

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Leather making (cont.)

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok cites a different version of Reish Lakish's teaching related to other cases where four mil is its essential time frame.

R' Yosi bar Chanina qualifies Reish Lakish's guideline and R' Acha bar Yaakov draws an inference from this qualification.

The Gemara concludes with a Beraisa that discusses the tum'ah of corpse skin.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the capacity of a hide to convey tum'ah as it is being removed. A dispute is recorded concerning whether the skin on the neck is considered attached.

3) Skinning an animal

Rav and R' Assi disagree about the capacity of an animal's hide to convey tum'ah as it is being skinned. According to Rav any part that is removed is tahor whereas R' Assi maintains that the part near the animal's flesh is tamei.

Three unsuccessful attempts to support Rav's position are presented.

4) "Enough to grab"

Two conflicting Beraisos are cited regarding the measure mentioned in the Mishnah of "enough to grab."

Abaye reconciles the two Beraisos and a Beraisa is cited in support of that definition.

5) A torn tallis

A Mishnah teaches that once a tallis rips a majority of the way through, the parts are no longer considered attached and it is tahor.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha qualifies this ruling.

Rabbah unsuccessfully challenges this qualification.

Another unsuccessful attempt to refute R' Nachman is presented, this one from our Mishnah.

A final unsuccessful attempt to refute R' Nachman is recorded.

R' Huna the son of R' Shimon the son of R' Yosi adds another qualification to the Mishnah that discusses the torn tallis.

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan disagree whether the halacha of the talis applies to a leather garment as well.

Reish Lakish's position that the halacha does not apply to leather is unsuccessfully challenged by R' Yochanan.

R' Yirmiyah poses another unsuccessful challenge to Reish Lakish's position.

R' Yosef challenges Reish Lakish from our Mishnah.

Abaye deflects the challenge and explains the point of dispute between the Tannaim of the Mishnah.

R' Yirmiyah begins another challenge to Reish Lakish's position. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Releasing the tum'ah of a torn garment

טלית שהתחיל בה לקורעה כיון שנקרע רובה שוב אינו חבור וטהורה

The Mishnah on our daf discussed the halacha of the hide of an animal and at what point it may serve as a "יד-holder" to transmit and transfer tum'ah between the flesh connected to it and that which comes in contact with the hide.

The Gemara cites a Mishnah from Keilim (28:8) which discusses the halacha of a tallis garment which is tamei and at what point it loses its status as a complete garment and, consequently, becomes tahor. The halacha is that if a garment is tamei, if it is torn and can no longer serve its original function, it becomes tahor, even if the pieces that remain are still a larger area than three by three fingers, which is normally the size of a piece of fabric which is eligible for tum'ah. Here, though, as soon as the garment is torn most of its length, it cannot be used for its original purpose, and the torn pieces are t'horim.

As the discussion continues, the Mishnah in Keilim and Rabbah bar Avuha's explanation of its halacha is contrasted to our Mishnah, and a resolution is given.

The Rishonim address an issue which arises regarding the Mishnah in Keilim. The Mishnah teaches that a garment which is torn the majority of its length is tahor, which implies that immediately at that point, it retains no element of tum'ah. Yet, an earlier Mishnah in Keilim (27:10) taught that if a piece of fabric which had an area of three by three handbreadths was tamei due to מדרס and מגע by a zav, and the fabric was cut in two, the tum'ah of מדרס is released, but the torn pieces still retain the tum'ah of מגע. Why does that Mishnah rule that the pieces still retain some tum'ah, while the Mishnah in Keilim 28:8 implies that the pieces are completely t'horim?

Rashi on our daf explains that the Mishnah in 27:10 is discussing a piece of fabric which had two elements of tum'ah, מדרס and מגע. When the fabric was cut to a size less than three by three handbreadths, it was no longer fit to be stepped on, so the tum'ah of מדרס was released. Yet, it was still larger than three by three thumbbreadths, so the tum'ah of מגע was still appropriate, and that remained. The Mishnah in 28:8 is discussing a garment which had only one type of tum'ah to begin with, so cutting the garment relieved it of this tum'ah completely.

