



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf ןע – Daf פד

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ןע---78-----

MAYIM KIDEI LASHUF BAHEN ES HAKILOR

- **Abaye** says, when an item has two uses and each use requires a different quantity (e.g. water is used for drinking and used for putting into medicine), a person is chayuv for carrying out that substance in the quantity used in the typical use, even if that leads to a leniency (i.e. you need to carry out a larger amount to be chayuv). If both uses are typical, you follow the stricter quantity.
 - **Q:** Water is typically used for drinking and not typically used for medicinal purposes. If so, why does the Mishna say that one is chayuv for carrying out the amount of water that is used for medicinal purposes?
A: **Abaye** said, this Mishna discusses the practice in the Galil, where water was typically used for medicinal purposes as well. **Rava** said, even outside of the Galil water is still the best liquid to be used for the eye medicine, because it doesn't blur or block the vision. Therefore, it is considered a typical use of water everywhere.

USHI'AR KOL HAMASHKIN B'RIVI'IS

- A Braisa says: "One is chayuv for carrying out blood and all other liquids in the amount of a revi'is. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says one is chayuv for taking out enough blood to apply to one eye, because (wild chicken) blood is applied to an eye when healing a condition where something is sticking out of the color of the eye. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says one is chayuv for taking out enough blood to apply to one eye, because (a bat's or mole's) blood is applied to an eye when healing it from cataracts. These amounts were stated for someone who carried them out on Shabbos, but someone who stored them is chayuv for any minute amount. **R' Shimon** says, the only one who is chayuv for these amounts is one who stores these amounts. Anyone else is only chayuv for a revi'is. The **Chachomim** agree with **R' Shimon** with regard to waste water, that one is only chayuv if he carries out a revi'is".
 - The Braisa said, the shiurim are only for one who carries it out, but one who stores it is chayuv for any amount.
 - **Q:** Even one who stores it is only chayuv for taking it out, so what does the Braisa mean? **A:** **Abaye** says, we are discussing a student who is carrying out items for his teacher. If he takes out items that are not stored by the teacher, he is only chayuv if he takes out the item in a quantity that most people consider significant. If he takes out an item in a smaller quantity, but it is something that the teacher stores, the student is chayuv for taking out this item in any quantity, even if most people consider it to be insignificant.
 - The Braisa said that the **Chachomim** agree with **R' Shimon** that one is chayuv for carrying out a revi'is of waste water.
 - **Q:** What is waste water used for? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** explains, it is fit for mixing with mud and kneading into clay.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one is chayuv for carrying a small amount of clay that is enough for use by an opening that one puts a bellow into, to fan a fire. That is considerably less than the amount of clay that will be produced by mixing with a revi'is of water!? **A:** Noone will make clay unless he is using that amount of water, because it just doesn't pay to make anything less. But, once made, one is chayuv for carrying out a much smaller portion of clay.

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for carrying out a rope long enough to make a handle for a basket, and for carrying out "gemi" (reed-grass) long enough to make a loop from which to hang a sieve or sifter.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda** says he is chayuv even if he takes out a rope or “gemi” that is long enough to measure a child’s foot.
- One is chayuv for carrying out: paper that is large enough to write a tax collector’s receipt on it (2 large letters), and one who takes this receipt out is chayuv; erased paper large enough to act as a cover on a small flask of perfume; leather large enough to make a “kemeya”; parchment large enough to write “Shema Yisrael” – the smallest parsha in tefillin; enough ink to write 2 letters; enough eye makeup to color one eye; enough glue to put on top of a “shafshaf”; enough tar or sulfur to be used for to cover the small keili in which liquid metal is put; enough wax to put on a small opening; enough crushed brick to be used for the opening where the bellow is placed in a keili where gold is melted, **R' Yehuda** says enough to make a stand for this keili; enough bran to fuel the fire under the gold melting keili; enough lime to smear on a girl’s little finger, **R' Yehuda** says enough to make the hair on the sides of her head stay down, **R' Nechemia** says enough to be spread on the “undipi”.

GEMARA

- **Q:** One should be chayuv for carrying out a rope that is big enough for a loop of a sifter as well? **A:** Rope is coarse and would damage a sifter, so it would not be used for that.
- A Braisa says, one is chayuv for carrying out: enough palm branches to make a handle for a basket of the bark of the palm tree; **Acheirem** say, enough “siv” (grows around the palm tree) to put on the opening of a small funnel to strain wine; enough grease to smear the bottom of a small cookie (which is the size of a sela coin, which is the same size as a dried fig); enough “muchin” (soft material) to make a ball the size of a walnut.

