

דף יומי • חקליון • דף קייט

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

THE SUGYA

We are continuing our deep dive into the sugyas of shomer (a protector) and yad (a handle) regarding the laws of tumas ochlin. The Gemara is trying to resolve the machlokes between Rav and Rabbi Yochanan about the minimum shiur of food required for a shomer or a yad to function. We will look at how each Amora establishes various tannaitic sources, including a baraisa about a marrow bone and a Mishnah about bean pods, to see if they fit with their respective shitos.

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

עמוד א' DAF 119A

QUESTION

ורב האי במאי מוקים לה?

The Gemara asks: **And Rav, this** baraisa, **in what** manner **does he establish it**? How does he explain it according to his view?

OBJECTION

אי ביד, קשׂיא רישא!

If you say the baraisa is dealing **with a handle**, then **the first clause is difficult**, because it implies that a handle attached to less than an olive-bulk of food is considered a handle to bring in tumah, which contradicts Rav's view!

OBJECTION

אי בשומר – קשׂיא סיפא.

And if you say it is dealing **with a protector**, then **the last clause is difficult**, because Rabbi Yehuda ben Nekosa rules that the house is tahor, implying that a protector attached to less than an olive-bulk is not considered a protector, whereas Rav holds that even a protector attached to a bean-bulk is effective.

ANSWER

איבעית אימא בשומר, איבעית אימא ביד.

The Gemara answers: **If you want, say** the baraisa is dealing **with a protector**, and **if you want, say** instead that it is dealing **with a handle**.

EXPLANATION

איבעית אימא ביד, והוא דאמר כרבי יהודה בן נקוסא,

If you want, say the baraisa is dealing **with a handle**, and **he**, Rav, **stated** his ruling **in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda ben Nekosa**, who holds that a handle attached to less than an olive-bulk does not bring in tumah.

EXPLANATION

וְאִיכָּעִית אִימָא בְּשׁוּמְרָא, וְהוּא דְאָמַר כְּתִנָּא קִמָּא.

And if you want, say the baraisa is dealing with a protector, and he, Rav, stated his ruling in accordance with the First Tanna, who holds that a protector attached to less than an olive-bulk, down to a bean-bulk, does bring in tumah.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: כּוּלָּהּ בֵּיד, וְהוּא דְאָמַר כְּתִנָּא קִמָּא.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: The entire baraisa is dealing with a handle, and he, Rabbi Yochanan, stated his ruling in accordance with the First Tanna, who holds that a handle attached to less than an olive-bulk is still considered a handle.

OBJECTION

תָּא שְׁמַע: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר, קוּלִית שְׂיִישׁ עָלֶיהָ כְּזִית בָּשָׂר – גּוֹרֶרֶת כּוּלָּהּ לְטוּמְאָה.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a challenge from a different baraisa: Rabbi Yehuda says: A marrow bone that has upon it an olive-bulk of meat, the meat drags the entire bone to tumah if any part of the bone touches a source of tumah.

OBJECTION

אַחֲרִים אוֹמְרִים: אֶפִּילוּ אֵין עָלֶיהָ אֶלָּא כְּפֹל – גּוֹרֶרֶת כּוּלָּהּ לְטוּמְאָה.

Acherim say: Even if there is only a bean-bulk of meat upon it, the meat drags the entire bone to tumah.

QUESTION

וְרַב הָאֵי בְּמַאי מוֹקִים לָהּ?

The Gemara asks: And Rav, this baraisa, in what manner does he establish it?

OBJECTION

אִי בֵּיד – קִשְׁיָא סִיפָא, אִי בְּשׁוּמְרָא – קִשְׁיָא רִישָׁא.

If you say it is dealing with a handle, the last clause is difficult, because Acherim hold that a handle attached to less than an olive-bulk is effective, which contradicts Rav. If you say it is dealing with a protector, the first clause is difficult, because Rabbi Yehuda holds that a protector attached to less than an olive-bulk is not effective, which also contradicts Rav.

