

דף יומי • חליון • דף קכ"ח

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

THE SUGYA

We start off the daf by diving deeper into the machlokes between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon from our Mishnah regarding a dangling limb. The Gemara is bothered by a contradiction from a Mishnah in Tevul Yom, where the positions of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon seem to be reversed. To resolve this kasha, the Gemara brings down several different terutzim, with Rabbi Yochanan, Rava, Rav Pappa, Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika, and Rav Ashi each offering a different way to understand the underlying dispute of our Mishnah.

After settling the machlokes in our Mishnah, the Gemara moves into a beautiful series of she'eilos raised by the Amoraim regarding the halachos of "yad" (a handle) for tumah. We explore whether an animal during its lifetime can serve as a handle for its dangling limb, and whether a tahor part of a plant can serve as a handle for its tamei counterpart. The Gemara brings proofs and challenges from various mishnayos and braisos, including cases of a perforated pot, a gourd used for avodah zarah, and a split fig branch.

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

עמוד א' DAF 128A

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רבי מאיר אומר: אם אוּחַז בְּקֶטֶן וְגָדוֹל עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ – הֵרִי הוּא כְּמוֹהוּ, וְאִם לֹא – אֵינוֹ כְּמוֹהוּ.

The Mishnah in Tevul Yom says that **Rabbi Meir says: If a person grasps the small piece of food and the large piece ascends with it, then it is like it**, meaning they are considered one single piece of food; **but if not, it is not like it**. This contradicts Rabbi Meir's view in our Mishnah that a dangling limb is considered connected even if the body does not lift up with it.

גמרא GEMARA

RESOLUTION

ואמר רבי יוחנן: מוחלפת השיטה.

And Rabbi Yochanan said to resolve this kasha: **The system is reversed** in the Mishnah in Tevul Yom, and it is actually Rabbi Shimon who requires the larger piece to ascend with the smaller one, while Rabbi Meir holds they are connected even if it does not ascend.

QUESTION

ומאי קושיא? דילמא שני ליה לרבי מאיר בין טבול יום לשאר טומאות.

The Gemara asks: **And what is the difficulty** that forced Rabbi Yochanan to switch the names? **Perhaps Rabbi Meir distinguishes between** the light tumah of a **tevil yom**, where we are more lenient and require a stronger connection, **and other** more severe **tumos**, where we are more stringent and consider even a weak connection sufficient?

PROOF

תנא, רבי אומר: אחד טבול יום ואחד שאר טומאות.

The Gemara answers: **It was taught** in a braisa, **Rabbi says: Both** regarding a **tevil yom** and regarding **other tumos**, the laws of connection and contact are the same.

QUESTION

ודילמא, לרבי לא שני ליה, ולרבי מאיר שני ליה?

The Gemara asks: **But perhaps to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi it is not different**, but to Rabbi Meir it is different, and Rabbi Meir indeed makes this distinction?

RESOLUTION

אמר רבי יאשיה, הכי אמר רבי יוחנן: לדברי רבי מוחלפת השיטה.

Rabbi Yoshiyah said, this is what Rabbi Yochanan meant to say: According to the words of Rabbi, who does not distinguish between them, **the system is reversed**, and Rabbi Yochanan was explaining the sugya according to Rabbi's view.

STATEMENT

רבא אמר: ביש יד לטומאה, ואין יד להכשר, קמיפלגי.

Rava said a different teretz for the dispute in our Mishnah: **They argue over** whether there is a "handle" for tumah, but there is no "handle" for hechsher.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר יש יד לטומאה ואין יד להכשר, ומר סבר יש יד לטומאה ולהכשר.

One **Master**, Rabbi Shimon, **holds there is a handle for tumah but there is no handle for hechsher**, so the body cannot act as a handle to bring the liquid's susceptibility to the limb; **and one Master**, Rabbi Meir, **holds there is a handle both for tumah and for hechsher**.

STATEMENT

רב פפא אמר: בהכשר קודם מחשבה קמיפלגי.

Rav Pappa said: **They argue over** a case of **hechsher** that occurred **before** there was **thought** or intention to use the item for food.

PROOF

דתנן, אמר רבי יהודה: כה הנה רבי עקיבא שונה – חלב שחוטא בפפריים צריה מחשבה, ואין צריה הכשר, שפכר הוכשר בשחיטה.

