

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קט"ז

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing our deep dive into the lomdus of the kal vachomer that attempts to derive the benefit prohibition of meat and milk. The Gemara analyzes the mechanics of refuting a kal vachomer when deriving a halacha from multiple sources, focusing on the unique status of kilayim of the vineyard. This leads to a fascinating discussion regarding whether the roots of kilayim are forbidden immediately upon taking root, and how we reconcile different pesukim on the matter.

Next, the Gemara transitions to the opinions of the Tannaim regarding the scope of the meat and milk prohibition. We explore the shitta of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda who permits deriving benefit from meat and milk, followed by a detailed analysis of the machlokes between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili regarding whether wild animals and birds are excluded from the Torah's prohibition, and whether a bird is even forbidden mid'Rabbanan. We then begin a new Mishnah discussing the status of milk found in the stomach of a carcass or an animal slaughtered by a non-Jew.

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

עמוד א' DAF 116A

STATEMENT

חָדָא מִחֲדָא קוּלָא וְחוּמְרָא פְּרָכִינָן, כֹּל דְּהוּ לָא פְּרָכִינָן,

When deriving **one** source **from one** other source, **we can refute** the kal vachomer only by showing a **leniency** in the supposedly stringent case **and a stringency** in the lenient case, but **we cannot refute** it by pointing out **any** unique characteristic **whatsoever** in the source case.

STATEMENT

חָדָא מִתְרַתִּי אֲפִילוּ כֹל דְּהוּ פְּרָכִינָן.

But when deriving **one** source **from two** other sources, **we can refute** the derivation **even** by pointing out **any** unique characteristic **whatsoever** in the source cases.

STATEMENT

חָדָא מִתְלַת, אִי הָדָר דִּינָא וְאֵתִי בְּמָה הִצַּד – פְּרָכִינָן כֹּל דְּהוּ, וְאִי לָא – קוּלָא וְחוּמְרָא פְּרָכִינָן, כֹּל דְּהוּ לָא פְּרָכִינָן.

And when deriving **one** source **from three** other sources, **if the derivation reverts and comes** to be established by way of the **common element** of all of them, **we can refute** it by pointing out **any** unique characteristic **whatsoever**; **but if not**, meaning the derivation does not revert, then **we can refute** it only by showing a **leniency and a stringency**, but **we cannot refute** it by pointing out **any** unique characteristic **whatsoever**. Since our derivation from three sources does not revert, we cannot refute it with a minor unique characteristic.

QUESTION

וּלְפָרוּךְ: מָה לְכָלֵּאי הַפָּרֶם, שֶׁכֵּן לֹא הָיְתָה לָהֶן שְׁעַת הַכּוֹשֵׁר?

But let us refute the kal vachomer by pointing out a major leniency and stringency: **What is unique about kilayim of the vineyard? That they never had a time of fitness**, as they are forbidden from the very moment they grow, unlike meat and milk which were permitted before being cooked together!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב אָדָא בַּר אַהֲבָה: זֹאת אוֹמֶרֶת – כָּלֵּאי הַפָּרֶם עֵינָם נֶאֱסָר, וְהָיְתָה לָהֶן שְׁעַת הַכּוֹשֵׁר קוּדָם הַשְׂרִיָּשָׁה.

Rav Adda bar Ahava said: This says, i.e., we must conclude from here, that regarding kilayim of the vineyard, their roots themselves are forbidden, and thus they did have a time of fitness prior to taking root in the soil. Therefore, the refutation is invalid.

OBJECTION

מְתִיב רַב שְׁמַעְיָה בַּר זְעִירָא: הַמַּעֲבִיר עֲצִיץ נָקוּב בַּפָּרֶם, אִם הוֹסִיף מְאֻתָּיִם – אָסוּר. הוֹסִיף – אֵין, לֹא הוֹסִיף – לֹא.