ANSWER

אִיכָּעִית אִימָא בֵּיד – וְהוּא דְאָמַר כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, וְאִיכָּעִית אִימָא בְּשׁוּמְרָא – פְּאַחֲרִים.

The Gemara answers: If you want, say it is dealing with a handle, and he, Rav, stated his ruling in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda. And if you want, say instead that it is dealing with a protector, and Rav ruled in accordance with Acherim.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: כּוּלָּהּ בְּשׁוּמְרָא, וְהוּא דְאָמַר פְּאַחֲרִים.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: The entire baraisa is dealing with a protector, and he, Rabbi Yochanan, stated his ruling in accordance with Acherim.

QUESTION

אַחֲרִים, הָא "כְּפֹל" קָא אָמְרִי!

The Gemara asks: But according to **Acherim**, don't they say the measure is "like a bean"? Rabbi Yochanan, however, holds that a protector is effective even for less than a bean-bulk!

ANSWER

אִיִּדִי דְקָאֵמֵר תְּנָא קִמָּא שְׂעוּרָא, קֶאֱמָרִי אֵינְהוּ נִמִּי שְׂעוּרָא.

The Gemara answers: **Since the First Tanna stated a specific measure** of an olive-bulk, **they**, Acherim, **also stated a specific measure** of a bean-bulk, but in truth they hold that even less than a bean-bulk is also susceptible.

PROOF

אָמַר רָבָא: דִּיקָא נִמִּי דְבִשְׂוִימֵר עֲסָקִינָן, דְקִתְנִי "קוֹלִית", שְׁמַע מִינָּה.

Rava said: It is also precise from the wording that we are dealing with a protector, as it teaches "a marrow bone" which protects the marrow inside. **Learn from this** that it is indeed discussing a protector.

STATEMENT

אִתְמַר, רַבִּי חֲנִינָא אָמַר: זֶהוּ שְׂעוּר, וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אֵין זֶה שְׂעוּר.

It was stated that Amora'im disputed this point: **Rabbi Chanina said: This is a precise measure**, and Acherim hold that a protector requires at least a bean-bulk. **And Rabbi Yochanan said: This is not a precise measure**, and they hold it is effective even for less.

QUESTION

אֵין זֶה שְׂעוּר, וְהָא קִתְנִי "כָּפוֹל"!

The Gemara asks: How can Rabbi Yochanan say **this is not a precise measure**? But doesn't it teach "like a bean"?

ANSWER

אִיִּדִי דְקָאֵמֵר תְּנָא קִמָּא שְׂעוּרָא, קֶאֱמָרִי אֵינְהוּ נִמִּי שְׂעוּרָא.

The Gemara answers: **Since the First Tanna stated a specific measure** of an olive-bulk, **they**, Acherim, **also stated a specific measure** of a bean-bulk, but they do not mean it as an exclusive limit.

OBJECTION

תָּא שְׁמַע: רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן עֲזַרְיָה מְטַהֵר בְּשָׁל פּוֹל, וּמְטַמֵּא בְּשָׁל קִטְנִית, מִפְּנֵי שְׂרוּצָה בְּמִשְׁמִישָׁן!

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear** a challenge to Rav from a Mishnah: **Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah rules tahor the stalk of a bean pod, but rules tamei the stalk of other legumes, because he wants their handling**. This implies that for a bean, which is larger, the stalk is not a protector, but for smaller legumes it is, which contradicts Rav's view on protectors!

ANSWER

כְּדָאֵמֵר רַב אַחָא בְּרִיהּ דְרַבָּא, בְּקוֹלָחָא, וּמִשּׁוּם יָד.

The Gemara answers: It is as **Rav Acha the son of Rava said** in another context, that we are dealing **with the main stalk, and because of** the law of a handle, not a protector.

EXPLANATION

הָכָא נִמִּי בְּקוֹלָחָא, וּמִשּׁוּם יָד, וּמֵאִי "בְּמִשְׁמִישָׁן"? בְּתִשְׁמִישָׁן.

