

דף יומי • פכורות • דף ל"ח

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf with a fascinating shakla v'tarya trying to clarify the exact shiur of a drilled hole according to Beit Shammai. The Gemara brings a beautiful teretz from Rav Chisda, who explains that Beit Shammai were referring to the size of a drill and its obstruction, which is just slightly larger than a sela. This leads us into a chashuve braisa containing the reliable testimony of Chizkiyah the father of Ikkesh regarding the halachos of tumah and taharah in earthenware vessels and vessels of rinsing.

As the Gemara delves deeper into this testimony, we explore the fundamental differences between d'Oraisa and d'Rabbanan tumah. The sugya focuses on how the Rabbis set up specific gzeiros and distinctions, particularly regarding the tumah of liquids, to ensure that people would not mistakenly burn terumah and kodashim. We also analyze the essential requirements for a vessel to be mekabel tumah, comparing them to the classic model of a sack.

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

עמוד א' DAF 38A

OBJECTION

כמלא נקב של עול!

The size of the drilled hole Beit Shammai spoke of is **like the full size of the hole of a yoke** of an animal, which is much larger than a sela!

STATEMENT

אישתיק,

Rav Tachlifa **was silent**, as he did not have an immediate answer.

STATEMENT

ואמר ליה רב חסדא:

And Rav Chisda said to him to help resolve the difficulty:

EXPLANATION

שפא מקדח וחסומו שנינו.

Perhaps when Beit Shammai said the size of a drilled hole, **we learned** that they meant the size of **a drill and its obstruction**, meaning the hole must be large enough for the drill to be inserted and removed easily, which is slightly larger than a sela, but not as large as the hole of a yoke.

STATEMENT

וַאֲמַר לִיה רַב תַּחֲלִיפָא:

And Rav Tachlifa said to him in response:

ANSWER

לֹא תִימָא שְׁמָא, אֶלָּא וּדְאִי מְקִדָּח וְחִיסוּמוֹ,

Do not say 'perhaps' as if it is only a doubt; **rather**, say **certainly** that Beit Shammai meant the size of a drill and its obstruction,

STATEMENT

צְרִיךְ לְהִתְלוֹת עָלֶיהָ כְּחִזְקֶיהָ אָבִי עֲקֶשׁ.

and **one must rely upon this** explanation as being absolutely true, **like** the reliable testimony of Chizkiyah the father of Ikkesh.

BRAISA

דָּתָנָן: זֹו עֲדוּת הָעִיד חִזְקִיָּה אָבִי עֲקֶשׁ לִפְנֵי רַבִּין גַּמְלִיאֵל בִּיבְנָה, שְׁאָמַר מִשּׁוּם רַבִּין גַּמְלִיאֵל הַזֶּקֶן:

As we learned in a braisa: This testimony testified Chizkiyah the father of Ikkesh before Rabban Gamliel in Yavneh, which he said in the name of Rabban Gamliel the Elder:

BRAISA

כָּל שֶׁאֵין לוֹ תוֹךְ בְּכָלִי חֶרֶס — אֵין לוֹ אַחֲרִים לְחִלְקָהּ.

Any vessel that does not have an inside (a receptacle) in an earthenware vessel, there is no back (exterior) for division of its halachic status from its interior.

BRAISA

נִטְמָא תוֹכוֹ — נִטְמָא גִבּוֹ, נִטְמָא גִבּוֹ — נִטְמָא תוֹכוֹ.

Therefore, if its inside became tamei, its back becomes tamei; and if its back became tamei, its inside becomes tamei.

QUESTION

כָּלִי חֶרֶס, בְּתוֹכוֹ תֵּלָה רַחֲמָנָא — אֵית לִיה תוֹךְ — אֵיטְמִי לִיה, לֵית לִיה תוֹךְ — לֹא אֵיטְמִי לִיה!