As we learned in a braisa, **Rabbi Yehuda said: This is how Rabbi Akiva used to teach: The fat of a slaughtered animal in the villages**, which is not usually eaten, **requires thought** to designate it for eating to become food, **but it does not require** a new **hechsher**, **because it was already made susceptible by the** blood of the **shechitah**, even though that happened before the thought.

STATEMENT

אמרתי לפניו: למדתנו רבינו, עולשין שלקטו והדיחו לבהמה, ונמלה עליהן לאדם – צריכות הכשר שני.

Rabbi Yehuda continued: I said before him: Our teacher, you taught us regarding endives that one gathered and rinsed for an animal, and then changed his mind about them for human consumption, that they require a second hechsher because the first rinsing was not done while they had the status of human food.

STATEMENT

וחזר רבי עקיבא להיות שונה כרבי יהודה.

And Rabbi Akiva retracted to teach like Rabbi Yehuda, that hechsher before thought is not effective.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר לה כמעיקרא, ומר סבר לה כחזרה.

So here, one Master, Rabbi Meir, holds like the original view of Rabbi Akiva, and one Master, Rabbi Shimon, holds like the retraction.

STATEMENT

רב אחא בריה דרב איקא אמר: בנתקנת הדם בין סימן לסימן קמיפלגי.

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika said: They argue over a case where the blood was wiped away between the cutting of the first siman and the second siman.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר ישנה לשחיטה מתחלה ועד סוף, והאי דם שחיטה הוא, ומר סבר אינה לשחיטה אלא לסוף, והאי דם מכה הוא.

One Master, Rabbi Meir, holds that shechitah is a continuous process from beginning to end, and therefore this blood shed during the first cut is halachically considered blood of shechitah which is machshir; and one Master, Rabbi Shimon, holds that shechitah is only accomplished at the end, and therefore this early blood is merely blood of a wound, which does not make food susceptible to tumah.

STATEMENT

רב אשי אמר: בשחיטה מכשרת ולא דם קמיפלגי.

Rav Ashi said: They argue over whether the act of shechitah itself makes the meat susceptible to tumah, and not specifically the blood.

QUESTION

בעי רבא: בהמה בחייה, מהו שתעשה יד לאבר?

Rabbah asked: Regarding an animal during its lifetime, what is the law as to whether it can serve as a handle for its dangling limb to transmit tumah?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara leaves this unresolved: **Let it stand.**

STATEMENT

אמר אביי: הרי אמרו, קישות שנטעה בעציץ והגדי לה ויצאת חוץ לעציץ – טהורה.

Abaye said: Behold, they said in the Mishnah: If there is a cucumber that one planted in a perforated pot, and it grew and went outside the pot, it is **tahor** because it is considered attached to the ground.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי שמעון: וכי מה טיבה לטהר? אלא הטמא בטומאתו, וטהור בטהרתו.

Rabbi Shimon said: And what is its nature to make it **tahor**? Rather, that which is **tamei** remains in its **tumah**, and that which is **tahor** remains in its **taharah**, meaning the part inside the pot is **tamei** and the part outside is **tahor**.

QUESTION

בעי אביי: מהו שתעשה יד לחברתה?

Based on this, Abaye asked: What is the law as to whether the **tahor** part can serve as a handle for its counterpart, the **tamei** part, to transmit **tumah**?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara leaves this unresolved: **Let it stand.**

QUESTION

אמר רבי ירמיה: הרי אמרו המשתחוה לחצי דלעת אסרה, בעי רבי ירמיה:

Rabbi Yirmeyah said: Behold, they said in a braisa: If one bows down to half of a growing gourd as **avodah zarah**, he has forbidden it. Based on this, Rabbi Yirmeyah asked whether the permitted half is considered connected to the forbidden half.

עמוד ב' DAF 128B

QUESTION

מהו שתעשה יד לחברתה?

The Gemara asks: What is the halacha as to whether the forbidden part of the gourd shall be made a handle for its counterpart, the permitted part, to transmit **tumah** to it?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara concludes: The question shall stand unresolved.

STATEMENT

אמר רב פפא: הרי אמרו יחור של תאנה שנפיש ומעורה בקליפתה – רבי יהודה מטהר, וחכמים אומרים: אם יכול לחיות – טהור, ואם לאו – טמא.

