

Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 28 Oct 2011 06:33

Inspired by Yosef Hatzaddik (from the forum, not my favorite Bible hero, but who is also my recent hero) I would like to start a thread of more or less meaningful divrei Toiro that I have collected and that I will come accross in the future. Feel free to add on, criticize, or quote.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 28 Oct 2011 06:35

Below is my free translation from the original Hebrew:

It says in Chullin 58a: Every creature that has no bones doesn't exist for more than 12 months, and Talmud Yerushalmi adds, that it doesn't even stay alive for more than 6 months, and then within the next six months it disintegrates totally. (Yerushalmi Shabbos 83, h. 5).

This, then, raises the question: Being that the mabul lasted 1 year and eleven days, how did all the boneless creatures survived?

The Talmud in Sanhedrin , 108b, learns out from the posuk "I'mishpochoiseichem yotz'u min hateivo" (they left the teivo according to their families) that the animals left the teivo by their families but not those same animals who entered. As a proof, the gemoro in Chullin 58a, is brought: Every creature that has no bones doesn't exist (eino miskayem) for more than 12 months.

So if we are to understand the gemoro in Chullin without the clarification from Yerushalmi, that these creatures do not live for more than 12 months, we have a good answer: The original boneless creatures (insect setc) came into teivo pregnant, gave birth to offspring, and died. And it were their children who left the teivo after the mabul was over (by their families but not themselves).

However, if you take into account Yerushalmi's opinion that they didn't even live for more than 6 months (and 12 months mentioned in Chullin refers merely to their body's existence), then their offspring would also be dead by the end of the second 6-month period.

And since procreation was prohibited in the teivo (and only three creatures transgressed this prohibition as in Sanhedrin 108b), we are back to the original question: where do boneless creatures come from if there was no way they could have survived the mabul, even in the teivo?

This question is asked by the Lubavitcher Rebbe, ZTz"l, in his Reshimos that were printed for

Parshas Noyach in 1997.

The Rebbe says, that we cannot answer this question by supposing that all boneless creatures come to be by spontaneous generation, and therefore, since they don't need a father and a mother to generate offspring, they came to life spontaneously after the mabul. This idea is not mentioned anywhere in Talmudic literature, and even though there is a concept of spontaneous generation, it is never said to include all creatures with no bones.

Additionally, the proof that even boneless creatures rely on male/female procreation is from Chullin 58b, where the gemoro brings down a male name and a female name for a particular boneless creature, suggesting that there is gender division within these species.

So the Rebbe offers the following explanation:

The supposition that all boneless creatures do not live for more than 6 months, and their bodies disintegrate after 12 months, relies on the movement of celestial bodies and on the pronouncements of new months. The proof of it is this: there is a halocho psuko (a known Rabbinical verdict) in Yore De'ot 124, that during a leap year even a boneless creature survives for 13 months. This is learnt out from Yerushalmi Ksubo, and brought down by Pri Magodim regarding checking of dried fruit for toloyim (bugs).

The Shulchan Oruch says, that those fruits which become infested while on the tree, need checking for bugs up to twelve months from harvest, but could be eaten without checking after that time because "kol beriyo sh'ein bo etzem einu miskaym 12 choidesh" (boneless creatures do not exist for more than twelve months). Adds the Pri Magodim, that during the leap year you must check for 13 months.

If this is the case, and the life-span of boneless (or perhaps all) creature is dependent on the movement of celestial bodies and the Beis Din's pronouncements of leap year (as in the case in above Yerushalmi), the answer is clear:

During the year of the Flood, stars and planets did not move (see Yerushalmi Psochim P. 1, H. 1; Breishis Rabbo 25 and 33; you can also deduce from Sanhedrin 108b, that this is also the opinion of Talmud Bavli), so much so that even when figuring out the years since Creation, the year of the Flood is not counted (according to Rabbi Yehuda in Breishis Rabbo, and Rabbi Nechemya seems to agree). Therefore, this year didn't count towards the life-span of the boneless creatures, and they survived the year in the teivo.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by Yosef Hatzadik - 28 Oct 2011 14:45

[obormottel wrote on 28 Oct 2011 06:33:](#)

Inspired by Yosef Hatzaddik (from the forum, not my favorite Bible hero, but who is also my recent hero)

:-[:-[:-[:-[:-[:-[:-[

Re: The question of how the insects survived the year-long mabul.

Rashi says on the possuk where Hashem tells Noach to leave the teiva, the possuk says: *V'shartzu b'aretz - "v'lo bateiva*. From here we learn that the **animals** and **birds** were also prohibited from engaging in procreation."

There is no mention of insects in that Rashi!!!

So we might infer from this that only those who can survive w/o relations were prohibited. The reason for this prohibition is, as explained by Rashi, that it is improper for them to 'enjoy' themselves while the rest of the world is being annihilated. This is only applicable for those animals which can survive the duration of the Mabul. For them, having relations is mere 'enjoyment', whereas the spine-less insects, for whom this is a matter of survival, might not have been included in this prohibition.

=====
=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 28 Oct 2011 20:37

This a great idea as it pertains to recovery from sex addiction.