The Gemara asks: But regarding an earthenware vessel, the Merciful One made its tumah dependent on its inside, as the Torah says 'into the inside of which...'! This implies that if it has an inside, it becomes tamei, but if it does not have an inside, it does not become tamei at all! How could Chizkiyah speak of an earthenware vessel without a receptacle becoming tamei?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק בַּר אָבִין: הֵכִי קָאָמַר,

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Avin said: This is what the Tanna of the testimony is saying:

EXPLANATION

כָּל שֶׁאֵין לוֹ תוֹךְ בְּכָלִי חֶרֶס — כְּנֻדָּה בְּכָלִי שִׁטָּף אֵין לוֹ אַחֲרִים לְחִלְקָהּ,

Any vessel that does not have an inside in an earthenware vessel—meaning, the corresponding case parallel to it in a vessel of rinsing (a wooden vessel that is purified by immersion) which also lacks a receptacle—there is no back for division of its halachic status.

EXPLANATION

נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ — נְטֵמָא גְבוֹ, נְטֵמָא גְבוֹ — נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ.

Therefore, if its inside became tamei, its back becomes tamei; and if its back became tamei, its inside becomes tamei.

QUESTION

לָמָּה לִי לְמִיתְּלִיָּיה בְּכָלִי חֶרֶס? נִימָא: כָּל שְׂאִין לוֹ תוֹף בְּכָלִי שֵׁטֶף — אֵין לוֹ אַחֲרִים לְחִלְקָה!

The Gemara asks: Why do I need to hang it and make it dependent on an earthenware vessel? Let us simply say: Any vessel that does not have an inside in a vessel of rinsing, there is no back for division!

ANSWER

הָא קָא מְשַׁמַּע לָן, דִּישׁ לוֹ תוֹף — הָרִי הוּא בְּכָלִי חֶרֶס;

The Gemara answers: This comes to teach us that if the vessel of rinsing has an inside, it is like an earthenware vessel in its halachos of tumah.

EXPLANATION

מָה כָּלִי חֶרֶס, נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ — נְטֵמָא גְבוֹ, לֹא נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ — לֹא נְטֵמָא גְבוֹ;

Just as with an earthenware vessel, if its inside became tamei, its back becomes tamei, but if its inside did not become tamei (meaning, the tumah only touched its exterior), its back does not become tamei;

EXPLANATION

אֲךָ כָּלִי שֵׁטֶף, נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ — נְטֵמָא גְבוֹ, לֹא נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ — לֹא נְטֵמָא גְבוֹ.

so too, a vessel of rinsing, if its inside became tamei, its back becomes tamei, but if its inside did not become tamei, its back does not become tamei.

QUESTION

בְּשִׁלְמָא כָּלִי חֶרֶס, גָּלִי בִּיה רַחֲמֵנָא "תּוֹכוֹ", אֵלָא כָּלִי שֵׁטֶף, מִי גָלִי בִּיה רַחֲמֵנָא תּוֹכוֹ?

The Gemara asks: Granted regarding an earthenware vessel, the Merciful One revealed in it that tumah depends on 'its inside'. But regarding a vessel of rinsing, did the Merciful One reveal in it that tumah depends on its inside? By Torah law, it should become tamei even if touched only on its exterior!

ANSWER

אִי בְטוּמְאָה דְּאֻרְיִיתָא — הֲכִי נָמִי, הֲכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינוּ? בְּטוּמְאָת מַשְׁקִין דְּרַבְּנָן,

The Gemara answers: If we are dealing with tumah of Torah law, indeed so—it would become entirely tamei from its exterior. But here with what are we dealing? With the tumah of liquids, which is Rabbinic,

PROOF

דְּתַנּוּ: כָּלִי שֶׁנְטֵמָא אַחֲרָיו בְּמַשְׁקִין — אַחֲרָיו טְמֵאִין, תּוֹכוֹ אֲגִנּוּ אֲזִנּוּ וְיָדָיו טְהוֹרִין, נְטֵמָא תּוֹכוֹ — כּוּלּוֹ טְמֵא.

as we learned in a Mishnah: A vessel whose back became tamei through liquids, its back is tamei, but its inside, its rim, its handle, and its hangers remain tahor. But if its inside became tamei, the whole of it is tamei.

