

## דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קכ"ג

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy &amp; Gold Edition • with Rashi

## THE SUGYA

We start off the daf by wrapping up the sugya of the four-mil shiur, clarifying who actually said this in the name of Reish Lakish and how it applies to different halachos. The Gemara brings down a fascinating ruling about a non-Jewish legion passing through a town, explaining why any house they enter becomes tamei under the halachos of ohel. From there, we move into a new Mishnah that deals with the halachos of connection (chibur) for tumah when someone is flaying an animal. The Mishnah teaches that the status of the hide depends on what the person is planning to make out of it, whether it is a carpet, a leather bottle, or a whole skin bag.

In the Gemara on the Mishnah, the Sages get into a beautiful shakla v'tarya about the exact shiur of "enough for a grasp" (k'dei achiza) and whether the flayed part of the hide is considered a handle (yad) to bring tumah to the rest of the meat. We see a major machlokes between Rav and Rabbi Assi on this point, with the Gemara bringing several challenges from different Braisos and a Tosefta to try and resolve the kasha. We also touch upon a sugya from Maseches Keilim regarding a torn cloak and whether we make a Rabbinic decree in certain cases.

*All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.*

## עמוד א' DAF 123A

## STATEMENT

אִיבּוֹ אָמְרָהּ, וְאַרְבַּעִי אָמַר בָּהּ, וְחֹדֶם מִינִיּוּהוּ עֲבוּדָהּ.

The Gemara clarifies: It was **Aivu** who **said this** statement in the name of Reish Lakish, and not Rabbi Abbahu, **and he said four** halachic rulings **regarding it**, regarding this measure of four mil, **and one of them** is the halacha of **tanning**, which is the ruling of our Mishnah that skins trodden upon for the time it takes to walk four mil are no longer considered flesh.

## STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסִי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא לְפָנָיו, אֲבָל לְאַחֲרָיו – אֶפִּילוּ מִל אֶחָד אֵינּוּ חוּזְרִים.

Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Chanina said: With regard to traveling for tefillah in a shul or for washing one's hands, **they only taught** that one must travel up to four mil **ahead of him**, in his direction of travel; **but behind him, even for one mil he does not** have to **turn back**.

## INFERENCE

רַב אַחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב אָמַר, וּמִינֵיהּ: מִל הוּא דְּאֵינּוּ חוּזְרִים, הָא פְּחוּת מִמִּיל – חוּזְרִים.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: **And from it**, from this statement, we can infer: It is specifically a full mil that he does not turn back, **but for less than a mil, he** must indeed **turn back**.

## BRAISA

תנו רבנן: ליגיון העובר ממקום למקום, ונכנס לבית – הבית טמא, שאין לה כל ליגיון וליגיון שאין לו כמה קרקפלין.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: In the case of a legion of non-Jewish soldiers that is passing from place to place, and one of them enters a house, the house is ritually tamei under the law of ohel, because you do not have any legion whatsoever that does not have several scalps of dead people that they carry with them for witchcraft.

#### EXPLANATION

ואל תתמה, שהרי קרקפלו של רבי ישמעאל מונח בראש מלכים.

And do not be surprised that they would do such a thing, for behold, the scalp of Rabbi Yishmael, after he was martyred by the Romans, was placed on the head of kings as a crown.

### משנה MISHNAH

#### MISHNAH

מתני' המפשית בבמה ובחיה, בטהורה ובטמאה, בדקה ובגסה – לשטיח, כדי אחיזה.

MISHNAH: One who flays an animal or a wild beast, whether a kosher animal or a non-kosher animal, whether a small animal or a large animal, if he is flaying it for the purpose of making a carpet, the hide remains connected to the flesh and is considered like flesh until he flays enough for a grasp.

#### MISHNAH

ולחמת – עד שיפשית את הקצה.

And if he is flaying it for a leather bottle, the hide remains connected until he flays the breast.

#### MISHNAH

המרגיל – כולו חבור לטומאה, ליטמא ולטמא.

One who flays from the feet upwards to make a whole skin bag, the entire hide is considered a connection for tumah, to become tamei from the flesh and to make other things tamei.

