



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf 1 – Daf 11

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shrager A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf 1---50-----

- A Braisa says, if one has branches that were cut for firewood, and he then decides to use them for sitting upon and wants to sit on them on Shabbos, T"K says he must tie the branches together before Shabbos (to do an action to show he intends to use it on Shabbos). **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says he only needs to have in mind to use them on Shabbos.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Channah** paskened like **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.
 - **Rav** says the branches must be tied (like the T"K). **Shmuel** says having in mind to use them is enough (like **R' Shimon**). **R' Assi** says, as long as he sits on them on Friday, there is no need to tie them or to have in mind to use them on Shabbos.
 - **R' Assi** follows the Tanna in a Braisa regarding wearing something to protect a wound. The Braisa says, one may wear flax or wool over a wound and walk into the reshus harabim as long as it was prepared for Shabbos use. The Braisa says, if it was worn on Friday, it may be worn on Shabbos without any further intention or preparation.
 - **R' Ashi** brings a proof to **R' Assi** from a Braisa which says, a person may not move straw which is on a bed on Shabbos (if it was placed there for making bricks or a fire) with his hands, but may move it with his body. If he had lain on the bed on Friday, he may even move the straw with his hands on Shabbos without further intention or preparation.
 - The T"K who argues on **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** is **R' Chanina ben Akiva**. Because **R' Dimi in the name of Zeiri in the name of R' Chanina** said, **R' Chanina ben Akiva** once told his talmidim to have in mind to use certain branches on Shabbos so that they could sit on them on Shabbos. **Zeiri** said, "I am not sure if this took place by a wedding house or a mourning house." It seems that if it wasn't in one of those houses, where people are very preoccupied, he would not have allowed the branches to be used based on intention and would have required an action (i.e. tying) to be done.
 - **R' Yehuda** said, one may bring in a boxful of earth into his house to use on Shabbos. **Mar Zutra** said, this may be done only when the person designates a corner for the earth.
 - **The Rabanan** said to **R' Pappa**, this must follow **R' Shimon**, because according the T"K, one must do an action to make it not muktze. **R' Pappa** said, this may even follow the T"K, because the T"K only requires an action when an action can be performed (e.g. tying the branches), but here nothing can be done, so the T"K would agree that it may be used.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that this is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. One Braisa says that silver may not be cleaned with earth and sand on Shabbos. Another Braisa says that it may be used. Maybe they argue in this same argument (whether an action is not required when there is no action to be done)? One Braisa says since no action was done to the sand, it cannot be used on Shabbos. The other Braisa says, since there is no action that can be done to the sand, it may be used without an action!? **A:** It may be that all agree that no action is needed when an action can't be done. The machlokes in the Braisos is that the first Braisa holds like **R' Yehuda** who holds davar she'eino miskaven is assur, and since rubbing with the sand may smooth out the silver, although unintended, it may not be done. The second Braisa holds like **R' Shimon**, and therefore, although the sand may smooth the silver, since it is unintended, it may be done.
 - **Q:** The end of the second Braisa (which we said follows **R' Shimon**) says that one may not rub his hair with sand on Shabbos (because it may remove some hair). Now, if this Braisa follows **R' Shimon** it would allow that to be done on Shabbos since it is only possible that it will remove hair and it is unintended!? **A:** Both Braisos follow **R' Yehuda**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

The one that permits the use of sand on silver holds that silver does not get smoothed by sand, and the other Braisa says that it does.

- **Q:** The Braisa says that one may wash his face with the sand. According to **R' Yehuda** he should not be allowed to do so because it will pull out hairs from his beard!? **A:** The Braisa refers to a minor, a woman or a “saris”, who don’t have beards.
- **R' Yehuda** says one may wash his face on Shabbos with crushed bricks (it does not remove hair). **R' Yosef** allows using sesame seed pulp. **Rava** allows crushed pepper. **R' Sheishes** allows “barda”, which **R' Yosef** explains is made of 1/3 aloe, 1/3 hadasim and 1/3 “sigli” (some type of grass). **R' Nechemya bar Yosef** said, as long as aloe is not the majority, it is allowed.
- **R' Sheishes** was asked, may one hit olives on a rock to sweeten them on Shabbos? He answered that it is even assur to do on a weekday, because some of the oil gets wasted in the process.
 - **Q:** Does he argue with **Shmuel** who allows one to use food for all his needs? **A:** **Shmuel** only allowed that when the food doesn’t get disgusting. Here, the olives get disgusting.
- **Ameimar** and **R' Ashi** washed with “barda” that was brought to them on Shabbos, but **Mar Zutra** did not. **R' Mordechai** explained, that **Mar Zutra** would not even wash with that during the week because he felt that was beautifying oneself like a woman, which is assur for a man to do. The others held that it is proper “kavod” for Hashem to keep oneself clean.

