

דף יומי • חליון • דף קכ"ד

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf continuing the sugya of how to purify an oven that became tamei. The Gemara goes deep into the machlokes between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis regarding whether we need to scrape off the plaster holding the oven together, and we analyze the shiurim of what makes an oven susceptible to tumah in the first place, comparing a large oven to a small one. We also look at the halachos of tearing garments and leather, and whether a minority connection is still considered connected to keep the piece tamei.

Then, we move on to a new Mishnah that brings us to the halachos of a hide that has pieces of neveilah meat on it. We learn about the concept of a "yad" (a handle) for tumah, such as a fiber or hair opposite the meat, and we open up a major machlokes between Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva regarding whether two half-olive bulks of meat on a single hide can combine to defile someone through carrying, or if the hide nullifies them.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד אי DAF 124A

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

עד שיהא בארץ.

until the oven is resting directly on the ground, without any plaster holding it.

MISHNAH

רבי מאיר אומר: אינו צריך לא לגרור את הטפילה ולא עד שיהא בארץ, אלא ממצטו מבפנים (מארבע) [מארבעה] טפחים.

Rabbi Meir says: One does not need to scrape off the plaster, and one does not need to go until the oven is on the ground; rather, one reduces its height from within the plaster casing by cutting it down until the unbroken part is less than four handbreadths.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

כי ממצט ליה (מארבע) [מארבעה] מיהא טהור, אמאי? לימא: הא חלים וקאי!

The Gemara asks: **When he reduces it** to less than four handbreadths, **at any rate, it is pure**. But **why** should it be pure? **Let us say** that since the plaster holds it together, **it is strengthened and stands**, and according to Reish Lakish it should remain impure!

ANSWER

אמר ליה רבא: ואימא מדרבנן – גורר את הטפילה עד שיהא בארץ.

Rava said to Rabbi Yirmeya: Instead of asking from Rabbi Meir, say a proof for Reish Lakish from the view of the Rabbis, who say that one must **scrape off the plaster until** the oven **is on the ground**. This shows that as long as the plaster holds it, it is considered connected!

EXPLANATION

אלא אמר רבא: הכי קאמר, תנור שנטמא כיצד מטהרין אותו? דברי הכל חולקו לשלשה, וגורר את הטפילה עד שיהא בארץ.

Rather, Rava said: This is what the Mishnah is saying: An oven that became impure, how do we purify it? Everyone agrees that one divides it into three parts, and scrapes off the plaster until the oven is on the ground.

EXPLANATION

והרוצה שלא יבא תנורו לידי טומאה, כיצד הוא עושה? חולקו לשלשה, וגורר את הטפילה עד שיהא בארץ.

And one who wants that his oven should not come to a state of susceptibility to impurity from the outset, how does he do it? The Rabbis say: One divides it into three parts and scrapes off the plaster until the oven is on the ground.

EXPLANATION

רבי מאיר אומר: אינו צריך לא לגרור את הטפילה ולא עד שיהא בארץ, אלא ממעטו מבפנים מארבעה טפחים.

But Rabbi Meir says: For an oven that is not yet impure, one does not need to scrape off the plaster, and does not need to go until the oven is on the ground; rather, one reduces its height from within the plaster casing to less than four handbreadths.

STATEMENT

אמר מר: חולקו לשלשה.

The Master said above: One divides it into three parts to purify it, meaning that dividing it into two is not enough because one part would contain the majority of the oven.

QUESTION

ורמינהו: תנור, תחלתו ארבעה, ושיריו ארבעה, דברי רבי מאיר.

And the Gemara raises a contradiction from a Mishnah: An oven, its beginning size to be susceptible to impurity is four handbreadths, and its remnants must be four handbreadths to remain impure; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

QUESTION

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אֲמוּרִים בְּגִדּוֹל, אֲבָל בְּקָטָן – תִּתְּלֶתוּ כָּל שְׁהוּא, מִשְׁתַּגְּמָר מְלֹאכְתּוֹ – שִׁירֵיו בְּרוּבוֹ.

