

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Elal (cont.)

R' Huna's ruling concerning a hide that has two half-olive's volumes of flesh is clarified.

This understanding of R' Huna's statement is challenged and then clarified.

The necessity for R' Huna's teaching is explained.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses creatures whose soft skin is treated the same as flesh. It is noted that except for human skin if the skins of the other enumerated animals was worked into leather or spread out for trampling they are t'horim from tum'ah of food. R' Yochanan ben Nuri disagrees with Tanna Kamma regarding the skin of the eight sheratzim.

3) Human skin

Ulla asserts that Biblically human skin is tahor and Chazal decreed that it should be treated as tamei.

According to a second version Ulla issued his statement regarding the latter part of the Mishnah.

The Gemara contrasts the opinions of these two versions.

4) Wild pig

The Gemara identifies the point of dispute regarding the skin of the wild pig.

5) Tender camel

Ulla in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi identifies how long a camel is considered "tender."

R' Yirmiyah and Abaye present inquiries that are left unresolved.

Two related incidents are presented.

The difference between Reish Lakish's behavior and R' Zeira's is noted.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva?
2. What is the difference between scholars in Eretz Yisroel and scholars in Bavel?
3. What type of intent is פיגול?
4. Regarding what halachos is the travel time of four mil significant?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Wolper family
in memory of their father and grandfather
ר' יהושע שכנא בן ר' יהודה לייב ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Halachos where four mil is a factor

רבי אבהו משום דריש לקיש אמר לגבל לתפילה ולנטילת ידים ארבעת מילין

The Gemara lists three halachos which are a function of the distance of four mil, and, according to Rav Nachman b. Yitzchak, there is a fourth halacha that is in this category. They are regarding kneading dough, davening with a minyan and washing one's hands before eating a meal. The fourth halacha, added by R' Nachman, is the initial processing of an animal's skin into leather.

Rashi explains that the first halacha of kneading dough is where a hourly worker is hired to knead dough, and he is prepared to do so in a pure state. If the utensils of the employer are impure and need to be immersed in a mikveh, the worker must make an effort and go to immerse the utensils as long as the mikveh is within a distance of four mil from where he is working. If the mikveh is farther than that, the worker may knead the dough with the impure utensils, unless the employer is willing to pay the worker extra for the effort needed to travel to the mikveh that is farther away than four mil.

In the name of the Aruch, Tosafos explains that the case is where an individual who is travelling wishes to eat, but his own utensils are impure. The halacha requires that if there is a mikveh within four mil ahead of where he is at, he must wait until he arrives at the mikveh, and he can immerse his utensils before preparing his food. If the mikveh is farther than four mil ahead, the person need not wait, and he may eat his food in an impure state.

Rambam (Hilchos Bikkurim 8:11) writes that a person should not prepare his dough in an impure state, because the challah which he separates will not be edible for a kohen. Rather, if there is a mikveh within four mil of where he is, he must go and immerse his utensils. If there is no mikveh within that range, he may mix his dough in an impure state. According to Rambam's presentation of this halacha, it is not necessarily dealing with a traveler. Any person, even in his own house, must make the effort to immerse his utensils before mixing dough so that the challah separated will be pure. Noda B'Yehuda (II, Y. D. 39) explains that even according to Rambam, if a person is kneading less than the volume of an olive, which is not susceptible to tum'ah, he need not immerse his utensils. Similarly, if the dough is not obligated in challah, i.e., a rice dough, impure utensils need not be immersed.

Shitta Mikubetzes (Berachos 15a) explains in the name of יש מפרשים that this halacha is dealing with a person who eats his food on a level of purity. He must seek water to wash his hands before kneading his dough. Shitta Mikubetzes points out, though, that this is already included in the next halacha of "washing hands." ■

HALACHAH Highlight

The obligation to daven with a minyan

And for davening ... four mil

Rav Moshe Feinstein¹ was asked whether a Torah scholar is permitted to daven without a minyan. Staying up late into the night to learn makes it very difficult to wake up in the morning to daven with a minyan. Rav Feinstein answered that davening with a minyan is obligatory and not just an enhancement of his davening (הידור ומעלה בעלמא). This is evident from the way Rashi² explains our Gemara. According to Rashi if a person is travelling and he is ready to stop for the night but there is no minyan in that town, he is obligated to continue travelling up to four mil to reach a city that will have a minyan. In the event that he would have to travel backwards he is only obligated to travel a mil. These parameters are codified in Shulchan Aruch³ and from them we infer that one who is in his home must travel up until a mil to daven with a minyan⁴. The fact that halacha requires one to travel in order to reach a minyan clearly indicates that one is obligated to daven with a minyan and it is not merely an enhancement to one's davening.

