



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Regarding a marrow bone of a (human) corpse, or a marrow bone of a consecrated animal,¹ he who touches it, whether it be closed or pierced, becomes tamei. Regarding a marrow bone of a carcass or of a [dead] reptile, if it was stopped up, he who touches it remains tahor,² but if it was at all pierced it conveys tumah by contact. From where do we know [that it conveys tumah] also by carrying? The text says: he that touches and he that carries: therefore, what comes within the scope of tumah by contact comes within the scope of tumah by carrying. And that which does not come within the scope of tumah by contact does not come within the scope of tumah by carrying.

GEMARA: He who touches it does [become tamei] but he who overshadows it does not [become tamei]. What are the circumstances? If there was an olive's bulk of flesh upon it, then surely it conveys tumah by overshadowing? — It must

be that there was not an olive's bulk of flesh upon it. But if there was an olive's bulk of marrow within it, then surely the tumah breaks through and rises upwards,³ and it should convey tumah by overshadowing? — It must be that there was not an olive's bulk of marrow within it. But if it is held that the marrow within [the bone] can restore [the flesh] outside it,⁴ then surely it is a proper limb, and it should convey tumah by overshadowing? — Rav Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya said: This proves that the marrow within cannot restore [the flesh] outside it.

How have you explained the case? That there was not an olive's bulk.⁵ Then why does it convey tumah in the case of consecrated animals?⁶ Furthermore, why does the marrow bone of a carcass or of a [dead] reptile, even when pierced, convey tumah?⁷ — These are no difficulties at all, for the first clause⁸ refers to the case where there was not an olive's bulk

¹ Which was rendered piggul in the course of the offering, or whose meat became nossar, i.e., was left over beyond the time prescribed for eating. The Rabbis, in order to prevent such abuses arising out of the negligence of the Kohen, decreed that sacrificial meat which was piggul or nossar shall render the hands tamei. This decree clearly applied to those parts of the sacrifice which were edible; therefore it did not apply to marrowless bones, but it did apply to a marrow bone for then the bone serves as a holder for the marrow within it.

² The bone of a carcass or of a reptile is in itself not tamei; it is, however, tamei because it serves as a 'protection' to the marrow that is within it. And this is so only if the marrow within was accessible, i.e., the bone must be pierced so as to allow a hair at least to reach the marrow.

³ Since presumably there is not within the bone an air-space of one cubic-handbreadth the tumah within it breaks through its enclosure and spreads in the house or 'tent'.

⁴ And even if the marrow of a bone in the living animal has entirely wasted away, and the flesh around it has gone, the bone is still regarded as a proper limb, for it is possible for new marrow to form in the bone and to restore the flesh around it.

⁵ Neither of marrow nor of flesh.

⁶ For to regard the bone as a holder for the flesh that is nossar there must be at least an olive's bulk either of marrow within it or of flesh upon it.

⁷ The bone is clearly a protection for the marrow that is within it, and it has been established that a protection can be included and reckoned together with the foodstuff only to convey the light tumah i.e., to render other foodstuffs tamei, but not to convey the grave tumah, i.e., to render the person that touches it tamei.

⁸ Which deals with the marrow bone of a corpse.

and the subsequent clause⁹ to the case where there was an olive's bulk.

What does he teach us then? — He teaches us a number of rules. The first clause teaches us [the principle] that the marrow within [the bone] cannot restore [the flesh] outside it.¹⁰ The clause concerning consecrated animals teaches us that whatever serves [as a holder for] the meat left over [from the sacrifice] is a matter of consequence,¹¹ for Mari bar Avuha said in the name of Rabbi Yitzchak: Bones of sacrifices which served [as a holder for] the meat left over [from the sacrifice] render the hands tamei, since they have become auxiliary to forbidden matter. The clause concerning the carcass [teaches us] that even if there is an olive's bulk [of marrow in the bone], only when [the bone is] pierced does it [convey tumah], but when not pierced it does not [convey tumah].

Abaye said: In fact [I maintain that] the marrow within [the bone] can restore [the flesh] outside it, but here we are dealing with a bone which was scraped away,¹² and it is in agreement with Rabbi Elozar's view. For Rabbi Elozar stated: If a man scraped away a marrow bone lengthwise it is still

⁹ Which deals with the marrow bone of consecrated animals and of a carcass or reptile.

¹⁰ Therefore if there was not an olive's bulk of marrow within the bone, it cannot convey tumah by 'overshadowing,' i.e., it cannot render tamei men and vessels that are in the same 'tent' or under the same roof.

¹¹ It is regarded as the meat itself and so renders the hands tamei.

