



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

The Master said: One should divide it into three parts.

The Gemara asks: But there is a contradiction to this, for we have learned: An oven must, in its first state, be [at least] four handbreadths high,¹ and any of its fragments² [is still tamei if it is] four handbreadths high; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. But the Sages say: This³ applies only to a large oven,⁴ but regarding a small oven⁵ no matter what its height was in its first state, provided its manufacture was complete, [it is susceptible to tumah,] and any of its fragments [are still tamei if they amount to] the greater portion of [the oven]. How much is meant by ‘no matter what its height’? Rabbi Yannai said: [At least] one handbreadth high, for it is usual to make an oven one handbreadth high [as a plaything]. Now only if there is a fragment of four handbreadths [is it still tamei], but if there is no fragment of four handbreadths it is tahor!⁶

I can answer: There he split it across the width,⁷ but here he split it lengthwise.⁸

The Master said: And any of its fragments [are still tamei if they amount to] the greater portion of [the oven].

The Gemara asks: But of what use can the greater portion of a handbreadth be?

Abaye said: It means, any fragment of a large oven [is still tamei if it amounts to] the greater portion of it.

The Gemara asks: But [with regard to a large oven] the Sages say [in agreement with Rabbi Meir that it is still tamei if the fragment is] four handbreadths?

The Gemara answers: This is no difficulty: one ruling refers to an oven nine handbreadths high, the other to an oven seven handbreadths high.⁹

Another version reports the passage as follows: Rav Huna said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi: Even if he left a portion sufficient for an apron [the garment is rendered tahor]. Thereupon Rish Lakish said: This [teaching] applies only to a garment, but in the case of leather [what is left] is of value.¹⁰ But Rabbi Yochanan said: Even in the case of leather [what is left] is of no value.

¹ In order to be susceptible to tumah.

² I.e., of a large oven which was broken in order to be made tahor again.

³ Sc. the ruling of Rabbi Meir.

⁴ I.e., an oven used for baking or cooking.

⁵ Which is used as a plaything.

⁶ This clearly contradicts the aforementioned Mishnah which states that an oven to be made tahor again must be divided into three parts, but it would not be sufficient to divide it into two, even though each part would be less than four handbreadths.

⁷ And if none of the fragments are of four handbreadths, the oven is absolutely useless and therefore tahor.

⁸ And if there remains standing the greater part of the oven, even though such part is less than four handbreadths, it remains tamei. It must therefore be divided into three parts so that no part is equal to the greater part of the oven.

⁹ The Sages adopt rules of leniency: where the greater portion of the oven is more than four handbreadths then they regard fragments up to the size of the greater portion as tahor; and where the greater portion is less than four handbreadths then they regard fragments up to four handbreadths as tahor.

¹⁰ Even though it is only the size of an apron. Hence it is not rendered tahor by ‘the tearing,’ for it cannot be said to be destroyed for all use.

Rabbi Yochanan raised the following objection against Rish Lakish: If a hide had contracted midras tumah and a man had the intention to use it for straps and sandals, so soon as he puts the knife into it, it becomes tahor; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. But the Sages say: Not until he has reduced its size to less than five handbreadths. It follows, however, that if he had actually reduced its size [to less than five handbreadths] it would be tahor; but why? Surely we should say [what is left] is of value!

The Gemara answers: We must suppose here that he intended [the hide] to serve as a seat for one suffering with an issue.¹¹

MISHNAH: if there was an olive's bulk of [tamei] flesh adhering to the hide and a man touched a shred hanging from it, or a hair that was opposite to it,¹² he becomes tamei.¹³ If there were two pieces of flesh each a half-olives bulk upon it, they convey tumah by carrying¹⁴ but not by contact;¹⁵ these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: neither by contact nor by carrying.¹⁶ Rabbi Akiva, however, agrees that if there were two pieces of flesh, each a half-olive's bulk, stuck on a chip and a man swayed¹⁷ them, he becomes tamei. Why then does Rabbi Akiva declare him tahor in the [case where they adhere to the] hide? Because the hide renders them negligible.

GEMARA: Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This rule¹⁸ applies only to the case where a wild animal tore it away,¹⁹ but where it was cut away by the knife [in flaying] it certainly is deemed negligible.²⁰

¹¹ I.e., for the seat of a zav. The argument is, since the hide was intended to be used for a particular purpose so soon as it is diminished and so rendered unfit for that purpose it is deemed to be of no value.

¹² I.e., on the outside of the hide, directly over the morsel of flesh.

¹³ For the shred is like the flesh itself, and the hair is a protection to the flesh.

¹⁴ For when a person carries the hide he carries at the same time an olive's bulk of the carcass.

¹⁵ Since the pieces are apart they cannot be touched simultaneously but only one after the other, and each time only a half-olive's bulk is touched. The two separate 'contacts' cannot be reckoned together to make up a 'contact' of an olive's bulk.

Rav Nachman inquired of Ulla: Did Rabbi Yochanan also say so even if it was as large as a tarta? — He replied: Yes. And even as large as a sieve? — He replied: Yes. By God! said the other; even if Rabbi Yochanan himself had told it me by his own mouth I should not have accepted it!