And the Sages say: In what case are these words said? Regarding a large oven; but regarding a small oven, its beginning size is any size, once its work is finished, and its remnants remain impure if they contain the majority of it.

EXPLANATION

וְכַמָּה "כָּל שְׁהוּא"? אָמְרֵי דְבֵי רַבִּי יַנָּאִי: טַפַּח, שֶׁכֵּן עוֹשִׂים (תְּנוּרִים) [תְּנוּרִי] בְּנוֹת טַפַּח.

And how much is "any size"? The school of Rabbi Yannai say: A handbreadth, because they make girls' toy ovens of a handbreadth.

INFERENCE

טַעֲמָא דְאִיכָא שִׁירֵיו אַרְבַּע, הָא לִיכָא שִׁירֵיו אַרְבַּע – טָהוֹר.

Now, the Gemara infers: **The reason** a large oven remains impure is **that there are remnants of four** handbreadths; **but if there are no remnants of four** handbreadths, it is **pure**, even if a piece contains the majority of the oven! This contradicts the Rabbis in our first Mishnah who require that no piece be a majority.

ANSWER

אָמְרֵי: הֵתֵם, דְּצִלְקִיָּה מְצִלְקָה; הֵכָא, דְּעִבְדִּיה גִּיסְטָרָא.

The Sages say in response: **There**, where the Rabbis hold that if there are no remnants of four handbreadths it is pure, it is a case **where he cut it horizontally**, so the pieces cannot stand stably; **here**, where they require that no piece be a majority, it is a case **where he made it a shard** by cutting it vertically, so a majority piece can stand on its own.

QUESTION

אָמַר מָר: שִׁירֵיו בְּרוּבוֹ, רוּבוֹ דְּטַפַּח לְמַאי הָיִי?

The Master said above: Regarding a small oven, **its remnants** remain impure if they contain **the majority of it**. The Gemara asks: **The majority of a handbreadth, what is it used for?** It is too small to be functional!

ANSWER

אָמַר אֲבַיִי: שִׁירֵי גִדּוֹל בְּרוּבוֹ,

Abaye said: That clause is actually referring to **the remnants of a large** oven, which remain impure if they contain **the majority of it**.

QUESTION

וְהָאָמְרֵי רַבִּנּוּן אַרְבָּעָה?

The Gemara asks: **But didn't the Rabbis say** that the remnants of a large oven must be **four** handbreadths?

ANSWER

לֹא קוּשְׁיָא: הָא בְּתִנּוּרָא בְּרִשְׁעָה, הָא בְּתִנּוּרָא בְּרִשְׁבָּעָה.

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**. **This** statement that it requires a majority refers **to an oven of nine** handbreadths, where the majority is five; and **that** statement that it requires four handbreadths refers **to an oven of seven** handbreadths, where four handbreadths is the majority.

STATEMENT

לִישָׁנָא אַחֲרִינָא אָמְרִי לֵה: אָמַר רַב הוּנָא מִשּׁוּם רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי: וְאִפִּילוּ שְׂיִיר בָּהּ כְּדֵי מַעֲפֹרֶת.

Another version of this discussion they say: Rav Huna said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosei: And even if he left in it only enough of a connection for a scar-like strip, it is still considered connected.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רֵישׁ לָקִישׁ: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא טְלִיתָ, אֲבָל עוֹר – חָשִׁיב,

Reish Lakish said: They only taught that tearing the majority purifies a garment, but leather is important and remains connected even with a minority connection.

STATEMENT

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אִפִּילוּ עוֹר נִמְי לֹא חָשִׁיב.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Even leather is also not considered so important as to remain connected.