R' ELAZAR BEN AZARYA OMER KUPAH MATEH AHL TZIDAH V'NOTEL SHEMA YITOL...

- **R' Abba in the name of R' Chiya bar Ashi** said, everyone agrees that if the space where the pot was sitting (the empty spot among the muktze insulation) gets messed up, he may not return the pot there (because he would have to move the muktze insulation to do so).
 - **Q:** The Chachomim in our Mishna argue and say that the pot may be returned. If they are talking about where the insulation did not get messed up, why would **R' Elazar** not permit it? It must be that they are talking about where it did get messed up and still they allow it to be returned!? **A:** They are discussing where it did not get messed up, and the machlokes is whether the pot may be removed or not, and that would be based on whether we are afraid that removing the pot will cause the space to get messed up.
- **R' Hunta** said, the “slikusta” (a good smelling plant that would be kept in earth and pulled out to smell and then returned) may be removed from its earth on Shabbos, if it was put in the earth, removed and then put back before Shabbos began (in that way the hole in the earth is big enough so that the removal of the plant on Shabbos does not move the muktze earth).
- **Shmuel** said, a knife that is stuck in between the rows of bricks may be removed on Shabbos, if it is stuck in, removed and stuck in again before Shabbos begins.
 - **Mar Zutra** (or **R' Ashi**) allows sticking a knife in between the reeds and says that we are not afraid that he will peel away some of the reed while doing so.
- **Q: R' Katina** asked, if one buries a turnip or radish in the ground with its leaves sticking out, the turnip or radish may be removed on Shabbos, although the earth will be moved by doing so!? **TEYUFTA** of the rulings of **R' Hunta** and **Shmuel**!

-----Daf X]---51-----

MISHNA

- If one did not do the hatmanah on Friday, it cannot be done on Shabbos. If he did the hatmanah on Friday and it became uncovered, he may recover it on Shabbos.
- One may do hatmanah on a bottle of cold water to try and keep it cold, even on Shabbos

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, one may insulate cold items on Shabbos to keep them cold.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, what is the chiddush? Our Mishna already said that?! **A: Abaye** said, from the Mishna we would think the allowance only refers to cold water, which hatmanah wouldn’t help to warm it up (water needs to be heated a number of degrees, which permissible hatmanah cannot achieve).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

However, hatmanah of cold food to keep it cold maybe is not allowed (since hatmanah is effective in heating food to a satisfactory temperature). **Shmuel** therefore teaches us that cold food may be insulated to be kept cold as well.

- **Q: R' Hunu in the name of Rebbi** said one may not do hatmanah on cold food on Shabbos, but in a Braisa he says that it is permitted?! **A:** At first **Rebbi** prohibited it. After he heard that **R' Yose** permitted it, he permitted it as well.
- **R' Nachman** told his servant to do hatmanah on Shabbos on cold food (like **Shmuel**) and to bring hot water cooked by a goy for him to drink from (like **Rav** who says that anything that is typically eaten raw does not have a problem of “bishul akum” if it is cooked by a goy).
 - **R' Ami** didn’t agree with **R' Nachman** doing this, because he felt that an “Adam Gadol” should be more machmir on himself.
- A Braisa says, although one may not do hatmanah on Shabbos, if hatmanah was already done, one may add to it on Shabbos. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** explains, one may even remove the insulation and replace it with more effective insulation. He said further, that although hatmanah may not be done to the pot in which the food was cooked, if one pours the contents of the keili into a second keili (and thereby cools the contents), he may do hatmanah to that second keili on Shabbos (the reason hatmanah is assur on Shabbos is because we are afraid one will heat up the food before the hatmanah. This person purposely cooled down the food, so he will surely not heat it). If hatmanah was done with muktze materials, but the pot cover is not a muktze item, the pot may be removed and returned to the hatmanah. If the pot cover is muktze and it is covering the entire pot, the pot may not be removed. **R' Yehuda** says, fine flax combings are like manure, in that they may not be used for hatmanah. A pot or kettle of hot items may be placed one on top of the other, and one may place a piece of dough as a cover to a pot or kettle to retain the heat of the contents in the pot, but not to cook it. Just as hatmanah may not be done on hot items, it may not be done on cold items. **Rebbi** permits it. One may not crush snow or hail on Shabbos to melt them. One may place the snow or hail into a cup to cool the contents of the cup, although it will cause the snow or hail to melt.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK BAMEH TOMNIN