Here too, we are dealing with the main stalk, and because of the law of a handle. And what is the meaning of "their handling"? It means **their use** as a handle.

OBJECTION

תָּא שְׁמַע, דִּתְנָא דְּבִי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל: "עַל כָּל זֶרַע זֶרַע אֲשֶׁר יִזְרַע", כְּדֶרֶךְ שְׂבָנֵי אָדָם מוֹצִיאִין – חֹטָה בְּקַלִּיפָתָהּ, וְשִׁעוּרָה בְּקַלִּיפָתָהּ, וְעַד שִׁים בְּקַלִּיפָתָהּ!

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear** another challenge, as the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: The pasuk says, "Upon any seed-sowing that is sown," which means seeds are susceptible to tumah in the manner that people take them out for sowing: wheat in its husk, barley in its husk, and lentils in their husks. This shows that even a tiny husk, which is less than a bean-bulk, acts as a protector!

ANSWER

בְּרִיָּה – שְׂאֵנִי.

The Gemara answers: **A whole entity is different**. Since the husk is protecting a complete, natural creation, it is considered a protector even if it is very small.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַב אוֹשְׁעִיא:

Rav Oshaya asked a question:

עמוד ב' DAF 119B

QUESTION

שְׁנֵי שוּמְרִין מֵהוּ שִׁיצְטָרְפוּ?

The Gemara asks: If there are **two protections** on a food, **what is** the halakha as to **whether they join together** with the food to make up the requisite egg-bulk volume to receive or transmit tumah?

QUESTION

הִיכִי דְּמִי?

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances** of this she'eilah?

OBJECTION

אֵילִימָא בָּזָה עַל גַּב זֶה – וּמִי אֵיכָא שוּמֵר עַל גַּב שוּמֵר?

If we say it is a case of one protection **this one on top of that other one**, i.e., concentric layers, **but is there** ever a halachic status of **a protection on top of a protection**?

PROOF

וְהִתְנִן: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: שְׁלֹשׁ קַלִּיפּוֹת בְּבֻצָּל – פְּנִימִית, בֵּין שְׁלֵמָה בֵּין קְדוּרָה – מִצְטָרְפִּת;

But didn't we learn in a Mishnah: Rabbi Yehuda says: There are three peels on an onion; the innermost peel, whether it is **whole or** whether it is **punctured, joins together** with the onion because it is considered like the food itself;

PROOF

אמצעית, שלמה – מצטרפת, קדורה – אין מצטרפת;

the **middle** peel, if it is **whole**, **joins together** because it serves as a protection, but if it is **punctured**, it **does not join together** because it no longer protects;

PROOF

חיצונה, בין כך ובין כך – טהורה.

while the **outermost** peel, **either way**—whether whole or punctured—is **tahor** and does not join at all, because a protection on top of another protection has no halachic status of shomer. Thus, concentric protections do not join!

EXPLANATION

רב אושעיא, שומר אוכל שחלקו קמיבעיא ליה.

The Gemara explains: Rather, **Rav Oshaya's** she'eilah is not about concentric layers; rather, a **protection of food that was divided is what he is inquiring about**, where the food is whole but the peel is split into separate sections.

EXPLANATION

כיון דהאי לא מגין אהאי, והאי לא מגין אהאי, לא מצטרף.

Do we say that **since this** part of the protection **does not protect that** part of the food, **and that** part of the protection **does not protect this** part of the food, therefore they **do not join together**?

EXPLANATION

או דלמא, כיון דהאי מגין אדידיה, והאי מגין אדידיה, מצטרפין.

Or perhaps, **since this** part **protects its own** portion of food, **and that** part **protects its own** portion of food, and the food itself is connected, they **join together**?

PROOF

תא שמע: רבי אלעזר בן עזריה מטהר בשל פול, ומטמא בשל קטנית. מפני שרוצה במשמיו.