NIYUR KIDEI LICHTOV ALAV KESHER MUCHSIN

- A Braisa says this is the size of 2 large letters
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says one may not carry out a blank paper if there is room to write 2 letters. This suggests that even if it is large enough for 2 regular sized letters?! **A:** **R' Sheishes** explains, it means 2 letters of a tax collector’s receipt – which are large. **Rava** says it refers to 2 regular sized letters, plus a place to hold the paper. Together, that area is large enough to hold 2 large letters.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one takes out an erased paper or a paid loan document, if there is enough room in the margins to write 2 letters, or if the entire paper is large enough to cover a bottle, he is chayuv. According to **R' Sheishes** who says that when the Braisa says “2 letters” it means 2 large letters, this makes sense. But, according to **Rava**, who says it means two regular size letters and a place to hold it by, here there is plenty of place to hold it by besides the margin, so why would we need that here?! **A:** **KASHYA**.
- A Braisa says, if one carries out a tax receipt before it is shown to the collector, he is chayuv (it has significance). After he shows it to the collector, he is not chayuv (it has no significance). **R' Yehuda** says, he is chayuv for taking it out even after he shows it to the collector.
 - **Q:** What is the point of difference between the **T”K** and **R' Yehuda**? **A:** **Abaye** says, they disagree about whether one saves the receipt to show to the people who go around and bring you to the tax collector if you can’t prove that you already paid. The **T”K** says one does not save it to show it to this person, and **R' Yehuda** says that he does. **Rava** says they argue whether one saves it to show it to the tax collector’s assistant. **R' Ashi** says they argue whether one saves it to show to tax collectors in other cities. **R' Yehuda** says he would do that to show that he is someone who is trustworthy and pays his taxes.
- A Braisa says, one is chayuv for carrying out a loan document prior to it being paid off (it is significant). However, once it has been paid off, one is not chayuv for carrying it out (it is not significant anymore). **R' Yehudah** says, one is chayuv for carrying out a loan document even if it had already been paid off.
 - **Q:** What is the point of difference between the **T”K** and **R' Yehuda**? **A:** **R' Yosef** says they argue regarding whether one may retain a paid loan document in his possession. The **T”K** says he may not, so once it is paid there is absolutely no use for it. **R' Yehuda** says he may, and therefore the paper has a use (e.g. a cover for a bottle). **Abaye** says, all agree that one may not retain a paid loan document. The machlokes is whether a document to which the debtor agrees was actually loaned upon, needs further verification before it can be used for collection. The **T”K** says that if the debtor agrees he wrote the loan document but now says he has already paid, the creditor can only collect if he can further verify the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

document, and since we are discussing a case where no further verification exists (Tosfos) the creditor is stuck and this document has no purpose or significance. Therefore, one is not chayuv for carrying it out. **R' Yehuda** says that the loan can be collected without further verification. Therefore, the document still has value and significance. **Rava** says, all agree that although the debtor agrees to having written the document, further verification is still needed. The machlokes is centered around whether, if the creditor claims to have lost the document, do we allow him to write a receipt for the debtor and require the debtor to forever keep that receipt, or do we say that the debtor need not pay unless the original loan document can be produced. The **T"K** says that we do allow the creditor to write a receipt. Therefore, if the loan is paid and a receipt is written, the document has no significance. **R' Yehuda** holds that we don't allow a receipt to be written. If the debtor pays and the document is not returned to him, he can demand return of his payment. Therefore, even after it is paid the document has significance, because if the creditor can't produce it, the debtor may demand his money back. **R' Ashi** says, the Braisa is referring to the debtor carrying the document out. The **T"K** says that the debtor has no use for the document and is therefore not chayuv for carrying it out. **R' Yehuda** says he uses it to show people that he is trustworthy and pays back his loans. Therefore, it has significance to him and he is chayuv for carrying it out.

-----Daf **טז**-----79-----

OIR KIDEI LA'ASOS ...

- **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, how much animal skins must one take out to be chayuv? He answered, the Mishna says enough to make a "kemeya". How big of a skin must one tan to be chayuv? He answered, the same amount (a kemeya). He asked, how much untanned skins must one take out to be chayuv? He answered, the same amount (a kemeya).
 - **R' Nachman** explained, I know that unprocessed is the same as processed from a Mishna which says that wool that will be spun into thread, has the halacha with regard to the shiur for spun threads. So too, unprocessed leather will have the same shiur as processed leather.
 - **Rava** asked, how much does one have to take out of skins which will not be tanned, in order to be chayuv? **R' Nachman** answered, the same amount (a kemeya).
 - **Q: Rava** asked, how can you say there is no difference between processed and unprocessed leather? A Braisa says there is a difference in the amount needed to be chayuv for taking out processed dyes and unprocessed dyes (a larger amount for unprocessed dyes)?! **A:** The Gemara answers that one will not process dyes in a very small quantity. That's why unprocessed dyes have a larger amount necessary to be chayuv. Once the dye is processed, a small amount is considered to be significant and therefore one is chayuv for a smaller amount.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we see that unplanted seeds are not significant, and therefore need a larger amount to be chayuv for taking them out, and planted seeds are deemed significant with even just one stalk. So why should we assume that processed and unprocessed leather should be chayuv for the same amount?! **A:** The Gemara answers, before a seed is planted, one seed alone is not significant and one would not carry out one seed. Once planted, even one stalk is significant.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we find that kneaded clay and clay which has not been kneaded are chayuv for being carried out in different amounts. Processed and unprocessed leather should be similarly different?! **A:** The Gemara answers that one would not go through the bother of making clay unless he was making a larger amount. That's why it is only chayuv to carry out the ingredients to make clay in those, larger amounts. However, once made, even a small amount is considered significant and makes one chayuv for carrying it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that leather that is untreated needs a larger amount to be chayuv than leather that has been treated?! **A:** The Gemara answers that the untreated leather referred to in this Braisa is leather that is still moist and therefore *cannot* be processed now. **R' Nachman** said that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

unprocessed leather that CAN be processed, but just isn't, has the same shiur as processed leather. Leather that *cannot* be processed is treated differently and requires a different shiur.

- **Q:** The Gemara asks, a Mishna discussing tumah says that leather can become tamei when it is 5x5 tefachim. The Mishna then says that same shiur is the amount needed to make someone chayuv for carrying it out on Shabbos. This is a larger amount than **R' Nachman** said, so it must be that this is discussing unprocessed leather?! **A:** The Gemara answers that the Mishna is discussing leather that is boiled and used to sit on. It is leather that is never tanned. That is why it has a much larger shiur.

