

3 Mar-Cheshvan 5773
Oct. 19, 2012



Shabbos Daf 16

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Glassware

The *Gemora* asks: Why did the Rabbis impose *tumah* upon glassware?

Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rish Lakish: Since it is manufactured from sand, the Rabbis declared it the same as earthenware.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let them be incapable of purification in a *mikvah*? Why then did we learn in a *Mishna* that the following interpose in utensils: pitch and musk in the case of glass vessels?

The *Gemora* answers: The circumstances here are where the glass vessels were perforated, and molten lead was poured into them, and it is following the opinion of Rabbi Meir, for he maintains that everything depends on the part that supports it (*and the perforated glass vessel is supported by the lead, i.e., it can be used only through the lead; therefore, according to R' Meir, it is a metal, which can be purified in a mikvah, and not a glass vessel*), for it was taught in a *braisa*: If glass vessels are perforated and molten lead is poured into them, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Rabbi Meir declares them *tamei*, while the Sages declare them *tahor*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let them not become *tamei* through their outer surface (*just as earthenware*); why did we learn in a *Mishna*: Earthenware vessels and natron vessels are alike in regard to their *tumah*: they become *tamei* and render other objects *tamei* through their airspace; they become *tamei* through a cavity on their outside, but they cannot become *tamei* through their outer surface, and their breaking renders them *tahor*. It may be inferred from here that only earthenware and natron vessels are alike in regard to their *tumah*, but not other things (such as glassware)!? [*This Mishna proves that glassware does not become tamei through its outer surface!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: I will tell you that since they can be repaired when broken, they were included in the category of metal utensils.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, let them revert to their former *tumah*, like metal utensils? For we learned in a *Mishna*: Regarding metal utensils - those which are flat and those which are formed as receptacles are susceptible to *tumah*. If they become broken, they lose their *tumah*, but if they are later repaired, they return to their former status of *tumah*. Whereas in respect to glass vessels we learned in a *Mishna*: Wooden, leather, bone and glass utensils, if they are flat, they are *tahor*; if, however, they are hollow, they are *tamei*. If they become broken, they lose their *tumah*, but if they are later repaired, they are susceptible to *tumah* from then onwards. We may infer that only from then and onwards, but not retroactively!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *tumah* of glass utensils is Rabbinical, and (*the restoration of*) former *tumah* is Rabbinical (*as well*). Now, in the case of that which is *tamei* by Scriptural law, the Rabbis have imposed (*retroactively*) *tumah* upon it, but upon that which is *tamei* by Rabbinical law, the Rabbis have imposed no (*retroactive*) *tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Yet at least let their flat utensils should be *tamei*, since flat metal utensils are (*susceptible to tumah*) by Scriptural law!?

The *Gemora* answers: The Rabbis made a distinction in their case, so that *terumah* and *kodashim* should not be burned on their account.

Rav Ashi answered: After all, it is similar to earthenware utensils, and as for your difficulty, 'let them not become *tamei* through their outer surface (*just as earthenware*),' the answer is because its inside (*of glass*) is as visible as its outside. (15b – 16b)

Tumah upon Metal Utensils

The *braisa* had stated: Shimon ben Shetach instituted the woman's kesuvah and imposed *tumah* upon metal utensils.

The *Gemora* asks: But (*the tumah of*) metal utensils is Biblical, for it is written: *But the gold and the silver etc. [the copper, the iron, the tin and the lead ... must be purified with the water of sprinkling]*?

The *Gemora* answers: This (*the Rabbinical law*) was necessary only in respect of (*restoring the*) former *tumah*, for Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: It once happened that Queen Shaltzion made a wedding banquet for her son and all her utensils became *tamei*. Thereupon, she broke them and gave them to the smith, who melted them down and manufactured new utensils of them. But the Sages declared: They revert to their previous *tumah*. What is the reason? They were concerned there to provide a fence against the waters of the *chatas*. [*People would not use the procedure that takes a week, which involves the mixture of water and the ashes from the red heifer. They were worried by metal only, for wooden and earthenware utensils would be difficult to fix.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Now, that is well according to the view that the Sages did not rule like this in respect of all forms of *tumah*, but only in respect of corpse *tumah*, for then it is correct (*for that is when the chatas waters are necessary*); but according to the view that they ruled like this for all forms of *tumah*, what can be said?

Abaye answered: It was as a preventive measure lest he might not perforate it to the standard of purification (*for the hole must be a certain size – as large as a pomegranate*).

Rava said: It was as a preventive measure lest it be said that immersion of that very day is effective for it.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the practical difference between them?

The *Gemora* answers: They differ where a smith refashioned it (*by completely flattening it first*). (16b)

Collected Rainwater

The *Gemora* mentions another of the eighteen measures: For we learned in a *Mishna*: If a vessel was placed beneath a water spout to gather rainwater, and then forgotten, Beis Shammai holds that the water that gathers in the vessel disqualifies a

mikveh. [A *mikveh* must contain 40 seah of water that was not drawn. Until it reaches that size, 3 lug of drawn water will disqualify it. Beis Shammai held that water that accumulated in a vessel without knowledge of the owner is considered drawn.] Although Beis Hillel held that such water does not disqualify a *mikveh*, Beis Shammai set this halachah according to them on the day that they were found to be in the majority. Beis Shammai agree, however, that if one places a vessel in a courtyard and forgets it, any water that accumulates in the vessel does not disqualify a *mikveh*, since it is not evident that he placed it there to gather water.