Come and hear a proof from our Mishnah: **Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya declares tahor the pod of a bean, but declares tamei the pod of legumes, because he desires their handling**, meaning he wants the pod to protect the legumes while handling them. Since one pod and its legume are less than an egg-bulk, this must refer to multiple pods joining together, proving that divided protections do join!

REFUTATION

אמר רב אחא בריה דרבא: בקולחא, ומשום יד, ומאי "במשמיו" – בתשמישו.

Rav Acha the son of Rava said in rejection of this proof: That Mishnah is talking **about the stalk** to which the pods are attached, **and** the tumah is **because of** the law of a **handle** (yad), not a protection. **And what is** the meaning of "**for their handling**"? It means **for their use**, i.e., carrying them by the stalk.

PROOF

תא שמע, דתנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: "על כל זרע וזרע (אשר יזרע)", כדרך שפני אדם מוציאין לזריעה – חטה בקליפתה, ושעורה בקליפתה, ועדשים בקליפתן.

Come and hear another proof, as the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught in a Braisa: The pasuk says, "Upon any sowing seed which is sown," teaching that seeds are susceptible to tumah in the manner that people take them out for sowing—wheat in its husk, barley in its husk, and lentils in their husks. This proves that husks join together as protections, and since one grain is less than an egg-bulk, it must refer to multiple grains joining together!

REFUTATION

בְּדֹאמַר רַב אַחָא בְּרִיהַ דְּרַבָּא, בְּקוּלָּחָא, וּמִשּׁוּם יָד. הָכָא נִמִּי, בְּשֻׁדְרָה, וּמִשּׁוּם שׁוּמֵר.

The Gemara rejects this: Just as Rav Acha the son of Rava said regarding the other Mishnah that it was about the stalk and because of a handle, here too, it is talking about the stem of the ear of grain, and because of its status as a protection.

QUESTION

בְּשֻׁלְמָא עִילָּתָא צְרִיכִי לְתַתִּיתָא, אָלָא תַתִּיתָא מָאי צְרִיכִי לְעִילָּתָא?

The Gemara asks: Granted, the upper grains on the stem need the lower grains to support them so they do not fall off, but why do the lower grains need the upper grains?

ANSWER

בְּחֵד דָּרָא.

The Gemara answers: This is a case where they are arranged in a single row around the stem, where if any grain is removed, the rest will fall.

QUESTION

מִי אִיפָא כְּבִיצָה אֶכְלִין בְּחֵד דָּרָא

The Gemara asks: Is there really an egg-bulk of food in a single row of grain?

ANSWER

בְּחֵטִי דְשִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן שֹׁטָח?

The Gemara answers: Yes, this refers to the wheat of the days of Shimon ben Shatach, which was extraordinarily large.

STATEMENT

הַשֵּׁתָא דְאַתִּית לְהָכִי, חֲדָא חֲטָה נִמִּי בְּחֵטִי דְשִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן שֹׁטָח.

The Gemara notes: Now that you have arrived at this answer, we can say that the Braisa is talking about even a single grain of wheat from the wheat of Shimon ben Shatach which itself was the size of an egg-bulk, and we do not need to establish it as multiple grains.

STATEMENT

גּוּפָא: שְׁנֵי עֲצָמוֹת וְעִלְיָהֶן שְׁנֵי חֲצָאֵי יִיתִים, וְהַכְּנִיס רָאשֵׁיהֶן שְׁנַיִם לְבֵית, וְהַבִּית מֵאֵהִיל עֲלֵיהֶן –

הַבִּית טָמֵא.

The Gemara returns to the text itself cited earlier: If there are two bones and upon them are two half-olive-bulks of meat from a corpse, and one brought their two ends into a house, and the house arches over them, the house is tamei because the bones act as handles to bring the tumah inside.

OBJECTION

יהודה בן נקוסא אומר בשם רבי יעקב: היאך שני עצמות מצטרפין לכזית?

Yehuda ben Nakosa says in the name of Rabbi Yaakov: How can two separate bones join together to convey the tumah of an olive-bulk? A handle cannot join with another handle!