KLAF KIDEI LICHTOV ALAV PARSHA KETANA

- **Q:** A Braisa says that one is chayuv for carrying out klaf or “duchsustus” (the skin is separated into klaf, which is the outer layer, and “duchsustus”, which is the inner layer) on which one can write a mezuzah. This is larger than the smallest parsha in tefillin!? **A:** The Braisa means a mezuzah (a parsha) in the tefillin.
 - We find that a parsha in the tefillin can be referred to as a mezuzah. In a Braisa which discusses one's hands becoming tamei for touching parts of the tefillin, **R' Zakkai** says that one who touches the mezuzah makes his hands tamei. Presumably this refers to the parsha in the tefillin.
 - **Q:** The end of the Braisa (in the initial question) says that one is chayuv for carrying out a piece of klaf large enough to write the small parsha of tefillin (Shema Yisrael) on it. The first part must therefore be referring to an actual mezuzah!? **A:** The Braisa's parts should be combined. The Braisa means to say, the shiurim for klaf and “duchsustus” are: for “duchsustus” it needs to be large enough to write a mezuzah on it. For klaf, it needs to be large enough to write the small parsha of tefillin on it.
- **Rav** says, “duchsustus” is the same thing as klaf. The Gemara explains this to mean, that just like tefillin can be written on klaf, it can be written on “duchsustus” as well.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says that klaf (and presumably *only* klaf) needs to be the size of the parsha of tefillin (to be chayuv for carrying it outside on Shabbos). It must be because “duchsustus” is not kosher to write tefillin on!? **A:** Klaf is preferred for the mitzvah, but “duchsustus” is kosher as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai that tefillin is written on klaf (on the side of the klaf that faced the animal) and mezuzos are written on “duchsustus” (on the part of the “duchsustus” that faced the outside)?! **A:** Again, that is the preferred way, but both are kosher.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if he deviates from this it is pasul!? **A:** That is referring to the mezuzah, that if it is written on klaf it is pasul.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if he deviates either one it is pasul! **A:** This too refers only to mezuzah and means that if the mezuzah is written on klaf on the side facing the outside, or on “duchsustus” on the side that faced the inside, the mezuzah is pasul. **A2:** It is a machlokes among Tana'im in a Braisa whether they become pasul if one deviates from this way. **A3:** **R' Pappa** says that **Rav** follows the **Tanna D'vei Menashe**, which says that if one wrote “it” on klaf, “g'vil” (treated skins not split into klaf and “duchsustus”) or “duchsustus”, it is kosher. This can't be referring to mezuzos, because that can't be written on klaf, so it must be referring to tefillin and we see that he holds that tefillin can be written on “duchsustus”!? **Q:** Tefillin can't be written on “g'vil”, so we can't be referring to g'vil here! Rather, the **Tanna D'vei Menashe** is talking about a Sefer Torah.
 - The Gemara brings a proof to **Rav** from a Braisa. The Braisa says that worn out tefillin cannot be used for a mezuzah, because we only increase things in level of kedusha, not decrease them. Therefore, the scroll cannot be used for a mezuzah. Seemingly, if not for this problem, tefillin could be used for a mezuzah. A mezuzah cannot be written on klaf, so it must be we are discussing tefillin that were written on “duchsustus”, and this proves that tefillin may be written on “duchsustus” as **Rav** said!
 - The Gemara says the Braisa is not a valid proof. The Braisa is discussing tefillin written on klaf, and it can be used for a mezuzah, because a mezuzah *can* be written on klaf, as a Braisa says that **R' Meir** would write his mezuzos on klaf because mezuzos stay better protected on klaf.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Based on this last answer, we can say that **Rav** never meant to say that “duchsustus” is like klaf and can be used for tefillin. He meant to say that klaf is like “duchsustus” and can be used for a mezuzah!

-----Daf ד--80-----

D'YO KIDEI LICHTOV

- A Braisa says, one is chayuv for carrying out enough ink to write two letters, whether the ink is dry, in a quill or in an inkwell.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, one if one takes out enough dry ink to write one letter, and enough for another letter in a quill or an inkwell. Do they combine? **TEIKU**.
- **Rava** says, if one takes out enough ink for 2 letters and writes the letters as he is walking (he never put the ink down so there is no “hanacha”), he is chayuv because the writing acts as the hanacha.
 - **Rava** says, if one took out enough ink for 1 letter and wrote the letter. Then, in the same period of unawareness, he takes out ink for another letter and writes that one as well, he is patur. The reason is, when he takes out the second ink, the first has already dried and thereby shrunk, which means that less the shiur exists at the time the second ink is brought out.
 - **Rava** says, if one takes out half a “grogres” (dried fig) volume of an item and puts it down, and then takes out an identical amount and puts that down, it is as if the first amount was caught by a dog mid-air and never put down or totally burned before it was put down and he is therefore patur.
 - **Q:** But, he truly put down the first amount, so why is it considered as if he didn't? **A: Rava** means to say, that if before putting down the second piece he picks up the first piece, it is as if it was never put down (because the 2 pieces were never down at the same time, so they can't be combined) and he is patur.
 - **Rava** says, if one took out a half of “grogres” and put it down and he then took another half “grogres” and passed it over the piece that was on the ground, he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** He never put it down, so why is he chayuv? **A:** He put it within 3 tefachim to the first piece, and it is therefore considered to be resting on top of the first piece.
 - **Q: Rava** says elsewhere that the **Rabanan** say one must physically put the item down for it to be considered a “hanacha”? **A:** That is only when something is thrown. However, something held in the hand is considered resting on the ground if the hand is within 3 tefachim of the ground.
- A Braisa says, if one takes a half grogres and then takes out another half grogres, if it is done in one period of unawareness, he is chayuv. If done in 2 periods, he is patur. **R' Yose** says, even if done in one period he is only chayuv if it is taken out into one reshus harabim. If taken out into 2 separate ones, he is patur.
 - **Rabbah** says, they are only considered separate if there is a reshus hayachid in between them. But, if there is a karmelis in between it is considered to be one reshus harabim. **Abaye** says, even a karmelis in between makes them into 2 separate places, but if there is only a block of wood in between them, they are still considered one. **Rava** says, even if there is a block of wood in between, they are considered 2 separate places. (**Rava** says this same concept by a “get”, that a block of wood can separate a yard for ownership purposes).

