

דף יומי • תלפין • דף ק"כ

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

THE SUGYA

We start off the daf with a classic Amoraic machlokes between Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish regarding whether hair on a hide can be considered a "protector" (shomer) for the meat underneath to join together with it for the shiur of tumas ochlin. Reish Lakish is bothered by a kasha of "shomer al gabbei shomer"—a protector on top of a protector—since the hide itself already protects the meat, while Rabbi Yochanan offers a fascinating physical teretz that the hair actually penetrates all the way through the hide to touch the meat directly. This leads the Gemara into a beautiful shakla v'tarya about how we write tefillin on such hides if they are full of hair-holes, and whether a single hair can function as a "handle" (yad) to carry tumah.

Next, the Gemara turns to clarify the definitions of "gravy" and "spices" mentioned in our Mishnah that join with the meat. We find a series of exchanges between Rava and Abaye, and Rabba and Rav Pappa, to determine exactly what state these items must be in—such as congealed fat versus liquid fat—to join together for tumah, contrasting this with the halachos of eating on Yom Kippur where any liquid that settles a person's mind can combine with food.

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

עמוד א' DAF 120A

STATEMENT

אמתניתין: "העור והרוטב והקיפה וכו'" מצטרפין לטמא טומאת אכלין.

The Gemara comments on our Mishnah which taught: "The hide, and the gravy, and the spices, etc." join together with the meat to impart the impurity of foods when there is an egg-bulk in total.

STATEMENT

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

Reish Lakish said: They only taught that these items join together with the meat in the case of a bone, which is considered a protector for the meat, but a hair is not considered a protector and therefore does not join together.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אפילו נימא נמי הויא שומר.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Even a hair is also considered a protector and joins together.

QUESTION

אמר ליה ריש לקיש לרבי יוחנן: ומי איכא שומר על גבי שומר?

Reish Lakish said to Rabbi Yochanan: But is there a halachic status of a protector on top of a protector? Since the hide already protects the meat, the hair on top of the hide is just a protector of a protector, which should not halachically join together!

ANSWER

חֲלוּלֵי מַחֲלָל.

Rabbi Yochanan answered: The hair **penetrates** through the hide and touches the meat directly, so it is not on top of another protector.

OBJECTION

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

Rav Acha objects to this: If that is so that the hair penetrates through the hide, **how do we write tefillin** on parchment made from hide? **Don't we require perfect writing, and** if there are holes from the hair, **there is not** perfect writing because the ink will run into the holes!

ANSWER

אישתמיטתיה הא דאמרי במערבא: כל נקב שהדיו עובר עליו – אינו נקב.

The Gemara answers: This halacha **escaped him, that which they say in the West**, Eretz Yisrael: Any hole that the ink passes over and covers **is not** considered a hole that invalidates the writing.

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 **hide upon which there is an olive-sized piece of meat, one who touches a strand of meat protruding from it, or touches a hair that is opposite it** on the other side of the hide, he becomes **tamei**.

QUESTION

מאי לאו משום שומר?

Is it not because the hair is considered **a protector** for the meat, which proves that hair is a protector?

ANSWER

לא, משום יד.

Reish Lakish answered: **No**, it is **because** the hair serves as **a handle** to hold the meat.

QUESTION

נימא אחת למאי חזיא?

The Gemara asks: But **what is a single hair fit for** to be considered a handle? You cannot lift the meat with it!

ANSWER

כדאמר רבי אילעא: במלאי שבין המלאין, הכי נמי בנמא שבין הנמימין.

The Gemara answers: It is **as Rabbi Ila said** in another context: We are dealing **with an awn that is among other awns**; here **too**, we are dealing **with a hair that is among other hairs**, which together can be used to lift the meat.

EXPLANATION

והיכא איתמר דרבי אילעא? אהא דתנן: המלאי שבשבלין מטמאין ומיטמאין ואין מצטרפין.

And where was this statement of Rabbi Ila said? On that which we learned in a Mishnah: The awns that are on the ears of grain can contract impurity and transmit impurity as handles, but they do not join together with the grain to make up the required volume.

QUESTION

מָלֵא לְמֵאֵי חַיִּי?

The Gemara there asked: **What is an awn fit for** to be considered a handle?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי אִילָעָא: בְּמָלֵא שְׂבִין הַמָּלְאִין.

Rabbi Ila said: It is referring to an awn that is among other awns.