Rav Pappa said: Behold, they said in a Mishnah: Regarding a branch of a fig tree that was split and mostly detached from the tree, **but is still attached by its bark, Rabbi Yehuda deems** the figs on it **pure**, because he considers them still attached to the tree. **And the Sages say: If** the branch **is able to live** and produce fruit if bound up, then it is considered attached and the fruit is **pure**, i.e., not susceptible to tumah. **But if not**, then it is considered detached and the fruit is susceptible to becoming **tamei**.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַב פָּפָא: מַהוּ שְׂיַעֲשֶׂה יָד לְחִבְרֹו?

Based on this, **Rav Pappa asks: What is** the halacha if a second branch, which cannot live on its own, grows out of this first branch which can live? **Shall** the first branch, which is not susceptible to tumah, **be made a handle for the other** branch to transmit tumah to it?

RESOLUTION

תִּיקוּ.

The Gemara concludes: The question **shall stand** unresolved.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי זִירָא, הָרִי אָמְרוּ: אָכֵן שְׂבֻגִית, כְּשֶׁהוּא חוֹלֵץ – חוֹלֵץ אֶת כּוּלָּהּ, וּכְשֶׁהוּא נוֹתֵץ – נוֹתֵץ אֶת שְׁלֹו וּמִנִּיחַ אֶת שָׁל חִבְרֹו.

Rabbi Zeira said: Behold, they said in a Mishnah: Regarding a stone that is in the corner of a wall shared by two houses, one of which is afflicted with tzaraas, **when he extracts** the stone during the quarantine period, **he must extract all of it**, even the part in his neighbor's house. **But when he demolishes** the house after the tzaraas returns, **he demolishes his own** part of the stone **and leaves his neighbor's** part of the stone.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַבִּי זִירָא: מַהוּ שְׂתַעֲשֶׂה יָד לְחִבְרָתָהּ?

Based on this, **Rabbi Zeira asks: What is** the halacha regarding the transmission of tumah from the leprous house to the neighbor's house? **Shall** the neighbor's half of the stone **be made a handle for its counterpart**, the afflicted half, to bring tumah into the neighbor's house?

RESOLUTION

תִּיקוּ.

The Gemara concludes: The question **shall stand** unresolved.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מֵתָה הַבְּהֵמָה.

The Mishnah taught: If **the animal died**, the hanging flesh needs to be rendered susceptible to tumah, but the hanging limb is tamei as a limb severed from a living animal.

QUESTION

מאי איכא בין אבר מן החי לאבר (של) [מן] הנבלה?

The Gemara asks: **What difference is there between** the tumah of a limb from the living and the tumah of a limb from a carcass?

ANSWER

איכא ביניהם בשר הפורש ממנו (מאבר בהמה), דאילו בשר הפורש מאבר מן החי – לא מטמא, מאבר מן הנבלה – מטמא.

The Gemara answers: **There is a difference between them** regarding flesh that separates from it. For whereas flesh that separates from a limb from the living does not transmit tumah, flesh that separates from a limb from a carcass does transmit tumah.

QUESTION

אבר מן החי דמטמא, מאי קרא?

The Gemara asks: Regarding a limb from the living that transmits tumah, what is the source in the verse?

ANSWER

אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: "וכי ימות מן הבהמה".

Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The verse states, "And if there die from the animal." The word "from" implies that even a part severed from the living animal is tamei.

OBJECTION

והאי מיבעי ליה לכאידך דרב יהודה אמר רב, דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב, ואמרי לה פמתניתא תנא: "וכי ימות מן הבהמה" – מקצת בהמה מטמאה, ומקצת בהמה אינה מטמאה, ואיזו זו? זו טרפה ששחטה!

The Gemara asks: **But this verse is needed for that other teaching of Rav Yehuda** who said that Rav said? For Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, and some say it was taught in a Braisa: "And if there die from the animal"—this teaches that a part of the category of dead animals transmits tumah, and a part of the category of dead animals does not transmit tumah. And which is this? This is a tereifah that one slaughtered, which does not transmit tumah of a carcass!

RESOLUTION

אם כן, לכתוב רחמנא "מבהמה", מאי "מן הבהמה"? שמע מינה תרתי.

The Gemara answers: **If so, let the Merciful One write "mibehema".** What is taught by the longer form "min habe hema"? **Learn from it two** laws—both the law of a slaughtered tereifah and the law of a limb from the living.

