



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

MISHNAH: Similarly any [hole in] an earthen vessel that lets in a liquid will¹ let it out,² but there may be one that will let it out and will not let it in. Any limb³ that grows a nail has also a bone in it⁴ but there may be one that has a bone in it but grows no nail.⁵ Whatever contracts midras-tumah also contracts corpse-tumah but there are such as contract corpse tumah and do not contract midras-tumah.

GEMARA. A vessel with a hole that lets in a liquid is unfit for the water of purification⁶ and is [even more so] unfit as a defective vessel;⁷ one with a hole that will let it out⁸ is fit for the water of purification⁹ but unfit as a defective vessel.¹⁰

Rav Assi stated, It was taught: The minimum size [of a hole to render] an earthen vessel [unfit for the consecration of the water of purification] is one that will let a liquid in;¹¹ and one that will let a liquid out was mentioned only in respect of a defective vessel. What is the reason? — Mar Zutra son of Rav

Nachman replied: Because people do not say,¹² ‘Bring a defective vessel for another defective vessel’.¹³

Our Rabbis taught: How is an earthen vessel to be tested in order to ascertain whether its perforation is big enough to admit a liquid or not? One brings a tub full of water and puts the pot into it. If it absorbs any of the liquid, it may be taken for granted that it lets liquids in; and if not, it may be taken for granted that it only lets liquids out.

Rabbi Yehudah said: One inverts the handles of the pot into the tub and allows water to float over it. If it then absorbs any, it may be taken for granted that it will let liquids in; but if not, it may be taken for granted that it only lets liquids out. Or else, it may be put upon a fire. If the fire stops the leakage it is certain that the pot will only let liquids out; but if not it is certain that it also lets liquids in. Rabbi Yosi said: One does not put it upon the actual fire since the fire stops it, but it is put upon embers. If the embers stop it, it is certain that it

¹ If the liquid was within the vessel.

² A lesser hole in fact being required for the latter process than for the former.

³ Sc. a redundant finger.

⁴ And is, therefore, regarded as a proper limb which conveys tumah by overshadowing even though it is smaller than the minimum prescribed for the flesh of a corpse.

⁵ In such a case, if the limb is a redundant one, the conveyance of tumah is subject to the prescribed minimum.

⁶ Which must be consecrated in a sound vessel.

⁷ Defective vessels which are still suitable for certain uses are, under given conditions, susceptible to tumah but when they have a hole of the nature mentioned they lose even the status of a defective vessel and, like broken sherds, are immune from all forms of tumah.

⁸ But will not let it in, sc. a smaller hole.

⁹ Such a small hole being disregarded in the case of an otherwise sound vessel.

¹⁰ Being already defective the smallest hole deprives it altogether of its status.

¹¹ If the hole is smaller the vessel retains in all respects the status of a sound one.

¹² When there is a leak in a defective vessel.

¹³ That the former should receive the leakage from the latter. A defective vessel may be so used under an otherwise sound one, since the latter is not discarded on account of a very small hole. When such a hole, however, occurs in a defective vessel it is completely discarded and, therefore, loses its status.

only lets liquids out, but if not, it is certain that it also lets liquids in. If it drips drop after drop it is certain that it lets liquids in. What is the practical difference between the first Tanna and Rabbi Yehudah? — Ulla replied: The practical difference between them is a case of absorption under pressure.¹⁴

Any limb that grows a nail etc. If it grows a nail¹⁵ it¹⁶ conveys tumah¹⁷ by means of touch, carriage and overshadowing. If it contains a bone but grows no nail it conveys tumah¹⁸ by means of touch and carriage but does not convey it by means of overshadowing.¹⁹

Rav Chisda stated: The following was said by our great Master,²⁰ may the Omnipresent be his help. A redundant finger that contains a bone but grows no nail conveys tumah by means of touch and carriage but does not convey it by means of overshadowing. Rabbah bar bar Chanah explained: This is the case only when it²¹ is not counted in [the row of the fingers of] the hand.²²

Whatever contracts midras — tumah etc. Whatever object is fit for midras contracts corpse-tumah, but there are such as contract corpse-tumah and do not contract midras-tumah. What is this rule intended to include? — It is intended to include a se'ah measure and a tarkav,²³ for it was taught: And he that sits on anything; as it might have been presumed that if the zav inverted a se'ah measure and sat upon it or a tarkav

measure and sat upon it, it shall be tamei,²⁴ it was explicitly stated: Upon which the zav sits, implying that the text refers only to a thing that is designated for sitting;²⁵ but this one²⁶ is excluded, since people would tell him, 'Get up that we may do our work with it'.²⁷

MISHNAH: Whoever is fit to try capital cases is also fit to try monetary suits, but one may be fit to try monetary suits and yet be unfit to try capital cases.

GEMARA: Rav Yehudah stated: This was meant to include a mamzer.²⁸

The Gemara asks: Have we not, however, learned this once before: 'All are eligible to try monetary suits but not all eligible to try capital cases'; and when the question was raised, 'What was this intended to include?' Rav Yehudah replied, 'It was intended to include a mamzer'? — One statement was intended to include a convert and the other to include a mamzer. And both statements were necessary. For if we had been informed of the convert only it might have been presumed that it applied to him alone because he is eligible to enter the Assembly²⁹ but not to a mamzer who is not eligible to enter the Assembly. And if we had been informed of the mamzer only it might have been presumed to apply to him alone because he issues from an eligible source but not to a convert who issues from an ineligible source. Hence the necessity for both rulings.

¹⁴ According to the first Tanna this also is proof that the vessel lets liquids in, while according to Rabbi Yehudah this is no proof.

¹⁵ Though the limb is a redundant one, a sixth finger for instance.

¹⁶ Being regarded as a proper limb.

¹⁷ However small its bulk.

¹⁸ If the bone is not smaller than a barley-grain.

¹⁹ Unless the bulk of the flesh was no less than that of an olive.

²⁰ Rav.

²¹ Being situated outside the row of the normal fingers.

²² A normal finger, or even a redundant one in the normal row, conveys tumah by overshadowing, however small in bulk it may be, as any proper limb.

²³ A measure of capacity containing two kavs.

²⁴ Midras-tumah that is conveyed to men and objects which become thereby a 'father of tumah'.

²⁵ Such an object only is subject to the major grade of tumah.

²⁶ An inverted measure.

²⁷ Hence they contract from a zav the tumah of touch only and this subjects them only to the tumah of the first grade, while through contact with a corpse they become a 'father of tumah'.

²⁸ Who is a fit person to act as judge in monetary suits but not in capital cases.

²⁹ To marry a Jewess.