

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF PEH BET

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

**She said to them: What can I do to you?** Witchcraft does not have control over you, as you are careful about things that bring about the control of witchcraft. **You do not wipe yourselves with earthenware shards and you do not kill lice on your clothes and you do not draw a vegetable out and eat it straight from the bundle that the gardener wrapped.** Rather, you first untie the bundle.

Thus, wiping with earthenware renders one susceptible to the effect of witchcraft.

\*

**Rav Huna said to his son Rabbah: What is the reason that you are not frequently before Rav Chisda,** i.e. studying from him, **for he is sharp in his learning?**

**He (Rabbah) said to him (Rav Huna): Why should I go to him? When I go to him, he speaks mundane matters with me.** For example, **he said to me: One who enters an outhouse should not sit down in haste and should not strain excessively, as the rectum is suspended on three strips of flesh that look like teeth. Therefore, one must be careful as perhaps the “teeth” of the rectum will become detached and he will come to danger,** as the rectum might come out.

**He (Rav Huna) said to him (Rabbah): He (Rav Chisda) is involved in matters relating to sustaining the life of created beings, and you said that he is discussing with you mundane matters?! All the more so that you should go to him!**

\*\*\*

If **there was in front of him a pebble and** a piece of **earthenware** on Shabbat, and he must choose between the two:

**Rav Huna said: He wipes with the pebble,** despite its *muktzeh* status **and he does not wipe with the earthenware.** This is because there is a danger, lest he detach the “teeth” of the rectum.

**And Rav Chisda said: He wipes with the earthenware,** as it has the Halachic status of a utensil **and he does not wipe with the pebble,** which is *muktzeh*.

\*

**They contradicted Rav Huna, from a Baraita: There was in front of him a pebble and a piece of earthenware: He wipes with the earthenware and does not wipe with the pebble.**

**This is a contradiction to Rav Huna!**

## PEREK 8 – 82A

**Answered Rafram son of Pappa**, when he was present **before Rav Chisda**, according to **Rav Huna's** approach, i.e. to answer for Rav Huna: The Baraita is discussing **the lips of earthenware utensils**. They are smooth, so there is no danger of detaching the “teeth” of the rectum. Therefore, it is better to use the earthenware than the pebble.

\*\*\*

**There was in front of him a pebble and grasses** on Shabbat, and he must choose between the two. There is a disagreement between **Rav Chisda and Rav Hamnuna**:

**One said: He wipes with the pebble and he does not wipe with the grasses.** This is because the grasses are wet and cut the skin. (This refers to wiping with them while they are still attached, and he does not detach them.)

**And one said: He wipes with the grasses** (that are still attached) as he is thereby not moving an item of *muktzeh*. **And he does not wipe with the pebble**, as he will be moving *muktzeh*.

\*

**They contradicted** the one who said that he wipes with grasses, from the following Baraita:

**One who wipes with an item that is flammable, his lower “teeth” of the rectum fall off.**

And grasses are a flammable substance.

The Gemara answers: **It is not difficult.**

**Here**, he wipes **with moist** grasses, that are not flammable.

**Here**, when his lower “teeth” fall off, it is **with dry** grasses that are flammable.

\*\*\*

Concerning **one who needs to relieve himself and does not**, there is a disagreement between **Rav Chisda and Ravina**:

**One said: A bad smell plagues him**, i.e. that he has bad breath, as the excrement spoils in his intestines and the smell comes out from his mouth.

## **PEREK 8 – 82A**

**And one said: A bad-smelling sweat plagues him**, i.e. his entire body smells from sweat, as the smell is absorbed into his skin and his limbs and is turned into bad-smelling sweat.

\*

**There is a Baraita in accordance with the one that said that a bad-smelling sweat plagues him.**

**As it was taught** in a Baraita: **One who needs to relieve himself, and before doing so, he eats, it is similar to an oven that was fueled on top of its ashes**, i.e. without first cleaning it of its ashes. **And this is the beginning of a bad smell of sweat.**

\*\*\*

**One who needed to relieve himself and is not able to relieve himself**, as the rectum is not opening:

**Said Rav Chisda: He should stand and sit, stand and sit.**

**Rav Chanan of Neharda'a said: He should move away to the sides**, i.e. he should try himself in this corner and then move away to another corner and again try himself.