EXPLANATION

מִדְאוֹרֵייתָא, אֵין אוֹכֵל מִטְמֵא כָּלִי, וְאֵין מַשְׁקָה מִטְמֵא כָּלִי, וְרַבֵּנן הוּא דְגִזּוּר מִשּׁוּם מַשְׁקָה זָב וְזָבָה.

The Gemara explains: By Torah law, food does not make a vessel tamei, and liquid does not make a vessel tamei. And it is the Rabbis who decreed this tumah because of the liquid of a zav and a zava (like their saliva or urine, which are Torah-level Avos HaTumah).

EXPLANATION

הִלָּכָה, שְׁוִיָּה רַבָּנָן כְּטוּמְאָה דְּכָלִי חָרָס, וְלֹא שְׁוִיָּה רַבָּנָן כְּטוּמְאָה דְּאוֹרֵייתָא דִּנְפֻשִׁיהּ.

Therefore, the Rabbis equated it to the tumah of an earthenware vessel (where the exterior can remain tahor), and the Rabbis did not equate it to the Torah-level tumah of itself (where the whole vessel would become tamei).

EXPLANATION

עֲבָדוּ רַבָּנָן הֵיפִירָא, כִּי הֵיכִי דִּלָּא לִישְׁרוּף עָלֶיהָ תְּרוּמָה וְקֹדָשִׁים.

The Rabbis made a distinction (an indicator) so that they would not burn terumah and kodashim because of it, since by Torah law the vessel is actually tahor.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, אֵין לוֹ תוֹף נָמִי, לְיַעֲבִיד נָמִי הֵיפִירָא!

The Gemara asks: If so, for a vessel that does not have an inside also, let them make a distinction also, so that they do not burn holy foods because of it!

ANSWER

כִּינּוּ דְעֲבָדוּ הֵיפִירָא בְּיֵשׁ לוֹ תוֹף, יְדִיעַ דְּאֵין לוֹ תוֹף דְּרַבָּנָן.

The Gemara answers: Since they made a distinction in a vessel that has an inside, it is already known that the tumah of a vessel that does not have an inside is only Rabbinic, so no further indicator is needed.

QUESTION

וְאֵין לוֹ תוֹף בְּכָלִי שִׁטָּה, דְּאוֹרֵייתָא בְּרַבָּנָן קְבוּלָּהּ טוּמְאָה הוּא?

The Gemara asks: And a vessel that does not have an inside in a vessel of rinsing, by Torah law is it even fit to receive tumah?

EXPLANATION

דּוּמְיָא דְּשִׁק בְּעִינּוּ, מָה שֶׁק מִיטְלִטֵּל מִלָּא וְרִיקוֹן, אַף כָּל מִיטְלִטֵּל מִלָּא וְרִיקוֹן.

Surely we require vessels to be similar to a sack (which has a receptacle): just as a sack is moved both when full and empty, so too, any vessel must be fit to be moved full and empty to be susceptible to tumah!

ANSWER

בְּהִנָּה דְּחִזּוּ לְמִדְרָסוֹת.

The Gemara answers: We are dealing with those flat vessels that are fit for midras-tumah (like a mat or seat), which do not require a receptacle.

QUESTION

אי הקי, תָּרַס נָמִי!

The Gemara asks: **If so**, let **earthenware also** be susceptible to midras-tumah when flat!

ANSWER

אִין מִדְרָס בְּכָלִי חָרָס.

The Gemara answers: **There is no midras-tumah in an earthenware vessel** by Torah law.

ANSWER

רַב פָּפָא אָמַר: מִקְדָּח גָּדוֹל שְׁנִינּוּ.