K'CHOL KIDEI LIKCHOL AYIN ACHAS

- **Q:** A woman will not make up only one eye!? **A: R' Huna** said, we are discussing especially modest women who cover their entire face besides one eye. They only make up that one eye.
- **Q:** A Braisa says one is chayuv for taking out eye makeup only if it is enough for 2 eyes!? **A: Hillel the son of R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, this refers to village women who don't need to be as modest because of the way people lived there.

DEVEK KIDEI LITEIN B'ROSH HASHAFHSUSH

- He must take out enough glue to use on a board that was put on a stick which was used to catch birds (which sat on the board atop the stick and got stuck on the glue).

ZEFES V'GAFRIS KIDEI LA'ASOS...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Enough to make a small hole to let liquid metal come out of a keili.

CHARSIS KIDEI LA'ASOS PI KOR

- **Q: R' Yehuda's** shiur seems larger, and we have a rule that **R' Yehuda's** shiurim for carrying on Shabbos are smaller than the **Rabanan's** shiurim!? **A: R' Yehuda's** shiur is not to make the entire stand, it is enough to fill in the cracks of an existing stand. This shiur is smaller than that of the **Rabanan**.
- A Braisa says, one is chayuv for carrying out hair if it is enough to knead clay with it. He is chayuv for taking out enough clay needed for the hole for the bellow in the keili used to melt gold.

SID KIDEI LASUD

- A Braisa said, one must take out enough lime to apply to a girl's small finger (it makes the skin nice).
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, Jewish girls who grow body hairs before the typical age are embarrassed of the hair and therefore remove them. Poor girls remove them using lime. Rich girls use fine flour. Princesses use "Mor" oil.
 - **R' Huna** says that "mor" oil is a perfumed oil. **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** says this is oil from olives which have not yet grown to a third of their potential size.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, "anpiknon" is oil from olives which have not yet grown to one third of their potential size. It is used to remove hair and to make the skin glow.
 - **R' Bibi** would apply lime to his daughter, limb by limb. Doing so made her so beautiful that he was paid a large sum to marry her off. A goy saw this and tried to do the same to his daughter, only he applied the lime to her entire body at one time. She died as a result of that.
 - **R' Nachman** said, **R' Bibi's** daughter needed that because they drank a lot of beer (which darkens and increases hair), but other girls do not need to do that.

R' YEHUDA OMER KIDEI LASUD KILKUL

- **Q:** What is "kilkul" and what is "andipi"? **A: Rav** says they refer to the temple and the area under the temple.
 - **Q:** That would mean that **R' Yehuda's** shiur is larger than that of **R' Nechemya**, and we have a rule that **R' Yehuda's** shiur is always smaller?! **A:** It is smaller than the **Rabanan's** (who say that he needs enough to apply to a girl's finger) but larger than **R' Nechemya's**.
- **Q: Rabbi** says **R' Yehuda's** amount is correct for dissolved lime (the type used on the temples) and **R' Nechemya's** shiur is right for clumps of lime. If they both refer to the temple area, why would they be discussing 2 different types of lime?! **A: R' Ami** says "andipi" refers to the 2 spigots of a barrel.
 - **Q: R' Kahana** asked, the wine would dissolve the lime. Noone would put lime there!? **A:** Rather he says it refers to the measurement markings on keilim (these markings were covered in lime to make them more visible). **A2:** "Andipi" refers to the forehead.

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for taking out:
 - Earth in the amount – **R' Akiva** says, to make a seal on the large boxes meant to carry merchandise on ships, **Rabanan** say, to make a seal on a letter.
 - Fertilizer and fine sand – **R' Akiva** says, enough to fertilize a stalk of cabbage, **Rabanan** say, enough to fertilize a stalk of leek.
 - Thick sand – enough to put in with the lime (to make the customary size mixture).
 - A reed – enough to make a pen. If it is too thick or cracked, enough to fuel a fire that can cook the most easily cooked egg which has already been beaten and put into a pot.

GEMARA

- A Braisa explains, the amount of thick sand referred to in the Mishna is enough for a plasterer to use to make his plaster.
 - We find that **R' Yehuda** says that sand is beneficial when mixed into lime because he says one may not use this mixture to build after the Churban. **Rava** says, it could be the **Rabanan** agree that it is beneficial, but they allow it to be used because it darkens the color and therefore is not so nice.

KANEH KIDEI LA'ASOS KULMUS

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the pen must be long enough to reach the knuckles.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asks, the upper knuckles or the lower ones? **TEIKU**.

V'IHM HAYA AVEH...