#### MISHNAH

עור שעל הצוואר – רבי יוחנן בן נורי אומר: אינו חבור, וחכמים אומרים: חבור עד שיפשית את כולו.

Regarding the hide that is on the neck when he has flayed everything else, Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri says: It is not considered a connection anymore, and the Sages say: It is still a connection until he flays the entirety of it.

### גמרא GEMARA

#### QUESTION

גמ' מפאן ואילך מאי?

**GEMARA:** We learned in the Mishnah that for a carpet, the hide is connected until he flays enough for a grasp. The Gemara asks: **From this point forward**, once he has flayed more than that measure, **what** is the status of the flayed hide?

ANSWER

אמר רב: טהור המופשט,

**Rav said:** The flayed part of the hide is completely **tahor**, because it no longer serves as a handle for the flesh.

ANSWER

רבי אסי אמר: טפח הסמוך לבשר טמא.

**Rabbi Assi said:** A tefach of the flayed hide **adjacent to the flesh** is **tamei**, because the flayer holds onto this part while flaying, so it serves as a handle.

OBJECTION

מיתיבי: המפשיט כשיעור הזה, מכאן ואילך, הנוגע במופשט טהור.

The Gemara **raises an objection** from a Braisa: **One who flays like this measure** of a grasp, **from this point forward**, one **who touches the flayed** part of the hide is **tahor**.

QUESTION

מאי לאו אפילו בטפח הסמוך לבשר?

**What, is it not** referring **even to the tefach adjacent to the flesh**, which would refute Rabbi Assi?

RESOLUTION

לא, לבר מטפח הסמוך לבשר.

The Gemara answers: **No**, the Braisa means the flayed hide **excluding the tefach adjacent to the flesh**.

OBJECTION

תא שמע: בעור שנגד הבשר – טמא.

**Come and hear** a challenge from another Braisa: If one touches **the hide that is opposite the flesh**, he is **tamei**.

INFERENCE

עור שנגד הבשר – טמא, הא בטפח הסמוך לבשר – טהור.

We deduce: It is only the **hide that is opposite the flesh**, meaning the attached hide, that is **tamei**, but the tefach adjacent to **the flesh** which is already flayed is **tahor**, which contradicts Rabbi Assi!

RESOLUTION

תנא: כל טפח הסמוך לבשר, עור שנגד הבשר קרי ליה.

The Gemara answers: The **Tanna** of that Braisa **calls the entire tefach adjacent to the flesh** 'the hide opposite the flesh', and therefore it is indeed tamei.

OBJECTION

תא שמע: המפשיט בפחמה ובחיה, בטהורה ובטמאה, בדקה ובגסה, לשטיח – כדי אחיזה, וטפח הסמוך לבשר – טהור.

Come and hear another challenge from a Tosefta: One who flays an animal or a wild beast, whether a kosher animal or a non-kosher animal, whether a small animal or a large animal, for a carpet, the hide is connected enough for a grasp, and the tefach adjacent to the flesh is tahor. This is a direct refutation of Rabbi Assi!

#### RESOLUTION

הכא במאי עסקינן? בטפח ראשון.

The Gemara answers: **With what are we dealing here? With the first tefach** that was flayed immediately after the measure of a grasp. In that case, it is tahor because he does not hold it.

#### BRAISA

תנא: כמה כדי אחיזה? טפח.

A Tanna taught in a Braisa: **How much is 'enough for a grasp'?** A tefach.

#### QUESTION

והא תניא: טפחיים!

The Gemara asks: **But behold, it was taught** in another Braisa that the measure is **two handbreadths**!

#### RESOLUTION

אמר אביי: טפח כפול.

Abaye said: There is no kasha; the first Braisa means **a folded tefach**, which is indeed two handbreadths of unfolded hide.

#### PROOF

תניא נמי הכי: כמה כדי אחיזה? טפח כפול.

The Gemara notes: **This was also taught** explicitly in a Braisa: **How much is 'enough for a grasp'?** A folded tefach.

### משנה MISHNAH

#### MISHNAH

תנו הָתָם: טְלִית שֶׁהִתְחִיל בָּהּ לְקוֹרְעָהּ, כִּיּוֹן שֶׁנִּקְרַע רֹבָהּ – שׁוֹב אֵינוֹ חֲבוּר, וּטְהוֹרָה.