Rav Papa said a different answer to resolve the contradiction between Beit Shammai's 'drilled hole' and Beit Hillel's 'sela': **We learned** that Beit Shammai meant **a large drill**.

INFERENCE

מִכָּלָּל דְּמִקְדָּח סֵתָם זֹוִטְרָא נָמִי מִכָּסְלָע.

The Gemara asks: This implies **by inference** that an ordinary drill is smaller even than a sela.

QUESTION

הַנִּיחָא לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר, אָלָא לְרַבֵּנּוּ מֵאִי אִיכָּא לְמִימַר?

This works out well according to Rabbi Meir, but according to the Rabbis, what is there to say?

PROOF

דִּתְנּוּ: בְּאִיזָּה מִקְדָּח אָמְרוּ? בְּקֶטֶן שֶׁל רוֹפְאִים, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: בְּגָדוֹל שֶׁל לְשָׁכָה.

As we learned in a Mishnah: **With regard to which drill did they speak? With the small drill of doctors**, these are the words of Rabbi Meir. **And the Sages say: With the large drill of the Chamber** of the Beis HaMikdash.

QUESTION

וּלְרַבִּי מֵאִיר, מִי נִיחָא? הֲוָה לִיה מְקוּלֵי בֵּית שְׁמַאי וּמַחוּמְרֵי בֵּית הֶלֶל.

And according to Rabbi Meir, does it work out well? If Beit Shammai's measure (a small drill) is smaller than Beit Hillel's (a sela), then **this would be a case of the leniencies of Beit Shammai and the stringencies of Beit Hillel**, which is not listed in Eduyos!

ANSWER

וְאַנּוּ דִּתְנּוּ — תֵּנּוּ, דְּלָא תֵּנּוּ — לָא תֵּנּוּ!

The Gemara answers: **And we, what we learned** in the tractate of Eduyos, **we learned**, and **what we did not learn**, we did **not learn** (it is not an exhaustive list).

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: סָלַע נִירוּנִית שְׁנִינּוּ, בְּמִקְדָּח גָּדוֹל, סָלַע סֵתָם זֹוִטְרָא מִמִּקְדָּח סֵתָם.

Rav Nachman said: We learned that Beit Hillel meant a Neronian sela, which is like a large drill, whereas an ordinary sela is smaller than an ordinary drill.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתניי הריס של עין שניקב, שנפגם, שנסדק, הרי בעינו דק, תבלול, חלזון, נחש, עצב.

MISHNAH: The eyelid that was perforated, or that was nicked, or that was split; or if there is in his eye a dak (cataract), a tevallul, a chilazon, a nachash, or an atzav—all these are blemishes in a bechor.

MISHNAH

איזהו תבלול? לבן הפוסק בפסירא ונכנס בשחור. שחור נכנס בלבן — אינו מום.

What is a tevallul? The white of the eye that breaks through the ring around the iris and enters into the black (the iris). But if the black enters into the white, it is not a blemish.

עמוד ב' DAF 38B

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ'

GEMARA:

QUESTION

מאי הריס?

The Mishnah listed a blemish of the eyelid, the ris. The Gemara asks: **What is** the meaning of **the ris**?

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: תורא ברא דעינא.

Rav Pappa said: It means **the outer line**, or barrier, **of the eye**, which is the eyelid.

STATEMENT

דק תבלול,

The Mishnah further listed a cataract, dak, and a tevallul. **With regard to a cataract**,

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: דק משוקע — הרי זה מום, צף — אינו מום.

the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: A sunken cataract, which is deep in the eye, is a blemish; but a floating cataract, which is on the surface, is not a blemish.

QUESTION

וְהִתְנִיחַ אִיפְכָּא!

The Gemara asks: **But isn't the opposite taught** in another Braisa, that a sunken cataract is not a blemish while a floating one is?

ANSWER

לֹא קָשִׁיָּא, הָא פְּשָׁחוּר הָא בְּלָבָן.

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**. This first Braisa is referring to a cataract **in the black** portion of the eye, whereas that second Braisa is referring to one **in the white** portion.