- A Braisa says, the reference is to an egg that is mixed with oil and placed in a pot.
- **Mar brei D'Ravina** asked his son – which egg is the most easily cooked? He answered the egg of a small dove (because it is tiny). He responded, if it's based on size, why not say the even smaller egg of a hummingbird? **Mar** therefore said, **R' Sheishes** said that the most easily cooked egg is a chicken egg. His son asked, with regard to the issur of carrying as it pertains to food we use the size of a groges. Why are we using the size of an egg here? **Mar** answered, **R' Nachman** said that here too, the shiur is the amount needed to cook a groges size of this egg.

-----Daf נ"ד--81-----

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for carrying out bone: **T"K** says, large enough to make a spoon. **R' Yehuda** says, large enough to make a lock.
- One is chayuv for carrying out glass large enough to sharpen the top of the tool used by weavers to separate the threads.
- One is chayuv for carrying out a pebble or rock large enough to throw at a bird. **R' Elazar bar Yaakov** says, large enough to throw at an animal.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Yehuda's** size seems larger, but that can't be correct because we know that **R' Yehuda** is more machmir with his shiurim for carrying out on Shabbos?! **A: Ulla** says **R' Yehuda** says the bone must be large enough to make the inside teeth of the lock, not the entire lock.
- A Braisa says, the teeth of a lock, when not yet attached to the lock, have no use and therefore cannot become tamei. Once attached to the lock, they can become tamei. If they are installed in a door attached to the ground, they can no longer become tamei, because anything attached to the ground is like the ground itself, which can't become tamei.

Z'CHUCHIS KIDEI LIGROR BO

- A Braisa says that one is chayuv for carrying out glass large enough to cut through 2 threads at once.

TZROR OH EHVEHN KIDEI LIZROK B'OIF, R' ELAZAR...

- **R' Yaakov in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the stone must be large enough for the animal to feel the stone when the stone is thrown at it. **R' Elazar ben Yaakov** says, it must weigh ten zuz.
- **Zunin** asked the **Chachomim**, how many stones may one take for use in the bathroom? They answered, one may take 3 stones: one the size of an olive, one the size of a walnut, and one the size of an egg. **Zunin** responded, is one supposed to measure for exact size before he goes to the bathroom? They answered, one can take a handful of stones.
 - In a Braisa, **R' Yose** says one may take 3 stones (the sizes of an olive, a walnut and an egg), and **R' Shimon the son of R' Yose** said in his father's name that one may take a handful of stones.
 - A Braisa says, 3 stones may be taken for use in the bathroom. **R' Meir** says all the size of a walnut, and **R' Yehuda** says, all the size of an egg.
 - **Rafam bar Pappa in the name of R' Chisda** said, the machlokes with regard to this size is the same machlokes with regard to an esrog.
 - **Q:** The machlokes with regard to an esrog is found in a Mishna. Why would we compare the Mishna to the lesser known Braisa? **A:** What **R' Chisda** said was that the machlokes by esrog applies here as well (comparing the Braisa to the Mishna).
- **R' Yehuda** says, one may not use "payis" (**R' Zeira** explains this to mean pebbles of earth from Bavel) in the bathroom on Shabbos because it is not effective for this use.
- **Rava** says, one may not use a stone on Shabbos to help alleviate constipation in the way that he does during the week. Rather, he should do so in an unusual way.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yannai** said, if there is a permanent place used as a bathroom, one may take a handful of stones to use there (because if it won't be used at this time, it will possibly be used at another point over Shabbos). If there is no permanent bathroom, he may bring in a stone the size of a walnut. With regard to using a stone that was used for crushing spices (and is therefore muktzeh to use in the bathroom because of its other use), **R' Sheishes** says, one may only use it if there is already some excrement on the stone.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that using a stone in the bathroom that was already used by somebody else leads to hemorrhoids, so how can he use the crushing stone if there is already excrement on it? **A:** It is only a problem when it is still moist. **A2: R' Sheishes** means he can use the other side. **A3: R' Sheishes** means that it was used by this same person before.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked **R' Yosef**, what if it rains and washes the excrement off, can it still be used? **A:** He answered, if the mark is still noticeable, he may still use it.
- **Rabbah bar R' Shilah** asked **R' Chisda**, may one carry the stones up to the roof if that is where he wants to use the bathroom? He answered that one may, because these stones serve to promote human dignity, which is so great that it sets aside a "lo sa'aseh" in the Torah.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **Mareimar**, the **Chachomim** only allow one to use a prepared piece of wood as a toothpick, although that is also a matter of human dignity?! **A:** A person knows where he will be eating and therefore had ample opportunity to prepare toothpicks. A person does not know where he will end up needing a bathroom, and therefore had no way of preparing stones for use.
- **R' Huna** says, one may not go to the bathroom in a freshly plowed field on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** If the problem with doing so is because he will ruin the field by walking on the freshly plowed field, doing so is prohibited during the week as well?! **A:** Rather, the reason for the prohibition is that such fields promote the growth of moss and the like on rocks, and we are afraid that he will detach the moss or grass from the rocks (when he uses the stones after going to the bathroom) which is prohibited on Shabbos.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** says one may use stones with moss or grass growing on them for the bathroom, although if one would intentionally remove the moss or grass he would be chayuv!? **A:** The problem with using a plowed field is that he may move a stone into a ditch and thereby be "oiver" the melacha of plowing.
 - **R' Pappi** says, from **Reish Lakish** it would seem that we are allowed to lift a flowerpot with a hole from the ground, just like we can lift a stone with growth on it from the ground (it too is being nurtured from the ground). **R' Kahana** says, the **Chachomim** allowed one to do so for stones because there is a need. That leniency would not apply to a flowerpot.
 - **Abaye** said, a flowerpot with a hole that one lifted off the ground, he would be chayuv for detaching something from the ground. If he places it on the ground, he would be chayuv for planting.
- **R' Yochanan** says, one may not wipe himself with broken pottery on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Why not? If it is because it is sharp and dangerous, then it should be prohibited during the week as well!? If it is because it is dangerous to use because "kishuf" may have been done on it, it should be assur during the week as well!? If it is assur due to its sharpness, because one may come to remove hair with it when using it, that would be unintentional and shouldn't be a problem!? **A: R' Nosson bar Oshaya** explains, during the week using these pieces is surely assur, for the reasons stated above. One would think, that on Shabbos, when moving stones is generally assur, maybe using the pottery should be allowed. That is why **R' Yochanan** tells us that it is assur on Shabbos as well, and one should use a stone instead.
 - **Q:** Where do we find that using broken pottery in the bathroom can be harmful because of "kishuf"? **A:** We find a story where **R' Chisda** and **Rabbah bar R' Huna** went on a ship and did not include a certain woman to go along. She became angry and, using a spell, paralyzed the ship's movement. They undid the spell. The woman said she was powerless to harm them, because they did not use broken pottery in the bathroom, did not kill lice on their clothing, and did not eat vegetables directly from the farmer's