OBJECTION

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְרֵישׁ לָקִישׁ: עוֹר טָמֵא מִדְּרָס, חֵישָׁב עָלָיו לְרִצּוּעָה וְסַנְדָּלִין – כִּיּוֹן שָׁנְתָן בּוֹ אֵיזְמֵל טָהוֹר, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

Rabbi Yochanan challenged Reish Lakish: A piece of leather that is tamei with midras impurity, and he planned to cut it for straps and sandals; once he placed the scalpel into it to cut it, it becomes pure; these are the words of Rabbi Yehuda.

OBJECTION

וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים: עַד שֶׁיִּמְעִיטְנוּ מִחֲמִשָּׁה טֶפְחִים.

And the Sages say: It does not become pure until he reduces it by cutting it to less than five handbreadths.

OBJECTION

כִּי מִמַּעַט מִיָּהָא טָהוֹר, אֲמַאי? לִימָא חָשִׁיב!

Now, when he reduces it, at any rate, it is pure. Why? Let us say that leather is important and the uncut part should keep it connected!

RESOLUTION

הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִין – דְּקָא בְּעֵי לִיָּה לְמוֹשֵׁב זָב.

Reish Lakish answers: With what are we dealing here? Where he wants it for a seat of a zav, which requires a minimum of five handbreadths, so once it is reduced below that, it is no longer fit for its purpose.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי עוֹר שֶׁיֵּשׁ עָלָיו כְּזֵית בָּשָׂר, הַנּוֹגֵעַ בְּצִיב חֵיוָא מְמַנּוּ, וּבִשְׁעָרָה שֶׁכָּנָגְדּוּ – טָמֵא.

MISHNAH: A hide that has upon it an olive's bulk of meat; one who touches a fiber protruding from it, or a hair that is opposite the meat on the other side, is **tamei** because they serve as a handle.

MISHNAH

הָיוּ עָלָיו בְּשָׁנֵי חֲצָאֵי זֵיתִים, מְטַמֵּא בְּמַשָּׁא וְלֹא בְּמַגָּע, דְּבַר רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל.

If there were upon it like two half-olive bulks of meat in different places, it defiles through carrying, but not through touching; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא אוֹמֵר: לֹא בְּמַגָּע וְלֹא בְּמַשָּׁא.

Rabbi Akiva says: Neither through touching nor through carrying does it defile.

MISHNAH

וּמוֹדָה רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא בְּשָׁנֵי חֲצָאֵי זֵיתִים שֶׁתְּחַבֵּן בְּקִיסָם וְהֵסִיטָן, שֶׁהוּא טָמֵא.

And Rabbi Akiva admits regarding two half-olive bulks that he stuck into a splinter and moved them, that he is tamei.

MISHNAH

וּמַפְנֵי מָה רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא מְטַהֵר בְּעוֹר? מַפְנֵי שֶׁהָעוֹר מְבַטֵּלָן.

And for what reason does Rabbi Akiva rule it pure in the case of the hide? Because the hide nullifies them, preventing them from combining.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

GEMARA

גְּמִ' אָמַר עוּלָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא פְּלִטְתוֹ חִיָּה, אֲכָל פְּלִטְתוֹ סַבִּין – בְּטִיל.

GEMARA: Ulla said that Rabbi Yochanan said: They only taught that the meat is not nullified where the beast's natural tearing left it on the hide, but where the knife left it during flaying, it is nullified.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיהִי רַב נַחֲמָן לְעוּלָא: אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אִפִּילוּ כְּתָרְטָא?

Rav Nachman said to Ulla: Did Rabbi Yochanan say this even if the meat left by the knife was as large as a tarta weight?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיהִי: אֵין.

Ulla said to him: Yes.

QUESTION

וְאִפִּילוּ כְּנַפְיָא?

Rav Nachman asked: And even if it was as large as a sieve?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין.

Ulla said to him: Yes.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה: האלהים! אם אמר לי רבי יוחנן מפומיה – לא צייתנא ליה.

Rav Nachman said to him: By Hashem! If Rabbi Yochanan himself had told me this from his own mouth, I would not listen to him, because it makes no sense that such a large piece of meat is nullified!