Rav Shemaya bar Zeira challenged this: We learned in a Mishnah: **One who carries a perforated pot** containing seeds **through a vineyard**, if the seeds **increased** in growth by one part in **two hundred** of their original size, the plant is **forbidden**. We infer: If it **increased**, **yes**, it is forbidden; but if it **did not increase**, **no**, it is not forbidden! This proves that the original roots are not forbidden, only the new growth!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר אַבְיִי: תְּרִי קָרְאִי כְּתִיבִי, כְּתִיב "כֵּן תִּקְדָּשׁ הַמְּלֵאָה", וּכְתִיב "הָרַע".

Abaye said: **Two verses are written**, or rather, two terms are written in the verse. **It is written:** "Lest the fullness of the seed... become forbidden," implying it must grow, **and it is written:** "The seed," implying the seed itself is forbidden immediately.

EXPLANATION

הָא כִּיצַד? זָרוּעַ מַעֲיָקְרוּ – בְּהַשְׂרִיָּשָׁה, זָרוּעַ וּבָא, הוֹסִיף – אֵין, לֹא הוֹסִיף – לֹא.

How is this reconciled? If it was **sown from the outset** in the vineyard, it becomes forbidden immediately **upon taking root**. But if it was already **sown and comes** from elsewhere, like in the pot, then if it **increased**, **yes**, it is forbidden, but if it **did not increase**, **no**, it is not.

STATEMENT

מִתְנִיתִין דְּלֹא כִי הָאִי תַנָּא, דְּתַנָּא: רַבִּי שְׁמַעְיֹן בֶּן יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר מְשׁוּם רַבִּי שְׁמַעְיֹן: כֶּשֶׁר בְּחֻלְבַּ אָסוּר בְּאִכְלָהּ וּמוֹתֵר בְּהִנָּאָה,

The Gemara notes: **Our Mishnah**, which rules that meat cooked in milk is forbidden for benefit, is **not in accordance with this Tanna**, as it is taught in a beraisa: **Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: Meat cooked in milk is forbidden to be eaten, but it is permitted for benefit**,

PROOF

שנאמר: "כי עם קדוש אתה", ונאמר להלן: "ואנשי קדש תהיון לי".

as it is stated regarding meat and milk: "For you are a holy nation to Hashem your Elokim," and it is stated elsewhere regarding a tereifah: "And you shall be holy people to Me."

INFERENCE

מה להלן אסור באכילה ומותר בהנאה, אף כאן אסור באכילה ומותר בהנאה.

Just as **there**, by tereifah, it is **forbidden to be eaten but permitted for benefit**, as the Torah says to throw it to the dogs, **so too here**, by meat and milk, it is **forbidden to be eaten but permitted for benefit**.

QUESTION

רבי עקיבא אומר: חיה ועוף וכו'. הני – הא אפקינהו לכדשמואל.

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Akiva says: A wild animal and a bird** are not forbidden from the Torah, because of the three mentions of "kid". The Gemara asks: **These** three mentions, **didn't we** already **apply them to that which Shmuel** derived, to exclude non-kosher milk, a dead animal, and a fetus?

ANSWER

קסבר רבי עקיבא: איסור חל על איסור, חלב ומתה לא צריכי קרא,

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Akiva holds** that a **prohibition can take effect upon** an existing **prohibition**, and therefore forbidden **fat and a dead animal do not need a verse** to exclude them from the prohibition of meat and milk, as both prohibitions can apply simultaneously.

EXPLANATION

שלי – גדי מעליא הוא, אייתרו להו כולו – פרט לחיה, ועוף, ולבהמה טמאה.

And a **fetus is a proper kid**, so it does not need a verse to include it. Therefore, **all of them**, the three mentions of "kid", **remain extra** for him, **to exclude a wild animal, a bird, and a non-kosher animal**.

QUESTION

רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: נאמר "לא תאכלו". מאי איכא בין רבי יוסי הגלילי לרבי עקיבא?

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: It is stated: "You shall not eat** any carcass..." and in the same verse "You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk." The Gemara asks: **What practical difference is there between Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and Rabbi Akiva**, since both agree that a bird is excluded from the Torah's prohibition?