Rav Mesharshiya, in the name of the school of Rav, said that even Beis Hillel agrees that if one places the vessel beneath the spout when clouds are gathering, even if he forgets about the vessel before it fills with water, the water that accumulates disqualifies a *mikveh*. Furthermore, even Beis Shammai agrees that if one placed the vessel beneath the spout when the clouds were dispersing, then water that later accumulated in it does not disqualify a *mikveh*. The point of debate is only when one placed the vessel beneath the spout when clouds were gathering, but those clouds dispersed without rain falling, and then new clouds gathered and filled the vessel with rain. Beis Hillel considers his initial intention to fill the vessel with rainwater to be nullified, since rain from the clouds he was looking towards didn't fall, and he subsequently forgot about the vessel. Beis Shammai considers his intention to fill the vessel with rainwater, in conjunction with the fact that clouds were gathering when he put the vessel down, enough to consider the water that accumulates as drawn.

Rabbi Yosi said, "They remain in dispute." [*According to Rashi, this means that this is not one of the 18 places where the halachah was set like Beis Shammai over Beis Hillel on the day that Beis Shammai attained the majority.*] If not, asks the *Gemara*, what was the halachah that was set? The *Gemara* answers that it was the rabbinic decree that Cuthean women always have the status of menstruants. The reason for this decree is that the Kuttim do not consider a woman as capable of becoming impure due to menstruation from birth. Therefore, if a girl did become impure, they would not purify her. Thus, we must consider all of them impure out of a doubt that perhaps she became impure in her youth. (16b)



INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Glassware

The *Gemora* begins by relating the rabbinic susceptibility of glass vessels to *tum'ah* to the Torah-ordained susceptibility of earthenware vessels. Later, the *Gemora* relates glass vessels to metal, since "if they are broken, they can be fixed" by being melted and reformed (Rashi), as opposed to earthenware.

Tosafos writes that even at this stage, however, the *Gemora* does not mean to say that the *tum'ah* of glass vessels is derived from metal, for the simple fact that glass can be repaired is not enough reason to grant them susceptibility to *tum'ah* in the first place. Rather, they are susceptible to *tum'ah* because they are entirely similar to earthenware. However, once glass vessels were already declared susceptible to *tum'ah*, they were given susceptibility even from their outsides (as opposed to earthenware vessels) because they can be repaired, like metal. Thus, Tosafos holds that the susceptibility of glass vessels to *tum'ah* is derived mostly from earthenware vessels, and their susceptibility to *tum'ah* from the outside of the vessel is derived from metal.

Tosafos even goes so far (s.v. *avdi*) as to state that the susceptibility to *tum'ah* that is derived from earthenware vessels is more severe, and that *terumah* or *kodashim* that become *tamei* from a glass vessel that itself became *tamei* from within should be burnt, as opposed to if the glass became *tamei* from the outside, where the *Gemora* says that the *terumah* or *kodashim* will not be burnt (since this *tum'ah* is only derived from the glass's slight similarity to metal).

The *Gemora* concludes, "Rav Ashi says, really, they are comparable to earthenware." According to Tosafos, this presumably means, "Even the fact that glass vessels are susceptible to *tum'ah* from the outside is comparable to earthenware, and not to metal." However, the fact that *some* of the laws of a glass vessel's susceptibility to *tum'ah* are derived from earthenware was never debated according to Tosafos.

Rashi, however, writes, "Really, they are comparable to earthenware: since they are made from sand. Therefore, flat vessels are not susceptible..." The implication seems to be that, until now, Rashi understood that the *Gemora* derived all the *tum'ah* of glass vessels entirely from metal. Only now do we say that, "Really, they are comparable to earthenware..."

The *Gemora* describes the susceptibility of glass vessels to *tum'ah* as being related to that of earthenware or metal. However, the decree that it should at all be susceptible was made quite late in history, with the Beis Din of Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yochanan.

According to Rav Avigdor Miller (Torah-Nation, 251), it was not necessary to decree *tum'ah* on glass vessels before this time, since glass was an expensive commodity, and the Rabbanan did not issue decrees for irregular occurrences. However, in the times of Yose ben Yoezer and Yose ben Yochanan, the Jewish people were under the grip of a ruthless party of tax-collectors headed by Yosef ben Tuviah and his sons, who enriched themselves at the people's expense and imported lavish goods like glass vessels from gentile nations, and glass became commonplace enough that the Rabbanan saw the need to issue a decree regarding it.

Water in a Vessel

The *Gemora* mentions the debate between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel over whether water accumulated in a vessel placed beneath a rain spout and forgotten can disqualify a *mikveh*. Regarding this debate, Beis Shammai agrees that water that accumulated in a vessel placed in a courtyard and forgotten does not disqualify a *mikveh*. Rav Yose says regarding this debate that "the debate remains."

According to Rashi, this means that this was not one of the 18 halachos that was decided in favor of Beis Shammai on the day that they were found in the majority. The *Gemora* therefore asks at the end, according to Rav Yose, what was the 18th halachah decided in favor of Beis Shammai? The *Gemora* answers that it was the decree that Cuthean women be considered as menstruants from the day they are born.

The Vilna Gaon, however, deletes this entire question and answer from the text of the *Gemora*. It seems, therefore, that he understood Rav Yose not as stating that this dispute was not one of the 18 that was decided in favor of Beis Shammai. Rather, Rav Yose is to be understood as discussing the phrase immediately before his comment: Beis Shammai agrees that if one forgets his vessel in a courtyard, (the collected water does not disqualify a *mikveh*). On this, Rav Yose says that the dispute remains, i.e. Beis Shammai did not agree even in this case. Even if one leaves a vessel in a courtyard and forgets it there, Beis Shammai considers any rainwater that accumulates in it as drawn water that can disqualify a *mikveh*.