Volume 6. Issue 13



## **Covered Utensils**

This week we learnt about a wooden table whose surface was covered with stone – a substance that is not susceptible to *tumah* (22:1). The *Mishnah* discussed the debate regarding how much of the originally wooden surface must be showing for the table to remain susceptible to *tumah*. The implication of the *Mishnah* is that if the table was completely covered then it would no longer be susceptible to *tumah*. The explanation of the *Bartenura* that "we go according to the [susceptibility of the material of the] cover" therefore seems appropriate.

The difficulty is that in earlier cases the *Bartenura* appeared to explain the opposite. For example, the *Mishnah* (11:6) discussed the susceptibility to *tumah* of a metallic *pika* (spinner's coil). The *Chachamim* ruled that it was indeed susceptible to *tumah*. However if it was made of wood, which in that form would not be susceptible to *tumah*, and then coated with metal, it would not be susceptible to *tumah*. There the *Bartenura* explains that we are only interested in the *ikar* (essence) of the utensil and not the coating. How can the apparent discrepancies between the *Mishnayot* be explained? How can the *Bartenura* be resolved?

The *Mishnah Acharona* differentiates between these two cases. In the earlier *Mishnayot* the coating only serves a decorative value. Consequently the coating is insignificant compared to the utensil itself. However in our case of the table, the stone serves a functional purpose – it cools and protects the food.

The Gra differentiate between classes of coatings in a similar way. The reason why in the earlier cases the metallic coating was not significant is because the coating alone cannot turn a wooden utensil into a metallic one (Eliyahu Raba 11:4-6). However if the prime use is through the material of the coating, then significance is given to the coating (Biur HaGra Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh Deah 120:16). The Chazon Ish (Keilim 14:8) explains that when the prime use is made from the coating, for example in the case of the table, then the coating is important. However if the prime use is made with the utensil itself and the coating simple serves as a protective layer, as in the case of the *pika*, then the substance of the coating is of no importance.

The *Rambam* (*Hilchot Keilim* 4:4) however explains that <u>any</u> utensil, even if it has a receptacle, with even a metallic coating, is not susceptible to *tumah*. He bases the rule on the *pasuk* that discuss the susceptibility to *tumah* of utensils as those "that one performs work inside them." The *Rambam* understands that this excludes coated vessels whose work is not performed inside them, but inside its coating. Consequently in both our *Mishnah* and the earlier ones, the object in question is not susceptible to *tumah* due to having a covering.<sup>1</sup>

Yisrael Yitzchak Bankier

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup> $\Gamma$ </sup> See the *Kesef Mishnah* for an explanation of the position of the *Rambam*.

## **Revision Questions**

כלים כי:די – כייב:וי

- Explain the debate regarding a large trough with a large hole that was modified for sitting on? (c'::r')
- What is the law regarding the large trough that was modified to contain animal feed and was fixed to a wall? (c'::r')
- What are the two requirements for a *kofet* that is built into a wall such that it is no longer susceptible to *tumah*? (c': :c')
- What are the other two cases similar to the one in the previous question, and which of the two is slightly different? (c': : הי)
- What is the law regarding a sheet that was modified to be used as a curtain? (כי: הי)
- What is the debate regarding the previous question and who are the parties in the debate? ('1: '2)
- What are some of the ways a *machtzelet* can be modified so that it is no longer susceptible to *tumat midras*? ('i: ')
- What is the law regarding a *machtzelet* that was cut in half along its width? Along its length? ('1: '2)
- At what point in a *machtzelet*'s production does it become susceptible to *tumah*? (c': :r)
- List some of the components of a weaving machine that are and are not a *yad* for the woven fabric. (כייא: אי)
- When is the ve'ira considered a yad for the fabric? (כייא אי)
- When is the *pika* a yad for the *plach*? (כייא אי)
- List some part of the of the yoke-plough apparatus that are a yad to the plough. (כייא: בי)
- Which parts of a *megeira* are considered a *yad*? (כ״א :ג׳)
- Is a bow ever considered a yad for an arrow? (כייא :גי)
- Explain the debate regarding a mole trap. (כייא גגי)
- How much space must be left from a table whose surface gives way for it to remain tameh? (כ״ב:א׳)
- What other case has the same rule as in the previous question? (כ״ב:אי)
- When can a table whose legs begin to break off once again, be susceptible to *tumah*? Include both opinions. ('c''ב: ב')
- When can a bench that looses both its legs still be susceptible to *tumah*? (כ״ב:ג׳)
- What is the law regarding a footstool that looses a leg? (כייב :גי)
- What is the three-way debate regarding the *kise shel kalla*? (כ״ב :ד׳)
- What else is the subject of debate between these parties? (כייב :די)
- In what case is a chair whose seat was removed still be susceptible to *tumah*? (כ״ב:ה׳)
- What is the law regarding a chair whose outer seat-boards were removed? (כייב:רי)
- What is the law if the inner seat-board was removed? (כ״ב :ר׳)
- What is the law if two adjacent seat boards were removed? (כ״ב: זי)
- What case does R' Yehuda add? (כייב:זי)

## Local Shiurim

Sunday -Thursday Between mincha & ma'ariv <u>Mizrachi Shul</u>

Friday & Shabbat 10 minutes before mincha <u>Mizrachi Shul</u>

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
17 <sup>th</sup> May כייג אייר	18 <sup>th</sup> May כייד אייר	19 <sup>th</sup> May כייה אייר	20 <sup>th</sup> May כ״ו אייר	21 <sup>st</sup> May כ״ז אייר	22 <sup>nd</sup> May כ״ח אייר	23 <sup>rd</sup> May כייט אייר
Keilim 22:8-9	Keilim 22:10- 23:1	Keilim 23:2-3	Keilim 23:4-5	Keilim 24:1-2	Keilim 24:3-4	Keilim 24:5-6

## Next Week's Mishnayot...