**Rav Hammuna said: He should touch in that place with a pebble.**

**And the Rabbis said: He should take his mind off** of it, as will be explained.

**Rav Acha son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: All the more so that if he takes his mind off** it, and stops trying altogether, **he will not relieve himself!**

**He (Rav Ashi) said to him: This is what the Rabbis said: He should take his mind off it, onto other matters.**

**Said Rav Yirmiyah of Difti: To me, I saw this Ishmaelite, who stood and sat down and stood and sat down, until he spilt out his excrement like a pot.**

\*\*\*

**The Rabbis taught** in a Baraita: **One who enters into a main meal** i.e. he is about to begin eating dinner, and it is a disgrace to leave in the middle of the meal if he needs to relieve himself; **he should walk ten times** a distance of **four ammot**<sup>1</sup>. Between each time, he should sit down and try himself, as walking assists in moving one's bowels.

**And some say that** he should walk **four times** a distance of **ten ammot**. This method is better as he walks further each time; **and relieves himself and** then he **enters** the meal **and sits in his place.**

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 ammah: 18.7in, 48cm

## PEREK 8 – 82A

### **MISHNAH**

**Earthenware** (the minimum amount in order to be liable for taking it out) **is in order to put it in between boards.** (When they would arrange pillars or beams, one on top of another, a cavity would be created between them and they would put there a piece of earthenware in order to prevent the top one from warping. This is the minimum size of earthenware that would obligate a sin-offering for the one who takes it out on Shabbat.) **These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah.**

**Rabbi Meir says: In order to stoke the fire with it,** i.e. to move coals from place to place.

**Rabbi Yosi says: In order to be a receptacle for a revi'it<sup>2</sup>** of water.

**Said Rabbi Meir: Even though there is no proof to the matter** that earthenware's minimum amount depends on stoking the coals, **there is a mention of the matter,** in the prophecy of Yeshayahu (Isaiah) the Prophet.

As it is written: “Therefore, this sin will be for you like the breach of a fallen (wall), like a protrusion in a lofty wall, that collapses suddenly with haste. And (Hashem) will break it like the breakage of a potters' flask into shards, (and the breakage will be into such small shards that) **there will not be found amongst its chips** (even) a piece of **earthenware** (suitable) **to stoke a burning coal from a fire.** And (there will not be found amongst the shards of earthenware, a piece of earthenware that is suitable) to scoop water from a pit (of water).”

**Rabbi Yosi said to him** (Rabbi Meir): **From there is a proof** to your words?

On the contrary, the end of the verse states that there will not be found earthenware that is suitable “**to scoop water from a pit** (of water)”, which supports Rabbi Yosi's view, that the minimum amount depends on it being used to hold water.

---

<sup>2</sup> Revi'it: 86.4gm or 2.9 fl.oz.

## PEREK 8 – 82A

### GEMARA

The Gemara deliberates: **It stands to reason that the minimum amount of Rabbi Yosi is larger** than the amount of Rabbi Meir.

Rabbi Meir said, “to stoke with it a coal”, without explaining any actual amount. This implies that he is referring even to a case of stoking one coal. This is a smaller amount than the amount of Rabbi Yosi, who said, “in order to be a receptacle for a *revi'it* of water.”

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **From the verse** brought in the Mishnah, it would seem that **the amount of Rabbi Meir** i.e. in order to stoke a coal, **is larger** than the amount of Rabbi Yosi, which is in order to hold a *revi'it* of water.

The proof for this is: **That if you would think that the amount of Rabbi Yosi is larger**, the verse becomes problematic:

Would **he curse them** i.e. would the Prophet first rebuke them **with a small utensil** (that they would not be left with earthenware even of the size needed to stoke a fire) **and then curse them with a large utensil** (that they would not be left with a larger piece of earthenware, that can hold a *revi'it* of water)?

Is it the way of people who rebuke to mention decreasingly severe curses?

Rather, the verse implies that the size of earthenware suitable to hold water is smaller than earthenware that can be used to stoke coals.

\*

This poses a difficulty to the Mishnah, which implies the opposite.

**Said Abaye:** It is not difficult. **The Mishnah also**, in which Rabbi Meir said that the size of earthenware must be large enough to be able to stoke coals, is referring **to stoking a sizable fire**, not just a single coal. For in order to remove even a small coal from a large fire, it requires a large piece of earthenware, to prevent him from being burned. Therefore, in truth, this amount is larger than the size that can hold water, and fits in well with the verse.

\*

## **PEREK 8 – 82A**

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Yosi says: From there is a proof** to your words?

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **It is well said**, what **Rabbi Yosi** responded to **Rabbi Meir**. What could Rabbi Meir say to defend his position?

The Gemara answers: **And Rabbi Meir** could respond: The verse was **said** in a “**not only that...**” structure. This will be explained:

**Not only that something that is important to people**, i.e. earthenware that is suitable for stoking fire, **will not be available for him** to use. **But even something that is unimportant to people**, for example earthenware that can hold a bit of water, **will also not be available for him**.

