

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the dispute (cont.)

The Gemara finishes demonstrating that R' Yochanan agrees with Abaye's understanding of the dispute recorded in the Mishnah between R' Meir and R' Shimon.

R' Yochanan's teaching is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava offers another explanation of the dispute between R' Meir and R' Shimon.

R' Pappa suggests a fourth explanation of the dispute.

A fifth explanation of the dispute is presented by R' Acha the son of R' Ika.

A final explanation of the dispute is suggested by R' Ashi.

### 2) Handles

The Gemara presents five different inquiries that relate to the halachos of handles and every one of the inquiries is left unresolved.

### 3) Dangling limb

The Gemara inquires about the practical difference whether a dangling limb is categorized as a limb from a living creature or a limb from a neveilah.

The difference has to do with the status of flesh taken from that limb. If it is a limb from a living creature it does not convey tum'ah but if it is from a neveilah it does.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav provides the source that a limb from a living creature conveys tum'ah.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Beraisa that was cited recorded the opinions of three Tannaim and the Gemara identifies the point of dispute among these Tannaim.

A related Beraisa is cited.

The Gemara again identifies the point of dispute between the different opinions recorded in the Beraisa.

The necessity for both of these related expositions is explained.

Another Beraisa discusses flesh cut from a living animal.

A related incident is cited. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*May a prohibited food item serve as a yad/holder?*

בעי רבי ירמיה מהו שתעשה יד לחבירתה

The Gemara analyzes several different situations to see when we use the concept of "yad/handle" to allow tum'ah to be transmitted to an item. One of the cases which is discussed involves an item of avoda zara.

In our Gemara, R' Yirmiyah asks whether a food item of avoda zara can serve as a yad/holder to transfer tum'ah to another item. The rule is that an item from avoda zara is prohibited from benefit. Rashi explains that this inquiry is based upon the opinion of R' Shimon (later, 129a) that a food item which is prohibited from benefit cannot become tamei with food-tum'ah. The source for this view is the verse (Vayikra 11:34) which discusses tum'ah, and states "from all food that may be eaten." This teaches that only food which is halachically permitted to be eaten may be susceptible to tum'ah, but not food that is prohibited. Accordingly, a food item used by avoda zara, which may now not be eaten, may also not become tamei. The point is that although it cannot contract food-tum'ah, perhaps it can serve to transmit tum'ah to a different item.

The illustration used in R' Yirmiyah's question is where someone bowed down to half of a gourd, and that half of a gourd becomes prohibited. R' Yirmiyah asks whether that half of the gourd can serve to transmit tum'ah to the other half, which was not worshipped. This question is left unresolved.

Rashi notes that the half of a gourd which was worshipped is prohibited to be eaten, and it cannot become tamei with food-tum'ah. Nevertheless, it is tamei as an item of avoda zara, which is either tamei as a sheretz, or as nidda according to R' Akiva (Shabbos 82a). There is a significant difference between the nature of the food-tum'ah, which is a Torah concept, as opposed to avoda zara-tum'ah, which is rabbinic. The Achronim explain that tum'ah of the Torah defines the status of an item itself. Rabbinic tum'ah is not intrinsic in the item, but it is rather that the sages determined that a person must conduct himself or refrain from certain conduct regarding handling the item. The item which is rabbinically tamei is itself tahor the same as before, but there are restrictions regarding how its owner must act vis-à-vis touching the item. This is why the question is based upon the item not having Torah-level tum'ah, and whether it can serve as a handle.

Mikdash David explains that the reason Rashi only refers to the Torah-level tum'ah, which does not apply to this item, and not to the rabbinic tum'ah of avoda zara is that Rashi wanted to explain the question even according to the view (73a) which holds that when only half of an item is prohibited we see it as if it is cut off, and here the two halves of the gourd are as if they are separated. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Jonah Bruck  
In loving memory of their grandfather*

*Mr. Samuel Bruck o.b.m. – ר' שלום בן ר' שמעון, ע"ה*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעילוי נשמת ר' מיכאל בן ר' שלמה יהודה ז"ל*

*Breiner*

*By his children*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by the Starr Family  
לזכר נשמת*

