



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

Tumah

Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri said: My opinion can be supported through the following *kal vachomer*: If the carcass of a bird can convey severe *tumah* (for when it is swallowed, the person and his utensils become *tamei*) even without intention (to use it as a food), should it not be able to convey light *tumah* (to contaminate foods and beverages) even without intention (to use it as a food)? They replied to him: No! In the case of severe *tumah* it is so, for it does not go down to this (necessity for intention).

The *Gemora* asks: What is the meaning that “it does not go down to this (necessity for intention)”?

Rava answers: They were responding to him as follows: No! In the case of severe *tumah* it is so (that it does not need intention), for it cannot cause a *tumah* (to a person) to be like it (for the person, upon swallowing the carcass of a bird, becomes a *rishon l'tumah*, and the *halachah* is that a person can only become *tamei* from an *av hatumah*); would you also maintain it (that it does not need intention) in the case of a light *tumah*, which does cause *tumah* to be like it (for food, upon becoming *tamei* from a *neveilah*, can transmit *tumah* to another food and render it a *sheini* – at least on a Rabbinical level)?

Abaye said to him: Shouldn't this (that it does not require intention) apply to the case of a light *tumah* with even more reason: If a severe *tumah*, concerning which the law has been lenient - in that it does not cause a *tumah* (to a person) to be like it, nevertheless, it conveys *tumah* in the absence of intention; how much more then should a light *tumah*, concerning which the law has been stringent - in that it does cause *tumah* to be like it, convey *tumah* even where there was no intention!?

Rather, said Rav Sheishes, It is this that they were arguing: No! In the case of severe *tumah*, which need not be rendered susceptible (through a liquid in order to convey *tumah*, for the carcass of a bird can transmit *tumah* immediately after its death); would you also maintain it in the case of a light *tumah*, which does require to be rendered susceptible (for if the bird was not “prepared” with a liquid, it cannot transmit *tamei* to foodstuffs)!?

The *Gemora* asks: But is it required to be rendered susceptible? Have we not in fact learned in a *Mishna*: Three things have been said about the carcass of a kosher bird:

1. It is necessary that it should be intended for food;
2. it conveys *tumah* through the throat only (while it is being swallowed);
3. there is no need for it to be rendered susceptible. [So why does Rav Sheishes say that it needs to be rendered susceptible in order to convey *tumah*?]

The *Gemora* answers: Granted that it (the bird) is not required that a *sheretz* shall render it susceptible (to become *tamei* with food *tumah*), it is nevertheless necessary that it shall be rendered susceptible by means of water (it must be moistened with any of the seven liquids; and therefore, it requires intention as well).

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it not required that a *sheretz* shall render it susceptible? Presumably, it is because of that which was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael; but then, there should be no need for it to be rendered susceptible by means of a liquid as well, based on that which was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael, for the School of Rabbi Yishmael taught the following *braisa*: upon any edible seeds that will be planted. This teaches us that preparation is needed only for things like seeds, which will never have severe *tumah* (to contaminate people or utensils), but anything that will convey severe *tumah*, such as the carcass of a kosher bird, is excluded, and will not require preparation!

Rather, replied Rava, or as some say Rav Pappa, the reference (*in the Rabbis' argument*) is to a severe *tumah* in general, and to a light *tumah* in general (*and not to the tumah from a bird*). [Accordingly, *the Rabbis argued as follows: We cannot derive that the light tumah of a neveilah bird should not require preparation from its severe tumah which doesn't require intention either; there might, however, be an exception by light tumah that it does require intention, and perhaps, even by the carcass of a bird, where it does not require any preparation.*]

Rava said: Rabbi Yochanan (*who maintains that it is not halachically regarded as intention for tumah when it occurred while the produce is still attached to the ground*), however, agrees in regard to *ma'aser* (*tithes*) that intention concerning attached produce (*that he decided that it should not be used for animal feed, but rather, for human consumption*) is a valid intention.

Rava explained: From where do I derive this? It is from that which we learned in the following *Mishna*: Pennyroyal, hyssop and savory that are grown in a courtyard, if they are kept under watch, are subject to *ma'aser*. Now, what are the circumstances of the case? It cannot be suggested that these herbs were originally planted for human consumption, for if so, was it at all necessary to express such a law? Consequently, the circumstances must be such that the herbs were originally planted for animal food, and yet it was stated that if they are kept under watch, they are subject to *ma'aser* (*even though the redesignation intention occurred while the produce was attached to the ground*).