OBJECTION

אי הכי, אפילו בשר נמי?

The Gemara challenges: **If so**, that we derive the tumah of a part of a living animal from this verse, then **even** simple **flesh** that separates from a living animal should **also** be tamei!

EXPLANATION

לֹא סָלָקָא דַּעְתָּהּ, דִּתְנִינָא: יָכוֹל יִהְיֶה בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הַחַי טָמֵא? תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "וְכִי יָמוּת מִן הַבְּהֵמָה" – מָה מִיתָה שְׂאִינָה עוֹשָׂה חֲלִיפִין, אֲפָּ כֹל שְׂאִינֹו עוֹשָׂה חֲלִיפִין, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יוֹסִי.

The Gemara responds: **Do not let this enter your mind**, as it was taught in a Braisa: **I might have thought** that flesh that separates from the living should be tamei? Therefore, the verse states: "And if there die from the animal"—just as death is something that does not regenerate, so too, any part of the animal that does not regenerate when severed is tamei, which excludes flesh, which does regenerate; **these are the words of Rabbi Yosei**.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא אוֹמֵר: "בְּהֵמָה", מָה בְּהֵמָה – גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת, אֲפָּ כֹל – גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת.

Rabbi Akiva says: The verse mentions "animal"—just as an animal is characterized by having sinews and bones, so too, any severed part must have sinews and bones to be tamei, which excludes flesh.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי אוֹמֵר: "בְּהֵמָה" מָה בְּהֵמָה – בָּשָׂר גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת, אֲפָּ כֹל – בָּשָׂר גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: "Animal"—just as an animal consists of flesh, sinews, and bones, so too, any severed part must consist of flesh, sinews, and bones to be tamei.

QUESTION

מַאי אִיכָּא בֵּין רַבִּי לְרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא? אִיכָּא פִּינְיָהּוּ אַרְכּוּבָה.

The Gemara asks: **What is** the difference between Rabbi and Rabbi Akiva? There is a difference between them regarding the lower joint of the leg, the **arkuba**, which has sinews and bones but no flesh.

QUESTION

בֵּין רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא לְרַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי, מַאי אִיכָּא פִּינְיָהּוּ?

The Gemara asks: **Between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili**, what is the difference between them?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב פָּפָא: כּוֹלִיא וְנִיב שְׁפָתִים אִיכָּא פִּינְיָהּוּ.

Rav Pappa said: A severed kidney or the tip of the lips, which do not regenerate but do not contain bones, is the difference between them.

STATEMENT

תְּנִינָא נָמִי גַבִּי שְׂרָצִים כְּהֵאֵי גִּוּוֹנָא: יָכוֹל בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הַשְּׂרָצִים יִהְיֶה טָמֵא? תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "בְּמוֹתָם" – מָה מִיתָה שְׂאִינָה עוֹשָׂה חֲלִיפִין, אֲפָּ כֹל שְׂאִינָה עוֹשָׂה חֲלִיפִין. דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי.

It was also taught in a Braisa regarding she ratzim in this manner: **I might have thought** that flesh that separates from she ratzim should be tamei? Therefore, the verse states: "In their death"—just as death is something that does not regenerate, so too, any part that does not regenerate is tamei; **these are the words of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili**.

STATEMENT

רבי עקיבא אומר: "שֶׁרֶץ", מָה שֶׁרֶץ – גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת, אֵף כֹּל – גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת.

Rabbi Akiva says: "Sheretz"—just as a sheretz has sinews and bones, so too, any severed part must have sinews and bones.

STATEMENT

רבי אומר: "שֶׁרֶץ", מָה שֶׁרֶץ – בָּשָׂר גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת, אֵף כֹּל – בָּשָׂר גִּידִים וְעֲצָמוֹת.

Rabbi says: "Sheretz"—just as a sheretz consists of flesh, sinews, and bones, so too, any severed part must consist of flesh, sinews, and bones.

STATEMENT

בין רבי לרבי עקיבא איכא ארכובא.

Between Rabbi and Rabbi Akiva, there is a difference between them regarding the arkuba.

QUESTION

בין רבי עקיבא לרבי יוסי הגלילי מאי איכא ביניהו?

Between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, what is the difference between them?