OBJECTION

וְהָא: אֵין מוּמִין בְּלָבָן!

The Gemara objects: **But** we have a rule that **there are no blemishes in the white** portion of the eye!

RESOLUTION

אֵלָּא, הָא בְּדוּק לָבָן, הָא בְּדוּק שָׁחוּר.

Rather, both Braisos refer to the black portion of the eye, but **this** second Braisa is referring **to a white cataract**, whereas **that** first Braisa is referring **to a black cataract**.

PROOF

דְּאָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חֲנָה: סָח לִי יֹאשִׁיָּה דְּמִן אוּשָׁא: דִּק שָׁחוּר מְשׁוּקָע — הֲרִי זֶה מוּם, צָף — אֵינּוּ מוּם.
דִּק לָבָן מְשׁוּקָע — אֵינּוּ מוּם, צָף — הֲרִי זֶה מוּם, וְסִימְנִיהּ: בִּרְקָא.

As Rabba bar bar Chana said: Yoshiya from Usha told me: A black cataract that is sunken is a blemish, but if it is floating, it is not a blemish. Conversely, a white cataract that is sunken is not a blemish, but if it is floating, it is a blemish. And your mnemonic to remember this is barka, which is a disease of white spots floating on the eye, and it is a blemish.

STATEMENT

חֲלָזוֹן נֶחֱשׁ וְעֶצֶב.

The Mishnah listed a growth in the shape of a snail, a snake, or a berry covering the pupil.

QUESTION

אִיפְכָּא לָהּ: חֲלָזוֹן הוּא נֶחֱשׁ, אוּ דְלָמָּא חֲלָזוֹן אוּ נֶחֱשׁ?

A dilemma was raised before them: Is the snail the same blemish as the snake, or perhaps they are two distinct blemishes, and the Mishnah means a snail or a snake?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּאָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חֲנָה: סָח לִי רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר, זָקוּ אֶחָד הָיָה בְּשִׁכּוּנֵיתֵינוּ, וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן יוֹסִי לְקוֹנֵיָא שְׁמוֹ, וּמִיָּמִי לֹא עָבְרִיתִי לְפָנָיו. פֻּעַם אַחַת עָבְרִיתִי לְפָנָיו, אָמַר לִי: שֵׁב בְּנִי, שֵׁב.

Come and hear, as Rabba bar bar Chana said: Rabbi Yochanan ben Elazar told me: There was a certain elder in our neighborhood, and Rabbi Shimon ben Yosei Lakonya was his name, and in all my days I did not pass before him. But once I did pass before him, and he said to me: Sit, my son, sit.

STATEMENT

חֲלוּזֵן זֶה מוֹם קְבוּעַ לְשִׁחוּט עָלָיו, וְזֶהוּ נֶחֱשׁ שְׁאֲמָרוּ חֲכָמִים.

He said: **This snail** that you see in the eye of a firstborn is a permanent blemish on account of which it is permitted to slaughter the animal, and **this is** the very same blemish as the snake that the Sages spoke of.

STATEMENT

וְאֵף עַל פִּי שְׁאֲמָרוּ: אֵין אָדָם רוֹאֶה מוֹמִין לְעַצְמוֹ, אֲבָל מוֹרֶה הַלָּכָה לְתַלְמִידִים, וְתַלְמִידִים מוֹרִין לוֹ.

He added: **And even though** the Sages said that a person cannot examine blemishes for himself, and therefore I cannot permit my own firstborn, **nevertheless**, a teacher may teach the halacha to his students, and the students may then rule for him based on what they learned. Therefore, you may now permit my firstborn for me.

QUESTION

וְהֶאֱמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: כָּל תַּלְמִיד חָכָם שְׁמוּרָה הַלָּכָה וּבָא, אִם קוֹדֵם מַעֲשֵׂה אִמְרָה — שׁוֹמְעִין לוֹ, וְאִם לֹא — אֵין שׁוֹמְעִין לוֹ!

