

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF PEH DALET

Translated by: *Rabbi Dov Grant*
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

[Rava said:] And according to Chananya, who said that a ship that can be moved while full is susceptible to impurity, one can make a deduction. That even if the ship is so large that it can be moved only by way of oxen, it is also susceptible to impurity. For **movement by way of oxen is considered movement**.

For it was taught in a Mishnah (*Keilim* 24:2): **There are three types of wagons** that are distinct in their laws with respect to impurity.

- A) A wagon that is **made like a *katedra***, which is short and surrounded by walls on three sides, **is susceptible to the impurity of *midras***¹. For a *katedra* is made for sitting on.
- B) A wagon that is made long, **like a bed**, specifically to transport goods, **is susceptible to the impurity of a corpse**. This actually means all impurity transmitted by touching. A corpse is just the most extreme example of it. But the impurity of *midras* is excluded. Although this long wagon is susceptible to impurity, nevertheless it is not made for sitting on.
- C) A wagon **of stones**, i.e. it is made to transport stones, **is not susceptible to any type of impurity**. For the bottom of this wagon contains large holes rendering it unfit to be considered a utensil.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: And if it has an area that can hold pomegranates i.e. the holes there are so small that pomegranates will not fall through, then it **is susceptible to the impurity of a corpse**. For if pomegranates would not be able to fall through the holes in the wagon of stones, then it is still regarded as a utensil of sorts. This is the standard measure used to determine whether an item is considered as a utensil.

So we see that a wagon of stones, which is so heavy that it has to be pulled by oxen, is susceptible to impurity. Thus we have a proof for Chananya that “movement by way of oxen is considered movement” in regards to impurity.

And it was taught in the end of that Mishnah that **there are three kinds of boxes** that are distinct in their laws with respect to impurity.

A box whose opening is from its side is susceptible to impurity of *midras*. For it is possible to lie on the box, while people are using the inside by way of its side opening. (A utensil that sitting or lying on interferes with its primary function is

¹ This is the impurity conveyed by sitting, leaning or lying on something.

PEREK 9 – 84A

not considered fitting for the use of sitting or lying, and is therefore not susceptible to *midras*.)

A box whose opening is **from the top is susceptible to impurity of a corpse**. This means *all* impurities, apart from *midras*. For this box is not intended for lying on. If someone would lie on it, we would tell him “Get up so that we can do our work!”

But a box that has a large dimension, enough to hold forty se’ah, **is not susceptible to impurity from anything**. For it cannot be moved when it is full.

*

Our Sages taught in a Baraita: A *zav*² cannot impart impurity of *midras* by sitting on an **earthenware utensil**. It will remain **pure**. For earthenware utensils only become impure when impurity enters their interior airspace.

Rabbi Yosi says: Even a ship.

The Gemara analyzes this. **What does he Rabbi Yosi mean?** What does a ship have to do with *midras* impurity? After all, a ship is always *completely* pure, even if it was touched by impurity.

The Gemara answers. **Rav Zevid said: This is what it means. *Midras* of an earthenware utensil** does not change it from being **pure**. **But its** coming into interior **contact** with a *zav* **makes it impure**. **And an earthenware ship** is similarly **made impure** on contact with a *zav*.

(However, it is not susceptible to *midras*. For the ship is not designated for sitting. Its main purpose is to transport goods. If someone would sit in it, we would tell him “Get up so that we can do our work!”).

And this **is in accordance with Chananya**. For he holds that an earthenware ship is different from wooden ships, and is not compared to a sack. And a sack, according to his view, is the source from which a ship’s insusceptibility to impurity is derived. Therefore an earthenware ship is susceptible to impurity.

Rabbi Yosi says: Even the ship is completely **pure**, even on contact with a *zav*.

And this is **like our Tanna** of the Mishnah. For he holds the view that all ships remain pure, even earthenware ones, from the verse “a ship in the heart of the sea” (see the Mishnah on *daf* 83b).

*

² A man impure due to a seminal-like emission.

PEREK 9 – 84A

Rav Pappa challenged this: If this is so, then **what is the meaning of “even a ship”** that Rabbi Yosi had said? For the first Tanna of the Baraita did not say that an earthenware utensil was pure regarding contact impurity. So how can Rabbi Yosi be adding on to the first Tanna’s words when he states “*even* the ship is pure”? On the contrary, it is *only* the ship that is pure.

Rather, said Rav Pappa: This is what it means. The Baraita can be understood by means of an amendment to the text. ***Midras of an earthenware utensil*** does not change it from being **pure**. **But** a *zav’s touching it* from the inside makes it **impure**. **And** a utensil made of wood – **whether its *midras*, or whether a *zav’s touching it*³ – it becomes impure. And a ship of the Jordan remains pure**, whether in respect to contact or *midras*. And this is **like our Tanna** of the Mishnah who says that all ships, whether full or empty, remain pure.

Rabbi Yosi says: Even the ship of the Jordan is **impure** on contact.