We learned in a Mishnah there in Maseches Keilim: In the case of a cloak that one began to tear, once the majority of it is torn, it is no longer considered a connection, and the pieces are tahor from their previous tumah.

### גמרא GEMARA

#### STATEMENT

אמר רב נחמן אמר רבה בר אבוי: לא שנו אלא בטלית טבולת יום.

Rav Nachman said that Rabbah bar Avuha said: They only taught this with regard to a cloak that is a tevul yom, which was immersed in a mikvah and is waiting for sunset to become completely tahor.

#### EXPLANATION

דמיגו דלא חס עלה ואטבלה, לא חייס עלה וקרע לה רופה.

Since, because he did not spare it and immersed it despite the effort, he also does not spare it and actually tears the majority of it to destroy its vessel status.

#### EXPLANATION

אבל טלית שאינה טבולת יום – לא, גזירה דלמא לא אתי למיקרעה רופה.

But regarding a cloak that is not a tevul yom, no, we do not say it is tahor immediately when he begins tearing, as a Rabbinic decree lest he does not come to tear the majority of it and leaves it as a functional vessel.

#### OBJECTION

אמר רבה: שתי תשובות בדבר: חדא – שםא יאמרו טבילה בת יומא עולה, ועוד –

Rabbah said: There are two refutations to this explanation: One is that if we only allow this for a tevul yom, perhaps people will say that immersion on that very day is effective on its own to purify a broken vessel without waiting for sunset; and furthermore there is another objection.

עמוד ב' DAF 123B

#### OBJECTION

עולת העוף לרבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון ליגזר, דילמא לא אתי למעבד רוב שנים.

And regarding a bird burnt offering according to Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon, who says that pinching only a majority of the two simanim is required, let us make a Rabbinic decree against doing so, lest he will not come to do the pinching on a majority of the two simanim, but rather on only half of them!

#### ANSWER

אמר ליה רב יוסף: דקא אמרת גזירה שםא יאמרו טבילה בת יומא עולה – קרעה מוכיח עליה.

Rav Yosef said to him, to Rabba, in defense of Rabba bar Avuh: As for that which you said, that we should make a decree lest they say that immersion on that same day is effective to purify a garment, there is no concern, because its tear proves about it that it is pure because of the tear, and not because of the immersion.

#### ANSWER

ודקא אמרת, עולת העוף לרבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון ליגזר – כהנים זריזים הן.

And as for that which you said, that regarding a bird burnt offering according to Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon let us make a decree, there is no concern, because Kohanim are meticulous and careful in their avodah, so they will not make a mistake.

#### OBJECTION

תא שמע: המפשיט בפכהמה ובחיה, בטמאה ובטהורה, בדקה ובגסה, לשטיח – כדי אחיזה.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear** a challenge from our Mishnah: **One who flays a domesticated animal or a wild animal, an impure animal or a pure animal, a small animal or a large animal**, if he is flaying it **for the purpose of making a carpet**, the hide remains connected to the flesh to convey impurity **up to the measure of grasping**.

#### INFERENCE

הא יתר מכדי אחיזה – טהור, אמאי? ליגזר, די למא לא אתי למעבד אלא כדי אחיזה, וקא נגע בטומאה, וקא מטהרינן ליה!

We infer: **But** if he flayed **more than the measure of grasping**, it is pure. **Why** is this so? **Let us make a decree** that it remains impure, **lest he will not come to do more**, but rather only the measure of grasping, and he will touch the impurity of the carcass, **and we will mistakenly rule him pure!**

#### ANSWER

אי בטומאה דאורייתא – הכי נמי, הקא במאי עסקינן? בטומאה דרבנן.

The Gemara answers: **If** we were dealing **with Torah impurity**, indeed so, we would make a decree. But **here**, with what are we dealing? **With Rabbinic impurity**, and the Rabbis did not make a decree upon a decree.

#### OBJECTION

תינח טמא בטהורה, טהור בטמאה – טומאה דאורייתא היא!

The Gemara objects: This **works out well** if we are talking about an **impure** person flaying a **pure** animal, which is only Rabbinic. But if a **pure** person is flaying an **impure** animal, that is **Torah impurity!** Why is there no decree there?

