can one make it tahor again? One should divide it into three parts<sup>39</sup> and scrape off the plastering so that it<sup>40</sup> lies on the ground. Rabbi Meir says. One need not scrape off the plastering nor [see to it] that it lies on the ground, but one need only cut it down to less than four handbreadths high inside. It follows that if one did cut it down to less than four

handbreadths high it would be tahor; but why? Surely we should say that it stands firm!<sup>41</sup>

Thereupon Rava said to him: Why not rather quote the view of the Rabbis: One should scrape off the plastering so that it lies on the ground [in support]?

Rather, said Rava, this is the interpretation: If an oven had become tamei how can one make it tahor again? It is the unanimous opinion that one should divide it into three parts and scrape off the plastering so that it lies on the ground. And if one desires that the oven should not be susceptible to tumah what should one do? One should divide it into three parts and should scrape off the plastering so that it lies on the ground. Rabbi Meir says: One need not scrape off the plastering nor [see to it] that it lies on the ground, but one need only cut it down to less than four handbreadths high inside.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>30</sup> For it cannot by any means be made to adhere again to the flesh, whereas in the case of a garment it can be sewn together to hold fast.

<sup>31</sup> It is negligible and soon falls away of itself by the weight of the rest of the hide, and therefore can no longer serve as a connective.

<sup>32</sup> The skin on the neck still adheres to the flesh, nevertheless, Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri holds that whoever touches this skin (the animal being tamei) is not thereby rendered tamei; thus conflicting with Rish Lakish's view.

<sup>33</sup> And this would be in support of Rish Lakish's view.

<sup>34</sup> Sc. between the Sages and Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri in our Mishnah.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., the skin around the neck when all the rest of the hide has been removed.

<sup>36</sup> The Sages hold that so long as it has not fallen off it still serves as a protection and conveys tumah to and from the flesh.

<sup>37</sup> Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri.

<sup>38</sup> It usually consisted of an earthenware pot with no bottom, placed on the ground, and plastered on all sides with clay to hold it firm.

<sup>39</sup> So that no part thereof be more than half the size of the original oven.

<sup>40</sup> The plastering must be entirely demolished so that it in no way supports the parts of the oven.

<sup>41</sup> By reason of the plastering around it. This then conflicts with Rish Lakish who maintains that if only a portion of an article remains firm, although the rest of it is broken or torn, it is still considered an article.

<sup>42</sup> The dispute therefore between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis is only with regard to an oven which was not tamei, concerning the measures necessary in order to prevent it from ever becoming tamei.