And this view of Rabbi Yosi is **like Chananya** who says that a movable small ship, whether full or empty, can become impure.

*

The Gemara now discusses an aspect of the above Baraita. **And *midras of an earthenware utensil* – from where do we know that the utensil remains pure?**

³ Even from the outside, since only earthenware remains pure when touched from the outside.

PEREK 9 – 84B

Chizkiyah said: For a verse states (*Vayikra*⁴ 15:5): “**And a man who touches his [a zav’s] place of lying down...is impure until the evening**”. Since the Torah refers to “his” place, **it is comparing his (the zav’s) lying place to himself**. That is, **just as he has the ability to achieve purification by means of a mikveh**⁵, **so too his lying place can only become impure if it has purification by means of a mikveh**. This excludes something made of earthenware, which does not become pure in a mikveh. (Earthenware only becomes pure by breaking it, as it states “it shall be broken” in *Vayikra* 15:12). Thus, earthenware is excluded from *midras* impurity.

The House of Rabbi Yishmael taught a Baraita: It is written regarding a *zavah*⁶ (*Vayikra* 15:26), “**Every place of lying down...like the lying down of her niddah**⁷ **state, it will be to her**”. **It the Torah is comparing her lying place to herself. Just as she has the ability to achieve purification by way of the mikveh, so too her lying place can only become impure if it has purification by way of the mikveh.**

This comes **to exclude a utensil** used for lying on but which is made of **earthenware, which does not become pure by means of a mikveh.**

*

Rabbi Ila contradicted this: Is it true that only something that can achieve purity in a mikveh can receive *midras* impurity?

But there is a Baraita to the contrary: **A mat** made of woven reeds, fitting for lying and sitting on, can receive *midras* impurity from **a corpse. From where** do we know that it is susceptible to such impurity by way of a corpse? (I.e. that it is different from wooden utensils lacking a cavity for holding things, which are *not* susceptible to impurity.)

AMMUD BET

It is a logical inference. By way of a *kal vachomer*⁸ we may derive that a reed mat can receive *midras* impurity from a corpse.

The inference is based on the premise that small earthenware jars are not susceptible to any kind of *zav* impurity. *Midras* is not applicable, for two reasons. Firstly, because small jars are not designated for sitting on. And secondly, because these jars are made of

⁴ Leviticus

⁵ purifying pool of water.

⁶ A woman who became impure due to an emission of blood that she had during days not attributable to her menstrual cycle.

⁷ Impurity due to menstruation.

⁸ A fortiori reasoning

PEREK 9 – 84B

earthenware. And impurity by way of touching is not applicable. For earthenware does not become impure by way of its outer surface. Rather, it can only become impure by way of something entering its internal airspace. And this cannot take place in small jars, for their opening is so narrow that a *zav* would not be able to insert even his finger into them.

These jars, however, can become impure by way of being under the same roof as a corpse (the impurity of *ohel*). Here, the impurity *can* enter by way of their opening. This is learnt from the verses (*Bamidbar*⁹ 19:14–15), “This is the law: If a man dies in a tent...any [man] that is in the tent shall be impure...And every open [earthenware] utensil whose cover is not fastened upon it, is impure”.

The *kal vachomer* is as follows.

Since small jars of earthenware, which remain pure with respect to a *zav*, nevertheless can become impure with respect to a corpse. Is it not logical that a reed mat, which can become impure with *zav* impurity¹⁰, should become impure with respect to a corpse?

Rabbi Ila concludes stating his contradiction to what was taught by the House of Rabbi Yishmael: **But why**, according to Chizkiyah and the House of Rabbi Yishmael, does this Baraita say that a reed mat becomes impure through *midras*? **Note that it does not have the ability to become pure by way of a mikveh!**

The mat does not become pure in the mikveh because it is a wooden utensil without a cavity made for holding things. In all the places in the Torah where purification is mentioned, utensils that have a receptacle were the subject.

*

Rabbi Chanina said to him to Rabbi Ila: **It is different there** in the case of wooden utensils without cavities. They are susceptible to *midras* impurity for the following reason: **since there are those in its type** (i.e. in the category of wooden utensils) that *can* become pure in a mikveh.

I.e., wooden utensils that do have a cavity made for holding things can be purified in a mikveh. Therefore, *all* types of wooden utensils are considered as if they can be purified in a mikveh. Hence, even wooden utensils without cavities can become impure by way of *midras*.

This is not the case regarding earthenware. Since *no* earthenware utensils can be purified in a mikveh, therefore none of them are susceptible to impurity by way of *midras*.

⁹ Numbers

¹⁰ Since it is fitting for lying on, it can become impure with *midras*.

PEREK 9 – 84B

He Rabbi Ila said to him: The Merciful One should save us from this view! It is not logical to say that the matter depends on “its type”. Rather, it depends on the status of the item itself.

Rabbi Chanina replied: **On the contrary! The Merciful One should save us from your view!**

*

The Gemara explains the basis of Rabbi Chanina’s view.

