

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קכ"ט

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by continuing our deep dive into the shakla v'tarya between Rabbi Asi, Rabbi Zeira, and Rabbi Abba bar Memel regarding the tumah of a dangling limb and flesh. The Gemara is bothered by how a concealed place (bais hasetarim) can transmit tumah, and whether we can establish this baraita according to Rabbi Meir. This leads us into a beautiful lomdishe discussion between Rava and Rabba bar Rav Chanan about whether a dangling piece of flesh needs hechsher (preparation by water) to become tamei, or if its connection to a severe tumah (tumah chamurah) of a limb from the living animal makes hechsher completely unnecessary.

From there, the Gemara brings a series of fascinating challenges from Abaye and Rav Pappa, who try to find cases where food might transmit a severe tumah mid'Oraisa. We look at sourdough designated as a seat, food offered to an idol, food connected to vessels, and the fat of a carcass in the villages. In each case, the Gemara establishes a major yeshivish yesod: when food is repurposed for a non-food function, it loses its status as food and is considered "like wood" (meshamesh k'etz), which allows it to carry severe tumah without violating the rule that food itself cannot become a primary source of tumah. We then turn to our Mishnah to analyze Rabbi Shimon's shitta that dangling limbs and flesh are tahor, exploring the source for his ruling.

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

עמוד א' DAF 129A

QUESTION

טומאת בית הסתרים היא, וטומאת בית הסתרים לא מטמא.

The contact between the flesh and the limb is **impurity of a concealed place**, and the rule is that **impurity of a concealed place does not transmit impurity**.

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אחי לדידי קשיא לי, ושאינן ליתיה לרבי אבא בר ממל, ואמר לי: הא מני רבי מאיר היא, דאמר: טומאת בית הסתרים מטמא.

Rabbi Zeira said to him, to Rabbi Asi: **Even to me** this was difficult, and I asked Rabbi Abba bar Memel about it, and he said to me: **Whose** opinion is this baraita? It is Rabbi Meir, who says that **impurity of a concealed place does transmit impurity**.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה: ולאו זימנין סגינאין אמרה קמאי, ואמרי ליה: שני ליה לרבי מאיר בין טומאה דבעיא הקשר ובין טומאה דלא בעיא הקשר.

Rabbi Asi said to him: But did he not say this answer before me many times, and I said to him that this is no teretz, because Rabbi Meir differentiates between impurity that requires preparation by water to become susceptible and impurity that does not require preparation? Since this flesh was not yet prepared, even Rabbi Meir would agree it cannot become tamei through a concealed place.

RESOLUTION

אמר רבא: ומאי קושיא? דלמא בשהוכשר.

Rava said: But what is the difficulty? Perhaps the baraita is speaking of a case where the flesh had been prepared while still attached, and so it was already susceptible to tumah!

QUESTION

אמר ליה: רבה בר רב חנן לרבא: למה לי הכשר, הרי מטמא טומאה חמורה אגב אביו?

Rabba bar Rav Chanan said to Rava: Why do I need preparation at all? Behold, it transmits a severe impurity along with its father, meaning, as part of the limb from the living animal which has a severe tumah. And we have a rule that any food that will eventually transmit a severe tumah does not need hechsher!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: בפשימש, מעשה עץ שימש.

Rava said to him: When it served as part of the limb, it served merely as the function of wood, meaning it was not considered food at all, but just a structural part of the limb. Therefore, it still needs hechsher to become tamei as food.

STATEMENT

אמר אביי: הרי אמרו כופת שאור שיחדה לשיכיה – בטלה.

Abaye said: Behold, they said in a baraita: A block of sourdough that one designated for sitting upon is nullified from being food, and is now considered a vessel.

EXPLANATION

טומאתה לאו דאורייתא, דאי סלקא דעתך דאורייתא, מצינו לאכלין שמטמאין טומאה חמורה,

Now, Abaye assumed: Its impurity as a seat is not mid'Oraisa but only mid'Rabbanan, for if it should enter your mind that it is mid'Oraisa, then we would find food that transmits a severe impurity of midras, which is impossible because food cannot become a primary source of tumah.

REFUTATION

פשימש – מעשה עץ שימש.

But the Gemara rejects this: It is indeed mid'Oraisa, because when it served as a seat, it served merely as the function of wood, and was no longer considered food at all.