QUESTION

וְהָרוּטָב. מֵאֵי רוּטָב?

The Mishnah taught: **And the gravy** joins together with the meat. The Gemara asks: **What is "gravy"?**

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבָּא: שׁוּמְנָא.

Rava said: It refers to the liquid **fat** that floats on top of the soup.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה אַבְיִי: הוּא עֲצָמוֹ יִטְמָא טוּמְאָת אֲכָלִין!

Abaye said to him: But that fat itself should be susceptible to the impurity of foods as a food on its own, whereas the Mishnah implies that the gravy itself is not susceptible to impurity!

ANSWER

אָלָא חֵלֵב דְּקָרִישׁ.

Rather, Abaye said, it refers to **fat that has congealed**, which is no longer eaten on its own but still joins with the meat.

QUESTION

מֵאֵי אִירְיָא קָרִישׁ? כִּי לֹא קָרִישׁ נִמְי!

The Gemara asks: **Why specifically** must it be **congealed**? **Even when it is not congealed**, it should also join together!

PROOF

דָּאֻמְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ: צִיר שֶׁעַל גִּבִּי יֵרַק מִצְטָרֵף לְכֻוֹתֶכֶת בְּיוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים.

For Reish Lakish said: **Brine that is on a vegetable joins together** with the vegetable to make up the volume of a large date on Yom Kippur to make one liable.

ANSWER

הָתָם מְשׁוּם יִתּוּבִי דַּעְתָּא הוּא, בְּכֹל דְּהוּ מִיתְבָּא דַּעְתִּיהּ.

The Gemara answers: **There**, regarding Yom Kippur, the liability is **because of settling one's mind**, and with anything that is consumed, **his mind is settled**, even if it is a liquid combining with a solid.

EXPLANATION

הָכָא מְשׁוּם אֵינְצִטְרוּפִי הוּא, אִי קָרִישׁ – מְצַטְרֵף, אִי לֹא קָרִישׁ – לֹא מְצַטְרֵף.

But **here**, regarding tumah, it is **because of joining together** to form a single food unit; therefore, if it is **congealed**, it **joins together**, but if it is **not congealed**, it **does not join together** because a liquid and a solid do not combine for tumas ochlin.

QUESTION

וְהַקִּיפָה, מֵאִי קִיפָה?

The Mishnah taught: **And the spices [kifa]** join together. The Gemara asks: **What is "kifa"?**

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבָּה: פִּירְמָא.

Rabba said: It is **minced meat** that settles at the bottom of the pot.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה אָבִי: הוּא עֲצָמוֹ יְטִמָּא טוּמְאָת אֶכְלִין!

Abaye said to him: But minced meat **itself** should be susceptible to the impurity of foods on its own!

ANSWER

אֵלָא אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: תְּבִלִין.

Rather, Rav Pappa said: It refers to the sediment of **spices**, which are not eaten on their own but join with the meat.

BRAISA

תַּנּוּ הֵתָם: הַקֶּפֶה אֶת הַדָּם וְאָכְלוֹ, אוֹ שֶׁהִמְחָה אֶת הַחֵלֶב וּגְמָעוֹ – חַיִּיב.

We learned in a braisa **there:** One who congealed blood and ate it, or who melted forbidden fat and swallowed it, is liable.

STATEMENT

בְּשִׁלְמָא הַקֶּפֶה אֶת הַדָּם וְאָכְלוֹ, כִּיּוֹן דְּאִקְפִּיה אַחֲשׁוּבִי אַחֲשִׁבִיהּ,

The Gemara asks: **Granted**, regarding one who **congealed blood and ate it**, since he congealed it, he gave it importance as a food, and the Torah prohibits eating blood.

QUESTION

אֵלָא הִמְחָה אֶת הַחֵלֶב וּגְמָעוֹ – אֶכְלִיָּה כְּתִיבָא בִּיהּ, וְהָא לֹא אֶכְלִיָּה הִיא!

But regarding one who **melted forbidden fat and swallowed it**, "eating" is written in the Torah concerning it, and this swallowing of liquid fat is **not** considered **eating**!

ANSWER

אָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: אָמַר קְרָא "נִפֶּשׁ" – לְרִבּוּת אֶת הַשּׁוֹתָהּ.

Reish Lakish said: The verse says "Any soul that eats..." to include one who drinks liquid fat.