When Rabbi Oshaya went up [to Eretz Yisroel] he met Rabbi Ammi and reported to him the discussion: So said Ulla and so answered Rav Nachman. Said [Rabbi Ammi] to him: And even if Rav Nachman is the son-in-law of the Exilarch shall he make light of the teaching of Rabbi Yochanan?

On another occasion he [Rabbi Oshaya] found him [Rabbi Ammi] sitting and expounding it with reference to the second clause [of our Mishnah] thus: If there were two pieces of flesh each a half-olives bulk upon it, they convey tumah by carrying but not by contact; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: neither by contact nor by carrying. Thereupon Rabbi Yochanan had said: This rule²¹ applies only to the case where a wild animal tore them away, but where they were cut away by the knife [in flaying] they are deemed negligible. Then said [Rabbi Oshaya]: Does the Master refer it to the second clause? — He replied: Yes; did Ulla tell it you with reference to the first clause? Said the other: He did. By God! said Rabbi Ammi: Even if Yehoshua the son of Nun had told it me by his own mouth I should not have accepted it!

When Ravin came down with all the company that used to come down [from Eretz Yisroel to Bavel] they reported that it referred to the first clause.

¹⁶ For Rabbi Akiva is of the opinion that flesh less than an olive's bulk adhering to hide is deemed as part of the hide itself.

¹⁷ I.e., moved them without actually touching them.

¹⁸ That an olive's bulk of flesh adhering to the hide is not rendered negligible.

¹⁹ I.e., a wild animal bit into the animal while alive and later when the animal was being flayed pieces of flesh were found to have been torn away and left hanging to the hide.

²⁰ Even though there is a whole olive's bulk of flesh.

²¹ That two pieces of flesh each a half-olive's bulk are not rendered negligible according to Rabbi Yishmael.

The Gemara asks: But is there not then a difficulty?²²

The Gemara answers: As Rav Pappa suggested [elsewhere] that the flesh was beaten thin, so here it could also be explained that the flesh was beaten thin.²³

The Mishnah had stated: If there were two pieces of flesh each a half-olives bulk upon it, etc. Bar Padda said: This ruling²⁴ applies only to the case [where a man touched them] from the outside,²⁵ but [where he touched them] on the inside²⁶ the two contacts can be reckoned together.²⁷ But Rabbi Yochanan said: The two contacts cannot be reckoned together.

The Gemara notes: Rabbi Yochanan is consistent in his view, for Rabbi Yochanan also said that Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Dosa ben Hurkenos said the same thing. Rabbi Yishmael taught it in the above passage,²⁸ and Rabbi Dosa ben Hurkenos in the following Mishnah which we learned: If any matter²⁹ which causes tumah in a 'tent'³⁰ was divided and [the parts]³¹ brought into a house, Rabbi Dosa ben Hurkenos declares [everything under the same roof-space] tahor, but the Sages declare it tamei. Now doesn't Rabbi Dosa ben Hurkenos hold that two overshadowings³² cannot be reckoned together? Similarly, two contacts cannot be reckoned together.

²² For if it is held that a whole olive's bulk of flesh is rendered negligible when cut away by the knife then the same should be the case where flesh the size of a tarta or a sieve was cut away. But this is contrary to reason!

²³ There was a thin slice of flesh the size of a tarta or even of a sieve which when collected and rolled tip amounted to an olive's bulk only.

²⁴ Of Rabbi Yishmael that the two pieces of flesh each a half-olive's bulk adhering to the hide do not convey tumah by contact.

²⁵ I.e., he did not actually touch the flesh but only the hide opposite each piece; the hide in such a case cannot serve either as a protection or as a handle to combine the two pieces in order to convey the tumah.

²⁶ I.e., he actually touched the pieces of flesh, first the one half-olive's bulk and then the other. In this case Rabbi Yishmael will hold that the two separate contacts are combined and are regarded as one contact of a whole olive's bulk, and the person would be tamei.

²⁷ Lit., 'there is such a thing as touching and again touching'.

²⁸ That according to Rabbi Yochanan, Rabbi Yishmael holds that two separate contacts, each time of half the minimum quantity, cannot be reckoned as one contact of the whole quantity.

The Gemara asks: As it is established that Rabbi Dosa ben Hurkenos is in agreement with Rabbi Yishmael, it follows that the Sages [the opponents of Rabbi Dosa] are in agreement with Rabbi Akiva [the opponent of Rabbi Yishmael]. But doesn't Rabbi Akiva hold that they are entirely tahor?³³

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva only declares them tahor when adhering to the hide, but otherwise they³⁴ convey tumah, as stated in the latter part [of the Mishnah]: Rabbi Akiva, however, agrees that if there were two pieces of flesh, each a half-olive's bulk, stuck on a chip and a man swayed them, he becomes tamei. Why then does Rabbi Akiva declare him tahor in the [case where they adhere to the] hide? Because the hide renders them negligible.