ANSWER

איכא ביניהו חיה: רבי יוסי הגלילי סבר חיה דאורייתא, ורבי עקיבא סבר חיה דרבנן.

There is a difference **between them** regarding a **wild animal**: **Rabbi Yosei HaGelili holds** that cooking a **wild animal** in milk is forbidden **from the Torah**, because it has mother's milk, and **Rabbi Akiva holds** that a **wild animal** is only forbidden **mid'Rabbanan**, as it is excluded by the word "kid".

ANSWER

איבעית אימא, עוף איכא ביניהו: רבי עקיבא סבר חיה ועוף אינן מן התורה, הא מדרבנן אסירי,

If you want, I can say that a **bird** is the difference between them: **Rabbi Akiva holds** that a **wild animal and a bird** are not from the Torah, but they are forbidden **mid'Rabbanan**,

EXPLANATION

ורבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי סָבַר עוֹף אֲפִילוּ מִדְּרַבָּנָן נָמִי לֹא אָסִיר.

and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili holds that a bird is not forbidden even mid'Rabbanan.

PROOF

תִּנָּא נָמִי הָכִי: בְּמִקְוָמוֹ שֶׁל רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר הָיוּ כּוֹרְתִין עֲצִים לַעֲשׂוֹת פַּחְמִין לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּרֹזֶל, בְּמִקְוָמוֹ שֶׁל רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי הָיוּ אוֹכְלִין בֶּשֶׂר עוֹף בְּחֶלֶב.

It is also taught this way in a beraisa: In the place of Rabbi Eliezer, they would cut wood on Shabbos to make charcoal to forge iron tools for a bris milah; and in the place of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, they would eat poultry meat in milk, because they held it is not forbidden even mid'Rabbanan.

STATEMENT

לֹוי אִיקָלַע לְבִי יוֹסֵף רִישָׁא, אֵייתוּ לְקַמִּיָּה רִישָׁא דְטוֹוֶסָא בְּחֶלֶב, וְלֹא אָמַר לָהּ וְלֹא מִיָּדִי.

The Gemara relates: Levi happened to come to the house of Yosef the hunter. They brought before him the head of a peacock cooked in milk, and he did not say anything to them to protest.

QUESTION

כִּי אָתָּא לְקַמִּיָּה דְרַבִּי, אָמַר לָיָהּ: אֲמַאי לֹא תַשְׁמַתִּינָהּ?

When he came before Rabbi, Rabbi said to him: Why did you not place them under a ban for eating poultry in milk?

ANSWER

אָמַר לָיָהּ: אֲתֵרִיָּה דְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בֵּיתֶירָא הוּא, וְאָמִינָא: דְּרִשׁ לָהּ כְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי, דְּאָמַר: יֵצֵא עוֹף שְׂאִין לוֹ חֵלֶב אִם.

Levi said to him: It was the place of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira, and I said to myself: Perhaps he expounded to them in accordance with Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, who said: A bird is excluded from the prohibition since it has no mother's milk, and they followed him even regarding the Rabbinic prohibition.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי קֶבֶת גּוֹי וְשֶׁל נֶבֶלָה – הָרִי זֶה אָסוּרָה.

MISHNAH: The milk found in the stomach of an animal slaughtered by a non-Jew, and the milk in the stomach of a carcass, behold, this is forbidden.

MISHNAH

הַמַּעֲמִיד בְּעוֹר שֶׁל קֶבֶה בֶּשֶׂרָה,

One who curdles milk with the skin of the stomach of a kosher animal that was properly slaughtered, if it imparts flavor, it is forbidden as meat in milk.

MISHNAH

אם יש פנומן טעם – הרי זו אסורה.

If there is enough of the skin of the stomach to impart flavor to the milk, behold, this cheese is prohibited because of the mixture of meat and milk.

MISHNAH

כשרה שינקה מן הטירפה – קבתה אסורה.

If a kosher animal suckled from a tereifa animal, the congealed milk in its stomach is prohibited because the milk originated from a tereifa.