BRAISA

תְּנִינָא נְמִי גַבִּי חֲמִץ כְּהֵאִי גִזְנָא: הִמְחֵהוּ וּגְמָעוּ – אִם חֲמִץ הוּא, עֲנוּשׁ כֶּרֶת; אִם מִצָּה הִיא, אֵין אָדָם יוֹצֵא בָּהּ יָדֵי חוּבָתוֹ בַּפֶּסַח.

It was also taught in a braisa regarding chametz in this manner: One who melted it and swallowed it, if it is chametz, he is punished with kares; if it is matzah, a person does not fulfill his obligation with it on Pesach.

STATEMENT

בְּשִׁלְמָא אִם מִצָּה הִיא אֵין אָדָם יוֹצֵא בָּהּ יָדֵי חוּבָתוֹ בַּפֶּסַח, "לֶחֶם עֲנִי" אָמַר רַחֲמִנָּא, וְהֵאִי לָאוּ לֶחֶם עֲנִי הוּא.

The Gemara analyzes this: Granted, if it is matzah, a person does not fulfill his obligation with it on Pesach, because the Merciful One said "bread of affliction," and this liquid matzah is not "bread of affliction."

QUESTION

אָלָא אִם חֲמִץ הוּא עֲנוּשׁ כֶּרֶת, אֲכִילָה כְּתִיבָא בִּיהּ!

But, if it is chametz, why is he punished with kares? "Eating" is written concerning it, and drinking is not eating!

ANSWER

אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: אָמַר קְרָא "נֶפֶשׁ" – לְרַבּוּת אֶת הַשּׁוֹתֵה.

Reish Lakish said: The verse says "Any soul that eats chametz..." to include one who drinks it.

BRAISA

וְתִנִּינָא נְמִי גַבִּי נִבְלָת עוֹף טָהוֹר כְּהֵאִי גִזְנָא: הִמְחֵהוּ בְּאוּר – טָמֵא, בַּחֲמָה – טָהוֹר.

And it was also taught regarding the carcass of a kosher bird in this manner: If he melted it in fire and swallowed it, he becomes tamei; but if he melted it in the sun, he remains tahor.

QUESTION

וְהוֹיֵנוּ בֵּהּ: אֲכִילָה כְּתִיב בִּיהּ!

And we discussed this: "Eating" is written concerning it, so why is he tamei for swallowing it?

ANSWER

אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: אָמַר קְרָא "נֶפֶשׁ" – לְרַבּוּת אֶת הַשּׁוֹתֵה.

Reish Lakish said: The verse says "And any soul that eats a carcass..." to include one who drinks it.

QUESTION

אִי הִכִּי, בַּחֲמָה נְמִי?

The Gemara asks: If so, if he melted it in the sun, why is he also not tamei?

ANSWER

בחמה איסרוהי מסרח.

The Gemara answers: When melted **in the sun, it becomes putrid** and is no longer fit for consumption, so it loses its status as food.

EXPLANATION

וצריכי, דאי כתב רחמנא חלב – חמץ לא אתי מיניה, שפן לא היתה לו שעת הכושר; נבלה לא אתי מיניה, שפן ענוש כרת.

The Gemara notes: **And** all three derivations are **necessary**, for if the Merciful One had only written "soul" by forbidden fat, **chametz could not be derived from it, because** forbidden fat **never had a time of fitness** to be eaten, whereas chametz was once permitted; and **nevelah could not be derived from it, because** forbidden fat carries the punishment of kares, which is more severe.

EXPLANATION

ואי כתב רחמנא חמץ – חלב לא אתי מיניה, שפן לא הותר מפללו, ונבלה לא אתיא מיניה, שפן ענוש כרת.

And if the Merciful One had only written it by chametz, forbidden fat could not be derived from it, because forbidden fat **was never permitted from its general prohibition**, whereas chametz is permitted on Yom Tov for cooking; **and nevelah could not be derived from it, because** chametz carries the punishment of kares.

EXPLANATION

ואי כתב רחמנא נבלה – הנך לא אתיא מיניה, שפן מטמאה.

And if the Merciful One had only written it by nevelah, these others could not be derived from it, because nevelah is more severe in **that it transmits impurity**.

QUESTION

חדא מהדא לא אתיא, תיתי חדא מתרתי!

The Gemara asks: Granted, **one cannot be derived from one, but let one be derived from the other two!**

EXPLANATION

הי תיתי? לא לכתוב רחמנא נבלה ותיתי מהנה – מה להנה שפן ענוש כרת!

