



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

From where do you know this?¹ From [the following Mishnah] which we learned: If a drawer in a cupboard had the capacity of a [cubic] handbreadth within,² and the opening [of the cupboard] was less than a handbreadth [square], and there was some tumah in it, the house becomes tamei;³ if there was some tumah in the house, what is in the drawer remains tahor, for the tumah must come forth [eventually] but need not come in at all. Rabbi Yosi declares [the house] tahor, for one could take out the tumah by halves or burn it in its place.⁴ And the next clause reads thus: If one set [the cupboard] in the doorway of the house and it [the cupboard] opened outwards, and there was some tumah in it, the house remains tahor;⁵ if there was some tumah in the house, what is in [the cupboard] remains tahor. And in connection with this it was taught that Rabbi Yosi declares [the house] tahor. Now to which clause [does Rabbi Yosi refer]? If to the last clause,

surely the first Tanna [in that case] also declares [the house] tahor! It must therefore [be this]: The first Tanna had said: If there was some tumah in it the house becomes tamei, either by virtue of the fact that the tumah must come forth eventually, or by virtue of the rule that concealed tumah breaks through.⁶ Whereupon Rabbi Yosi said to him: As for your argument, ‘The tumah must come forth eventually’, [I reply that] one could take out the tumah by halves, or burn it in its place; and as for your ruling, ‘Concealed tumah breaks through’, [I maintain that] concealed tumah does not break through.

The Gemara points out a contradiction in the views of Rabbi Yosi. For we have learned: If a dog ate the flesh of a corpse and died⁷ and lay upon the threshold,⁸ Rabbi Meir says: If its neck was one handbreadth wide, it brings the tumah [into the house];⁹ and if not, it does

¹ That according to Rabbi Yosi concealed tumah (over which there is not the space of one handbreadth) cannot break through.

² So that any tumah inside it would not be regarded as concealed tumah.

³ By Rabbinic decree everything in the house becomes tamei immediately, even while the tumah is still closed up in the drawer, because eventually the tumah will be brought forth and then it will certainly render everything in the house tamei.

⁴ It is not inevitable that the house be rendered tamei, for the tumah can either be destroyed in the drawer, or be brought out in such quantities as does not render tamei.

⁵ For the tumah will not pass through the house at all and as there was the space of a cubic handbreadth in the cupboard the tumah in it cannot break through.

⁶ I.e., Rabbi Yosi had heard the first Tanna declare the house tamei in every case to which one of the reasons stated in the text applies. E.g., (in the case that is inferred from the last clause) where there was not the space of a cubic handbreadth in the drawer, even though the cupboard stood in the doorway of the house, the house is tamei because of concealed tumah; or, the case quoted in the first clause, the house is tamei for the tumah will eventually pass through.

⁷ If alive there would be no question at all of tumah, for, as already stated, tumah that is swallowed within a living being cannot render tamei.

⁸ With its head pointing inside the house.

⁹ Since the width of the neck is one handbreadth (even though it is not one handbreadth of space but consists of flesh, vertebrae,

not bring in the tumah.¹⁰ Rabbi Yosi says: We must see [where the tumah lies]: if it¹¹ lies opposite the lintel and inwards,¹² the house is tamei;¹³ but if opposite the lintel and outwards, the house is tahor. Rabbi Elozar says: If its mouth lies inside,¹⁴ the house remains tahor; but if the mouth lies outside, the house is tamei, because the tumah passes out by way of its lower parts.¹⁵ Rabbi Yehudah ben Beseirah says: In all circumstances¹⁶ the house is tamei. Now presumably Rabbi Yosi deals with the case where its neck was not one handbreadth wide; hence you can deduce [that he holds], concealed tumah breaks through!

Rava said: He [Rabbi Yosi] means to say: We must consider the space in connection with the tumah';¹⁷ and Rabbi Yosi consequently differs on two points, saying to Rabbi Meir thus: As for your saying: 'If its neck was one handbreadth wide it brings in the tumah', [I maintain that] we must consider only the space; and as for your saying, [If it lies] anywhere upon the threshold¹⁸ the

arteries etc.) the uppermost side of the neck overshadows as a 'tent' the tumah, and seeing that the 'tent' extends into the house it thus leads in the tumah.

