



The Uniqueness of *Kli Cheres*

The fourth *perek* starts by recording two debates. We know that if a *kli cheres* breaks and a broken piece can still serve as a receptacle, then it is still susceptible to *tumah*. The *Mishnah* teaches that if there is handle or protrusion that prevents that piece from standing freely then it is not susceptible. If however the problematic part breaks off, thereby allowing it to stand then there is a debate regarding whether it is susceptible. *Rabbi Yehuda* maintains it is, while the *Chachamim* disagree.

The second argument in the *Mishnah* is regarding a barrel that is cut in half down its vertical axis. The barrel can no longer function as it was original intended, yet the parts can be placed on their sides and still be useful. In this case, *Rabbi Yehuda* argues that the *kli* is now *tahor*. The *Bartenura* explains that he requires the broken parts to rest on their original base and not on the walls. The *Chachamim* however maintain that the parts are still susceptible to *tumah* since the barrel does sometimes function as a container when rested on its side.

The *Mishnah Achrona* understands that the debate in the *Mishnah* is similar to the debate between the *Rambam* and *Raavad* (*Keilim* 18:10). He explains that the *Rambam* understands that the fact that the *Torah* explicitly mentions *kli cheres* (“*ve’kol kli cheres*”) sets them apart from other types of *keilim* treating them more stringently. For *klei cheres*, if a broken piece is useful it is still susceptible to *tumah* even if it can no longer serve in its original

capacity. This is not the case for other *keilim* whose broken parts must be able to function in the same way.

The *Raavad* however disagrees; he understands that there is no difference between *kli cheres* and the other *keilim* regarding the broken parts. The *Torah* needed to stress *klei cheres* since they are inferior to other materials and one might think that once broken they would *tahor* no matter what.

The *Mishnah Achrona* understands that this is precisely the debate between the *Chachamim* and *R’ Yehuda*. The *Chachamim* understand like the *Rambam* that the *Torah* was teaching a novelty regarding broken pieces of a *kli cheres*. That novelty however is only regarding a functioning piece. If that piece breaks then it cannot be remedied. *R’ Yehuda* however understands like the *Raavad* that the *pasuk* teaches that there is no difference and we do not say that a broken piece cannot be repaired.

The opinions align in the second debate in the *Mishnah* as well. *R’ Yehuda* understands like the *Raavad* that there is no difference, so since the broken pieces of other *keilim* must be able to still serve the original function, the same is true for *klei cheres*. The *Chachamim* however understand that the *Torah* was treating *klei cheres* more stringently and for it to be susceptible, as long as it can serve a function, it is susceptible to *tumah*.

Yisrael Bankier

Revision Questions

סיילכ נא: ג' – יב: יה

- How large must a hole be in a *tameh kli cheres* to render it *tahor*? (Provide both measures.) נא: ג'
- Regarding the previous question, how large must the holes be in the following utensils: נא: ג'
 - A barrel?
 - A large pot?
 - A *pach*?
 - A *tzartzur*?
- If a broken piece of *kli cheres* had a hole that was sealed, when is it still *tameh*? נא: ג'
- What other case shares a similar law to the previous question? נא: ד'
- Explain the debate regarding when an outer coating of plaster on a *kli cheres* is considered part of the *kli* and why is this important? נא: ה'
- If food touches the plastering of a *tameh* oven, does it become *tameh*? נא: ו'
- Which of the following two substances that are used to plaster a water-heater are considered a *chibur* (attachment): *chomer* or *charsit*? נא: ז'
- Why does *R' Yosi* declare that a kettle whose hole is plugged with *zefet* (pitch) is considered *tahor*? נא: ח'
- What is the law regarding a barrel whose hole has been repaired with an excessive amount of *zefet*? נא: ט'
- What are the three opinions regarding plugged funnels made of wood or of earthenware and their susceptibility to *tumah*? נא: י'
- What is the law regarding a broken piece of *cheres* that cannot stand due to the attached handle? נא: יד'
- Explain the debate regarding the previous case if the handle then broke off. נא: יד'
- Explain the debate regarding a barrel that splits down the middle. נא: יד'
- How poor must a severely cracked barrel be in order that it is no longer susceptible to *tumah*? נא: יז'
- What is a *gistra*? נא: יח'
- What is the rule regarding a *gistra* that has *chidudim*? נא: יח'
- What are the three cases of an earthenware utensil that has “three rims”? נא: יח'
- From what point in production is an earthenware utensil susceptible to *tumah*? נא: יח'
- What are the minimum dimensions of a *tanur* and a broken *tanur* such that it is susceptible to *tumah*? נא: יח'
- What is the “*g'mar melacha*” of a *tanur*? נא: יח'
- Regarding the previous two questions, what is the law regarding a *kira*? נא: 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
30 th November יח ולסכ	1 st December ט ולסכ	2 nd December י ולסכ	3 rd December יא ולסכ	4 th December יב ולסכ	5 th December יג ולסכ	6 th December יד ולסכ
Keilim 5:3-4	Keilim 5:5-6	Keilim 5:7-8	Keilim 5:9-10	Keilim 5:11-6:1	Keilim 6:2-3	Keilim 6:4-7:1