STATEMENT

אמר ריש לקיש: לא שנו אלא עצם, דהוי יד, אבל נימא לא הויא יד.

Reish Lakish said: They only taught that it acts as a handle in the case of a bone, which is significant enough to be a handle, but a hair is not significant enough to be a handle.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אומר: אפילו נימא נמי הויא יד.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Even a hair is also able to serve as a handle.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רבי יוחנן לריש לקיש: עור שיש עליו כזית בשר, הנוגע בציד היוצא ממנו, ובשערה שפנגדו – טמא.

Rabbi Yochanan challenged Reish Lakish from a Mishnah: If there is a hide upon which there is an olive-bulk of meat, one who touches a fiber protruding from it, or a hair that is opposite the meat, is tamei.

QUESTION

מאי לא, משום יד?

Is it not because the hair serves as a handle? This refutes Reish Lakish!

ANSWER

לא, משום שומר.

Reish Lakish answers: No, it is because of its status as a protection, not a handle.

QUESTION

ומי איכא שומר על גבי שומר?

The Gemara asks: But is there a status of a protection on top of a protection? The hide is already protecting the meat, so how can the hair on the hide also be a protection?

ANSWER

חלחולי מחלחל.

The Gemara answers: The hair is rooted through the hide directly into the meat, so it is loose and penetrates through, protecting the meat directly.

OBJECTION

מתקיה לה רב אחא בר יעקב: אלא מעתה, תפילין היכי כתבינן? הא בעינן כתיבה תמה, וליכא!

Rav Acha bar Yaakov challenged this: If that is so, that the hair roots leave actual holes through the parchment, how do we write Tefillin on parchment? Don't we require perfect writing without any perforated letters, and here it is not present

because of the hair holes?

ANSWER

אֶשְׁתַּמִּיטֶיהָ הָא דְאִמְרֵי בְּמַעֲרָבָא: כָּל נֶקֶב שֶׁהָיָה עֹבֵר עָלָיו - אֵינוֹ נֶקֶב.

The Gemara answers: **It escaped his attention what they say in the West (Eretz Yisrael): Any hole that the ink can span over is not** halachically considered **a hole** to invalidate the writing.

ANSWER

וְאִיבְעִית אִימָא, כּוּלִּיָּה מְשׁוּם יָד, כּדָא מַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָא: בְּמַלְאֵי שְׁבִין הַמָּלְאִים. הָכִי נָמִי, בְּנִימָא שְׁבִין תְּנִימִין.

And if you want, say instead: **The entire** reason the hair conveys tumah is indeed **because of a handle**, and as for your question of how a single hair can be a handle, it is **as Rabbi Il'a'i said** in another context regarding **the filling between the fillings**; so **too here**, it refers **to a hair that is between other hairs**, which together form a usable handle.

EXPLANATION

וְהִיכָא אֲתָמֵר דְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָא? אָהָא: מָלֵאִי שְׂבִשְׁבָּלִים מִיַּטְמָאִין וּמִטְמָאִין, וְאֵינִן מִצְטָרְפִין.

And where was this statement of Rabbi Il'a'i said? On this Mishnah: The bristles of ears of grain become tamei and transmit tumah, but they do not join together with the grain to make up the egg-bulk.

QUESTION

מִלֵּאִי לְמֵאִי חַיִּי?

The Gemara there asked: **What is a bristle fit for** to act as a handle?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי אֱלֻעָאִי: בְּמַלְאִי שְׂבִין הַמַּלְאִים.

Rabbi Ila'ai said: It refers to a bristle that is between other bristles, which together are fit to be grasped.

STATEMENT

לִישָׁנָא אַחֲרִינָא אָמְרִי לֵהּ. הָכִי נָמִי מִסְתַּבְּרָא, דְּמַשּׁוּם שׁוּמְר, דְּאִי סְלָקָא דַּעְתָּךְ מַשּׁוּם יָד – נִימָא אַחַת לְמַאי חֲזִי?