STATEMENT

כי סליק רב אושעיא, אשכחיה ליה לרבי אממי, אמרה לשמעתייה קמיה: הכי אמר עולא, והכי אהדר ליה רב נחמן.

When Rav Oshaya went up to Eretz Yisrael, he found Rabbi Ammi and stated this teaching before him: This is what Ulla said, and this is how Rav Nachman replied to him.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה: ומשום דרב נחמן חתניה דבי נשיאה הוא, מזלזל בשמעתייה דרבי יוחנן?!

Rabbi Ammi said to him: And because Rav Nachman is the son-in-law of the house of the Nasi, does he disparage the teaching of Rabbi Yochanan?!

STATEMENT

זמנין אשכחיה דיתבי וקאמר לה אסיפא:

Another time, he found him sitting and saying this teaching of Rabbi Yochanan on the latter clause of the Mishnah:

STATEMENT

היו עליו שני חצאי זיתים – מטמאים במשא ולא במגע, דברי רבי ישמעאל. רבי עקיבא אומר: לא במגע ולא במשא.

"If there were upon it two half-olive bulks, they defile through carrying but not through touching; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: Neither through touching nor through carrying."

STATEMENT

אמר רבי יוחנן: לא שנו אלא פלטתו חיה, אבל פלטתו סבין – בטיל.

And on this, Rabbi Yochanan said: They only taught that they do not combine according to Rabbi Yishmael where the beast's tearing left it, but where the knife left it, it is nullified and does not even defile through carrying.

QUESTION

אמר ליה מר אסיפא מתני לה?

Rav Oshaya said to him: Does the Master teach it on the latter clause?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין.

He said to him: Yes.

QUESTION

ואלא עולא ארישא אמרה ניהליכו?

Rav Oshaya asked: **But did Ulla say it to you on the first clause**, where there is a whole olive's bulk?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין.

He said to him: Yes.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה: האלהים, אי אמר לי יהושע בן נון משוםיה – לא צייתנא ליה!

Rabbi Ammi said to him: **By Hashem**, if Yehoshua bin Nun had told me in his name that it applies to the first clause, **I would not listen to him!** It only makes sense on the latter clause.

STATEMENT

כי אתא רבין וכל נחותי, אמרוה ארישא.

When Ravin and all those who go down from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia **came**, they said it on the first clause.

RESOLUTION

ואלא משא? כדאמר רב פפא:

But then it is difficult how a large piece can be nullified! The Gemara answers: It is as **Rav Papa said**:

עמוד ב' DAF 124B

EXPLANATION

במרודד, הקא נמי במרודד.

The reference is **to a thin layer of flesh** that is spread out and attached to the hide. **Here, too**, we must say that Rabbi Yochanan's statement is referring **to a thin layer of flesh** attached to the hide, which is nullified by the hide.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

היו עלי.

We learned in the Mishnah: If there **were upon** the hide two half olive-bulks of carcass flesh, the hide imparts the impurity of a carcass through carrying but not through contact; this is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael.

STATEMENT

אמר בר פדא: לא שנו אלא מאחוריו, אבל מלפניו – יש נוגע וחוזר ונוגע.

Bar Padda said: They only taught that Rabbi Yishmael holds that the hide does not impart impurity through contact **from its back**, meaning when one touches the hide on the outside. **But from its front**, where the pieces of flesh are, if one directly touches the pieces of flesh inside, he is impure, because **there is** a principle of **touching and touching again**, meaning that the two separate touchings of the half olive-bulks join together to make a full shiur.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אין נוגע וחוזר ונוגע.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: There is no principle of touching and touching again to join two separate touchings of less than the shiur.

STATEMENT

ואזדא רבי יוחנן לטעמיה, דאמר רבי יוחנן: רבי ישמעאל ורבי דוסא בן הרפינס אמרו דבר אחד.