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

bundle. Not doing these things made that they were not subject to the effects of “kishuf”. We see from here that using broken pottery exposes one to the dangers of “kishuf”.

-----Daf כב--82-----

- **R' Huna** asked his son **Rabbah** why he didn't go learn by **R' Chisda**. **Rabbah** replied that **R' Chisda** doesn't teach Torah, he discusses mundane matters. For example, he taught that when going to the bathroom, one should not sit down and force out the wastes quickly, one should also not strain himself when in the bathroom, because doing so may cause the “teeth” (the muscles) around that area to become dislocated and would put the person in a “sakanah”. **R' Huna** said to **Rabbah**, **R' Chisda** is dealing with things that effect life itself, and you call it “mundane” matters? For sure you should go and learn by **R' Chisda**!
- If one has a choice to use a stone or broken pottery in the bathroom on Shabbos, **R' Huna** says he should use a stone (although it is muktzeh, it is better than putting oneself into a sakanah), **R' Chisda** says he should use the pottery (better than using something that is muktzeh).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that, if given the choice, one should use broken pottery rather than a stone, in the bathroom on Shabbos?! **A: Rafram bar Pappai** explained, that can be discussing the broken rim of a keili, which is smooth and therefore not dangerous to use.
- If one has a choice to use a stone or grass, **R' Chisda** and **R' Hamnuna** argue. One says to use a stone (because moist grass is sharper and more dangerous, or because using the grass while attached to the ground may end up detaching it from the ground) and the other says to use grass (without detaching it, rather than to use a stone which is muktzeh).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, using a flammable thing to clean oneself in the bathroom leads to the “teeth” of that area to fall out?! **A:** The one who says to use grass is talking about moist grass, which is not flammable.
- One who holds himself back from going to the bathroom, **R' Chisda** and **Ravina** argue. One says it causes bad breath. One says it causes bad smelling perspiration.
 - A Braisa says that one who eats when he needs to use the bathroom is like an oven which is lit without first clearing the ashes, and it leads to bad smelling perspiration.
- If one needs to use the bathroom, but can't (e.g. constipation), **R' Chisda** says he should repeatedly stand up and sit down. **R' Chanan from Naharda'a** says he should move from place to place and try to relieve himself. **R' Hamnuna** says, he should rub a stone around that area. The **Rabanan** say he should not think about it.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked, if he doesn't think about it, he certainly will not be able to relieve himself!? **A: R' Ashi** explained, the **Rabanan** mean, he should not think of anything *else*, but that.
 - **R' Yirmiya M'Difti** saw an Arab who repeatedly stood and sat and ultimately was able to fully relieve himself.
- A Braisa says, if one is planning on entering a long meal (and doesn't want to have to leave in middle to go to the bathroom), he should walk 4 amos, ten times, after each 4 amos checking to see if he can relieve himself. Some say he should walk 10 amos, four times and check after each 10 amos. When done, he should go and begin his meal.

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for taking out earthenware that is large enough: **R' Yehuda** says, to be used to place in between beams of wood that are being piled up (the earthenware is placed as a space filler to prevent warping of the wood); **R' Meir** says, to be used to pick up a burning coal with it; **R' Yose** says, to be used to hold a revi'is of liquid.
 - **R' Meir** says a pasuk, although not a full proof, may lend support to his view. In the pasuk, the Navi tells the Yidden that their hope for protection by trusting in the Egyptian king will crumble like a wall whose crumbled pieces will be so small to the point of no use. The pasuk says one will not even find a piece large enough to pick up fire.
 - **R' Yose** said, that is not a proof to **R' Meir**, because the pasuk ends off that one will not even be able to find a piece large enough to hold water.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Logic would say that **R' Yose's** shiur is a larger one, but from the fact that the pasuk first says one will not find a piece large enough to hold a coal and then says, or a piece large enough to hold water, it would seem that **R' Yose's** shiur is smaller!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Meir** is referring to a piece large enough to take a coal from a large bonfire. Therefore, his shiur *is* larger than **R' Yose's** shiur.