STATEMENT

אמר אביי: הרי אמרו תקרובת עבודה זרה של אכלין מטמאין באוהל,

Abaye said further: Behold, they said: An offering of food to an idol transmits impurity in a tent like a corpse.

EXPLANATION

טומאתה לאו דאורייתא, דאי סלקא דעתך דאורייתא – מצינו לאכלין שמטמאין טומאה חמורה!

Its impurity is not mid'Oraisa, for if it should enter your mind that it is mid'Oraisa, we would find food that transmits a severe impurity!

REFUTATION

כְּשִׁימֵשׁ – מַעֲשֵׂה עֵץ שִׁימֵשׁ.

The Gemara rejects this: It is mid'Oraisa, because **when it served** as an idol offering, **it served** merely as the function of wood, losing its status as food.

STATEMENT

אָמַר אַבְיִי: הָרִי אָמְרוּ חֲבוּרֵי אֶכְלִין כְּכֵלִים דָּמוּ,

Abaye said: Behold, they said: Foods that are connected to vessels are considered like the vessels themselves, and can contract severe tumah.

EXPLANATION

טומאתן לאו דאורייתא, דאי סלקא דעתך דאורייתא – מצינו לאוכל שמטמא טומאה חמורה!

Their impurity is not mid'Oraisa, for if it should enter your mind that it is mid'Oraisa, we would find food that transmits a severe impurity!

REFUTATION

כְּשִׁימֵשׁ – מַעֲשֵׂה עֵץ שִׁימֵשׁ.

The Gemara rejects this: It is mid'Oraisa, because **when it served** as a connector, **it served** merely as the function of wood.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיָּה: רַב פָּפָא לָרְכָא: הָא דִּתְנִיָּא, חֵלֵב נָבֵלָה בְּכִפְּרִים צְרִיךְ מַחֲשָׁכָה וְהִכָּשֵׁר,

Rav Pappa said to Rava: That which is taught in a baraita, that the fat of a carcass in the villages (where people do not usually eat it) **requires designation and preparation** to become tamei as food,

EXPLANATION

טומאתו אגב כוליא לאו דאורייתא, דאי סלקא דעתך דאורייתא, מצינו לאוכל שמטמא טומאה חמורה!

proves that its impurity along with the kidney (as a carcass) is not mid'Oraisa; for if it should enter your mind that it is mid'Oraisa, then we would find food that transmits a severe impurity, and it would not need hechsher!

REFUTATION

כְּשִׁימֵשׁ – מַעֲשֵׂה עֵץ שִׁימֵשׁ.

Rava answered him: It is mid'Oraisa, because **when it served** as a protective covering for the kidney, **it served** merely as the function of wood.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב מִתְּנָה: הָרִי אָמְרוּ בֵּית שְׁסָפְכוּ בְּזָרְעִים – טְהוּרוּ.

Rav Mattana said: Behold, they said: A house that one roofed with seeds, the seeds become pure from their previous tunah because they are now part of the building.

EXPLANATION

טומאתו לאו דאורייתא, דאי סלקא דעתך דאורייתא – מצינו לזרעים שמתמאין טומאה חמורה!

But if the house becomes afflicted with tzaraas, the seeds become tamei with the house. Its impurity as part of the house is not mid'Oraisa, for if it should enter your mind that it is mid'Oraisa, we would find seeds that transmit a severe impurity of tzaraas!

REFUTATION

כששימש – מעשה עץ שימש.

The Gemara rejects this: It is mid'Oraisa, because when it served as roofing, it served merely as the function of wood.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רבי שמעון מטיהר.

Our Mishnah stated: Rabbi Shimon rules them pure.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

מה נפשך: אי מיתה עושה ניפול – ליטמא משום אבר מן החי, אי אין מיתה עושה ניפול – ליטמא משום אבר מן הנבלה!

The Gemara asks: Whichever way you look at it, Rabbi Shimon's ruling is difficult: If death causes detachment, then let it be tamei as a limb from the living! And if death does not cause detachment, then let it be tamei as a limb from a carcass!

ANSWER

רבי שמעון ארישא קאי: האבר והבשר המדולדלין בבהמה מטמא טומאת אכלין במקומן, וצריכין הקבשר, ורבי שמעון מטיהר.

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Shimon is referring to the first clause of the Mishnah, which taught: A limb or flesh that are dangling from an animal transmit the impurity of foods in their place while the animal is alive, and they require preparation; and Rabbi Shimon rules them pure because he holds they are not considered food while still attached.