And Rabbi Yochanan goes according to his own reasoning, as Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas said the same thing, meaning they both hold that separate contacts or roof-overs do not join together.

EXPLANATION

רבי ישמעאל – הא דאמרן;

The statement of **Rabbi Yishmael is this which we said**, that two touchings do not join together.

EXPLANATION

רבי דוסא בן הרפינס – דתנו: כל המטמאין באהל, שנחלקו והכניסן לתוך הבית – רבי דוסא בן הרפינס מטהר, וחכמים מטמאים.

The statement of **Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas is as we learned in a Mishnah: Any parts of a corpse that impart impurity in a tent, which were divided** into two pieces of less than an olive-bulk, **and one brought them into the house**, Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas rules that the house is **pure**, and the Sages rule that it is **impure**.

INFERENCE

לאו אמר רבי דוסא בן הרפינס התיב, אין מאהיל וחוזר ומאהיל, הקא נמי אין נוגע וחוזר ונוגע.

Did not Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas say there that **there is no principle of overlying and overlying again** to join the two pieces? **Here, too**, Rabbi Yishmael holds **there is no principle of touching and touching again**.

QUESTION

ומדרבי דוסא בן הרפינס ברבי ישמעאל, רבנן ברבי עקיבא? והא רבי עקיבא טהורי קא מטהר!

The Gemara asks: **And since Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas is like Rabbi Yishmael**, must we say that **the Rabbis** who argue with him hold **like Rabbi Akiva** who argues with Rabbi Yishmael? **But doesn't Rabbi Akiva rule** them completely **pure** from both contact and carrying, whereas the Rabbis rule them impure?

ANSWER

עד כאן לא קא מטהר רבי עקיבא אלא בעור, אבל בעלמא מטמא, כדקתני סיפא:

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Akiva only rules** them **pure in the case of the hide** because the hide nullifies the pieces of flesh, **but in general** where there is no hide, Rabbi Akiva **rules** them **impure** because they do join together, as **the latter clause** of the Mishnah **teaches**:

PROOF

ומודה רבי עקיבא בשני חצאי זיתים שתחבן בקיסם והסיטן שהוא טמא.

And Rabbi Akiva concedes in the case of two half olive-bulks where one skewered them with a wood chip and moved them, that he is **impure** because they join together.

EXPLANATION

ומפני מה רבי עקיבא מטהר בעור? מפני שהעור מבטלן.

And for what reason does Rabbi Akiva rule them **pure in the case of the hide**? Because the hide nullifies them.

OBJECTION

מתיב רב עוקבא בר חמא: "בגבלתם" – ולא בעור שיש עליו שני חצאי זיתים.

Rav Ukva bar Chama raised an objection from a Braisa: The Torah says, "**in their carcass**" to teach: **and not** to include a hide that has upon it two half olive-bulks of flesh, which does not make one impure through contact.

BRAISA

יכול אף במשא? תלמוד לומר "והנושא יטמא" – דברי רבי ישמעאל.

One **might** have thought that this is the halacha **even** regarding carrying? Therefore, the verse says: "And he who carries their carcass **shall be impure**" to teach that carrying does make him impure; **this is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael**.

BRAISA

רבי עקיבא אומר: "הנוגע" "והנושא" – את שפא לכלל מגע, פא לכלל משא; לא פא לכלל מגע, לא פא לכלל משא.

Rabbi Akiva says: The Torah juxtaposes "**he who touches**" and "**he who carries**" to teach: that which comes into the category of contact, comes into the category of carrying; that which does not come into the category of contact, does not come into the category of carrying.

QUESTION

ואם איתא, הרי פא לכלל מגע מלפניו?

Rav Ukva bar Chama asks: **And if it is so** like Bar Padda said, that Rabbi Yishmael holds there is contact from the front, **behold, it does come into the category of contact from the front!** Why then does Rabbi Akiva say it has no contact at all?