Among several answers given by Tosafos (73a, בשעת) is that he distinguishes between a garment and a piece of fabric. When a garment is torn and cannot serve its original function, it is completely tahor. However, when a piece of fabric becomes torn it still is a piece of fabric, and whatever level of tum'ah is appropriate remains upon it. When it is no longer 3 x 3 handbreadths, it cannot be tread upon, but it can retain the tum'ah of its having been handled by a zav. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Rabbi & Mrs. Michael Balinsky
in memory of their father

ר' לוי שמחה בן ר' משה, ע"ה

HALACHA Highlight

A Sefer Torah with torn stitches

טלית שהתחיל בה לקרועה וכו'

A garment that one began to tear etc.

Shulchan Aruch¹ writes that even if the majority of stitches come undone between two pieces of parchment a Sefer Torah remains valid as long as five or six stitches remain intact. The source for this ruling is Terumas HaDeshen who writes that **בדיעבד** as long as the pieces of parchment were initially held together properly and they still are held together by five of six stitches the parchment is valid. Taz² challenges this ruling from our Gemara. Our Gemara teaches that when a garment rips a majority of the way through, it is no longer considered held together and is tahor. Rashi³ explains that the Gemara refers to a garment that was tamei and one wanted to rip it so that it would no longer qualify as a garment. Once it is no longer fit for its original function and it is no longer referred to as a garment it is tahor. Even if the pieces remain large enough to be used for another function and thus are still susceptible to tum'ah since it lost its original function that tum'ah dissipates. So too regarding a Sefer Torah once the majority of stitches are no longer intact the pieces of parchment are no longer considered attached and it is considered a Sefer Torah that is incomplete.

Shach⁴ disagreed with Taz about this matter and rejected

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is a house into which a Roman legion enters tamei ?

2. What is the definition of **כדי אחיזה** ?

3. Does a tereifah transmit tum'ah ?

4. What is the point of dispute between Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan ?

Taz's proof from our Gemara. In our Gemara the garment itself became ripped so that it no longer serves its original function. In Shulchan Aruch's case the sefer Torah did not rip, it was only some of the stitches that connect two pieces of parchment. Furthermore, the halacha is that once a utensil loses its original function as a result of a tear or breakage the utensil loses its tum'ah. On the other hand, when it comes to a Sefer Torah, as long as the pieces of parchment are still attached, even if with only a few stitches, it remains a valid Sefer Torah. ■

¹ שו"ע יו"ד סי' רע"ח סעי' ג'.

² ט"ז שם סק"ב.

³ רש"י ד"ה טלית.

⁴ נקודת הכסף על ה"ט"ז הנ"ל. ■

STORIES off the Daf

Rushing to Mitzvos

"כהנים זריזים הם..."

On today's amud we find that kohanim act with alacrity. The Mesilas Yesharim writes that this is the way of tzaddikim since in this manner they fulfill the Talmudic prescription, **זריזים מקדימים למצות** — The zealous rush to do mitzvos.¹

When Rav Chaim Volozhiner, zt"l, decided to establish Yeshivas Volozhin, it was erev Shabbos. Most people would have been tempted to wait until after Shabbos to begin teaching, but not Rav Chaim. He immediately gathered those interested and began giving a shiur that

very day.²

A certain person was quite close with Rav Chaim Shmuelevitz, zt"l. He figured that because of this, any request within Rav Chaim's ability to fulfill would be done immediately. He eventually asked for something which could have caused trouble for someone else while providing himself with a benefit. To the friend's surprise, Rav Chaim did not do as requested.

After asking about this a few times he grew impatient and made a rude remark. "You must be lazy!"

Rav Chaim calmly explained that his friend's assumption was erroneous. "You have a mistaken understanding of alacrity. You believe that this means one acts at every opportunity without considering the consequences of his actions. This is incorrect. Our sages teach

that kohanim act with alacrity. Nevertheless, in Beitza 18 we find this expression used regarding kohanim who are careful not to become defiled. We see that sometimes proper alacrity means desisting from action!"³

Rav Simcha Kaplan, zt"l, the Rav of Tzfas, explained this statement in an interesting manner. "People think that kohanim have an abnormal tendency to anger since they act with alacrity. This is not true. Everyone has a tendency to get angry. Since kohanim act with alacrity, they are merely quicker to anger!"⁴ ■

¹ מסילת ישרים, פ"ו

² מובא בספר "אבי הישיבות"

³ מובא בספר "מח ולב"

⁴ מובא בספר "שמחת התורה" ■