



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

Serves as Wood

Abaye said: Behold they have said in a *braisa* that if a man especially set aside a block of leaven to be used as a seat, he has thereby nullified it (*and it no longer counts as chametz, and one may keep it for Pesach; as a seat, it would contract tumas moshav – if a zav or zavah sit on it, which is a case of a severe tumah*). The *tumah* is not decreed by Biblical law; for should you say so, then we should have a case of food being able to convey severe *tumah* (*which would contradict the principle taught above that foods that do not convey severe tumah require hechsher – the preparation to become tamei*).

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for it now serves as wood (*and not as food*). [*This is Rava’s principle, stated above, that something that serves as wood, although it conveys tumah, it nevertheless requires hechsher to transmit tumah as food.*]

Abaye said: Behold they (*Rabbi Yehudah ben Beseirah*) have said in a *braisa* that a sacrifice of food for idolatry makes someone in its tent impure. This *tumah* is not decreed by Biblical law; for should you say so, then we should have a case of food being able to convey severe *tumah*.

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for it now serves as wood (*and not as food*).

Abaye said: Behold they have stated that food that is connected to vessels are like the vessels themselves (*and, if, for example, pieces of dough are lodged in the cracks of the kneading vessels, they are regarded as part of the vessel and, if something tamei comes into contact with them, the vessel is rendered tamei*). This *tumah* is not decreed by Biblical law; for should you say so, then we should have a case of food being able to convey severe *tumah*.

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for it now serves as wood (*and not as food*).

Rav Pappa said to Rava: Regarding that which has been taught in a *braisa*: The *cheilev* (*forbidden fat*) of a *neveilah* (*carcass of a kosher animal – which does not convey tumas neveilah*) in the villages (*where, due to the limited amount of people, the cheilev will only be regarded as food if the owner plans to feed it to a non-Jew*), needs the intention (*to be used as food*) and also needs preparation to be made susceptible to *tumah*. I say that the *tumah* that the fat conveys by reason of the kidney (*which protrudes into the cheilev, and acts as a shomer*) is not decreed by Biblical law; for should you say so, then we should have a case of food being able to convey severe *tumah*.

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for it now serves as wood (*and not as food*).

Rav Masneh said: Behold they have spoken of a house roofed with seeds (*that were in stalks*), the *tumah* (of the seeds) are rendered *tahor* (for they are not a food any longer, but rather – a roof). [They now can become *tamei* with *tzaraas tumah* along with the rest of the house.] This *tumah* is not decreed by Biblical law; for should you say so, then we should have a case of food being able to convey severe *tumah*.

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for it now serves as wood (*and not as food*). (129a)

Rabbi Shimon

Rabbi Shimon (*in the Mishna*) stated that the dangling flesh and limb of an animal that died is *tahor*. The *Gemora* asks: But whichever view you take it is difficult: If at death (*not through shechitah*) the limb is considered as already fallen off (*beforehand*), then it should be *tamei* as a limb severed from a living creature, and if at death it is not considered as already fallen off, then it should be *tamei* as a *neveilah!*?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon refers to the first ruling of the *Mishna*, which reads: Limbs or pieces of flesh which dangle from a living creature are *tamei* in respect of food *tumah* while they are in their place, and require preparation to be rendered susceptible to *tumah*. But Rabbi Shimon declares them *tahor*.

Rav Assi quotes Rabbi Yochanan who explains that Rabbi Shimon says that only food that can be eaten can become impure, since the verse says that “food, which is eaten,...will become impure”. Since a *minchah* which one planned to eat improperly is prohibited from any benefit, it is not eaten by anyone, and Rabbi Shimon would say it cannot become impure.

Rabbi Zeira said to Rav Assi: Perhaps the reason for Rabbi Shimon’s view there is that since it is attached, it is attached (*and as long as it is joined to the living animal, however slender the attachment may be, it is still regarded as part of a living creature, and as such cannot become tamei*)? The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna*’s ruling that Rav Assi explained like that.

Rav Assi agrees and states that Rabbi Yochanan was referring to the middle clause of the *Mishna*, which reads as follows: if the animal was slaughtered, the dangling limb and flesh become susceptible to *tumah* through the animal’s blood; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Shimon says: They have not become susceptible to *tumah*. Rabbi Yochanan said: What is the reason for Rabbi Shimon’s view? It is because only food that can be eaten can become impure, since the verse says that “food, which is eaten,...will become impure”.

Rabbi Zeira asked: But perhaps the reason for Rabbi Shimon’s view there is that given by Rabbah or Rabbi Yochanan (*stated above on 127b - 128a*)?

Rav Assi answers that Rabbi Yochanan indeed is referring to the last clause, but Rabbi Shimon does not differ with regard to the dangling limb (*which he agrees is tamei*) but only with regard to the pieces of flesh. Thus, the *Mishna* should be understood as follows: if the animal died, the dangling flesh requires to be rendered susceptible to *tumah*. Rabbi Shimon declares it *tahor*. Rabbi Yochanan said: What is the reason for Rabbi Shimon’s view? It is because only food that can be eaten can become impure, since the verse says that “food, which is eaten,...will become impure”. (129a – 129b)

Mishna

Limbs or pieces of flesh which dangle from a person are *tahor*. If he died, the flesh is *tahor* (as if it fell off before his death), but the limb is *tamei* as a limb severed from the living body, but is not *tamei* as a limb severed from a corpse these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Shimon declares it *tahor*. (129b)

Severed Limbs

The *Gemora* asks: But whichever view you take it is difficult: If at death the limb is considered as already fallen off (*beforehand*), then it should be *tamei* as a limb severed from a living creature, and if at death it is not considered as already fallen off, then it should be *tamei* as a limb from a corpse!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon refers to the law in general (*of limbs from a corpse*), for the *Tanna Kamma* had stated: The limb (*from a corpse*) is *tamei* as a limb severed from the living body but is not *tamei* as a limb severed from a corpse. This clearly shows that the law in general is that a limb severed from a corpse is *tamei*; thereupon Rabbi Shimon said to him that in general a limb severed from a corpse is not *tamei*. The *Gemora* cites support for this from a *braisa*.

The *Gemora* asks: What difference is there between a limb severed from the living body (*that is tamei*) and a limb severed from a corpse?

The *Gemora* answers: The difference is with regard to an olive's volume of flesh or a barleycorn's volume of bone separated from a limb that was severed from a living person, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: If an olive's volume of flesh was separated from a limb that was severed from the living body, Rabbi Eliezer declares it

tamei; but Rabbi Nechunia ben Hakaneh and Rabbi Yehoshua declare it *tahor*. If a barleycorn's volume of bone separated from a limb that was severed from the living body. Rabbi Nechunia ben Hakaneh declares it *tamei*; but Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua declare it *tahor*.

The *Gemora* notes: Now that you have come to this, you can also say that the difference between the *Tanna Kamma* and Rabbi Shimon is with regard to an olive's volume of flesh or a barleycorn's volume of bone. (129b)

**WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU,
HA'OR V'HAROTEIV**

DAILY MASHAL

What Is Eagerness?

An acquaintance asked HaGaon Rabbi Chayim Shmuelevitz zt"l to do him a favor but he didn't do it for different reasons.

"You're lazy", he accused.

"You're making a mistake", replied Rabbi Chayim. "You think that *zerizus* - eagerness means always to do something but that's not true. Chazal said that *kohanim* are quick but this statement sometimes means that they are careful not to become impure (see Beitzah 18a). We thus see that sometimes *zerizus* means not to do something" (*Moach Velev*).