PEREK BAMEH BEHEIMAH -- PEREK CHAMISHI

MISHNA

- With what may an animal go out into the reshus harabim and with what may an animal not go out?
 - An camel may go out with an “afzar” (a rope that is used to control and lead the camel). A female camel may go out with a “chatam”. “Luvdikim” may go out with a “prumbia”. A horse may go out with a collar (like a dog collar with a ring through which a rope is attached as a leash). All animals that typically wear a collar may go out with a collar and may be pulled by a collar.
 - A collar may be sprinkled with the parah adumah ashes while the collar is on the animal’s neck, and may be placed in the mikvah while on the animal’s neck.

GEMARA

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** explains that the mention of the female camel refers to a white, female camel and teaches that it may go out with a metal nose ring used for a leash (this gives more control than a collar, which this type of camel needs because this camel is harder to control).

V’LUVDIKIM B’PRUMBIA

- **R' Hunu** explained that this means a donkey that comes from Luv may go out with a bit made of iron.
 - **Levi** wanted to buy a Luv donkey (they were very strong). The people told him, giving a regular donkey a lot of barley to eat will make it just as strong.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, they asked **Rebbi**, may the camel go out with the nose ring (it doesn’t need to be so excessively controlled, so maybe it is therefore unnecessary and therefore considered “carrying” for this animal on Shabbos), and may a female camel go out with an “afzar” (it is not enough to control it, so

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

maybe it is useless and therefore “carrying”)? **Rebbi** answered, a female camel can’t go out with an “afsar” because it is useless and is therefore clearly carrying on Shabbos. The question is regarding a regular camel with a nose ring – is it too excessive and therefore “carrying”, or does that not make it considered as “carrying”? **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yose** said that his father allowed 4 animals to go out with an “Afsar” – a horse, mule, camel and donkey. Seemingly he means to disallow a camel with a nose ring!? **Rebbi** said, It could be he means to disallow a female camel with an “afzar”.

- The Gemara says that this question of whether an animal may go out with an excessive restraint is actually a machlokes Tana'im. A Braisa says, a “chaya” may not go out with a rope collar. **Chananya** says it may go out with a rope collar or any other restraint. Now, they can’t be discussing a large chaya, because a rope collar wouldn’t be sufficient. They can’t be discussing a small chaya because the **T”K** wouldn’t prohibit a rope collar for a small chaya. They must be discussing an obedient chaya, like a cat. The machlokes is that the **T”K** says a rope is excessive and therefore forbidden as carrying, and **Chananya** permits it because he allows even excessive restraints.
 - **R’ Huna bar Chiya in the name of Shmuel** paskens like Chananya.

-----Daf 21-----52-----

- They taught in the Yeshiva of **Menashya**, if one makes holes in the horns of a goat, and places an “afzar” through those holes, the goat may go out with that on Shabbos. (A goat may not go out with an “afzar” tied onto it in the way it is typically tied to other animals, because a goat’s normal thrashing movements would result in the “afzar” coming off and may lead to the owner carrying it in the reshus harabim.)
 - **Q: R’ Yosef** asked, what about tying it to the goat’s beard, are we still afraid the goat will make it come off, or because it will be painful for the goat to get it off (the beard will have to be pulled out) maybe it will not come off? **TEIKU**.
- A Mishnah says, a cow may not go out with a strap between its horns.
 - **R’ Yirmiya bar Abba** said, **Rav and Shmuel** argue: one says the Mishna prohibits a strap used for decoration or for control (of the cow) purposes, the other says the Mishna only prohibits a strap of decoration.
 - **R’ Yosef** says, **Shmuel** is the one who says that a strap used for control is allowed. Because **Shmuel** said the halacha follows **Chananya** (that an excessive restraint is permitted, and although a cow does not need a strap to be controlled, it is still allowed). **Abaye** says, **Shmuel** says a strap for control would be prohibited. Because **Shmuel** said, they asked **Rebbi** regarding the halachah of an excessive restraint on Shabbos, and **R’ Yishmael** said, his father **R’ Yose** paskened that a camel may go out with an “afzar”, which suggests that it may not go out with a nose ring (because that would be an excessive restraint). Since **Shmuel** brought this down, he must hold this way!
 - The Gemara says, **R’ Yosef** is correct and we must delete **Abaye’s** proof, because we find elsewhere that **Shmuel** explicitly says that a strap used for control is mutar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if the owner of a parah adumah put a leash on the cow, it remains kosher. A leash on a cow is an excessive restraint. If an excessive restraint is considered to be a “burden”, the parah adumah would become pasul, because a parah adumah may not carry a burden. We see that it is not a burden?! **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa is referring to the owner leading the cow from one city to another, in which circumstance a leash is not considered excessive. **Rava** said, because the parah adumah is so valuable, a leash is not considered to be an excessive restraint. **Ravina** said, the Braisa refers to a rebellious cow which needs this level of restraint.