The Gemara analyzes: **Which one should be derived? Let the Merciful One not write it by nevelah, and let it be derived from these** other two? That is impossible: **What is unique to these** other two is **that they carry the punishment of kares**, which is not true of nevelah!

EXPLANATION

הנה, שפן לא היתה להן שעת הכושר!

Let the Merciful One not write it by chametz, and let it be derived from these other two? That is impossible: **What is unique to these** other two is **that they never had a time of fitness**, which is not true of chametz!

EXPLANATION

לֹא לְכַתּוֹב רַחֲמָנָא בְּחֵלֶב, וְתִיתִי מִהֶנּוּ – מָה לְהֵנּוּ שָׁפֵן לֹא הוּמַר מִכָּלֵל, תֹּאמַר בְּחֵלֶב שְׁהוּמַר מִכָּלֵל!

Let the Merciful One not write it by forbidden fat, and let it be derived from these other two? That is impossible: What is unique to these other two is that they were never permitted from their general prohibition; can you say the same of forbidden fat, which was permitted from its general prohibition?

QUESTION

ומאי ניהו? אי לימא חלב בהמה לגבוה – נבלה נמי אשתראי מליקת עוף לגבוה.

The Gemara asks: **And what is** this permission of forbidden fat? **If we say** it is the **fat of an animal** offered **to the Altar**, that is not unique, for **nevelah** was also permitted through the **melikah** of a bird offered to the Altar!

QUESTION

ואלא חלב חיה להדיט – נבלה נמי אשתראי מליקה דחטאת העוף לכהנים!

Rather, is it the **fat of a wild beast** which is permitted for an ordinary person? But **nevelah** was also permitted through the **melikah** of a bird sin-offering for the **Kohanim** to eat!

ANSWER

לעולם חלב חיה להדיט, ודקא קשיא לה כהנים – כהנים משלחן גבוה קא זכו.

The Gemara answers: **Actually**, it refers to the **fat of a wild beast** for an ordinary person, and as for your difficulty regarding the **Kohanim**, that is different because **Kohanim** acquire their food from the **table of the Most High**, so it is not considered fully permitted to an ordinary person.

QUESTION

והא דתנא: "הטמאים" – לאסור צירן ורוטבן וקיפה שלהן, למה לי? ליגמר מהני!

The Gemara asks: **And that which was taught** in a braisa, that the verse says "**the unclean ones**" to forbid their brine, their gravy, and their spices, why do I need this derivation? **Let us learn** it from these other cases of melted forbidden foods!

ANSWER

צריכי, דאי לא כתב רחמנא – הוה אמינא: די' לבא מן הדין להיות פנדון, מה התם – עד דאיכא כזית, אף הקא נמי – עד דאיכא כזית.

The Gemara answers: **They are necessary**, for if the Merciful One had not written it, I would have said: It is enough for that which is derived from a logical comparison to be like the source of the comparison; just as there, by forbidden fat, one is only liable **when there is an olive-bulk**, so too here, by sheratzim, one would only be liable **when there is an olive-bulk**, whereas the actual measure for a sheretz is a lentil-bulk. Therefore, a special verse is needed.

עמוד ב' DAF 120B

QUESTION

ולכתוב רחמנא בשרצים, וליתו הנה ולגמרו מינניהו!

The Gemara asks: **And let the Merciful One write** the prohibition against consuming the juice of **creeping animals**, and let these other halachos of liquefied forbidden fat, dissolved chametz, and a melted bird carcass **come and be learned from them**,

without the Torah needing to state them explicitly!

ANSWER

משום דאיכא למיפרה: מה לשרצים, שכן טומאתן במשהו.

The Gemara answers: This is not possible **because there is** a way **to refute** the derivation: **What** is notable **about creeping animals?** **That their impurity** is imparted **in any amount**, which is a unique stringency. Therefore, we cannot derive other prohibitions from them.

QUESTION

והא דתניא: הטביל, והחדש, וההקדש, והשביעית, והפלגים – כולן משקין היוצאין מהן כמותן.
מנלן?

The Gemara continues: **And that which is taught** in a braisa: With regard to **untithed produce, and the new crop, and consecrated produce, and the Sabbatical Year produce, and diverse kinds** of the vineyard — **with regard to all of them, liquids that emerge from them are like them** in their prohibition. **From where do we** derive this halacha?