#### ANSWER

בטרפה.

The Gemara answers: The Mishnah is dealing **with a treifah**, a pure animal that was slaughtered but found to be a treifah.

#### QUESTION

טרפה בת טמויי היא?

The Gemara asks: **Is a treifah capable of imparting impurity** after shechita?

#### ANSWER

אין, כדאבוה דשמואל, דאמר אבוה דשמואל: טרפה ששחטה מטמאה במוקדשין.

The Gemara answers: **Yes**, in accordance with the view of Shmuel's father, for Shmuel's father said: A treifah that one slaughtered imparts impurity by Rabbinic law if it was of consecrated animals.

#### OBJECTION

תא שמע: רבי דוסתאי בן יהודה משום רבי שמעון אומר: המפשיט בשרצים – חבור, עד שיפשיט את כולו.

**Come and hear** another challenge: Rabbi Dostai ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: One who flays creeping animals, the hide is considered a connection to the flesh until he flays all of it.

#### INFERENCE

## הא בגמל – אינו חבור.

We infer: **But in** the case of a **camel** carcass, once he flays past the measure of grasping, **it is not a connection**, and we do not decree otherwise.

### ANSWER

לא תימא הא בגמל אינו חבור, אלא אימא: בעור שעל הצואר אינו חבור, ורבי יוחנן בן נורי היא.

The Gemara rejects this: **Do not say** that the inference is: **But in** the case of a **camel** it is **not a connection**. Rather, say that the inference is: **With the hide that is on the neck, it is not a connection**, and **this is** in accordance with the view of Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri.

### STATEMENT

אמר רב הונא משום רבי שמעון ברבי יוסי: לא שנו אלא שלא שייר בה כדי מעפורת, אבל שייר בה כדי מעפורת – חבור.

Rav Huna said in the name of Rabbi Shimon son of Rabbi Yosei: They only taught that a torn garment is pure when he did not leave over in it an untorn part the size of a scarf; but if he left over in it an untorn part the size of a scarf, it is still considered a **connection** and remains impure.

### STATEMENT

אמר ריש לקיש: לא שנו אלא טלית, אבל עור – חלים.

Reish Lakish said: They only taught that tearing purifies it regarding a **garment**, but a **hide** heals and can be easily repaired, so it remains impure.

### STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אפילו עור נמי לא חלים.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Even a **hide** also does not heal so easily, and therefore it becomes pure.

### OBJECTION

איתיביה רבי יוחנן לריש לקיש: עור טמא מדרס, חישוב עליו לרצועות וסנדלים – כיון שננתן בו איזמל טהור, דברי רבי יהודה.

Rabbi Yochanan challenged Reish Lakish from a Mishnah: In the case of a **hide** that is **impure** with **midras-impurity**, and he planned to use it for straps and sandals, once he places a scalpel into it, it is pure; these are the words of Rabbi Yehuda.

### STATEMENT

וחכמים אומרים: עד שימעיטנו מחמשה טפחים.

And the Sages say: It is not pure until he reduces it to less than five handbreadths.

### INFERENCE

כי ממעיט ליה מיקא טהור, אמאי? לימא חלים!

In any event, when he reduces it, at least, it is pure. Why? Let us say it heals and can be repaired!

#### ANSWER

כִּי קָאָמְרִי דַחֲלִים, הֵיכָא דְקָא צָרִי לִיהּ לְהִדָּא, הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינַן – בְּמַקְצֵעַ וּבָא לֹו דְרָרָה סְבִיבוּתֵיּוּ.

The Gemara answers: **When they say that it heals, that is where he cuts it straight**, but **here, with what are we dealing?** **With one who shaves and cuts it all around** in a circular fashion, which cannot be repaired.

#### OBJECTION

מֵתִיב רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה: הַמְּפָשִׁיט בְּבִהְמָה וּבַחֲתָה, בְּטָהוֹרָה וּבְטָמְאָה, בַּדָּקָה וּבַגָּסָה, לְשִׁטִּיחַ כְּדֵי אַחֲיָזָה –  
הָא יֵתֵר מִכְּדֵי אַחֲיָזָה טָהוֹר, וְאַמַּאי? לֵימָא חֲלִים!