Another version of this discussion says: So too it is logical that the hair on the hide is because of protection, for if it should enter your mind that it is because of a handle, what is a single hair fit for as a handle?

ANSWER

כְּדָאֹמֶר רַבִּי אֱלֵעָא: בַּמִּלָּאִי שָׁכִין הַמִּלָּאִים, הֵכָא נָמִי – בְּנִימָא שָׁכִין הַנִּימִין.

The Gemara answers: It is as Rabbi Ila'ai said regarding the bristle between the bristles, so too here, it is a hair between other hairs.

EXPLANATION

וְהִיכָא אֵיתֵמַר דְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָאי? אַהֲא דְתַנֵּן: הַמֵּלֵאִי שְׂכַשְׁכְּשֵׁי לִים מִיטְמְאִין וּמִטְמְאִין וְאִין מִצְטַרְפִּין.

And where was this statement of Rabbi Ilai said? On this which we learned in a Mishnah: The bristles of ears of grain become tamei and transmit tumah, but they do not join together.

QUESTION

מַלְאֵי לְמַאי חֲזִי?

The Gemara there asked: **What is a bristle fit for?**

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי אֱלֵעָאִי: בְּמַלְאֵי שֶׁבֵּין הַמְּלָאִים. וְאִיכָּא דְּמַתְּנִי לָהּ

Rabbi Ilai said: It refers to a bristle that is between other bristles. And there are those who teach this discussion on a different source.

SUMMARY

The Gemara works through the shakla v'tarya of how Rav and Rabbi Yochanan explain the baraisa of Rabbi Yehuda ben Nekosa and the baraisa of the marrow bone, showing how each Amora can align the Reisha and Seisha with his own shita. We then address challenges from a Mishnah regarding bean pods and a d'rashah from the school of Rabbi Yishmael about husks, resolving them by distinguishing between handles and protectors, and by introducing the concept that a whole entity (bria) has a different status. Finally, Rav Oshaya raises a kasha regarding whether two concentric protections (shomer al gabbei shomer) can join together to make up the requisite shiur of an egg-bulk for tumah, bringing a raaya from Rabbi Yehuda's ruling on the three peels of an onion.

The sugya on our daf delves into the deep mechanics of how tumah is conveyed, focusing on the concepts of a "yad" (a handle) and a "shomer" (a protector). The Gemara brings a beautiful teaching from the school of Rabbi Yishmael on the pasuk, "Upon any seed-sowing that is sown," explaining that seeds are susceptible to tumah in the exact way people take them out for sowing, wheat, barley, and lentils in their husks. The Gemara concludes with a powerful rule: "Briyáh shani", a whole, complete entity is different. When something is whole, even the tiniest husk that protects it is significant and connected.

Lichoira, we can take a tremendous yesod from this for our own avodas Hashem. In the world of ruchniyus, we often feel small, or we feel that our small actions don't have the "shiur" to make a real impact. We look at our daily learning, our tefillah, or a small mitzvah we did, and the yetzer hara whispers that it is too insignificant to carry any weight. But the Torah is teaching us a major chiddush: "Briyáh shani." When you keep yourself whole, when you stay connected to the Klal, to the mesorah, and to your own integrity as a complete Yid, then every single small thing about you matters. Even the smallest "husk," the tiniest protective boundary you make for yourself, becomes kadosh and carries the weight of the entire entity.

When a Yid is a "briyáh," a complete creation standing proud in his emunah and yiras Shamayim, Hashem looks at every single detail of his life. Your small kabbalah, your five minutes of learning inside the bais medrash, the extra care you take not to speak lashon hara, these are not loose, insignificant pieces. Because they are attached to a whole neshamah, they have the status of a shomer and a yad, bringing tremendous ruchniyus and bracha into your entire life.

Today, remember that you are a complete, precious briyáh in the eyes of Hashem. Choose one small protective boundary, a "shomer" for your neshamah, like putting your phone away during davening or learning, and know that because you are whole, this small act has infinite value.