OBJECTION

וכי תימא: ליגמר מהנה? מה להנה – שכן איסור הבא מאליו הו.

And if you would say: **Let us learn** these prohibitions **from those** previously mentioned cases of creeping animals, fat, chametz, and carcasses? We can refute this: **What** is notable **about those?** **That they are a prohibition that comes on its own**, without human action, whereas these agricultural prohibitions require human growth or ownership.

QUESTION

תינח היכא דאיסור בא מאליו, היכא דלאו איסור הבא מאליו – מנלן?

The Gemara analyzes: This **works out well where** the agricultural **prohibition comes on its own**, such as untithed produce, the new crop, Sabbatical Year produce, and diverse kinds. But **where it is not a prohibition that comes on its own**, such as consecrated produce which only becomes holy when a person consecrates it, **from where do we** derive that its liquid is forbidden?

ANSWER

גמרינן מבכורים,

The Gemara answers: **We learn** it **from first fruits**, which also require human designation.

QUESTION

ובכורים גופיהו מנלן?

The Gemara asks: **And first fruits themselves, from where do we** derive that their liquid is forbidden like the fruit?

ANSWER

דתני רבי יוסי: "פרי" – פרי אתה מביא, ואי אתה מביא משקה. הביא ענבים ודרכן – מניין? תלמוד לומר: "תביא".

The Gemara answers: **As Rabbi Yosei taught** in a braisa: The verse says "**fruit**" to teach that **fruit you must bring, but you may not bring liquid** initially. But if **he brought grapes and pressed them** into wine on the way, **from where** do we know he fulfilled his obligation? **The verse teaches: "You shall bring."** This shows that the liquid of first fruits has the status of the fruit itself.

OBJECTION

איכא למיפרך: מה לבכורים שכן טעונין קרייה והנחה!

The Gemara objects: But **there is** a way **to refute** this: **What** is notable **about** first fruits? That they require **recitation** of the passage **and placing** before the Altar, which is not true of consecrated produce!

ANSWER

א לא גמר מתרומה.

Rather, the Gemara suggests: **learn** the halacha of consecrated produce **from** **te rumah**.

EXPLANATION

ותרומה גופה מנלן? דאיתקש לבכורים, דאמר מר: "ותרומת ידך" – אלו בכורים.

The Gemara asks: **And terumah itself**, from where do we derive this? The Gemara answers: **Because it is compared to first fruits**, as the Master said on the verse: "**And the terumah of your hand**" — these are the first fruits. Since they are compared, terumah inherits the rule that its liquid is like the fruit.

OBJECTION

מה לתרומה, שכן חייבין עליה מיתה וחומש?

The Gemara objects: **What** is notable **about** **terumah**? That non-priests are **liable to death** at the hand of Heaven **and** must pay an added **fifth for** eating **it**, which is not the case for consecrated produce!

OBJECTION

א לא, גמר מתרומיהו, מתרומה ובכורים – מה לתרומה ובכורים, שכן חייבין עליהם מיתה וחומש!

Rather, the Gemara suggests: **learn it from both of them**, from **terumah** and **first fruits** combined. The Gemara objects: **What** is notable **about** **terumah** and **first fruits**? That non-priests are **liable for them to death** and an added **fifth**, which is not true of consecrated produce!

RESOLUTION

א לא, אתיא מתרומה וחד מהנה, או מבכורים וחד מהנה.

Rather, the Gemara concludes: the halacha **comes from** a combination of **terumah** and **one of those** other prohibitions (like chametz or a bird carcass), **or from first fruits and one of those** other prohibitions, which breaks any unique stringency.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וקא דתנן: דבש תמרים, וזין תפוחים, וחומץ סיתונגיות, ושאר מיני פירות של תרומה – רבי אליעזר מחייב קרן וחומש, ורבי יהושע פוטר.

The Gemara now analyzes a related Mishnah: **And that which we learned in a Mishnah**: If a non-priest consumed **date honey**, or **apple wine**, or **vinegar made from autumn grapes**, or other types of fruit juice of **terumah** — Rabbi Eliezer deems him **obligated** to pay the **principal** and an added **fifth**, and Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him from the fifth.

QUESTION

במאי פליגי? בדון מינה ומינה, ובדון מינה ואוקי באתרה קמיפלגי.

The Gemara asks: In what principle do they argue? They argue over the hermeneutical rule of "judge from it and from it" versus "judge from it and place it in its own place."