Rav Ukva bar Chama raised an objection: It is written: [He that touches] its carcass, but not the hide upon which are two pieces of flesh each a half-olive's bulk. I might think that the same is the case with regard to carrying, the verse therefore says: And he that carries . . . shall be tamei; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: It is written: 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 what does not come within the scope of tumah by contact does not come within the scope of tumah by carrying.³⁵ Now if

²⁹ E.g. an olive's bulk of the flesh of a corpse, or a ladleful of corpse-mold.

³⁰ By overshadowing, i.e., which renders tamei everything which happens to be in the same tent or under the same roof space as the tamei matter.

³¹ Each less than the minimum quantity.

³² Each time of half the minimum quantity. According to Rabbi Dosa ben Hurkenos, overshadowing must be in one place, at the same time, and over a whole olive's bulk.

³³ Sc. the flesh adhering to the hide. Thus Rabbi Akiva is more lenient in his view than Rabbi Yishmael, whereas the Sages who differ with Rabbi Dosa declare everything in the house to be tamei.

³⁴ Sc. the two pieces of flesh, each a half-olive's bulk, when touched separately.

³⁵ Therefore, argues Rabbi Akiva, it cannot be said that these pieces of flesh convey tumah by carrying and not by contact, as Rabbi Yishmael would have it.

it were so,³⁶ it indeed comes within the scope of tumah by contact on the inside!

Rava answered. He means to say this: What comes within the scope of tumah by contact on every side comes within the scope of tumah by carrying, and what does not come within the scope of tumah by contact on every side does not come within the scope of tumah by carrying.³⁷

Rav Avya the Elder inquired of Rabbah son of Rav Huna: Can a closed marrow-bone, according to Rabbi Yishmael, convey tumah [by carrying] or not? Does Rabbi Yishmael accept the principle: What comes within the scope of tumah by contact, comes within the scope of tumah by carrying, and what does not come within the scope of tumah by contact, does not come within the scope of tumah by carrying,³⁸ — but here [in our Mishnah] the reason³⁹ is because it comes within the scope of tumah by contact on the inside; or does he not accept this principle at all? — He replied: See, there's a raven flying past.⁴⁰ [When Rav Avya left,] his son Rava said to him: Was that not Rav Avya the Elder of Pumbedisa whom you, sir, have praised as a great man? He replied: I am today [in the condition of one who said,] Revive me with flasks of wine!⁴¹ And he asks me a matter which requires much reasoning!

Ulla said: If there were two pieces of flesh, each a half-olive's bulk, stuck on a chip and a man waved them to and fro, even the whole day long, he remains tahor. Why? Because [as] written [the word can be read] 'be carried', but [by tradition] we read 'carries'; it is necessary therefore that when one 'carries' it, it must be able to 'be carried' at one time.⁴²

³⁶ That, according to Bar Padda, Rabbi Yishmael holds that these pieces can convey tumah also by contact, namely, on the inside), then Rabbi Akiva's argument is void of meaning.

³⁷ I.e., Rabbi Akiva means that unless a substance can convey tumah by every contact with it, from the outside as well as from the inside, it will not convey tumah by carrying.

³⁸ And therefore a closed-up marrow-bone of a carcass, since it does not convey tumah by contact (for the bone itself is not considered tamei as the carcass, and the marrow within it is inaccessible for it is closed-up), will not convey tumah by carrying.

³⁹ Why the two morsels of flesh convey tumah by carrying.

⁴⁰ An evasive answer.

The Gemara asks: We have learned: If there were two pieces of flesh each a half-olives bulk upon it, they convey tumah by carrying but not by contact; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Why is this so? They surely cannot 'be carried' at one time?

Rav Pappa suggested that there was a thin strip [of flesh joining the two pieces].

Come and hear: Rabbi Akiva, however, agrees that if there were two pieces of flesh, each a half-olive's bulk, stuck on a chip and a man swayed⁴³ them, he becomes tamei. Why is this so? They surely cannot 'be carried' at one time?

The Gemara answers: Here, too, we must suppose that there was a thin strip of flesh.

Tannaim differ on this point.⁴⁴ It was taught: It is all one⁴⁵ whether one touches them⁴⁶ or sways them. Rabbi Eliezer says. Even if one carries them. But doesn't the one that carries them also sway them?⁴⁷ — This must be the interpretation: It is all one whether one touches them or sways them even though they cannot be carried [at one time]. Whereupon Rabbi Eliezer comes to say: [No,] only if they can be carried at one time.

The Gemara asks: Then what is the meaning of 'even'?⁴⁸

The Gemara answers: Read: Only if they can be carried at one time.

⁴¹ He had just finished his lecture for that day and was too exhausted for any argument or discussion but required rest and refreshment.

⁴² I.e., the olive's bulk must be one whole piece so that if one were to lift up part thereof the whole would be lifted up.

⁴³ I.e., moved them without actually touching them.

⁴⁴ As to whether it is essential that the olive's bulk be in one whole so that it could be carried at one time.

⁴⁵ And one is rendered tamei.

⁴⁶ Sc. the two pieces of tamei flesh each a half-olive's bulk.

⁴⁷ Why then does Rabbi Eliezer differ from the first Tanna?

⁴⁸ The word 'even' implies an extension of the law beyond that stated by the first Tanna; on the other hand, 'only' is a limitation.