## **HADRAN ALACH HAMOTZI YAYIN**

**WE WILL RETURN TO YOU,  
PEREK HAMOTZI YAYIN**

**PEREK AMAR RABBI AKIVA**

**MISHNAH**

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF PEH BET

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

**Rabbi Akiva said, “From where do we know that idols convey impurity if they are carried, even though no one touched the idol, like a niddah<sup>3</sup> who conveys impurity onto someone who carries her even when there is no physical contact<sup>4</sup> between them? Because the verse (*Yeshayahu*<sup>5</sup> 30:22) states, “You will contaminate the covering of your silver idols and the decorations of your gold images. **Estrange them, [the idols,] like a Niddah. Tell it, ‘Get out!’**” Since this verse compares an idol to a Niddah, we can conclude **just as a Niddah conveys impurity when she is carried, so too an idol conveys impurity when it is carried.****

### Gemara

**It was taught** in a different Mishnah **there** (*Avodah Zarah* 47b): **“Someone whose wall is next to an idol**, meaning that he owns a building which shares a common wall with another building that houses and serves an idol, **and the wall fell down**, the owner **is prohibited to rebuild** the wall—because in so doing he is benefiting the idol.

---

<sup>3</sup> A woman with the impurity of menstruation.

<sup>4</sup> Certain categories of impure items, such as a Niddah, convey impurity onto a person or item that carries them, even though there is no direct physical connection with the Niddah, such as someone picks up a chair on which a Niddah is sitting.

<sup>5</sup> Isaiah

## **PEREK 9 – 82B**

**What should he do?** That is, how can he rebuild his own property in a permitted way. **He enters into his own property four ammot<sup>6</sup> and builds** the wall. Thus by rebuilding the wall in this fashion the idol receives no benefit from his wall, since the idolater will have to build a totally new wall.

### **Ammud Bet**

If the land on which the wall stood **was both his and the idol's**, i.e. it was jointly owned property since the original wall stood half on his land and half on the idol's, **it should be judged as half and half**, meaning that half the area on which the wall originally stood can be included in the four ammot of his own land that must be left between the new wall and the idol's property.

For example, if the original wall was two ammot thick, he may construct the new wall three ammot in from the original wall – thus, together with the one amah of the wall that is his, there are four ammot between the reconstructed building and the idol's property.

**Its stones, wood, and earth** of the wall that fell down **convey impurity like a creeping creature (*sheretz*)<sup>7</sup>** which convey impurity only if they are touched but not if they are carried, as the Torah says, **“You shall distance it as a disgusting thing (*shakeitz teshaktzenu*).”** The Hebrew word used in this verse, *shakeitz*, implies that it should be treated like a *sheretz*. Thus, according to this Tanna, idols convey impurity only if they are touched, but not if they are carried or in any other way.

**Rabbi Akiva says**, They convey impurity even if they are carried, **“like a Niddah**. Just as someone who carries a Niddah becomes impure, so someone who carries an idol becomes impure **as the verse (*Isaiah 30:22*) states, ‘Estrange them like a Niddah**. The verse thereby compares an idol to a Niddah — **just as a Niddah conveys impurity when she is carried, so too an idol conveys impurity when it is carried**.

\*

**Said Rabbah: “When Scripture states ‘Estrange them,’ it means ‘Treat them as strange** i.e. distance them **from you like a stranger**; when the verse continues **‘Tell it, ‘Get out!’**”, it means **don't tell it ‘Enter.’<sup>8</sup>**

**And Rabbah also said** (here he modifies the apparent meaning of the above-quoted Baraita): Regarding that an idol conveys impurity **when it is carried—all** the Tannaim quoted above, that is, Rabbi Akiva and the first Tanna, **concur. For it is compared to a Niddah** in the above quoted verse. Although the literal reading of the Mishnah implies

---

<sup>6</sup> 1 ammah: 18.7 in., 48 cm

<sup>7</sup> The Torah lists eight small, creeping creatures whose carcass conveys impurity if they are touched, but not in any other way. See Vayikra 11:29-30 and Mishnah Keilim 1:1.

<sup>8</sup> It is unclear what this statement of Rabbah adds to the discussion. See Tosafot.

## **PEREK 9 – 82B**

that the first Tanna disagrees and contends that an idol does not convey impurity when it is carried, Rabbah rejects this interpretation of the Baraita and substitutes a different interpretation.