Modern science says, that only two species have sex for pleasure: humans and dolphins. Be it as it may, divrei Rashi tzrichim iyun. But the lesson for us is: you won't die without sex even if you don't have it for an entire year. Cham didn't think so (sex addict?) and look what happened to him: he kept on acting out even after the mabul etc until his life was truly ruined. As for the dog and the raven (the other two), they couldn't control their natural procreation instinct, or perhaps they were drawn by pleasure, modern science notwithstanding.

As for the insects having procreative sex in the teivo, my only objection to that is, the Gemoro says that **only** three did it in the teivo. Is it just an omission about millions of insects, or what?

Gut Shabbos!

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by Yosef Hatzadik - 31 Oct 2011 14:40

[obormottel wrote on 28 Oct 2011 20:37:](#)

As for the insects having procreative sex in the teivo, my only objection to that is, the Gemoro says that **only** three did it in the teivo. Is it just an omission about millions of insects, or what?

Maybe the gemara is referring to only those who did it in violation of the prohibition....??

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 01 Nov 2011 07:05

it did occur to me, too....but the gemoro says:

tonu rabonon: shloisho shimshu bateivo....to me it's mashma that **just three**.

Anyways, I'll go hunt for more vertlach. I learned something last night that blew my mind how in line it was with GYE, but it's too long to call a vertel.

I'm gonna try to summarize, but it'll take me some time to get ready.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 03 Nov 2011 00:33

As heard from an old and unrepentant lust addict:

ach ki eilech b'gey tzalmoves, loy eero roh, ki ato imodi:

Even as I walk in the Valley of the Shadow of Death, I shall fear no evil, because You are with me. Put the punctuation differently and you get the following pshat:

Even as I walk in the Valley of the Shadow of Death (i.e. even as I act out my darkest fantasies), loy eero - I do not fear! Roh ki ato imodi - It's bad that You are with me (because I drag You with me into the Death Valley).

Only once in recovery, do we really get the meaning of the true pshat: No matter how forlorn I may be, as long as I take You with me, I shall fear no evil.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by gibbor120 - 03 Nov 2011 15:09

[obormottel wrote on 03 Nov 2011 00:33:](#)

ach ki eilech b'gey tzalmoves, loy eero roh, ki ato imodi:

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 03 Nov 2011 16:00

Do the chassidim have a different version of tehilim? Mine says "**gam** ki eilech".
I knew I should have looked inside it.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 04 Nov 2011 06:52

This is not exactly a vertel, but for the benefit of the public that likes tuna wraps: The question of whether it is mezonos or hamotzi only comes up if you figure that the tortilla is not lechem gomur, because if it is, you wash and bentch on any amount over a kezais. In my humble layman's opinion, flour tortillas are lechem gomur. It seems so from the Shulchan Oruch HaRav, Seder Hilchos Hanehenin, Perek 2. There are two types of tortillas, pressed and cut, but the dough they are made out of starts off as thick as you wife's chala dough, so it is not b'lila racho (runny batter), so essentially it is a soft matzo, which we know is hamotzi. The tortilla's primary function is to be a main part of the meal (k'vius pseudo) and it is not eaten for pleasure. These reasons compel that flour tortillas are lechem gomur. But even if we say for argument sake, that they are lechem sh'eino gomur, as long as you eat more than 230gr (4 kabeitzas acc. To Rav A.C. Noe) and going to be full, you say hamotzi. (If you going to be full from the amount lesser than 229, you should wash on kezais lechem gomur). The size 4 kabeitzas includes the "lipton", the stuffing of tuna or whatever, in the wrap, because the "lipton" is secondary to the bread and is therefore included in shiur sviyo. If you're not gonna be full, and going to eat less than 335gr (up to 6 beitzim), then you say mezonos, but if eating 336gr or more, you should wash on kezais of lechem gomur, and only then eat your wrap. So thinking it's lechem sh'eino gomur is confusing, and should therefore be avoided in favor of washing and bentching on tuna wraps. And here is a vertel: A frum Jew has three ta'avois: to be o-gedavente, o-gebenchte, and pareve. (Heard from rav Reisman). Sorry if I ruined it for you.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by gibbor120 - 04 Nov 2011 13:05

I assume o-gebenchte means having bentched or not having to bentch, but what does o-gedavente mean?

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by ZemirosShabbos - 04 Nov 2011 14:55

thank you ~~Mottel~~ Reb Mottel, very nice presentation.

one he'ara. maybe add another taiva to the list (after you clear it with Rabbi Reisman): to eat in

(gibor, o-gedavente means to get it over with, done in a quick and backhanded fashion)

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by gibbor120 - 04 Nov 2011 16:28

[ZemirosShabbos wrote on 04 Nov 2011 14:55:](#)

*(gibor, o-gedavente means to get **it** over with, done in a quick and backhanded fashion)*

Thanks, but get what over with? Anything in particular?

o'mottel's kitchen

=====

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by ZemirosShabbos - 04 Nov 2011 16:30

o-gedavente

get the davening over with quickly

=====

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by gibbor120 - 04 Nov 2011 16:43

Thanks, I guess I'm slow all around today. TGIF! I can smell Shabbos!

=====

=====