¹⁰ For a space with one of its dimensions less than a handbreadth cannot be regarded as a tent with regard to tumah.

¹¹ Sc., that part of the dog in which the tumah happens to be.

¹² I.e., the inner side of the lintel so that the house overshadows the tumah.

¹³ Presumably even though the dog's neck was not one handbreadth wide, for the tumah concealed within breaks through, so that the house overshadows the tumah.

¹⁴ The tumah being in that part of the dog's carcass which is lying outside.

¹⁵ And therefore one may regard the tumah in the dog as extending along the lower parts of the animal (for by this way it would have been evacuated) into the house.

¹⁶ Whether the neck was one handbreadth wide or not, and whether the actual tumah lay on the inside of the lintel or not, and whether the mouth of the dog lay inside or not.

¹⁷ Where there is in the neck a space of one handbreadth, the uppermost side of the neck would serve as a 'tent' and would lead

house is tamei, [I maintain that] if it lies on the inside of the lintel the house is tamei, but if on the outside of the lintel the house remains tahor.¹⁹

Rav Acha the son of Rava actually quotes the Mishnah with these words: Rabbi Yosi says. We must consider the space in connection with the tumah.

And who is the Tanna that disagrees with Rabbi Yosi?²⁰ — It is Rabbi Shimon. For it was taught: Rabbi Shimon says: There are three matters of tumah issuing from a corpse which convey tumah by two means but not by the third,²¹ and these are they: a ladleful of corpse-mold, a barley's bulk of bone, and the covering stone and side stones of the grave. A ladleful of corpse-mold conveys tumah by carrying and by overshadowing but not by contact;²² [tumah by] contact, however, is to be found with each of the others. A barley's bulk of bone conveys tumah by carrying and by contact but not by overshadowing;²³ [tumah by] overshadowing, however,

the tumah into the house. Where, however, there is no space of a handbreadth in the neck, even though the neck in which the tumah lies is entirely within the house, the house is tahor, for the tumah is concealed and cannot break through.

¹⁸ Even if it lies on that part of the threshold which is outside of the lintel.

¹⁹ Rabbi Yosi therefore is in every respect less strict than Rabbi Meir, and not, as was previously assumed, more so.

²⁰ I.e., who is it that holds, in opposition to Rabbi Yosi, that overshadowing is in no way included in the expression 'he who touches', for contact and overshadowing are separate categories of tumah.

²¹ The three means of conveying tumah are: by contact, by carrying, and by overshadowing. With regards to the three matters stated, only two of these means apply, the actual two varying with each case, but not all three.

²² This clearly conflicts with the aforementioned view of Rabbi Yosi.

²³ This is a traditional law and not derived from the exposition of a verse.

is to be found with each of the others. The covering stone and side stones of the grave convey tumah by contact and by overshadowing but not by carrying; [tumah by] carrying, however, is to be found with each of the others.

The Mishnah had stated: A marrow bone of a carcass or of a [dead] reptile, etc.

Our Rabbis taught: It is written: [He that touches] its carcass, but not a closed marrow bone. I might think [that the same is the case] even if it was pierced, the verse therefore says: He that touches . . . shall be tamei, that is, whatever can be touched is tamei²⁴ but whatever cannot be touched is tahor.

Rabbi Zeira said to Abaye: In that case a carcass with the hide still upon it should not convey tumah?²⁵ — [He replied,] Just go and see how many openings there are in it!²⁶

Rav Pappa said to Rava: In that case the kidney [of a carcass], so long as it is surrounded with fat, should not convey tumah?²⁷ — [He replied:] Just go and see how many strands run through it!²⁸

²⁴ If the flesh, or, as in this case, the marrow, that is inside can be touched from the outside, then the outer covering serves as a protection to what is inside, and as such conveys the tumah.

²⁵ Since one cannot touch the flesh directly and the hide itself is tahor.

²⁶ E.g., the nose and the mouth which give direct access to the flesh.

²⁷ For the fat itself is tahor.

²⁸ And the strands are accounted as flesh.

²⁹ And what is incomplete does not convey tumah.

³⁰ And therefore since there was a clear intention to pierce it, it conveys tumah.