The Gemara asks: **But didn't** Rabbi Abba say that Rav Huna said: Any Torah scholar who rules on a halacha and comes to apply it to his own case, **if he stated** the ruling **before the incident** occurred, we listen to him; but if not, we do not listen to him? How could he rule now?

ANSWER

אִיהוּ נָמִי מוֹרֶה וּבָא הֵנָּה מַעֲיָקְרָא.

The Gemara answers: **He too was already teaching** this halacha **from the outset**, before this specific case arose.

STATEMENT

אִיזְהוּ תֵבֵלּוּל? לָבָן הַפּוֹסֵק אֶת הַסִּירָא.

The Mishnah stated: **What is a tevallul?** A white thread that bisects the iris and enters the black pupil.

EXPLANATION

מִתְנִיתִין מִנִּי? רַבִּי יוֹסִי הִיא, דִּתְנִינָא: לָבָן וְנִכְנָס בְּשַׁחֲוֹר, שַׁחֲוֹר וְנִכְנָס בְּלָבָן — הֲרִי זֶה מוֹם, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

The Gemara asks: **Whose opinion is our Mishnah?** It is Rabbi Yosei, as it is taught in a Braisa: If there is a white thread that enters the black, or a black thread that enters the white, it is a blemish; this is the opinion of Rabbi Meir.

BRAISA

רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: לָבָן וְנִכְנָס בְּשַׁחֲוֹר — הֲרִי זֶה מוֹם, שַׁחֲוֹר וְנִכְנָס בְּלָבָן — אֵינוּ מוֹם, שְׂאִין מוֹמִין בְּלָבָן.

But Rabbi Yosei says: A white thread that enters the black is a blemish, but a black thread that enters the white is not a blemish, because there are no blemishes in the white of the eye.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב: מאי טעמא דרבי יוסי? דכתיב: "יצא מחלב עינימו", תרבא דעינא — איקרי, "עינימו" סתמא — לא איקרי.

Rav said: What is the reason of Rabbi Yosei? As it is written: "Their eyes stand forth from fatness." This teaches that the white portion is called the fat of the eye, but it is not called simply "their eyes." And a blemish must be in the eye itself.

EXPLANATION

ורבי מאיר מאי טעמיה? מה לשון "תבלול"? דכר המבלבל את העינים.

And Rabbi Meir, what is his reason? What is the meaning of the word tevallul? It means something that confuses and mixes the eyes, which applies to any thread crossing between the white and the black.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' תורוור והמים הקבועין.

MISHNAH: Pale spots on the eye and constant tears streaming from the eye are blemishes.

MISHNAH

איזהו תורוור הקבוע? כל ששעה שמונים יום.

Which are the pale spots that are constant? Any that remained for eighty days.

MISHNAH

רבי חנניא בן אנטיגנוס אמר: בודקין אותו שלש פעמים בתוך שמונים יום.

Rabbi Chananya ben Antigonus says: One examines it three times within eighty days to see if it is constant.

MISHNAH

ואלו הן מים הקבועין: אכל לח ויבש של גשמים, לח ויבש של שלחים, או אכל היבש ואחר כך הלח — אינו מום, עד שיאכל הלח ואחר כך היבש.

And these are the constant tears: If the animal ate moist and dry fodder from a rain-watered field, or moist and dry fodder from an irrigated field, or if it ate the dry fodder and afterwards the moist fodder, and was not healed, it is not considered a permanent blemish, until it eats the moist fodder and afterwards the dry fodder and is still not healed.

גמרא GEMARA

EXPLANATION

גַּמְ' מִתְנִיתִין מְנִי? רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הִיא, דִּתְנִיָא: חֲרֻר קְבוּעַ — אֲרַבְעִים יוֹם, וּמִים הַקְּבוּעִים — שְׁמוֹנִים יוֹם, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: חֲרֻר — שְׁמוֹנִים יוֹם.