ANSWER

אמר רבא: הכי קאמר, את שפא לכלל מגע בכל צד – פא לכלל משא, לא פא לכלל מגע בכל צד – לא פא לכלל משא.

Rava said: This is what Rabbi Akiva is saying: That which comes into the category of contact from every side, comes into the category of carrying; that which does not come into the category of contact from every side, but only from the front, does not come into the category of carrying.

QUESTION

בָּעָא מִיֵּינִיה רַב אַוְיָא סָבָא מִרְבָּה בַּר רַב הוּנָא: קוֹלִית סְתוּמָּה, לְרַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל, מַהוּ שְׁתַּטְמָא?

Rav Avya the Elder asked of Rabba bar Rav Huna: A sealed thigh bone containing marrow of a carcass, according to Rabbi Yishmael, what is the halacha as to whether it imparts impurity through carrying?

EXPLANATION

אֵית לִיה לְרַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל: אֵת שָׂבָא לְכָלֵּל מִגֵּעַ – בָּא לְכָלֵּל מִשָּׂא, לֹא בָא לְכָלֵּל מִגֵּעַ – לֹא בָא לְכָלֵּל מִשָּׂא, וְהָכָא הֵיִינוּ טַעְמָא מְשׁוּם דְּבָא לְכָלֵּל מִגֵּעַ מְלַפְנֵיו.

Does Rabbi Yishmael accept the principle of Rabbi Akiva that that which comes into the category of contact comes into the category of carrying, and that which does not come into the category of contact does not come into the category of carrying, and here in the case of the hide **this is the reason** he rules it impure through carrying, because it comes into the category of contact from the front? If so, a sealed thigh bone, which cannot be touched at all, would be pure.

EXPLANATION

או דלמא לית ליה?

Or perhaps he does not accept this principle at all, and therefore the sealed thigh bone would be impure through carrying?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיה: עוֹרְבָא פָּרַח.

Rabba bar Rav Huna said to him to deflect the difficult question: Look, a raven is flying!

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה: רָבָא בְרִיה: וְלָאוּ הֵיִינוּ רַב אַוְיָא סָבָא מִפּוּמְבִּידָתָא, דְּמִשְׁבַּח לֵן מָר בְּגוּיָה דְּגַבְרָא רַבָּה הוּא?

Rava, his son, said to him: Is this not Rav Avya the Elder from Pumbedita, whom Master praised to us that he is a great man? Why did you push him off with such an answer?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיה: אֲנִי הַיּוֹם "סְמִכוֹנִי בְּאַשִׁישׁוֹת", וּבָעָא מִינָאי מִלְּתָא דְּבָעִי טַעְמָא.

Rabba bar Rav Huna said to him: Today I am weak and need to say, "Sustain me with flasks of wine," and he asked of me a matter that requires deep reasoning which I did not have the strength to analyze.

STATEMENT

אָמַר עוּלָא: שְׁנֵי חֲצָאֵי זֵיתִים שְׁתַּחְכֵּן בְּקִיסָם, אֲפִילוּ מוֹלִיךְ וּמִבִּיא כָּל הַיּוֹם כּוּלּוֹ – טָהוֹר.

Ulla said: Two half olive-bulks that one skewered with a wood chip, even if he carries them back and forth all day long, he is pure from the impurity of carrying.

EXPLANATION

מֵאי טַעְמָא? כְּתִיב "וְנִשָּׂא" וְקָרִינוּ "נוֹשָׂא", בְּעֵינָן "נוֹשָׂא" וְהוּא דְּנִישָׂא בְּכַת אַחַת.

What is the reason? It is written "and it shall be carried" and we read it "he who carries"; this teaches that we require "he who carries" in a way that it is carried at one time, meaning the two pieces must be carried together as one unit, which is not the case when they are merely on a stick.

OBJECTION

תנו: היו עליו שני חצאי זיתים – מטמאין במשא ולא במגע, דברי רבי ישמעאל.