MISHNAH

טירפה שינקה מן הכשרה – קבתה מותרת, מפני שפנוס במעייה.

But if a tereifa animal suckled from a kosher animal, the milk in its stomach is permitted, because the milk is merely collected in its innards and does not become part of the tereifa's body.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמי אטו קבת גוי לאו נבלה היא?

The Gemara begins the Gemara: Is that to say that the stomach of an animal slaughtered by a gentile is not itself a carcass? Why does the Mishnah list them as two separate cases?

ANSWER

אמר רב הונא: הכא בלוקח גדי מן הגוי עסקינן, וחישינן שמא ינק מן הטירפה.

Rav Huna said: Here we are dealing with a Jew who purchases a kid from a gentile and slaughters it himself, so the animal itself is kosher, but we are concerned that perhaps before it was bought it suckled from a tereifa animal, and therefore the milk in its stomach is prohibited.

QUESTION

ומי חישינן שמא ינק מן הטירפה? והתנן: לוקחים ביצים מן הגוים, ואין חוששין לא משום נבלה ולא משום טירפה!

The Gemara asks: And are we concerned that perhaps it suckled from a tereifa? But didn't we learn in a Braisa: We may purchase eggs from gentiles, and we do not fear that they are prohibited neither on account of being from a carcass nor on account of being from a tereifa! Why should we be more strict here?

ANSWER

אלא אימא: חישינן שמא ינק מן הטמאה.

Rather, say like this: **We are concerned** that perhaps it suckled from a **non-kosher** species of animal, which is why the milk in its stomach is prohibited.

QUESTION

ומאי שנא טרפה דלא חיישינן, ומאי שנא טמאה דחיישינן?

The Gemara asks: **And what is the difference** regarding a tereifa that we are not concerned, and what is the difference regarding a **non-kosher** animal that we are concerned?

ANSWER

טרפה לא שכיחא, טמאה שכיחא.

The Gemara answers: **A tereifa is not common**, so we do not make a decree, whereas a **non-kosher** animal is **common**, so we must be concerned.

OBJECTION

אי שכיחא, אפילו גבי דידן ניהוש!

The Gemara objects: **If it is so common, let us be concerned even regarding our own** animals that we raise!

RESOLUTION

אנו דבדלינן מיניהו, וכי חזינן להו מפרישין להו – לא גזרו בהו רבנן.

The Gemara resolves: **We** Jews, **who separate ourselves from them** (non-kosher animals), **when we see them** coming to suckle, **we separate them** and keep them away; therefore, **the Rabbis did not decree regarding them** when buying from a Jew.

RESOLUTION

אינהו דלא בדילי מיניהו, וכי חזו להו לא מפרישי להו – גזרו בהו רבנן.

But **they** (the gentiles), **who do not separate themselves from them**, and when they see them they do not separate them, the Sages **decreed regarding them** when buying from a gentile.

STATEMENT

ושמואל אמר: חדא קתני, קבת שחיטת גוי – נבילה.

And Shmuel said a different p'shat: The Mishnah is **teaching one** single halakha, meaning: **The stomach** of an animal of a **gentile's slaughter** is considered like a **carcass** and is prohibited.

QUESTION

ומי אמר שמואל הכי? והאמר שמואל: מפני מה אסרו גבינת הגוים – מפני שמעמידין אותה בעור קבת נבילה.

The Gemara asks: **And did Shmuel really say this? But didn't Shmuel say:** For what reason did the Sages **prohibit the cheese of gentiles?** Because they curdle it with the skin of the stomach of a carcass.

INFERENCE

הא קבה גופה שריא!

We see from Shmuel's words that **the** congealed milk of the **stomach itself is permitted!** Why then does Shmuel say here that the stomach of a gentile's slaughter is prohibited like a carcass?

ANSWER

לֹא קָשִׁיָּא: כָּאן – קוּדָם חֲזָרָה, כָּאן – לְאַחַר חֲזָרָה.