EXPLANATION

דרבי אליעזר סבר: דון מינה ומינה, מה בכורים – משקין היוצא מהן כמותן, אף תרומה נמי – משקין היוצא מהן כמותן, ומינה – מה בכורים אפילו שאר מינן, אף תרומה נמי אפילו שאר מינן.

For Rabbi Eliezer holds: "Judge from it and from it." Just as with first fruits, the liquid that emerges from them is like them, so too with terumah, the liquid that emerges from them is like them. And we learn further from it: Just as with first fruits, this applies even to other types of fruit besides grapes and olives, so too with terumah, this applies even to other types of fruit.

EXPLANATION

ורבי יהושע סבר, דון מינה: מה בכורים – משקין היוצאין מהן כמותן, אף תרומה – משקין היוצאין מהן כמותן.

And Rabbi Yehoshua holds: "Judge from it" to a limited extent: Just as with first fruits, the liquids that emerge from them are like them, so too with terumah, the liquids that emerge from them are like them.

EXPLANATION

ואוקי באתרה: מה משקין דקדשים בתרומה, תירוש ויצהר – אין, מידי אחרינא – לא, אף משקין היוצאין מהן כמותן, תירוש ויצהר – אין, מידי אחרינא – לא.

But "place it in its own place" to apply the rules of terumah itself: Just as the primary liquids of holy things in terumah, namely wine and oil, are indeed subject to the laws of terumah, but any other thing is not, so too regarding liquids that emerge from them being like them, wine and oil are indeed included, but any other thing is not.

STATEMENT

והא דתנן: אין מביאין בכורים משקה אלא היוצא מן הזיתים ומן הענבים – מני? רבי יהושע היא, דאמר: דון מינה ואוקי באתרה, וגמר להו לבכורים מתרומה.

And that which we learned in a Mishnah: We do not bring first fruits as liquid except for that which emerges from olives and from grapes — whose opinion is this? It is Rabbi Yehoshua, who says: "Judge from it and place it in its own place," and he learned first fruits from terumah, limiting it to wine and oil.

STATEMENT

והא דתנן: אין סופגין את הארבעים משום ערלה, אלא על היוצא מן הזיתים ומן הענבים – מני? רבי יהושע היא, דאמר: דון מינה ואוקי באתרה, וגמר להו לבכורים מתרומה.

And that which we learned in a Mishnah: We do not administer the forty lashes for violating the prohibition of orlah except for drinking that which emerges from olives and from grapes — whose opinion is this? It is Rabbi Yehoshua, who says: "Judge from it and place it in its own place," and he learned first fruits from terumah, and applied this limitation to orlah as well.

SUMMARY

The daf concludes with a deep analysis of a braisa regarding one who congeals blood and eats it, or melts forbidden fat (chelev) and swallows it. The Gemara is bothered by how swallowing melted fat can be considered "eating" to make one liable, which prompts Reish Lakish to bring a d'rasha from the pesukim to include drinking liquid fat. This same principle is applied to one who melts and drinks chametz on Pesach, as well as one who melts the carcass of a kosher bird (neveilas oph tavor), where the Gemara distinguishes between melting it over a fire—which keeps it fit for consumption—and melting it in the sun, which makes it putrid and tavor.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by a basic kasha: if the Torah prohibits the "eating" of forbidden fat or chametz, how can someone be chayav for melting it down and swallowing it as a liquid? That is drinking, not eating! The teretz of Reish Lakish is that the Torah uses the word "nefesh", a soul, to teach us that any way a person derives physical satisfaction and settles his mind, even by drinking what should be eaten, he is held responsible.

Lichoira, this is a powerful yesod for our entire avodas Hashem. The Torah is telling us that Hashem does not just look at the technical, external action of "eating" with your teeth. Hashem looks at the "nefesh", the inner experience of the person. If your neshama is getting a gishmak and settling its mind from something, that is where your ratzon is.

We often think that as long as we do not do a technical, formal aveirah, we are completely fine. But the yetzer hara is a munche at finding loopholes, melting things down so they do not look like a classic dabar assur, or finding ways to indulge that seem technically muttar. We have to ask ourselves: is my "nefesh" seeking out things that take me away from yiras Shamayim, even if I can find a heter for them?

Today, before you engage in an enjoyment that feels like a "gray area" or a clever loophole, stop and ask yourself: "Is this truly bringing my neshama closer to Hashem, or am I just melting down a gashmius' dike desire to make it slide down easier?"