Rav Ashi disagreed by stating that the *Mishna* is dealing with a courtyard in which the herbs grew spontaneously, so that as a rule they are destined for human consumption, and the following is what was meant: If the courtyard affords protection for the produce it grows, the herbs are subject to *ma'aser*; otherwise, they are exempt (*because they are ownerless*).

Rav Ashi asked on Rava from a *Mishna*: Whatever is subject to *ma'aser* is susceptible to food *tumah*. Now, if it were so (*that intention to use attached produce for human consumption is effective with regard to ma'aser*), would there not be the case of these (*herbs, planted for the purpose of producing animal food, concerning which the grower reconsidered while they were still attached to the ground, and decided to use the crop as food for*

human consumption), which are liable to *ma'aser*, and yet do not become susceptible to the *tumah* of food?

Rava answers: The *Mishna* means that any species that is liable to *ma'aser* is susceptible to food *tumah*.

Rava continued: This is also logically sound, for in the latter clause of that *Mishna*, it was stated: Whatever is subject to the law of the first of the fleece (*from sheep*) is also subject to that of the *Kohanic* gifts (*the right foreleg, the jaws and the abomasum given from slaughtered cattle*), but there is something (*such as cattle*) that is subject to the law of the *Kohanic* gifts and is not subject to that of the first of the fleece. Now, if it were so (*that the Mishna means to include all specific cases; not only a certain type of species*), the question could be asked: Is there not also the case of the *tereifah* (*an animal with a physical defect that will cause its death; it is forbidden to be eaten even if it was slaughtered properly*) which is subject to the law of the first of the fleece and yet is not subject to that of the *Kohanic* gifts?

Ravina replied that this is not a valid proof, for this represents the view of Rabbi Shimon, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon exempts the *tereifah* from the law of the first of the fleece.

Rav Shimi bar Ashi said that a proof can be brought for Rava's opinion from the following *braisa*: If a man declares his vineyard *hefker* and rises early on the following morning and picks his fruit, he is obligated in *peret* (*one or two grapes that fall off from the cluster during the cutting, which must be left for the poor*), *oleilos* (*a small, underdeveloped cluster of grapes*), *shich'chah* (*one or two vines which were forgotten while harvesting are left for the poor*) and *pe'ah* (*leaving over a corner of the field for the poor*); but he is exempt from giving *ma'aser*. [The *Ra"n* in *Nedarim* explains: *Normally, ownerless crops are exempt from all of these; however, since in all these (excluding ma'aser) the Torah uses an extra expression of abandoning (ta'azov), it is inferred that the obligation applies in any case where he is keeping them for himself. But since there is no extra expression by ma'aser, there is no distinction between a case where others harvest it or if he himself harvests it; there is still no obligation for ma'aser.*] And yet, we have learned in a *Mishna*: Whatever is subject to *pe'ah* is subject to *ma'aser*? Evidently, it is a proof that the *Mishna* is referring only to the species (*and not to all individual cases*). This indeed is a proof.

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* taught elsewhere: The Sages agree with Rabbi Akiva that if a man planted dill or mustard seed in two or three different spots (*in a field*), he must give *pe'ah* from each (*for they are regarded as separate fields*). Now, dill, surely, since it is liable to *pe'ah* is also liable to *ma'aser*, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: Whatever is subject to the obligation of *pe'ah* is also subject to that of *ma'aser*; and since it is liable to *ma'aser* it is also susceptible to food *tumah*. It is accordingly evident that anything that is used for flavor is susceptible to food *tumah*, since dill is used for flavor. But is not this contradicted by the following *Mishna*: Costus, pyrethrum and the principal spices, pennyroyal, *chiltis*, pepper and loaves of safflower may be bought with *ma'aser sheini* money (*for they are regarded as food*), but they are not susceptible to food *tumah*; these are the words of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri said to him: If they may be bought with *ma'aser sheini* money, why are they not susceptible to food *tumah*? And if they are not susceptible to food *tumah*, they should not be bought with *ma'aser sheini* money! And in connection with this Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri stated: A vote was taken and they decided that these are not to be bought with *ma'aser sheini* money and that they are not susceptible to food *tumah*!?

Rav Chisda replied: When that *Mishna* was taught (*that dill is not subject to pe'ah*), the reference was to dill intended as an ingredient of a *kutach* dip.