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**. **Here** in our Mishnah it is **before the retraction** of Rabbi Yehoshua, who originally held that the rennet of a carcass is prohibited, whereas **there** Shmuel's statement is **after the retraction** of Rabbi Yehoshua, when it was established that the rennet itself is permitted.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

כְּשֶׁרָה שִׁינְקָה מִן הַטֵּרֵפָה [וכו.].

The Gemara turns to the next clause of the Mishnah: **A kosher animal that suckled from a tereifa, etc.,** the milk in its stomach is prohibited.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

וְהָא קִתְּנִי רִישָׁא: קִבֵּית גּוֹי וְשֵׁל נִבְלָה הֲרִי זֹ אֲסוּרָה?

The Gemara asks: **But didn't the first clause teach: The stomach of the animal of a gentile and of a carcass, behold, this is prohibited?** Why is the milk in the stomach of a tereifa permitted in the latter clause, while the milk in the stomach of a carcass is prohibited in the first clause?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: רִישָׁא נִרְאָה כְּאוֹכֵל נִבְלֹת, הֵכָא אֵיכָא שְׁחִיטָה.

Rav Chisda said: In the **first clause**, eating the milk of a carcass is prohibited because it **looks like one who is eating carcasses**, which is repulsive. But **here**, in the case of a tereifa, **there is slaughter**, so it does not look like eating a carcass.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיהִי רִבָּא: וְלָאוּ כָּל דִּכְּנָן הוּא?

Rava said to him: But is it not all the more so?

EXPLANATION

וְמָה נִבְלָה דְּמֵאִיסָה, דְּאֵי שְׁרִית לִיהִי קִבְּתָהּ לֹא אֶתִּי לְמִיכָל מִינָהּ, אָמַרְתָּ לֹא.

If regarding **a carcass, which is repulsive**, such that if you permit its **stomach** people will still not come to eat from the **meat** itself, yet **you say** it is **not** permitted;

EXPLANATION

טִרְפָּה שְׁחוּטָה, דְּאִי שְׂרִית אֶתִי לְמִיכַל מִינָהּ, לֹא כָּל שֶׁפֶן?

then regarding a slaughtered tereifa, which is not repulsive, so if you permit its stomach people might come to eat from the meat itself, is it not all the more so that we should prohibit it?

RESOLUTION

אַלֵּא אָמַר רַב יִצְחָק, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: לֹא קָשָׁיָא, כָּאן קוֹדֵם חֲזָרָה, כָּאן לְאַחַר חֲזָרָה, וּמִשְׁנָה לֹא זָזָה מִמָּקוֹמָהּ.

Rather, Rav Yitzchak said that Rabbi Yochanan said: This is not difficult. Here in the first clause it was taught before the retraction, while there in the latter clause it was taught after the retraction, and the text of the Mishnah did not move from its place even after the halakha changed.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בַּר אֲבָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מַעֲמִידִין בְּקֶבֶת נְבִלּוֹת, וְאִין מַעֲמִידִין בְּקֶבֶת שְׁחִיטָת גּוֹי.

Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: One may curdle milk with the rennet of carcasses, but one may not curdle milk with the rennet of an animal of a gentile's slaughter.

QUESTION

אָמַר לְפָנָיו רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בַּר אֲבָא: כִּמְאֵן? כָּרַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר, דְּאָמַר סֵתָם מִחֲשַׁבֶּת גּוֹי לְעִבּוּדָה זָרָה.

Rabbi Shimon bar Abba said before Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba: In accordance with whose opinion is this? Is it in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer, who said that the ordinary thoughts of a gentile are for idol worship, making his slaughter prohibited for any benefit?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: וְאֵלֹא כִּמְאֵן?

He said to him: And otherwise, in accordance with whom else could it be?

STATEMENT

כִּי אֶתָּא רַב שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר רַב יִצְחָק, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מַעֲמִידִין בִּין בְּקֶבֶת נְבִלָּה, בִּין בְּקֶבֶת שְׁחִיטָת גּוֹי, שְׁלֹא לְחוּשׁ לְדַבְרֵי רַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר.

When Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak came, he said that Rabbi Yochanan said: One may curdle milk whether with the rennet of a carcass or with the rennet of an animal of a gentile's slaughter, so as not to be concerned for the words of Rabbi Eliezer.

RULING

וְהִלְכְתָּא: אִין מַעֲמִידִין פְּעוֹר קֶבֶת נְבִלָּה, אֲבָל מַעֲמִידִין בְּקֶבֶת נְבִלָּה, וּבְקֶבֶת שְׁחִיטָת גּוֹי, וּבְקֶבֶת פְּשָׁרָה שְׂיִנְקָה מִן הַטְּרִפָּה, וְכָל שֶׁפֶן בְּקֶבֶת טִרְפָּה שְׂיִנְקָה מִן הַכֹּשֶׁרָה.

And the halakha is: We do not curdle milk with the skin of the stomach of a carcass, but we may curdle milk with the rennet of a carcass, and with the rennet of an animal of a gentile's slaughter, and with the rennet of a kosher animal that suckled from a tereifa, and all the more so with the rennet of a tereifa that suckled from a kosher animal.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? חלב המכונס בה פירשא בעלמא הוא.

What is the reason? The milk collected in it is merely waste matter and not an actual part of the animal's body.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' חומר בחלב מן הדם, וחומר בדם מן החלב. חומר בחלב – ששה חלב

Mishnah: There is a stringency regarding chelev (forbidden fat) more than regarding blood, and there is a stringency regarding blood more than regarding chelev. The stringency regarding chelev is that chelev is subject to the prohibition of me'ilah...

SUMMARY

The Gemara first establishes that according to Rav Adda bar Ahava, the roots of kilayim of the vineyard are forbidden immediately upon taking root, which resolves a potential refutation of our kal vachomer. We then learn that Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda permits deriving benefit from meat and milk, learning a gezeirah shavah from tereifah. Analyzing the Mishnah, the Gemara explains that Rabbi Akiva excludes wild animals and birds from the Torah prohibition because he holds that a prohibition can take effect upon an existing prohibition, leaving the three mentions of "kid" free to exclude them. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, however, permits poultry even mid'Rabbanan because birds have no mother's milk, a practice Levi observed without protesting in the place of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira. Finally, the new Mishnah rules that milk found in the stomach of a carcass or a non-Jew's shechitah is forbidden, and discusses the halacha of curdling milk using the skin of a kosher stomach.

The Gemara brings down a fascinating machlokes between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili regarding whether a bird cooked in milk is forbidden mid'Rabbanan. We see that in the place of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, they actually followed his psak and would eat poultry with milk! But when Levi visited the home of Yosef the bird-catcher, they served him a peacock's head cooked in milk, and Levi did not say a word to protest. When he returned to Rabbi, Rabbi asked him why he didn't place them under a ban for violating the accepted halachah. Levi answered that since it was the local place of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira, who expounded like Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, he could not protest.

Look at the incredible derech erez and respect for local mesorah we learn from Levi. Lichoira, Levi knew that the general halachah is not like Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, and that eating poultry with milk is a d'Rabbanan prohibition for the rest of the world. Yet, he understood that in that specific community, they had a solid, authentic mesorah to follow. He didn't barge in to reform them or start a machlokes. He respected their local authority and stayed silent.

In our own avodas Hashem, we often encounter other Yidden who do things differently. Whether it is a different minhag in davening, a different standard of kashrus, or a different way of running a home, the yetzer hara loves to make us feel superior or urge us to "correct" them. Levi teaches us the true yeshivish approach: have the humility to recognize that another community's established mesorah has holiness and validity. Unless someone is clearly violating an absolute halachah, our job is to respect their space and their rabbanim, not to impose our own standards on them.

Today, when you see someone practicing a minhag or halachic leniency that is different from your own family's or yeshiva's path, consciously hold back from judging or commenting. Remind yourself that they have a mesorah to rely on, and focus instead on strengthening your own avodah with warmth and humility.