Where do the Tannaim disagree? **They only disagree in** the case of the law of the **“placed stone (*even mesama*)”** which is a stone resting on pegs that is placed above utensils and the idol is resting on the stone.<sup>9</sup>

The disagreement is that **Rabbi Akiva holds the view** that the verse teaches that an idol causes impurity just like a **niddah. Just like a niddah, who causes impurity by means of a placed stone** if the niddah sat on the stone, even though her weight is not borne by the utensils beneath, **so too, an idol causes impurity by means of a placed stone** to the utensils beneath it. Whereas **the Rabbis** i.e. the first Tanna **hold the view** that an idol is **like a *sheretz*. Just like a *sheretz*, which does not cause impurity by means of a placed stone** to the utensils beneath it **so too, an idol does not cause impurity by means of a placed stone.**

\*

The Gemara asks for clarification. **According to Rabbi Akiva, for what Halachah is an idol compared** (in the verse which says “You shall distance it as a disgusting thing”) **to a *sheretz*?** What halachah are we meant to learn from this?

The Gemara answers that it is to teach us about **items which serve** the idol and its worship. They impart impurity by being carried, but not by means of a placed stone.

The Gemara asks for more clarification. **And according to the Rabbis** i.e. the first Tanna, **for what halachah is an idol compared** (in the verse which says about idols: “Estrange them”) **to a niddah?** What halachah are we to learn from this?

The Gemara answers **for carrying.** For, as Rabbah told us above, everyone agrees that an idol causes impurity to someone who carries it, even without touching it. However, the Rabbis learn from the verse which says “You shall distance it as a disgusting thing,” which connects it to a *sheretz*, that an idol does not cause impurity through a placed stone, unlike a niddah.

\*

The Gemara points out a difficulty with the view of the Rabbis. **And let the Merciful One** i.e. the Torah instead **compare** the idol to an animal’s **carcass (*neveilah*)**, which

---

<sup>9</sup> Certain categories of impure items, such as a Niddah, convey impurity onto utensils that are beneath them even if they are resting their weight on a stone that is held up by pegs that in turn are resting on the ground, and the utensils are beneath the stone. The utensils become impure for being beneath the impure source (that is in our example, the Niddah) even though there is no physical contact between the utensil and the source either directly or indirectly, and even though the weight of the impure source does not rest on the utensil becoming impure. This type of impurity conveyance is called *even mesama*, a placed stone.

## **PEREK 9 – 82B**

causes impurity through being carried, but not through a placed stone. Then, there would be no need for the roundabout comparison to a niddah (to teach that it causes impurity through being carried) and also to a *sheretz* (to teach that it does not cause impurity through a placed stone).

The Gemara answers **it is correct** that as far as the primary laws of causing impurity are concerned, it would have been enough to compare an idol to *neveilah*. **Rather**, the Torah compared an idol to a niddah to teach us something else. Namely, that **just as a niddah does not cause impurity by means of her severed limbs, so too does an idol not cause impurity by means of its severed limbs**.

That is, if a limb is amputated from a niddah while she is alive, the amputated limb does not cause impurity by means of a placed stone. It is not regarded as niddah (and is like the severed limb of any other person, possessing only the impurity of a severed limb, *eiver min hachai*). So too concerning an idol constructed from various parts. The detached parts do not render impurity.

\*

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **However, that inquiry which Rav Chama son of Guria posed: An idol— does it impart impurity by means of limbs or not? You could answer from this, that the Rabbis said that it does not impart impurity by means of limbs**. Yet since we see that Rav Chama nevertheless posed such an inquiry, it cannot be that the answer is so simple and obvious.

The Gemara answers: **Rav Chama son of Guria posed it according to Rabbi Akiva**. That he, in fact, compares idolatry to niddah in the matter of the placed stone. But there is a question whether Rabbi Akiva says this even as a leniency, that the severed limbs do not impart impurity. Perhaps he only compares idolatry to niddah as a stringency, but not as a leniency.

**And Rabbi Elazar said: Regarding a placed stone, all agree that it (an idol) does not render things impure. They disagree over carrying.**

**Rabbi Akiva holds the view: An idol is like a niddah. Just as a niddah renders things impure by means of carrying, so too an idol renders impure by means of carrying.**

**And the Rabbis hold the view: Like a *sheretz*. Just as a *sheretz* does not render impure by means of carrying, so too an idol does not render impure by means of carrying.**

The Gemara raises a difficulty according to Rabbi Elazar who maintained that the disagreement of the Rabbis and Rabbi Akiva is only over carrying but not over the placed stone:

**And Rabbi Akiva, for which law is idolatry compared to a *sheretz*?**

## **PEREK 9 – 82B**

The Gemara answers: **For the items which serve** the idol and its worship, That is, they do not render things impure by means of carrying.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And the Rabbis, for which law do they compare** idolatry **to a niddah**, since they compare it entirely to a *sheretz*?

The Gemara answers: To tell you: **Just as a niddah does not** impart impurity **by means of limbs, so too an idol does not** impart impurity **by means of limbs.**