



Volume 12. Issue 20

Keilim vs. Clothes

The first *perek* of *Masechet Ohalot* deals with the transferability of *tumah*. The *perek* is structured such that the first four *mishnayot* deal with levels of *tumah* in relation to *Tumat Hamet*. We learn of fundamental concepts, including the fact that a *kli* that is touching a source of *tumah* becomes affected with the same level of *tumah* as that source. This is learnt from the *pasuk* “*bechalal cherev*” (*Bamidbar* 19:16) which teaches that a utensil that comes into contact with a dead body becomes an *avi avot hatumah*, and if it touches a person that has come into contact with a dead body it becomes like that person. The type of utensil that is referred to here is the subject of debate. According to *Rashi* and *Rabbeinu Tam* the *pasuk* refers to a utensil that is like a *cherev* (sword), i.e. metal utensils only. Other *mefarshim* explain that this refers to all utensils with the exception of earthenware.

Whereas the early part of the *Masechet* deals with *tumat hamet* and utensils, the fifth *Mishnah* discusses *tumat hazav* and *tumah* of clothes. The *Mishnah* states that a man and clothing can receive *tumah* from a *zav*. A man has a stringency over clothing as one who is touching a *zav* will transfer *tumah* to his clothing, whereas any clothing worn by a *zav* will only be a *rishon*, by virtue of it being worn by a *zav*, and cannot transfer *tumah* to other *keilim*. Clothing on the other hand has a stringency, in that clothing that is sat or rested upon by a *zav* becomes an *av hatumah* which can transmit *tumah* to a person, whereas a man who carries a *zav* cannot transmit *tumah* to a person.

The *mefarshim* ask why the *Mishnah* departs from referring to utensils to begin discussing clothes. The *Gra* answers that the *Mishnah* discusses clothes in order for the first part of the *Mishnah* to teach us that a person who is touching a *zav* is only able to transmit this *tumah* to other utensils only when he is in contact with these utensils at the same time. This is why the case of clothing is used - just as one can only transmit *tumah* to clothes by virtue of being in contact with them, the same applies to *keilim* – i.e. *tumat hazav* is only transmitted via a person when he is in contact with the

zav at the same time as being in contact with the utensil. The *Gra* adds that the *Mishnah* also needed to refer to clothes due to the fact that the *seifa* of the *Mishnah* refers to items that are fit for lying upon; therefore clothes are a more suitable subject than utensils.

The *Mishnah Achrona* has another explanation for why the *Mishnah* departs from discussing utensils and refers to clothes. He states that there is a differentiation in the first four *mishnayot* and the fifth in order to support the opinion that the *pasuk* “*chalal cherev*” refers to metal utensils (i.e. the opinion of *Rashi* and *Rabbeinu Tam* above). This is because the first four *mishnayot* refer specifically to *tameh met* and *keilim*, and when the *Mishnah* moves on to discuss *tumat hazav* it also refers to other types of utensils (i.e. clothes) in order to emphasise that there is a clear distinction in the types of *keilim* that is being referred to in the two ‘groups’ of *mishnayot*.

The *Tifferet Yisrael* has a different explanation for why this *Mishnah* refers specifically to clothes as opposed to utensils. He states that the first four *mishnayot* are talking specifically about cases where the items that came into contact with one another were not attached to one another. This teaches us about a usual (*stam*) case where utensils are not directly attached to a person. However, in the fifth *Mishnah* we are now teaching the law of a man and utensils that are in contact and therefore the case must reflect this – and so specifically refers to clothing. This demonstrates a *stam*/usual case where a person comes into contact with a *tameh* person and the effect on utensils that are considered attached to him. This teaching that is learnt from the first part of the *Mishnah* extends to the *seifa*. The *seifa* refers to clothing that ‘carries’ a *zav* rather than other utensils. This is because in a ‘*stam*’ / usual case, a person does not lie or sit on utensils as this is not their purpose. However, something like clothing, which a person would sit on in a regular manner is used to demonstrate the teaching of the *Mishnah* as this is something that would occur regularly.

Yehuda Gottlieb

Revision Questions

יא תולהאבי – ז: יב:

- Through what chain of event beginning with contact with a corpse can:
 - Two things become *tameh* for seven days and another till the evening? יב: יא(
 - Three things become *tameh* for seven days and another till the evening? יג: יא(
- In what way is the law regarding *tumah met* more strict for a person than utensils and in what way is it more lenient? יד: יא(
- In what way is the law regarding *tumah zav* more strict for a person than clothing and in what way is it more lenient? יה: יא(
- At what point does a person become a source of *tumat met*? יז: יא(
- List some other law for which this is important. יח: יא(
- If an animal is decapitated and is convulsing, is it source of *tumat neveilah*? יט: יא(
- Is there a minimum measure for a limb for it to be a source of *tumah*? יכ: יא(
- In what three forms of *tumah* can a limb from a dead creature be a source of *tumah*? יל: יא(
- How many *eivarim* are there in a man? (Hard: list them.) ימ: יא(
- In what three ways can they transfer *tumah*? ינ: יא(
- What condition is not fulfilled if they cannot transfer *tumah* in one of these ways? יפ: יא(
- What is the *shiur* (minimum measure) of the following things for them to transfer *tumah* under an *ohel*:
 - *Netzel*?
 - *Rakav*?
 - Bones? (Provide three measures.) יב: יא(
 - Blood from a corpse?
 - *Dam tevusah*?
 - *Dam katan*?
 - *Ever serufin*? יב: יב(
- Explain the debate for the last three cases. יב: יב(
- What is the law regarding *rakav* that is mixed with water regarding *chibur*? יב: יב(
- Which seven things transfer *tumat met* but not via an *ohel*? יג: יב(
- When is a spine and skull considered *chaser*? (Include both opinions.) יד: יב(
- Explain the debate regarding how a *golel* and *dofek* transfer *tumah*. יד: יב(
- Which six things from a *met* are *tahor* if they are *chaser*? יה: יב(
- Explain the debate regarding *rova atzamot* that came from two corpses. יז: יב(
- What else is debated in the same manner? יז: יב(
- Explain the debate regarding an *etzem ke'seorah* that split in two. יז: יב(
- Explain the debate regarding *rova atzamot* that have been ground. יז: יב(

Local Shiurim

Melbourne, Australia

Sunday -Thursday

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
Melbourne, Australia

Friday & Shabbat

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Beit Ha'Roeh
Melbourne, Australia

Efrat, Israel

Shiur in English

Sunday -Thursday

Rabbi Mordechai Scharf
9:00am
Kollel Magen Avraham
Reemon Neighbourhood

ONLINE SHIURIM

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

Rav Meir Pogrow
613.org/mishnah.html

Rabbi E. Kornfeld
Rabbi C. Brown
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm>

SHIUR ON KOL HALOSHON

Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss
In US dial: 718 906 6400
Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שדוק תבש
29 th March ט"ט וסני	30 th March י" וסני	31 st March יא" וסני	1 st April יב" וסני	2 nd April יג" וסני	3 rd April יד" וסני	4 th April ט"ו וסני
Ohalot 3:1-2	Ohalot 3:3-4	Ohalot 3:5-6	Ohalot 3:7-4:1	Ohalot 4:2-3	Ohalot 5:1-2	Ohalot 5:3-4