R' YOSE OMER MISHAM RA'AYA

- **Q: R' Yose** has a valid point, that his shiur is also mentioned in the pasuk, which would mean that his shiur is also considered to be a significant piece!? **A: R' Meir** explains the pasuk to mean, not only will there be no useful pieces (like the size needed to hold a coal), there will not even be smaller pieces. The pasuk, however, does not mean to say that the smaller piece is significant and should lead to a chiyuv chatas for carrying it out into the reshus harabim.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMOTZI YAYIN!!!

PEREK AMAR R' AKIVA -- PEREK TESI'I

MISHNA

- **R' Akiva** asked, from where do we know that an idol is metameh one who carries it (even without touching it) just like a nidah? He answers, the pasuk says about idols that they should be “cast away like a nidah”. Just like a nidah is metameh one who carries her, so too an idol is metameh one who carries it as well.

GEMARA

- A Mishna says, one whose house shares a common wall with an avodah zarah, and that common wall falls down, he may not rebuild it, because he is thereby benefitting the avoda zarah. What he must do is build a new wall 4 amos into his own property (he fills the empty space that is left with garbage or thorns so as not to benefit the avodah zarah). If the wall was on shared property, he begins counting the 4 amos from the halfway point of the wall. The stones, wood and dirt from the wall: the **T”K** says are metameh like a sheretz (through touching, but not through carrying), because in regard to avoda zarah the pasuk says “Shakeitz T’shaktzenu”, which we are darshening to mean that it should be treated like a sheretz. **R' Akiva** says they are metameh like a nidah (through carrying as well as touching), because in regard to avodah zarah the pasuk says, “Throw them away like a nidah”, and he darshens, just like a nidah is metameh through carrying, so too avodah zarah is metameh through carrying as well.
 - **Rabbah** says that the Torah tells us to totally distance ourselves from avodah zarah (“Tizreim” – throw them away, and “Tzei tomar lo” – tell them to go out) which means we must be very stringent with regard to avodah zarah. Therefore, **Rabbah** explains the machlokes between the **T”K** and **R' Akiva** as follows. He says all agree that an avodah zarah is metameh through carrying, because the pasuk compares it to a niddah. They argue in whether there is also a more stringent form of tumah on avodah zarah – namely the tumah of “Ehven Mesameh” (this means that if, for example, a niddah sits on a rock that is supported on pegs, and there is a pillow underneath that rock, even though the rock is not leaning on the pillow, the pillow becomes tamei). **R' Akiva** says this type of tumah exists by an avodah zarah in the same way as it does for a niddah (since the pasuk compares the two). The **T”K** says that it does not exist by avodah zarah just as it does not exist by a sheretz (since the pasuk compares the two).
 - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva**, why does the pasuk compare avodah zarah to sheretz? **A:** The comparison is for the service items of the avodah zarah, which are only metameh like a sheretz.
 - **Q:** According to the **T”K**, why does the pasuk compare it to nidah? **A:** To teach that avodah zarah is metameh through carrying like a nidah.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't the pasuk just compare it to a neveilah, which would teach that it is metameh through carrying but not through “ehvehn mesameh”, like a neveilah is?! **A:** It is compared to a niddah to teach, that just like a niddah's limbs, if detached from the niddah, would not have tumah of a niddah anymore, so too, if the avodah zarah is disassembled, it no longer has tumah of an avoda zarah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Chama bar Gurya** asked whether a disassembled avodah zarah continues to be metameh. We can answer from here that it does not?! **A:** He was asking according to **R' Akiva**, not according to the **Rabanan**.
- **R' Elazar** explains the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Akiva** as follows. All agree that avodah zarah is not metameh via "ehvehn mesameh". The machlokes is regarding tumah through carrying. The **T"K** says it is like a sheretz and is not metameh through carrying. **R' Akiva** says it is like a niddah and is metameh through carrying.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva**, why does the pasuk compare avodah zarah to sheretz? **A:** The comparison is for the service items of the avodah zarah, which are only metameh like a sheretz.
 - **Q:** According to the **T"K**, why does the pasuk compare it to niddah? **A:** To teach that avodah zarah is not metameh when it is disassembled, just like the limbs of a niddah are not metameh.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva**, why doesn't the pasuk just compare it to a neveilah, which would teach that it is metameh through carrying but not through "ehvehn mesameh", like a neveilah is?! **A:** It is compared to a niddah to teach, that just like a niddah's limbs, if detached from the niddah would not have tumah of a niddah anymore, so too, if the avodah zarah is disassembled, it no longer has tumah of an avoda zarah.
 - **Q: R' Chama bar Gurya** asked whether a disassembled avodah zarah continues to be metameh. We can answer from here that it does not?! **A:** He was asking according to **Rabbah's** version of **R' Akiva**, according to which there is no clear answer.

-----Daf 83-----

- **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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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).