*Rabbi Selig Starr – הרב זעליג בן דוד, ע"ה*

# HALACHA Highlight

## *Slicing a loaf before reciting hamotzi*

ר' מאיר אומר אם אוחוז בקטן וגדול עולה עמו הרי הוא כמוהו  
 R' Meir says that if one grabs the smaller part and the larger part lifts up as well it has the same status as the smaller part

The Gemara discusses the parameters of food attachment. If a food is cut in two but the two parts remain partially attached and a tevul yom touched one of the parts what is the degree of attachment necessary for the second part to also be tamei? R' Meir contends that if when one lifts the smaller piece the larger piece will lift up as well the foods are considered attached. If the larger piece would fall off they are not considered attached even if when lifting the larger piece the smaller piece would lift up together with it. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> questions this ruling from another Mishnah (Tevul Yom 3:1) in which R' Meir rules that if one grabs the larger piece and the smaller piece lifts up as well the smaller piece has the same status as the larger piece and it is R' Yehudah who maintains that foods are considered one if one can lift the smaller piece and the larger piece will lift up as well. Tosafos Yom Tov<sup>2</sup> answers that the matter relates to R' Yochanan's comment about the correct version of the opinions in the Mishnah and it is R' Meir who maintains that all that is necessary is for one to be able to grasp the larger piece and have the smaller piece lift up as well. R' Yehudah is the Tanna who requires that one should be capable of lifting the smaller piece and have the larger piece lift as well.

# REVIEW and Remember

1. According to Rava what is the point of dispute between R' Meir and R' Shimon ?
2. What is the moment at which slaughtering occurs ?
3. What is the difference between a limb from a living animal and a limb from a neveilah ?
4. What is the status of flesh cut from a limb severed from a living animal ?

Rosh<sup>3</sup> notes that since the rule of psak is that when there is a dispute between R' Meir and R' Yehudah halacha follows R' Yehudah's position that means that a cut food is not considered a single unit unless one can lift the smaller piece and the larger piece is lifted as well. This is also Shulchan Aruch's ruling<sup>4</sup> regarding the obligation to cut a loaf of bread before hamotzi. He writes that one should cut the loaf only a little bit so that when one lifts the smaller piece the larger piece will lift up as well. ■

<sup>1</sup> תוס' ד"ה ר' מאיר.  
<sup>2</sup> תוס' יו"ט טבול יום פ"ג מ"א.  
<sup>3</sup> רא"ש ברכות פ"ו ס"י י"ט.  
<sup>4</sup> שו"ע או"ח ס"י קס"ז סעי' א'.

# STORIES off the Daf

## *"There is None as Wise as You"*

”וחזר רבי עקיבא להיות שונה כרבי יהודה...”

On today's daf we find that when Rabbi Akiva heard a compelling argument, he changed his opinion and began to teach in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah's view.

The Alter of Kelm, zt"l, explains the great importance of admitting one's errors. "We find in Maseches Avos that there are seven attributes of the wise, one which is to admit the truth. Who was more evil than Pharaoh? Yet when he heard Yosef's interpretation of his dreams, he was amazed and immediately

said, אחרי הודיע אלוקים אותך... אין נבון ,  
 '1. וחכם כמוך... ועל פיד ישק כל עמי  
 The Ramban explains that Pharaoh was very wise and could discern broad inferences from minor hints. From this one episode, he understood the great wisdom of Yosef and nullified his own understanding to that of Yosef. He saw that Yosef was the fittest person to rule the land, not him.

"We see that the nature of a true chacham is to admit to the truth. Nothing held him back from treating Yosef as was fitting. Not the negative language of the royal butler, who called Yosef a נער עברי; not that he had served in prison—despite the Egyptian law that one who had been a prisoner was forbidden to rule. He didn't even check

why Yosef had been placed in prison. Instead, he understood what so few with his vested interests would have grasped: that Yosef is exceedingly wise. And that it would be fitting to learn from him as a young child learns from his father. It was clear to Pharaoh that Yosef deserved to rule."

The Alter concluded: "I have written just a little of what is in my heart on this matter, but it is enough for a wise man to understand that failure to admit the truth reveals a lack of understanding."<sup>2</sup> ■

<sup>1</sup> בראשית, מ"א: ל"ט-מ"ו  
<sup>2</sup> בית קלם, ע' שייג-שייד