GEMARA: Whose opinion is our Mishnah? It is Rabbi Yehuda, as it is taught in a Braisa: Constant pale spots require forty days, and constant tears eighty days; this is the opinion of Rabbi Meir. But Rabbi Yehuda says: Pale spots require eighty days.

BRAISA

וְאֵלּוּ הֵן מִים הַקְּבוּעִים: אָכַל לֶחָ וְיָבֵשׁ שֶׁל בֵּית הַשְּׁלֶחִין, אוֹ שָׁאָכַל יָבֵשׁ וְאַחֵר כֶּהָ אָכַל הֶלֶח — אֵין מוֹם עַד שִׁיאָכַל יָבֵשׁ אַחֵר הֶלֶח, וְיִשְׁנֹו שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים.

The Braisa continues: And these are the constant tears according to Rabbi Yehuda: If it ate moist and dry fodder from an irrigated field, or if it ate dry and afterwards ate moist, it is not a blemish until it eats dry after moist, and this feeding period lasts for three months.

QUESTION

וְהָא תְרוּיָהּ תִּנְנָהּ: אָכַל לֶחָ וְיָבֵשׁ שֶׁל גִּשְׁמִים, לֶחָ וְיָבֵשׁ שֶׁל בֵּית הַשְּׁלֶחִין!

The Gemara asks: But we learned both of them in our Mishnah: If it ate moist and dry of rain-watered fields, and moist and dry of irrigated fields! Why does the Braisa present them as a dispute?

RESOLUTION

חֲסוּרֵי מִיחְסָרָא וְהָכִי קִתְנִי: אָכַל לֶחָ וְיָבֵשׁ שֶׁל גִּשְׁמִים — הֲרִי זֶה מוֹם, בֵּית הַשְּׁלֶחִין — אֵינוֹ מוֹם, וְהַגִּשְׁמִים נָמִי, אָכַל יָבֵשׁ וְאַחֵר כֶּהָ אָכַל לֶחָ — אֵינוֹ מוֹם, עַד שִׁיאָכַל יָבֵשׁ אַחֵר הֶלֶח. וְיִשְׁנֹו שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים.

The Gemara answers: The Mishnah is missing words, and this is what it is teaching: If it ate moist and dry of rain-watered fields and was not healed, this is a blemish. But if it ate from an irrigated field, it is not a blemish. And even for rain-watered fields, if it ate dry and afterwards ate moist, it is not a blemish until it eats dry after moist, and this feeding lasts for three months.

QUESTION

אֵינִי? וְהִתְנִיָא — וְהָא רַב אִידִי בַר אֲבִין אָמַר רַב יִצְחָק בַּר אֲשִׁיָּאן: אֶדָר וְנִיסָן — לֶחָ, אֱלוּל וְתִשְׁרִי — יָבֵשׁ!

The Gemara asks: Is that so? But didn't Rav Idi bar Abin say that Rav Yitzchak bar Ashyan said: Adar and Nissan are the season of moist fodder, while Elul and Tishrei are the season of dry fodder? That leaves a gap of several months between them, so how can they be eaten consecutively?

ANSWER

אִמָּא: אֶדָר וְחֻצֵי נִיסָן — לֶחָ, אֱלוּל וְחֻצֵי תִשְׁרִי — יָבֵשׁ.

The Gemara answers: Say instead: Adar and half of Nissan are the season of moist, and Elul and half of Tishrei are the season of dry.

QUESTION

אִיפֹעֵיָא לָהּ: לֶחָ בְּזִמְנָא לֶחָ, וְיָבֵשׁ בְּזִמְנָא הַיָּבֵשׁ, אוֹ דְלָמָא: לֶחָ וְיָבֵשׁ בְּזִמְנָא הַלֶּחָ?