QUESTION

אמר רבי אסי, אמר רבי יוחנן: מאי טעמא דרבי שמעון?

Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yochanan said: What is the reason of Rabbi Shimon?

ANSWER

אָמַר קָרָא "מִכָּל הָאֵכָל אֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל", אוֹכֵל שְׂאֵתָהּ יָכוֹל לְהֵאָכִילוֹ לְאַחֲרִים – קָרוּי אוֹכֵל, אוֹכֵל
שְׂאֵי אֶתָּה יָכוֹל לְהֵאָכִילוֹ

The verse says regarding food tumah: "Of all the food which may be eaten"; this teaches that food that you are able to feed to others right now is called food, but food that you cannot feed to others (since eating dangling flesh from a living animal is a prohibition) is not called food.

עמוד ב' DAF 129B

EXPLANATION

לְאַחֲרִים – אֵין קָרוּי אוֹכֵל.

that you cannot feed to others, such as a non-Jew, is not called food with regard to receiving tumah.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיָּה רַבִּי זִירָא לְרַבִּי אָסִי: דִּילְמָא טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן הָתָם, הוּאִיל וּמַעֲוָה – מַעֲוָה.

Rabbi Zeira said to Rabbi Asi: Perhaps the reason of Rabbi Shimon there, in the first clause of our Mishnah, is not because of this drasha, but rather since the limb or flesh is attached to the living animal, it is considered fully attached and part of the animal itself, and therefore it cannot become tamei as food?

PROOF

דִּתְנִינָא: יָחוּר שֶׁל תְּאֵנָה שֶׁנִּפְשָׁהּ וּמַעֲוָה בְּקָלִיפָה – רַבִּי יְהוּדָה מְטַהֵר, וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: אִם יָכוֹל
לְחִיּוֹת – טָהוֹר, וְאִם לֹא – טָמֵא.

As it is taught in a Mishnah: Regarding a branch of a fig tree that was broken off but remains attached by the bark, Rabbi Yehuda rules it pure, meaning the figs on it are still considered attached to the tree and cannot become tamei; and the Sages say: If the branch is able to live and produce fruit, it is pure, and if not, it is considered detached and the figs are tamei.

PROOF

וְאָמְרִינוּ לָהּ: מַאי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? וְאָמַרְתָּ לָּן: הוּאִיל וּמַעֲוָה – מַעֲוָה.

And we said to you, Rabbi Asi, when we were learning this: What is the reason of Rabbi Yehuda? And you said to us: Since it is attached by the bark, it is considered fully attached. So lichaira, the same logic applies to Rabbi Shimon's ruling in our Mishnah!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר לִיָּה, אֲמִצְיַעְתָּא: נִשְׁחַטָּה הִבְהֵמָה, הוֹכְשָׁהּ בְּדָמֶיהָ – דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר; רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן אוֹמֵר: לֹא
הוֹכְשָׁרוּ.

Rabbi Asi said to him: Rabbi Yochanan's explanation was said on the middle clause of the Mishnah, which teaches: If the animal was slaughtered, the hanging limb and flesh were rendered susceptible to tumah by its blood; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Shimon says: They were not rendered susceptible.

STATEMENT

(אָמַר רַבִּי אָסִי) אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מַאי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן?

And on this, **Rabbi Asi said** that **Rabbi Yochanan said**: What is the reason of Rabbi Shimon?

EXPLANATION

אמר קרא "מכל האכל אשר יאכל" – אוכל שאתה יכול להאכילו לאחרים – קרוי אוכל, אוכל שאין אתה יכול להאכילו לאחרים – אין קרוי אוכל.

The pasuk says, "From all the food which may be eaten." This teaches: **Food that you are able to feed to others**, meaning non-Jews, **is called food**; **food that you are not able to feed to others**, such as a limb from a living animal which is forbidden to Bnei Noach, **is not called food**.

QUESTION

ודילמא טעמא דרבי שמעון ביהיא אי כדרבא, אי כדרבי יוחנן?

The Gemara asks: **But perhaps the reason of Rabbi Shimon in that middle clause is either like Rava's explanation or like Rabbi Yochanan's** other explanation, which both focus on whether the blood touched the limb itself or only the body, and have nothing to do with this drasha?

RESOLUTION

אלא, לעולם אסיפא, ולא אאבר, אלא אבשר.

Rather, actually, Rabbi Yochanan's drasha refers **to the last clause** of the Mishnah, and **not to the limb**, but rather to the hanging **flesh**.