Rabbi Oshaya raised the question: What is the position if a man intended to pierce [the bone] but did not pierce it? Does the absence of piercing make it incomplete,²⁹ or not? He later answered the question himself: the absence of piercing does not make it incomplete.³⁰

MISHNAH: The egg of a sheretz in which there has formed an embryo is tahor;³¹ if it was pierced, however small the hole was, it is tamei.³² Regarding a mouse which is half flesh and half earth.³³ If a man touched the flesh he becomes tamei, but if he touched the earth he remains tahor. Rabbi Yehudah says: even if he touched the earth that is over against the flesh he becomes tamei.

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: 'Those that are tamei' include the egg of a sheretz and the marrow bone of a sheretz. I might think [that it is the same] even if there had not formed an embryo in it, the verse therefore adds: The creeping things, that is, just as the creeping thing is fully formed so the sheretz's egg must also be fully formed. I might think [that it is the same] even if they had not been pierced, the verse therefore states: Whoever doth touch them . . . shall be tamei, that is, whatever can be touched is tamei, but whatever cannot be touched is tahor. How much must be pierced? A hairbreadth, for then it could be touched with a hair.³⁴

³¹ And if a man touched the shell he remains tahor since the developed embryo within cannot be touched at all.

³² And contact with the shell would render the person tamei, for in this case the shell serves as a protection to foodstuff and as such conveys tumah.

³³ According to the Rabbis, there exists a kind of mouse which is generated from the earth itself; in the process of generation there would be a time when it is half flesh and half earth.

³⁴ For it is established law that if a person touched the hair of a tamei body or if by his hair he touched a tamei body, in either case he becomes tamei.

The Mishnah had stated: Regarding a mouse which is half flesh etc.

Rabbi Yehoshua the son of Levi said: provided the entire length [of the creature] had developed.³⁵

Others, however, report this statement in reference to the last clause thus: Rabbi Yehudah says: even if he touched the earth that is over against the flesh he becomes tamei. Thereupon Rabbi Yehoshua the son of Levi said: provided the entire length [of the creature] had been developed.

He who reports it in reference to the first clause will with more reason apply it also to the last clause,³⁶ but he who reports it in reference to the last clause will hold that in the first clause even though the entire length [of the creature] had not been developed [whoever touches the fleshy part thereof becomes tamei].

Our Rabbis taught: Since Scripture mentioned 'the mouse,'³⁷ I would have said that it included the sea-mouse for it bears the name 'mouse'. There is, however, an argument [against this]: [Scripture] declared the weasel tamei and the mouse tamei, therefore as the weasel refers only to those that live upon the land³⁸ so the mouse refers only to those that live upon the land. Or you might argue in this way: [Scripture] declared the weasel tamei and the mouse tamei, therefore as the

³⁵ If the creature had already developed in its entire length from head to tail, even if only in half the width of its body, whoever touches the fleshy part which has already developed becomes tamei.

³⁶ For had it not developed in its entire length Rabbi Yehudah surely would not have said that whoever touched its earth would become tamei.

weasel refers to every creature which bears the name weasel, so the mouse refers to every creature which bears the name mouse, and so it will include the sea-mouse since it bears the name mouse! The text therefore teaches: Upon the earth.³⁹ But if I had only the expression 'upon the earth' to go by, I might say that while upon the earth it can render tamei, but if it went down into the sea it cannot render anything tamei! The text therefore teaches: That creep, signifies, wherever it creeps [it renders tamei]. But perhaps it is not so but that the expression 'that creep' signifies, all that breed can render tamei, but those that do not breed cannot render tamei, and so I would exclude the mouse which is half flesh and half earth since it does not breed. There is, however, a good argument [against this]: [Scripture] declared the weasel tamei and the mouse tamei, therefore as the weasel refers to all that bear the name weasel, so the mouse refers to all that bear the name mouse, and [in this way] I include the mouse which is half flesh and half earth. Or you might argue in this way: As the weasel breeds so the mouse [includes all species that] breed, [and so I would exclude the mouse which is half flesh and half earth]! The text therefore teaches. Among the creeping things.

³⁷ And these are they which are tamei to you among the creeping things that creep upon the earth: the weasel, and the mouse, and the toad after its kind.

³⁸ For there are no weasels, nor any creatures by the name of weasel, that live in the sea.

³⁹ This serves to exclude those that live in the sea.