



Making and Breaking Stone Ovens

In the fifth *perek* we began learning about the unique laws regarding an earthenware oven or stove. Even though these *keilim* do not have a base and are attached to the ground, we learnt that they are still susceptible to *tumah* in the same way as ordinary earthenware *keilim*. In the sixth *perek* we learnt that this law also applies to a makeshift oven. This is where one takes two stones places the next to one another with a space between, and cements them.¹ That way the pot is raised, resting on the stones, with the fire beneath. Note that this is despite the fact the stone utensils are not susceptible to *tumah*.

The third *Mishnah* discusses cases where this stove has been extended. In other words, there are three stones now placed in a row, thereby providing two places for the pots to rest, with the middle stone shared by both pots.

The end of the *Mishnah* discusses a case where both “stoves” became *tameh* and the middle stone was then removed. The *Mishnah* teaches that if a large pot could still rest on the two outer stones, then it is still *tameh*.² If not, the two stoves are considered broken and they would be *tahor*.

The *Tifferet Yisrael* explains that when the two outer stones can still serve a large pot, it is important to understand that the now combined stove remains *tameh* and not just that they are *tahor* and susceptible to *tumah*. Despite the fact it is not the same stove as it was before, since it is still a stove, it retains the *tumah*.

The *Mishnah* however continues that if the middle stone was returned to its place, the stoves are *tahor*.³ Why?

The *Bartenura* explains that by placing the middle stone there it effectively breaks the oven. It is still not however clear what the difference is between when the stone was

removed and when it was returned. Why is the ruling different?

The *Tifferet Yisrael* explains that widening the space, as long as it can still function, is not considered breaking the oven, whereas reducing the space is. Again, it is not immediately clear what the difference is between widening and narrowing.

The *Chazon Ish* (*Keilim* 8:9) also ask the same questions. If returning the stone is considered as if the large oven is broken and replaced with two new smaller oven, then the same should be true in the reverse when removing the middle stone.

The *Chazon Ish* explains the difference as follows. When returning the stone, it indeed creates two new ovens. Nevertheless, there is a delay before they can become *tameh*. That middle stone needs to be cemented in place. Even if the *Mishnah* was referring to where the middle stone was cemented, it would still need its first firing up to become susceptible to *tumah*. Consequently, due to this “delay” the *tumah* disappears from the ovens. In the first case however, when the stone is removed, the new large oven is immediately susceptible to *tumah*. There is nothing materially lacking and it does not even need its first firing up.

The *Chazon Ish* is still not satisfied. He asks that when the stone is removed, why should it still be *tameh*. It should only be considered like taking two have *tameh keilim* and combining them together. He explains, that removing the stone is therefore understood as being like expanding the space of the original stove and it therefore retains its *tumah* (much like the *Tifferet Yisrael* explained above). When returning the stone, it is not yet fit for use until the middle piece is firmly established.

israel Bankier

¹ The *Rishonim* debate whether the *Mishnah* means that they were cemented to the ground and connected at the top.

² The *Mishnah Achrona* assumes that this is the law only if both the original, small stoves were *tameh*. If however, one was originally *tameh* and the other *tahor*, it would not make that outer *tahor* brick *tameh*, because it was never *tameh*.

³ The *Tifferet Yisrael* (*Boaz* 5) explains that this is even if the middle stone was not cemented in place. Despite the fact the placement of stone is not ordinarily enough to break the *kli*, in this case, there was a stone in that location previously.

Revision Questions

טהרות ה' ה' - ז' ג'

- What is a *mussaf ha'tanur* and when is it *tahor*? (ה' ה')
- What is the law regarding a *tanur* that:
 - Is half filled with earth?
 - Was placed over a pit? (ה' ר')
- How does one purify a *tanur* that became *tameh*? (Include all opinions) (ז' ה')
- If a *tanur* was sliced horizontally, how thin must the rings be such that they are *tahor*? (ה' ח')
- What type of a *tanur* can be used by a *niddah* and would remain *tahor*? (ה' ח')
- If a *tanur* came in parts how does the addition, removal and subsequent addition of *limudin* affect its *tumah* and *tahara*? (ה' ט')
- What is the *tanur shel achnai* and what is the debate regarding it? (ה' י')
- What is the *tanur shel ben dinai* and what is its status regarding *tumah* and *tahara*? (ה' י')
- How does an oven made of metal differ from the ovens discussed so far with respect to: (ה' י"א)
 - Susceptibility to *tumah*?
 - When it becomes *tahor*?
- Does covering a metal oven with clay give it the status of an earthenware oven? (ה' י"א)
- What are *pitputim* and when are they susceptible to *tumah*? (ה' י"א)
- If a stone is used to rest a pot on alongside another item, for which of those items is the stone susceptible to *tumah* and for which is it not? (ה' י"ב)
- What was the *kirat nezirim*? (ה' י"ב)
- Explain the case of the *kirat hatabachim*. (ה' י"ב)
- What is the law regarding three stones that are used as two stoves (the middle stones serving both) where the outer stone became *tameh*? (ה' י"ג)
- What is the law regarding the previous question if: (ה' י"ג)
 - The other outer stone were removed?
 - The *tameh* stone was removed?
 - The centre stone was very large?
 - If the centre stone was removed? Then returned?
- What is the law regarding a *kira* of two stones where additional stones were placed on either side? (ה' י"ד)
- Regarding *kalatut* of *ba'alei batim*, when does it become *tahor*? (ה' י"א)
- What is a *dachon* and why (and how) is it susceptible to *tumah*? (ה' י"ב)
- If a *kira* is cut in a vertical direction, when is it *tahor* and when is it (still) *tameh*? (ה' י"ג)
- Does the same rule apply to a *kofach* and why? (ה' י"ג)
- When is a *chatzar ha'kira* susceptible to *tumah*? (ה' י"ג)

Shiurim

ONLINE SHIURIM

Yisrael Bankier
mishnahyomit.com/shiurim

Rabbi Reuven Spolter
mishnah.co

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

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

APPS

Mishnah Yomit
mishnahyomit.com

All Mishnah
 Orthodox Union

Mishna Yomi
 Our Somayach, South Africa

Kehati

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	שבת קודש
31 May ט"ו סיון	1 June ט"ז סיון	2 June י"ז סיון	3 June י"ח סיון	4 June י"ט סיון	5 June כ' סיון	6 June כ"א סיון
Keilim 7:4-5	Keilim 7:6-8:1	Keilim 8:2-3	Keilim 8:4-5	Keilim 8:6-7	Keilim 8:8-9	Keilim 8:10-11