STATEMENT

מתה הבהמה – הבשר צריך הכשר, ורבי שמעון מטהר.

As the Mishnah taught: If **the animal died**, the **flesh needs hechsher** according to Rabbi Meir, and **Rabbi Shimon rules it pure**, meaning it cannot become tamei even with hechsher.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי יוחנן: מאי טעמא דרבי שמעון?

And on this, **Rabbi Yochanan said**: What is the reason of Rabbi Shimon?

EXPLANATION

אמר קרא "מכל האכל אשר יאכל", אוכל שאתה יכול להאכילו לאחרים – קרוי אוכל, אוכל שאי אתה יכול להאכילו לאחרים – אין קרוי אוכל.

The pasuk says, "From all the food which may be eaten." Food that you are able to feed to others is called food; food that you are not able to feed to others, like ever min hachai which is forbidden to non-Jews, **is not called food**.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' האבר והבשר המדולדלין באדם – טהורים.

MISHNAH: A limb or flesh that are hanging from a person but still attached are pure and do not convey tumah while the person is alive.

MISHNAH

מֵת הָאָדָם – הַבָּשָׂר טָהוֹר.

If the person died, the hanging flesh is pure, because it is treated as flesh that separated from a living person.

MISHNAH

הָאֶבֶר מְטַמֵּא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַחַי, וְאֵינוֹ מְטַמֵּא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַמֵּת, דְּבִרֵּי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

But the limb conveys tumah as a limb from the living, and it does not convey tumah as a limb from the dead; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

MISHNAH

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן מְטַהֵר.

And Rabbi Shimon rules both the flesh and the limb pure.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמ' וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן מָה נִפְשָׁר?

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: And as for Rabbi Shimon, whichever way you look at it, his ruling is difficult!

QUESTION

אִי מִיתָה עוֹשָׂה נִפּוּל – לִיטְמֵא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַחַי,

If death causes the hanging limb to be considered as if it fell off before death, then let it convey tumah as a limb from the living!

QUESTION

וְאִי אֵין מִיתָה עוֹשָׂה נִפּוּל – לִיטְמֵא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַמֵּת!

And if death does not cause it to be considered as if it fell off, then it was attached at the moment of death, so let it convey tumah as a limb from the dead! Why does Rabbi Shimon rule it completely pure?

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בְּעֶלְמָא קָאֵי, דְּקָאֵמַר תָּנָא קָמָא: הָאֶבֶר מְטַמֵּא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַחַי וְאֵין מְטַמֵּא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַמֵּת, אֵלְמָא אֶבֶר הַמֵּת בְּעֶלְמָא מְטַמֵּא,

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Shimon is referring to a different law in general. Since the First Tanna, Rabbi Meir, said: "The limb conveys tumah as a limb from the living and does not convey tumah as a limb from the dead," we see from his wording that a limb from a dead person in general, which has no bone or marrow, conveys tumah.

EXPLANATION

וַאֲמַר לִיה רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: אֶבֶר הַמֵּת בְּעָלְמָא לֹא מְטַמָּא.

And Rabbi Shimon said to him: A limb from a dead person in general does not convey tumah unless it has a k'zayis of flesh or a barley-corn of bone.

PROOF

דְּתַנְיָא: אָמַר רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר: שָׁמַעְתִּי שְׁאֶבֶר מִן הַחַי מְטַמָּא.

As it is taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Eliezer said: I heard from my teachers that a limb from the living conveys tumah.

PROOF

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: מִן הַחַי וְלֹא מִן הַמֵּת?

Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: Do you mean to say that a limb from the living conveys tumah, but not a limb from the dead?

PROOF

וְקַל וְחוֹמֶר – וּמָה חַי שֶׁהוּא טָהוֹר, אֶבֶר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ טָמֵא; מֵת שֶׁהוּא טָמֵא, לֹא כָּל שֶׁפֶּן?

But is it not a kal vachomer? If a living person, who is pure, yet a limb that separates from him is tamei; then a corpse, which is already tamei, is it not all the more so that a limb separating from it should be tamei?

PROOF

כְּתוּב בְּמִגִּילַת תַּעֲנִית: "פֶּסַח אֶזְעִירָא דְלֹא לְמַסְפַּד", הֲאֵרַבָּה לְמַסְפַּד? אֵלֶּא כָּל דְּכֵן! הֲכֹא נָמִי, כָּל דְּכֵן!