Rav Ashi said: I submitted the following argument before Rav Kahana: Do not say that when Rav Chisda said that the reference was to dill intended as an ingredient of a *kutach* dip, from which it would follow that generally it is used for flavor, but rather that dill is generally intended as an ingredient of a *kutach* dip, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: Dill, as soon as it has imparted some flavor to a dish of food, it is no longer subject to the restrictions of *terumah*, and it is no longer susceptible to food *tumah*. We can infer from there that before it had imparted any flavor to a dish, it is subject to the restrictions of *terumah* and is susceptible to food *tumah*. Now, if it should enter your mind that as a rule it is used for flavoring, the question be asked: Even if it had not imparted any flavor to a dish, should it not be free from the restrictions of food, since as a rule it is used for flavor? Must you not then infer from this that generally it is used as an ingredient of a *kutach* dip? This indeed is conclusive. (50b – 51b)

DAILY MASHAL

Less than Three Weeks !!!

The trip is about to end and immediately start anew. From afar we hear echoes of the gigantic convoy that has been marching on for over seven years. The peak is already in view, where a workforce toils to prepare the festive *siyum* in honor of the important guests who are returning to take-off point, to make a new departure. You look at the Daf HaYomi learners and you know, with all your very being, that hidden within each one of them is the fierce will-power to persevere - one more day, another week, another month, another chapter and another tractate. Will-power is our specialty, the secret of our existence.

This week we assemble a few interesting letters, some received recently and others that have patiently awaited their big day, such as this one:

Everyone Can

To Meoros HaDaf HaYomi:

I am the grandson of a great *talmid chacham* from Bnei Berak whose advice is sought by many. On a simmering summer day I was at his home when someone knocked at the door. He was sweating and breathing heavily. Judging by his appearance, he had an urgent matter to discuss.

"How can I help you?"

"I want to ask the Rav a question."

He entered. "*Kvod HaRav*, our *magid shiur* for the Daf HaYomi told us a *chidush* in your name and I have a question..."

I was speechless. I came to realize what great influence Daf HaYomi has on all kinds of people, to such a degree that he troubled to come on a sweltering afternoon 'just' to ask a question.

Wishing you much success and Heavenly blessings, A.Y.S.

Never Too Late

To Meoros HaDaf HaYomi:



Thank you... In my youth I learnt at the Tifrach Yeshivah. There I became familiar with a person who was far from any link with Torah study. One day he resolved to start learning *Shas*. He was 80 years old! His face began to shine and he became a different person. When meeting a student of the yeshivah, he would converse with him in learning and if in the past his connection with Torah summed up to purchasing an *'aliyah* for the *rav* to the success of some sports team... now he truly began to enjoy learning. After a while he moved to Petach Tikvah and when he reached the age of 83½, he finished the *Shas* and held a *siyum* in the synagogue.

Be strong and courageous,
Moshe Shachar, Bnei Berak

Thanks to the Person Who Hung the Notice

To Meoros HaDaf HaYomi:

The current Daf HaYomi cycle began on the eve of Rosh HaShanah 5758. After *ma'ariv* on Rosh HaShanah I left the synagogue and a small notice caught my attention: "He who began to learn the Daf HaYomi seven and a half years ago is now making a *siyum haShas*!!!" The words thundered in my heart. "What's with you?" I asked myself. "You don't want to finish *Shas*?" After all, that's everyone's ambition. I considered the matter during the *se'udah* and decided to begin learning the Daf HaYomi. Immediately after *birkas hamazon* I took a tractate Berachos, went to the synagogue and began to learn. *Baruch Hashem*, although I sometimes encountered difficulties, I succeeded in overcoming them. I've "grown up" and been through a lot since then and now I stand with everyone, full of great joy and pride at the approaching *siyum haShas* and want to greatly thank the anonymous person who hung the small notice.

With much thanks, B.Y.

The Youngest Magid Shi'ur

We proceed to an item from a collection of interesting information on the subject of Daf HaYomi sent by a faithful reader from Yerushalayim, Rav Z.G.

"Aside from being gifted with brilliant talent, Rav Gedalyah Shor was blessed with an effervescent thirst for Torah and, combined

with ever-increasing diligence, he absorbed his wealth of knowledge in *Shas* and *poskim*. When the founding of Daf HaYomi was announced at the first Knessiah Gedolah, he was 12 years old and he joined in the public learning of the Daf, in addition to his regular lessons. **At the age of 15 he already delivered the *shi'ur* with excellence.** When HaGaon Rabbi Meir Shapira zt"l visited the U.S.A. and got to know him, he excitedly testified that he had the best head in America.