

Shabbos Daf Pey Gimmel

- **Q:** A Braisa brings the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Akiva** and says that the **T"K** holds that an avodah zarah and its service items are tamei like a sheretz (i.e. they do not give off tumah through carrying). This does not fit according to **Rabbah!**? **A: Rabbah** will answer, the Mishna quoted earlier said the same thing and he explained it to mean that the **T"K** holds there is no "ehvehn mesameh" tumah by avodah zarah, just like there is no such tumah by a sheretz. He will explain this Braisa in the same way.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, a non-Jewish man, a non-Jewish woman, an avodah zarah and its service items are all tamei, but do not give off tumah through carrying. **R' Akiva** says that they are tamei and they give off tumah through carrying as well. This is again problematic according to the way **Rabbah** explained the machlokes!? **A: Rabbah** will say, the Mishna can't be understood as is, because the **Rabanan** were goizer that non-Jewish men and women have the tumah of a zav, which means that they certainly give off tumah through being carried and also give off tumah through an "ehvehn mesameh". Therefore, we will have no choice but to amend the words of the Braisa. Once it is being amended, **Rabbah** will amend it to fit according to his explanation. According to him, the **T"K** in the Braisa means to say, the non-Jewish men and women are themselves tamei, they give off tumah through carrying, and through "ehvehn mesameh". An avodah zarah is tamei and gives off tumah through carrying, but not via "ehvehn mesameh". **R' Akiva** says that the non-Jews and the avodah zarah are each tamei, and give off tumah through carrying and "ehvehn mesameh".
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asks, if all these entities give off tumah through carrying, why did the Braisa need to say that they are tamei themselves? That is obvious once we know that they give off tumah through carrying!? **A: R' Ashi** therefore explains the Braisa differently. He says, that the Braisa doesn't mean to say that they themselves are tamei. The Braisa is referring to 2 different kinds of carrying tumah – where a person carries the tamei entity, and where the tamei entity carries a person. The **T"K** holds that non-Jews bring tumah to the person carrying them or being carried by them. Avodah zarah only brings tumah to the one carrying it, not to the one carried by it. Service items have no type of carrying tumah. **R' Akiva** holds that non-Jews and avodah zarah give off both kinds of carrying tumah, whereas the service items give off no carrying tumah at all.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, how is possible for an avodah zarah to carry a person?! **A: Rami the son of R' Yeiva** said, the "carrying" we are referring to here is like the one mentioned in a Mishna that says, if a zav is on one side of a scale and food is on the other side, if the zav's side is weighed down, the food becomes tamei because it is being supported by the zav. That is the type of "carrying" tumah that an avoda zarah can do as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that only a zav can create this type of support tumah. This seems not to follow **R' Akiva**, because according to him, avodah zarah creates that tumah as well!? **A:** This can follow **R' Akiva**. The Braisa may mean that only a zav or anything learned from a zav (which is where **R' Akiva** learns the tumah of avodah zarah, via a niddah).
- **Q: R' Chama bar Gurya** asked, do the disassembled limbs of an avoda zarah have tumah or not? There are 2 circumstances in which this question can be asked. **1)** If it can be easily reassembled even by a layman it is considered still attached and surely has tumah. The question is only where it can only be reattached by a craftsman. Do we say, that since it cannot be reattached by a layman it is considered broken and therefore the limb has no tumah, or do we say that since it is truly not broken and can be reattached, it retains its tumah status? **2)** If a layman cannot reattach it, it is clearly considered broken and loses its tumah status. The question is where a layman can reattach it, do we say that since a layman can reattach it, it is considered attached and therefore retains its tumah status, or do we say that right now it is not attached and therefore not tamei? **A: TEIKU.**

- **Q: R' Achadvoi bar Ami** asked, is an idol that is smaller than an olive considered to be an avodah zarah?
 - **R' Yosef** asked, with regard to what aspect of avodah zarah is the question being asked? With regard to the prohibition of benefitting from the idol, an idol smaller than an olive is surely considered an avodah zarah. A Braisa says that the Yidden worshipped an avodah zarah the size of a fly, and they each kept a personal idol in their pockets. That had a full-fledged din of avodah zarah and was prohibited to derive benefit from. The question must have been in regard to tumah. The question asked is, does an avodah zarah smaller than an olive give off tumah? On the one hand, avodah zarah is compared to sheretz, and just like a sheretz is metameh even when it is less than the size of an olive (up to the size of a lentil), avodah zarah should be the same. On the other hand, avodah zarah is compared to a meis, and just like a meis is only metameh when it is the size of an olive, so too avodah zarah must be the size of an olive to be metameh?!
 - **A: R' Avya** answered that avodah zarah is compared to a meis, and therefore, it will not be metameh unless it is the size of an olive.
- **Q:** The Gemara asks, according to **R' Elazar's** explanation of the machlokes, the **Rabanan** use each comparison to teach a leniency about avodah zarah: it is compared to sheretz to teach that there is no tumah via carrying; it is compared to niddah to teach that disassembled limbs don't have tumah; it is compared to meis to teach that it must be at least the size of an olive to give off tumah. Why doesn't he use the comparisons to teach stringencies (tamei when the size of a lentil like a sheretz, "ehven mesameh" like a niddah and tumas ohel like a meis)?! **A:** Tumah of avodah zarah is not D'Oraisa, it is only D'Rabanan, and therefore they are lenient.

MISHNA

- From where do we know that a ship cannot become tamei? We learn it from the pasuk that says "Derech aniya b'lev yam" (the path of a ship is in the heart of the sea).

GEMARA

- The Mishna means, it is obvious that a ship goes in the sea. The pasuk teaches us, that just like the sea cannot become tamei, so too a ship cannot become tamei.
- A Braisa says, **Chananya** says, we learn that a ship cannot become tamei in the same way we learn about tumah for wooden keilim – from the comparison to a sack. Just like a sack can become tamei only if it can be carried when it is empty and full, so too a wooden keili can only become tamei when it can be carried when empty and full. According to this, a ship, which cannot be carried when full, cannot become tamei.
 - **Q:** What is the practical difference between our Mishna's way of learning and that of **Chananya** (at the end they both agree that a ship does not become tamei)? **A1:** A ship made out of earthenware. According to the Mishna, it will not become tamei because it travels in the sea. According to **Chananya**, since earthenware is not compared to a sack, it will not have those limitations and can become tamei even though it cannot be carried when full. **A2:** A ship that is meant to sail in the Jordan River, which is narrow and therefore the ship is small as well. Such a ship is carried when empty and full. Like **R' Chanina ben Akavya** explained a Mishna which says that a boat that is meant for the Jordan River can become tamei. He explained that the ship is carried on the ground, even full, and then placed into the river.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, one should never be absent from the Beis Hamedrash for even one minute, because he may miss an important lesson. For many years this Mishna was not explained until **R' Chanina ben Akavya** came along and explained it.
 - **R' Yonasan** said, one should never be absent from the Beis Medrash or hold back from learning Torah, even at the time of death, because the pasuk says, "Zos HaTorah, adam ki yamus b'ohel" – even at the time of death one should be learning Torah.
 - **Reish Lakish** said this pasuk teaches that Torah will only be retained by someone who "kills" himself over the Torah (i.e. he doesn't indulge in all the unnecessary physical pleasures).