¹² In which case there is no hope of the limb being restored by the formation of new marrow and flesh. Hence as there is not an olive's bulk of marrow now in the bone, neither is there any prospect for the bone to form new marrow, it cannot convey tumah by overshadowing.

¹³ Although it does not now contain the requisite quantity of marrow, since in a portion of the bone there is a continuous strip of marrow, it will be invested in time with marrow and flesh, and it therefore conveys tumah as the corpse itself.

¹⁴ If a long strip of the bark of the tree is removed, the tree will in no way be affected by it, but if a strip around the circumference of the tree is removed, the tree will soon wither.

tamei,¹³ if transversely it is tahor; as a mnemonic think of the palm tree.¹⁴

Rabbi Yochanan said: In truth, there was an olive's bulk [of marrow in the bone], and [I maintain that] the marrow within can restore [the flesh] outside it,¹⁵ but the expression 'He who touches' stated [in the Mishnah] means also overshadowing.¹⁶

The Gemara asks: But surely if the marrow within can restore [the flesh] outside it, why is it that the marrow bone of a carcass or of a dead reptile, if not pierced, is tahor?¹⁷

Rabbi Binyamin bar Giddal said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: We are dealing here with an olive's bulk of marrow that shakes about¹⁸ [in the bone]; so that with regard to a corpse¹⁹ the tumah breaks through and rises upwards, but with regard to a carcass, since the marrow shakes about within,²⁰ if the bone was pierced, it does [convey tumah], but if it was not pierced, it does not [convey tumah].

¹⁵ I.e., even if there was not an olive's bulk of marrow within the bone, it would still convey tumah as a corpse, for the limb would, in time, be restored.

¹⁶ So that the original assumption at the outset that the Tanna of our Mishnah excluded tumah by overshadowing was incorrect.

¹⁷ It is surely regarded as a whole limb, for even if it has no marrow or flesh at present, it will be invested with these later on; of what avail is it, therefore, that the bone is closed?

¹⁸ I.e., it is dried up and shriveled so that it shakes about within the bone; in such a case the limb cannot be restored.

¹⁹ Since there is the requisite quantity of marrow within the bone it is immaterial whether it is closed or not, for the tumah breaks through. With regard to consecrated meat, too, as the bone should as a holder for an olive's bulk of marrow which was nossar, it conveys tumah.

²⁰ And since it cannot restore the flesh on the outside, it cannot then be considered as a limb; it therefore requires the minimum standard of an olive's bulk which must be accessible.

Rabbi Avin (others say Rabbi Yosi bar Avin) said: We have also learned the same:²¹ If a man touched one half-olive's bulk [of a corpse] and [at the same time] overshadowed another half-olive's bulk²² or the other half-olive's bulk overshadowed him,²³ he is tamei. Now if you hold that they²⁴ fall within one category then it is quite right that they combine [to render the person tamei]; but if you hold that they fall within two categories, can they in any way combine? Surely, we have learned: This is the general rule: All [means of conveying tumah] which fall within one category combine to convey tumah, but all which fall within two categories do not [combine to] convey tumah. What do you say then? That they fall within one category? Read the following clause: But if he touched one half-olive's bulk and some other thing overshadowed both him and another half-olive's bulk,²⁵ he is tahor. Now if they fall within one category why is he tahor?²⁶

The Gemara asks: But doesn't this clause conflict with the first clause?²⁷

Rabbi Zeira answered: We are dealing there [in the first clause] with tumah that was confined between two

cupboards between which there was not a handbreadth's space, in which case [overshadowing] is regarded as actual contact.²⁸

Who then is the Tanna that includes 'overshadowing' in the term 'he who touches'? — It is Rabbi Yosi. For it was taught: Rabbi Yosi says: A ladleful of corpse mold²⁹ conveys tumah by contact, by carrying, and by overshadowing. Now it is clear [that a person is rendered tamei] by carrying and by overshadowing, for he carries the whole quantity and overshadows the whole quantity, but with regard to tumah by contact, he surely does not touch the whole quantity!³⁰ One must say, therefore, that the expression 'contact' means 'overshadowing'.

The Gemara asks: But does it not expressly state 'by contact' as well as 'by overshadowing'?

Abaye suggested: [To overshadow tumah] within a handbreadth of it is termed 'overshadowing by contact', but more than a handbreadth away it is termed 'plain overshadowing'.³¹

²¹ The Tanna in the following Mishnah clearly holds the view that the expression 'contact' means also 'overshadowing', and that these two forms of tumah fall within one category.

²² E.g. one hand of the man was touching one half-olive's bulk while the other hand was directly above and overshadowing the second half-olive's bulk.