Rabbi Yirmiyah challenged: **One who flays a domesticated animal or a wild animal, a pure animal or an impure animal, a small animal or a large animal, for a carpet, up to the measure of grasping** is a connection. **But** if he flayed **more than the measure of grasping, it is pure. Why?** **Let us say it heals and reconnects!**

#### ANSWER

תַּרְגֻּמָּה רַבִּי אָבִין: רֹאשׁוֹן רֹאשׁוֹן עוֹשֶׂה נִפְוֹל.

Rabbi Avin explained it: **As each part is flayed, it falls away and hangs down**, so it cannot heal back.

#### OBJECTION

מֵתִיב רַב יוֹסֵף: עוֹר שֶׁעַל הַצְּנוֹאֵר, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי אוֹמֵר אֵינוֹ חֵבּוּר. אַמַּאי? הָא חֲלִים וְקָאִי!

Rav Yosef challenged: **Regarding the hide on the neck, Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri says it is not a connection. Why?** **But it heals and stands** in place!

#### ANSWER

אָמַר לִיהּ אָבִי: אֵימָא סִיפָא, וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים: חֵבּוּר.

Abaye said to him: **Say the latter clause: And the Sages say it is a connection** because it heals!

#### ANSWER

אָלָא אָמַר אָבִי: בְּשׁוּמֵר הָעֶשְׂוִי לְנִתְק מֵאֲלִיו קָא מִיפְלָגִי, מָר סָבַר: הָוִי שׁוּמֵר, וּמָר סָבַר: לָא הָוִי שׁוּמֵר.

Rather, Abaye said: **It is not about healing; rather, they argue about a protector that is destined to detach on its own.** **One Master holds: It is considered a protector, and one Master holds: It is not considered a protector.**

#### OBJECTION

מֵתִיב רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה: תַּנּוּר שֶׁנִּטְמָא כִּיצַד מְטַהְרִין אוֹתוֹ? חוֹלְקוּ לְשִׁלְשָׁה, וְגוֹרֵר אֶת הַטִּפִּילָה

Rabbi Yirmiyah challenged: **An oven that became impure, how do we purify it?** **One divides it into three parts, and scrapes off the plaster coating.**

#### SUMMARY

The daf begins by identifying Aivu as the one who transmitted the four-mil rulings of Reish Lakish, including the halacha of tanning, and notes the distance one must travel for tefillah or netilas yadayim. After discussing the tumah of a house entered by a military legion, the Mishnah outlines how much of a hide remains connected to the flesh for tumah purposes based on

the owner's intent: for a carpet, it is "enough for a grasp"; for a leather bottle, until the breast; and for a skin bag, the entire hide. The Gemara debates the status of the flayed hide, with Rav ruling it tahor and Rabbi Assi arguing that a tefach adjacent to the flesh remains tamei as a handle, a view the Gemara challenges using various Braisos. Finally, the Gemara transitions into a discussion of a torn cloak's tumah status, debating Rav Nachman's view that a distinction is made for a tevul yom, which Rabbah refutes with several strong objections.

## למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara brings a beautiful yeshivish discussion about a cloak that was torn. Rav Nachman tells us that if a person went through the trouble to immerse a tamei cloak in the mikvah, we can trust that when he starts tearing it, he is really going to go all the way and tear the majority of it to make it tahor. Why? Because we see his ratzon. Since he didn't spare the effort to immerse it, we know he is serious about the taharah, so he won't hold back from tearing it completely.

This is a deep yesod in our own avodas Hashem. Sometimes we start a mitzvah, a kabbalah, or a new seder in learning, and the yetzer hara whispers, "What's the point? You're only doing a little bit, you'll never finish it anyway." But the Torah is mechadesh here that when a Yid shows a real, active desire, when you take that first step and make the effort to "immerse" yourself in a spiritual goal, it has the power to carry you through to the end. Your initial ratzon and effort are not just a temporary start; they create a momentum that defines where you are headed.

Today, don't worry about how you will finish the entire task. Just make that first real, energetic effort in your learning or your davening. Show Hashem that you are serious about your taharah, and that ratzon will give you the koach to complete it.