-----Daf 75-----84-----

- **Rava** said, according to **Chananya**, if the boat can only be moved with the help of oxen, it is considered “able to be moved” and can become tamei.
 - This can be proven from a Mishna which says that a wagon made to carry stones cannot become tamei, because it typically has holes in it too large to hold pomegranates. However, if the holes were smaller, it would be able to become tamei, even though the only way it can be moved when full of stones is with the help of oxen. We see that movement with the help of animals is considered “able to be moved” and will therefore make the item subject to tumah.
- A Braisa says, an earthenware keili is not subject to tumas medras (tumah when a zav, zava or niddah sits on it) laws. **R' Yose** says, “*also* a ship”.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Yose** mean to say? Obviously a ship can't become tamei medras (the Mishna had said that a ship can't become tamei at all)!? **A:** **R' Z'vid** amends the Braisa to say, that the **T”K** says an earthenware keili cannot become tamei as a medras but can become tamei though being touched on its inside by a tamei item. Even a ship made out of earthenware can become tamei through being touched by a tamei item. [This would follow **Chananya**, who said that an earthenware ship can become tamei]. **R' Yose** argues and says that any ship, even one made of earthenware, cannot become tamei. [This would follow our Mishna which says that no ship can become tamei].
 - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asks, according to **R' Z'vid**, why does **R' Yose** say “ahf” – *also* a ship doesn't become tamei. “*Also*” means that the **T”K** said something doesn't become tamei and **R' Yose** is adding to that. According to **R' Z'vid**, the **T”K** said no such thing?! **A:** **R' Pappa** therefore amends the Braisa differently. He says, the **T”K** says, an earthenware keili cannot become tamei as a medras but can become tamei though being touched by something that is tamei. A wooden keili can become tamei though medras and through being touched. However, a ship (even if made of wood) that sails the Jordan River cannot become tamei [this would follow our Mishna]. **R' Yose** argues and says that a ship *can* become tamei [like **Chananya** said].
- **Q:** From where do we know that an earthenware keili cannot become tamei as a medras? **A1:** **Chizkiya** says, the pasuk speaks about the couch of the zav and says “his couch” which tells us to compare the couch to the zav and say that just like the zav can become tahor by going to the mikvah, so too, the only couch that will become tamei as a medras is a couch made of a material that can become tahor by being placed in the mikvah. This excludes one made of earthenware, which does not become tahor by going to the mikvah, and must be broken. **A2:** **The Yeshiva of R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk says about the couch of a zavah, “Kimishkav nidasah yihiyeh lah” – it should be to her like the couch of the days of her niddah period. The couch of a niddah is compared to the niddah herself. Just like a niddah can become tahor by going to the mikvah, so too, the only couch that can become tamei as a medras is one that can become tahor by being placed in the mikvah. This excludes one made of earthenware.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Illa** asked, a Braisa asks, from where do we know that a mat of reeds can become tamei from a meis? The Braisa explains that we learn it from a kal v'chomer as follows: very small earthenware keilim cannot become tamei from a zav (they are not meant to sit on so cannot become tamei through medras, and they also cannot become tamei through being touched by the zav because earthenware must be touched on the inside to become tamei and even a zav's small finger cannot fit into these keilim), yet they become tamei by being under the same roof as a meis, so a mat of reeds, which does become tamei when a zav sits on it, surely becomes tamei with tumas meis! **R' Illa'a** asks, a mat of reeds does not become tahor by being placed in the mikvah, so why does it become tamei when a zav sits on it?! **A: R' Chanina** answered, a mat of reeds is different since other keilim made of reeds (e.g. a wood keili that has a receptacle to hold something) can become tahor by being placed in the mikvah. Therefore, the mat of reeds will become tamei as a medras. However, an earthenware keili, which can never become tahor via a mikvah, can never become tamei as a medras either (based on the drasha of **Chizkiya** or **R' Yishmael**).
 - **R' Illa'a** said to **R' Chanina**, "Hashem should save us from that understanding"! **R' Chanina** answered back, "Hashem should save us from your understanding"!
 - **R' Chanina** learns his point from the psukim. One pasuk about the couch of a zav says "b'mishkavo" – it compares the couch to the zav. Another pasuk says "kol hamishkav" – without the possessive, thus not comparing the zav's couch to him. The Torah is telling us that at times we compare the couch to the zav, meaning that it can only become tamei as a medras if it can become tahor in a mikvah, and at times we don't make that comparison. **R' Chanina** explains, the comparison to a zav is not to be made when, although this particular keili will not become tahor in a mikvah, there are other keilim made of that material which would become tahor in the mikvah (e.g. a mat of reeds can become tamei medras because other wooden keilim can become tahor by being placed in a mikvah).
- **A3: Rava** says, we learn that an earthenware keili cannot become tamei as a medras from a pasuk. The pasuk says that an earthenware keili that is sealed does not become tamei from a meis. There is no reason to say that this is limited to a particular kind of earthenware keili, but rather includes all earthenware keilim. It even includes earthenware keilim that are used as a seat for a niddah. Now, if the keili would become tamei medras, sealing the keili would not prevent it from becoming tamei from the meis. A sealed earthenware keili doesn't become tamei from a meis because the outside of the keili doesn't become tamei. If it would become tamei as medras, it would become tamei on the outside and therefore would not be prevented from become tamei to a meis just because it is sealed. We see from here that an earthenware keili cannot become tamei as a medras.

MISHNA

- From where do we know, that a field that is 6x6 tefachim can have 5 different types of seeds planted in it (and it will not lead to an issue of kilayim), 4 on the four outer sides and one directly in the center? We learn it from the pasuk that says "Ki cha'aretz totzi tzimcha u'chigana zeyru'eha satzmiach". The pasuk doesn't say "zar'ah", it says "zeyru'eha".

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda** explains the Mishna, that each reference to "growing" or "vegetation" refers to another type of seed that is allowed in a single planting area. Therefore, "totzi" is one, "tzimcha" is one, "zeyru'eha" is plural and therefore is two, "satzmiach" is one, for a total of 5. The **Rabanan** determined that the smallest area in which 5 different species can be planted and not draw nourishment from each other is 6x6 tefachim.