A dilemma was raised before them: Does the animal eat moist in the moist season and dry in the dry season, or perhaps it must eat both moist and dry during the moist season?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּאָמַר רַב אִידִי בַר אָבִין אָמַר רַב יִצְחָק בַּר אֲשִׁיָּא: אָדָר וְנִיסָן — לַח, אֶלּוּל וְתִשְׁרֵי — יָבֵשׁ.

Come and hear, as Rav Idi bar Abin said that Rav Yitzchak bar Ashyan said: Adar and Nissan are the season of moist, and Elul and Tishrei are the season of dry. This implies they are eaten in their respective seasons.

OBJECTION

דְּלָמָא פִּירִי דְּאֶלּוּל וְתִשְׁרֵי מְאָכִילָנּוּ לִיָּה בְּאָדָר וְנִיסָן!

The Gemara objects: Perhaps we feed it the produce of Elul and Tishrei which was stored, during Adar and Nissan! So both are eaten in the moist season.

QUESTION

וְכַמָּה מְאָכִילִין אוֹתוֹ?

The Gemara asks: And how much do we feed it of this fodder to test the blemish?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן מְשׁוּם רַבִּי פִּנְחָס בֶּן עֲרוּבָא: כְּגִוּוֹגֶרֶת.

Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Pinchas ben Arova: The size of a dried fig.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבָּא: (בְּעִי) [בְּעֵין] בְּמַעְרְבָא: כְּגִוּוֹגֶרֶת בְּסַעֲוָדָה רְאִשׁוֹנָה,

Rava said: They asked in the West (Eretz Yisrael): Does it mean the size of a dried fig in the first meal of each day, or throughout the day?

SUMMARY

In summary, the daf resolves the kasha on Beit Shammai by establishing that their shiur of a drilled hole refers to a drill and its obstruction, bringing a raaya from the testimony of Chizkiyah the father of Ikkes. The Gemara then analyzes the halachos of tumah in flat vessels and those with receptacles, explaining that while d'Oraisa tumah of an earthenware vessel depends on its inside, the Rabbis created a special distinction for vessels of rinsing affected by Rabbinic liquid tumah to prevent the mistaken burning of holy foods. Finally, the Gemara addresses the requirement of being similar to a sack for susceptibility to tumah, concluding that flat wooden vessels are susceptible because they are fit for midras-tumah, whereas flat earthenware vessels are completely tahor d'Oraisa.

In our sugya, we see a beautiful and deep yesod about how we look at ourselves and others. The Gemara is discussing the mum of a "tevalul" in the eye of a bechor, which is a blemish that disqualifies it from the Mizbe'ach. The Mishnah teaches that if the white part of the eye breaks through and enters the black part, it is a mum. But if the black part enters the white part, it is not a mum. Why? Because, as Rabbi Yose says, "ein mumin b'lavan", there are no halachic blemishes in the white of the eye. The white is not considered the essential place of sight, so a blemish there is not a blemish at all.

Think about this, my dear friend. How often do we look at another Yid, or even at ourselves, and focus entirely on the "white", the external, less central parts of their personality, their background, or their daily struggles? We see a flaw there and we think, "Oy, what a blemish!" But the Torah is teaching us a major chiddush in how to look at a neshama. The white of the eye is not the main thing. The essence of a Yid is the "black" of the eye, the pupil, the place of actual sight, which represents the inner ratzon, the pure neshama that wants nothing more than to do the ratzon of Hashem.

When you look at your spouse, your children, or the person sitting next to you in the bais medrash, remember this yesod: "ein mumin b'lavan." Don't define people by the external areas where they might seem a bit off or lacking. Those are just the outer white of the eye. Look at their inner core, their pnimiyus, where their true desire to connect to Hashem lies. When we train our eyes to look past the external "blemishes" and focus on the beautiful, holy core of every Yid, we bring more ahavas Yisrael and shalom into the world.

Today, when you interact with someone who pushes your buttons or seems to have a flaw, consciously tell yourself "ein mumin b'lavan", ignore the external blemish and find one good, pure point in their inner essence to focus on instead.