Rabbi Yehoshua brought a parable: It is written in Megillas Taanis: "On the minor Pesach, one may not eulogize." Does this mean that on the major Pesach one may eulogize?! Rather, it is all the more so forbidden! Here too, it is all the more so that a limb from a corpse is tamei!

PROOF

אָמַר לִיה: כֹּה שָׁמַעְתִּי.

Rabbi Eliezer said to him: I only heard this specific halacha from my teachers, and I cannot extend it by logical deduction.

QUESTION

וּמַאי אִיכָא בֵּין אֶבֶר מִן הַחַי לְאֶבֶר מִן הַמֵּת?

The Gemara asks: And what practical difference is there between a limb from the living and a limb from the dead according to Rabbi Eliezer?

ANSWER

כּוֹזֵית בְּשָׂר וְעֶצֶם כְּשֶׁעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מֵאֶבֶר מִן הַחַי אִיכָא בֵּינֵיהוּ.

The Gemara answers: The status of a k'zayis of flesh or a barley-corn-sized bone that separates from a limb from the living is the difference between them.

PROOF

דתנו: כזית בשר הפורש מאבר מן החי – רבי אליעזר מטמא, ורבי נחוניא בן הקנה ורבי יהושע
מטהרין.

As we learned in a Mishnah: A k'zayis of flesh that separates from a limb from the living – Rabbi Eliezer rules it tamei, and Rabbi Nechunya ben HaKaneh and Rabbi Yehoshua rule it pure.

PROOF

עצם כשעורה הפורש מאבר מן החי – רבי נחוניא מטמא, רבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע מטהרין.

And regarding a barley-corn-sized bone that separates from a limb from the living – Rabbi Nechunya rules it tamei, and Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua rule it pure.

EXPLANATION

השתא דאתית להכי, בין תנא קמא לרבי שמעון נמי, כזית בשר ועצם כשעורה איכא בינייהו.

The Gemara concludes: Now that you have arrived at this explanation, we can say that between the First Tanna and Rabbi Shimon as well, the status of a k'zayis of flesh and a barley-corn-sized bone that separate from a limb is the difference between them.

STATEMENT

הדרן עלה העור והרוטב.

May we return to you, "Ha'or Ve'harotev"!

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara resolves the kasha on the baraita by explaining that even if the dangling flesh was not prepared after detachment, it had already received hechsher while still attached to the animal. We then analyze Abaye's series of proofs regarding food transmitting severe tumah, with the Gemara establishing that in all these cases—such as sourdough used as a seat or food offered to an idol—the food is treated mid'Oraisa "like wood" because it has been completely diverted from its normal eating purpose. Finally, the Gemara clarifies Rabbi Shimon's ruling in our Mishnah, explaining that he rules dangling flesh tahor because of a drasha on the pasuk "of all the food which may be eaten," which teaches that food which cannot currently be fed to others (due to the prohibition of eating a limb from a living animal) does not have the halachic status of food to receive tumah.

The Gemara on our daf brings a fascinating yeshivish sevara to explain how food can sometimes lose its status entirely. Abaye and the other Amoraim discuss various cases, like sourdough designated for sitting, or seeds used as roofing for a house, where the food becomes tamei with a severe tumah. The Gemara is bothered: how can food contract such severe tumah? The teretz is a powerful concept: "when it served, it served merely as the function of wood" (ma'aseh etz shimesh). Once a person designates food for a physical, structural purpose, it completely loses its identity as food. It is no longer something to be consumed; it is now just "wood", a building block.

Think about the deep yeshivish chiddush here for our own avodas Hashem. A person can take something that is naturally meant for consumption, for physical pleasure and eating, and by dedicating it to a higher, structural purpose, they completely change its metzius. It is no longer "food" for the guf; it becomes "wood" for the Bais HaMikdash of one's life. When we take our physical needs, our eating, our sleeping, our business dealings, and we designate them b'davka to serve as the scaffolding for our Torah learning and mitzvos, we are mechadesh a whole new reality. We elevate the physical so that it is no longer just gashmius; it becomes the very structure of our avodah.

Today, before you sit down to eat a meal or go about your daily business, take a second to make a conscious designation. Say to Hashem, either out loud or in your heart, that you are doing this physical act solely to have the strength and means to learn His Torah and do His mitzvos. By doing this, you transform the physical "food" of your day into "wood", the holy building blocks of a life dedicated to Shamayim.