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: כוליא וניב שפתים איכא ביניהו.

Rav Pappa said: A severed kidney or the tip of the lips is the difference between them.

EXPLANATION

וצריכא, דאי אשמעינן בהמה – היינו טעמא דלא מטמא מחיים, משום דלא מטמא בכעדשה, אבל שרץ דמטמא בכעדשה – אימא לטמא מחיים.

The Gemara notes: **And** both derivations are **necessary**, for if the Torah had only let us hear this regarding an animal, we would say **this is the reason** that its flesh **does not** transmit tumah from the living, because its carcass **does not** transmit tumah in a small size like a lentil-bulk. But a sheretz, which transmits tumah in a size of a lentil-bulk, I might say its flesh should transmit tumah from the living.

EXPLANATION

ואי אשמעינן שרץ, משום דלא מטמא במשא – לא מטמא מחיים, אבל בהמה, דמטמא במשא – אימא תטמא מחיים, צריכא.

And if the Torah had only let us hear this regarding a sheretz, we would say because it does not transmit tumah through carrying, its flesh **does not** transmit tumah from the living. But an animal, which transmits tumah through carrying, I might say its flesh should transmit tumah from the living. Therefore, both are **necessary**.

BRAISA

תני רבנן: החותך פזית בשר מאכר מן החי, חתכו ואחר כך הישב עליו – טהור. הישב עליו, ואחר כך חתכו – טמא.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: Regarding one who cuts an olive-bulk of flesh from a limb from the living to use as food, if he cut it and afterwards had intent for it to be food, it remains pure, because it was not susceptible to tumah when severed. But if he had intent for it and afterwards cut it, it is tamei.

STATEMENT

רבי אסי לא על לבי מדרשא, אשפחיה לרבי זירא, אמר ליה: מאי אמור בבי מדרשא?

Rabbi Assi did not enter the Beis Medrash one day. Later, he found Rabbi Zeira and said to him: What did they say in the Beis Medrash today?

QUESTION

אמר ליה: מאי קשיא לך?

Rabbi Zeira said to him: What is difficult to you in the Mishnayos or Braisos that you want to clarify?

ANSWER

אמר ליה, דקתני: חישב ואחר כך התכו טמא.

Rabbi Assi said to him: That which is taught in the Braisa: If he had intent and afterwards cut it, it is tamei. This is difficult to me!

SUMMARY

The daf begins by resolving the apparent contradiction between Rabbi Meir's view in our Mishnah and his view in Tevul Yom. After Rabbi Yochanan suggests reversing the names, the Gemara explores other approaches, with Rava explaining that they argue over whether there is a handle for hechsher, and Rav Pappa suggesting they argue over whether hechsher is effective before there is thought to use the item for food. Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika and Rav Ashi offer further explanations of the machlokes. The second half of the daf is dedicated to a series of deep conceptual questions raised by Rabbah, Abaye, Rabbi Yirmeyah, and Rav Pappa regarding different scenarios of connection and handles for tumah, all of which the Gemara ultimately leaves unresolved with a "teiku" (let it stand).

In the sugya, the Gemara brings down a beautiful yesod from the words of Rabbi Yehuda to Rabbi Akiva regarding endives. If a person gathered and rinsed these greens for an animal, and only later changed his mind to use them for human food, the first rinsing is not effective to make them susceptible to tumah. Why? Because at the moment the water hit them, they didn't have the status of human food. The hechsher, the preparation, must happen while the object is actually in a state of readiness and purpose.

Lichoira, this is a powerful lesson for our own avodas Hashem. We often go through the motions of life, doing actions that look like preparation for something holy, but our minds and hearts are completely somewhere else. We think, "Later, when I am ready, I will turn this into something spiritual." But the Torah is teaching us that the preparation itself must be infused with ratzon and machshavah. To make something truly receptive to kedushah, you have to be present and intentional right now, in the very moment of preparation.

Whether you are setting up your bais medrash seat, preparing a meal for Shabbos, or even just working to earn a parnassah to support your family, do not treat the preparation as a mindless chore. If you wait until the very end to "think holy thoughts," you miss the point. The preparation itself is where the vessel is made.

Today, before you begin preparing for any mitzvah or daily task, stop for five seconds and think: "I am doing this right now to serve Hashem." Infuse the preparation itself with conscious thought.