The Gemara objects: **We learned** in our Mishnah: If there were upon the hide two half olive-bulks, they impart impurity through carrying but not through contact; this is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael.

QUESTION

אמאי? והא לא נישא הוא!

Why? But they are not carried as one unit, since they are separated by the hide!

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: בפרודד.

Rav Papa said: This is where they are spread out and touch each other, so they are carried as one.

OBJECTION

תא שמע: מודה רבי עקיבא בשני חצאי זיתים שתחבון בקיסם והסיטן שהוא טמא.

Come and hear another objection: Rabbi Akiva concedes in the case of two half olive-bulks where one skewered them with a wood chip and moved them, that he is impure.

QUESTION

אמאי? והא לא נישא הוא!

Why? But they are not carried as one unit!

ANSWER

הכי נמי בפרודד.

The Gemara answers: **Here, too**, it is a case where they are spread out and touch each other.

STATEMENT

בתנאי: אחד הנוגע ואחד המסיט, רבי אליעזר אומר: אף הנושא.

The Gemara notes: This dispute is like a dispute among Tannaim, as it is taught in a Braisa: Whether one touches or whether one moves them, he is impure; Rabbi Eliezer says: Even one who carries them.

QUESTION

אטו נושא לאו מסיט הוא?

The Gemara asks: Is carrying not a form of moving? Why does Rabbi Eliezer use the word "even"?

ANSWER

אָלס לָאוּ הָכִי קָאָמַר: אֶחָד הַנוֹגֵעַ וְאֶחָד הַמְסִיט בְּלֹא נִשָּׂא, וְאַתָּא רַבִּי אֶלְעִזֶּר לְמִימַר: וְהוּא דְנִשָּׂא, וּמַאי "אֶחָד"? אֵימָא: וְהוּא דְנִשָּׂא.

Rather, is it not that this is what he is saying: Whether one touches or whether one moves them, even without them being carried as one unit, he is impure; and Rabbi Eliezer comes to say: Only if they are carried as one unit. And what is the meaning of "even"? Say instead: "Only if they are carried." Thus, Ulla's ruling is a dispute between these Tannaim.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנֵי קוּלִית הַמֵּת

MISHNAH: The thigh bone of a corpse

SUMMARY

The Gemara first clarifies the process of purifying an oven, explaining that cutting it vertically into shards requires that no single piece contains the majority of the oven, whereas a horizontal cut renders it tahor because the pieces cannot stand stably. We then transition to the laws of leather, where Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish argue whether a minority connection keeps leather pieces halachically joined. Finally, the new Mishnah introduces the halachos of a hide with neveilah meat; Rabbi Yishmael holds that two half-olive bulks of meat on a hide can combine to cause tumah through carrying, while Rabbi Akiva rules that the hide nullifies the meat. In the Gemara, Ulla quotes Rabbi Yochanan to qualify this, explaining that the meat is only considered significant and not nullified if it was left on the hide through natural tearing, but if it was left behind by the butcher's knife during flaying, it is completely nullified to the hide.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by how we break the susceptibility of an impure oven. The Rabbis tell us that to truly purify it, we cannot just make a small crack; we must divide it into three parts and scrape off the plaster until it rests directly on the ground. We see from here a powerful sevara in avodas Hashem: if you want to break a bad habit or a negative influence in your life, you cannot leave the 'plaster' holding it together. You cannot just make a small, superficial change while keeping the old structure intact.

Lichoira, we often try to make compromises with our yetzer hara. We say, 'I will change, but I will keep the same environment, the same old connections.' The Tanna is telling us that as long as the plaster is holding the pieces, the oven is still considered whole and susceptible to tumah. True taharah requires us to scrape away the external support systems that keep our bad habits standing. We have to go all the way down to the ground.

Today, identify one negative habit or distraction you are trying to break. Do not just make a small resolution; scrape away the 'plaster', the trigger, the app, or the environment that keeps that habit standing, so it has no structure left to hold it up.