He then notes that in another place Shulchan Aruch⁴ using language that gives the impression that davening with a minyan is not obligatory. Shulchan Aruch writes that one should make an effort to daven with a minyan in the Beis Ha-Knesses. This implies that an effort should be made but it does not rise to the level of an obligation. He explains that Shulchan Aruch's intent is that if the effort involved in getting to a minyan is not greater than the effort involved in travelling a mil one is obligated to make that effort to daven with a minyan. In the event that reaching a minyan would involve greater effort one is exempt. The point that Shulchan Aruch emphasizes is that one should not categorize any effort as one that exempts him from davening with

ולתפלה ... ארבעת מילין

(Overview...continued from page 1)

6) Tender calf

Ulla and R' Yochanan disagree about what is considered a tender calf.

The exact parameters of the dispute are explained.

Reish Lakish inquires whether the skin of the head of a tender calf transmits tum'ah.

R' Yochanan answered that it does not.

Reish Lakish challenged this from a Mishnah to which R' Yochanan asserted that the Mishnah represents a minority opinion.

7) The skin on the hooves

Rav and R' Chanina give different opinions regarding the location of the skin on the hooves.

8) Sheratzim

A Baraisa identifies the sheratzim whose skin is treated the same as their flesh.

Rav's position about this matter is explained.

The reason the Tanna of the Baraisa disagrees is explained.

9) Leather making

The Mishnah's ruling that when skin is trampled it is tahor is challenged.

The Gemara answers that skin is tahor if it was trampled or made into a patch.

The amount of time it must be trampled is explained.

R' Avahu in the name of Reish Lakish identifies other cases where four mil is its essential time frame. ■

a minyan; rather one should make an effort to reach a minyan even though at first glance it may seem that extraordinary effort is required to reach a minyan. ■

1. שו"ת אג"מ או"ח ח"ב סי' כ"ז.
2. רש"י ד"ה ולתפלה.
3. שו"ע או"ח סי' צ' סעי' ט"ז.
4. ע"י מ"ב שם ס"ק נ"ב.
5. שו"ע שם סעי' ט"ו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"I Will Wash My Hands in Innocence"

ולנטילת ידים

One common challenge to the Jewish traveler is that it can sometimes be difficult to find water and a vessel with which one may wash for bread. Today, we can usually find an acceptable facility if we just wait long enough on the road. Centuries ago, however, there were no sinks or ubiquitous convenience stores along the roads. People had to use whatever they found or go without eating bread.

One frequent traveler was somewhat frustrated by available water sources. He had very little trouble finding drinking water, since there were several conveniently located pools on his road. Unfortunately, none of them contained forty se'ah of water. He had no room in his meager traveling kit for a vessel to wash his hands and wondered if he could immerse them in such a pool.

He wondered, "Do I really have to delay eating a decent meal for this?"

When he asked Rav Yehudah, ז"ל, the son of the Rosh, ז"ל, he ruled that it is forbidden. "Your conjecture was correct: you may not immerse your hands in such a

pool. If there is a water source within four mil you must wait, as we find in Chullin 122. Wiping your hands on sand or the like is also worthless in this regard. This only works for prayer, regarding which the verse states, ארחץ בנקיון כפיי — I will wash my hands in innocence'— not regarding washing one's hands for bread."

Rav Yehudah added, "We find that Rabbi Akiva was careful about netilas yadayim while in prison. Although this was a middas chasidus, it teaches us to go to great lengths to fulfill this precious mitzvah. You should try your utmost not to eat bread without washing in an acceptable manner."¹ ■

1. שו"ת זכרון יהודה, סי' כ"ז