And what is the reasoning? Where is it written that for a utensil to be susceptible to impurity, even though it cannot be purified in a mikveh, it is enough for it to be in a broad category of utensils that can become purified? We learnt previously that the Torah compares the lying place of a *zav* to the *zav* himself. Surely this would imply that the place itself where the *zav* lies down should be able to be purified, like the *zav*, in order for it to be susceptible to impurity.

The reason of Rabbi Chanina is based on the fact that **two** seemingly contradictory **verses are written**.

It is written (*Vayikra* 15:5): **“And a man who touches *his* (the *zav*’s) lying place”**. This makes a comparison between a *zav* and his lying place.

And in another verse **it is written** (*ibid.* 15:4): **“Any lying place on which the *zav* lies down will become impure”**. Here it does not state “*his* lying place”. This implies that the place does not have to be similar to the *zav* himself, in order to be susceptible to impurity.

How can this be resolved?

It could be explained as follows. The second verse, “any lying place”, is referring to where **there are in its type** items that can become purified in a mikveh. Therefore, the place of lying can become impure, **even though it itself does not have** the possibility of **purification by way of a mikveh**.

Whereas the first verse, “*his* lying place”, is referring to where **there are not in its type** items that can become purified in a mikveh. There we do **compare his lying place to him** himself. That if it cannot be purified by way of a mikveh, then it cannot become impure through *midras*.

*

Rava said: *Midras* of an earthenware utensil, that it does not change the utensil from being **pure** – this is derived **from here**:

PEREK 9 – 84B

It is written regarding being under the same roof as a corpse (*Bamidbar* 19:15): “**And every open** [earthenware] **utensil whose cover is not fastened upon it**, [is impure]”.

Note that this implies: when **there is a cover** fixed tightly **on it – it is** remains **pure**.

And **isn't this** verse **dealing** also **with** a utensil **that he had designated for his wife who is a niddah**, for her to always sit on? And normally such a utensil can become impure by way of *midras*.

And nevertheless the Torah stated that if it has a cover fixed tightly on it, that it remains **pure**.

Rava reasons as follows: if an earthenware utensil could become impure by *midras*, how could its cover save its inside from the impurity of a corpse? For an impure utensil cannot serve as a partition regarding impurity. Thus, since the tightly covered earthenware utensil is impervious to impurity, it perforce is not susceptible to *midras* impurity.

Thus we see that an earthenware utensil cannot become impure by way of *midras*.

MISHNAH

This Mishnah deals with the laws of *kilayim* (the prohibition of sowing seeds of different kinds of plants together). It is taught here as a continuation of the previous Mishnayot that had started with the word “From where”, *Minayin*.

The prohibition only applies when the different plants appear to be mixed together. It is permitted, however, to plant and grow them if it will appear as if they are growing separately. This is true, even though we know that they are drawing sustenance from the earth together.

If they would appear to be mixed, one must distance the seeds an amount that ensures they are not being sustained from the same ground.

The amount of earth from which a plant derives its sustenance is a *tefach* and a half all around. Therefore, the distance between two seeds needs to be three *tefachim*.

PEREK 9 – 84B

From where do we know the following law **regarding a garden-patch that is six by six tefachim**¹¹: **That they may sow within it five different seeds** without a prohibition of *kilayim*?

And the permitted case is specifically when he sows **four** rows, of four different types of seeds, **on the edge of four sides of the garden-patch**. And he leaves the four corners clear, so that all the rows will appear separate from each other.

In this way, each row will grow separately, perpendicular to the rows next to it. And the corner of the garden-patch is left fallow at each end of the row, so that the different seeds do not become intermingled.

And one seed is sown in the middle of the garden-patch, three *tefachim* away from the other seeds. This seed needs to be distanced the joint amount of actual sustenance from the soil by both seeds. This is so, since here it is not apparent that it is growing separately from them.

The Mishnah now answers the question of “From where do we know?”: **For it is stated** (*Yeshayahu*¹² 61:11): **“For, like the earth, which gives forth its sprout, and like a garden that causes its seeds to grow, so shall the L-rd G-d cause righteousness and praise to grow in front of all the nations”**.

And the Mishnah expounds: **“Its seed” is not stated. Rather, “its seeds”** is stated.

The explanation of this appears right away in the Gemara.

Gemara:

The Gemara asks for clarification: **What is the implication?** How does the verse imply that it is discussing five species planted in a vegetable patch six *tefachim*¹³ on a side?

Said Rav Yehudah: We explain the verse thusly. **“For, like the earth, which gives forth its sprout...”**

“Gives forth—one” species.

“Its sprout—one” species. **This is two** species.

“Its seeds—two” species. **This is four** species.

“To grow—one” species. This is five species.

¹¹ 1 tefach: 3.1 in., 8 cm

¹² Isaiah

¹³ 1 tefach: 3.1 in., 8 cm.