²³ E.g. the second half-olive's bulk was stuck on a chip which was inserted in the wall and the man stood directly underneath it.

²⁴ Sc., tumah conveyed by contact and by overshadowing.

²⁵ E.g., both the man and the second half-olive's bulk were directly underneath and overshadowed by a plank.

²⁶ Shouldn't the contact and the overshadowing, each in connection with a half-olive's bulk of a corpse, combine to render the person tamei?

²⁷ I.e., there is a contradiction in this Mishnah itself between the first clause and the next one.

²⁸ For it is established law that tumah which is confined or wedged in — i.e., there is not the air-space of a handbreadth on all sides — breaks through its confines and rises, as it were, in a column directly above,

so that whoever passes at any height whatsoever over the tumah actually comes into contact with the column of tumah and is rendered tamei.

²⁹ I.e., the earth of a decomposed body found in a coffin.

³⁰ For the corpse mold is composed of many particles, and when a person touches a part of it he cannot be said to have touched the whole ladleful, in which case he should not be rendered tamei by contact therewith.

³¹ The terms 'contact' and 'overshadowing' employed in the foregoing Baraisa are both to be understood in the sense of overshadowing, but Abaye draws a distinction between two modes of overshadowing. It must be observed that Abaye's suggestion is in no way in support of Rabbi Yochanan's contention that the Tanna of our Mishnah is Rabbi Yosi and that

the expression in our Mishnah 'he who touches' includes overshadowing, for according to him only overshadowing within a handbreadth from the tamei matter can be referred to by the term 'touch', accordingly our Mishnah does exclude plain overshadowing so that the difficulty propounded at the beginning of the argument

Rava said: Even more than a handbreadth away, it is also termed 'overshadowing by contact'; but what is meant by 'plain overshadowing'? Where there is a projection.³²

Raba said: From where do I know this?³³ From what was taught [in the following Baraisa]: Rabbi Yosi says: The woven cords of beds and the lattice-work of windows serve as partitions between the house and the upper room to prevent the passage of tumah to the other side.³⁴ If these were spread over a corpse, being suspended in the air, whatever touches³⁵ directly over a mesh is tamei but whatever is not directly over a mesh is tahor. Now what are the circumstances? If [they were suspended] within a handbreadth [from the corpse], why does that which was not directly over a mesh remain tahor? Surely it is nothing else but the corpse in its shroud, and the corpse in its shroud conveys tumah!³⁶ They must then [have been suspended] more than a handbreadth away [from the corpse], nevertheless the expression 'whatever touches' is used!

Abaye said: In fact [they were suspended] within a handbreadth [from the corpse], but as for your objection: Surely it is nothing else but the corpse in its shroud! [I reply that] with regard to the corpse in its shroud a man certainly

stands. Of course Abaye himself has already explained the Mishnah to his satisfaction as stated above.

³² I.e., where the person and the tumah are side by side, but some projection overshadows both, forming a 'tent' or roof over both.

³³ That whatever overshadows more than the distance of a handbreadth away from the tumah is still regarded as 'overshadowing by contact' according to Rabbi Yosi, and is implied in the term 'touch'.

³⁴ If these networks are stretched out across the lower room forming a ceiling above it, they become part of the structure of the room and as such cannot contract tumah. Moreover they serve as a partition and prevent the tumah from passing into the room above, for the meshes or holes in the network do not give passage to the tumah since there is no opening a handbreadth square in it. Consequently whatever happens to be in the upper room, even that which is directly over a hole in the net, remains tahor.

ignores [the existence of the shroud],³⁷ but he does not ignore the existence of these.

The Gemara asks: But is this not a case of concealed tumah³⁸ which [according to established law] breaks through and rises upwards?

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yosi is of the opinion that concealed tumah cannot break through and rise upwards.

³⁵ I.e., happens to be directly over one of the holes in the net. In this case the network is in no way intended as a ceiling, consequently whatever directly overshadows the corpse becomes tamei, but whatsoever is not directly over a hole but over a bar or thread of the net does not become tamei, for in this respect the threads of the net, inasmuch as they do not contract tumah, form a partition to prevent the tumah from passing upwards.

³⁶ The network, since it is so close to the corpse, can almost be regarded as the shroud of the dead, and the shroud of the dead surely cannot prevent the tumah of the corpse from spreading!

³⁷ I.e., he mentally ignores the separate existence of the shroud as a garment but looks upon it as part of the corpse; this, however, cannot be said with regard to the network.

³⁸ I.e., tumah over which there is not the space of one handbreadth.