HASUS B’SHEIR...

- **R’ Huna** says the Mishna means that the animal may go out with the rope wrapped around its neck, or with the person pulling it in front. **Shmuel** says it may only go out when being led in front.
 - A Braisa says, the animal may go out with it wrapped around its neck to be pulled by it (only if it will be pulled by it, like **Shmuel** says).
 - **R’ Yosef** saw the calves of **R’ Huna** walking out with the rope wrapped around their necks on Shabbos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rav Dimi in the name of R' Chanina** said, **Rebbi's** mules would go out with an “ afsar” on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Did they go out with the ropes wrapped around their necks or were they led with the ropes?
A: **R' Chanina** said that they went out with the rope wrapped around their necks.
 - **Q:** The **Rabanan** asked **R' Assi**, we could have figured this out without **R' Chanina's** statement, because **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said in front of **Rebbi** that his father allowed 4 animals to go out with an “Afsar” – a horse, mule, camel and donkey. **Rebbi** didn't voice disagreement, so he must have agreed that a mule may go out with an “afsar”. When **R' Dimi** said that **Rebbi's** mules went out with the “afsar”, he therefore must have meant that the ropes were wrapped around their necks, because if not, he was not adding anything to what we already knew!?! **A:** We would think that **Rebbi** did not actually agree with **R' Yose**. That's why **R' Dimi** repeated the halacha. **R' Chanina** was teaching even further, that **Rebbi's** mules even went out with the ropes wrapped around their necks.

UMAZIN ALEIHEN V'TOVLAN BIMKOMAN

- **Q:** How can the collar become tamei? A Mishna says that only a person's ring can become tamei, not a ring of a keili or an animal (which would include a collar)?! **A:** **R' Yitzchak** said, our Mishna is discussing a collar that was used by a person (and became tamei at that time) and was then used for an animal, but had never yet become tahor. **A2: R' Yosef** says, the collar of an animal can become tamei, because it is used by a person to help control the animal (just like a prodding stick can become tamei, because it is used by a person to prod and control an animal).

V'TOVLAN BIMKOMAN

- **Q:** The ring holding the strap is tightly inserted into the collar. If so, the ring acts as a “chatzitza” to the collar?!
A: **R' Ami** said, the Mishna refers to a case where the hole was widened. **A2:** A Braisa said the Mishna is referring to a collar with wide holes.
 - **R' Ami** must hold like **R' Yosef**, that the collar is tamei because it is considered to be the keili of a person, and therefore, making the hole larger will not make it lose its tumah. If he held like **R' Yitzchak** who says it is only tamei because it used to be used by people, the fact that he made a physical change to the collar should have made it lose its tumah (which is an accepted halacha).
 - The Gemara says, it could be that he holds like **R' Yitzchak**, but he also holds like **R' Yehuda** who says that only a destructive physical change removes tumah. This change of widening the holes is not considered to be destructive.
- A Braisa says, a talmid asked **R' Eliezer**: I heard there is a halachic difference between one type of ring and another, but I don't know what that difference is. **R' Eliezer** answered, you must have heard that there is a difference in halacha regarding Shabbos (a regular ring may be worn into reshus harabim, but a signet ring may not), because there is no difference with regard to tumah.
 - **Q:** We learned that there is a difference with regard to tumah: a person's ring can become tamei but other rings cannot?! **A:** He was only referring to rings of people.
 - **Q:** We learned that a ring used as a belt buckle or to tie the sleeves of a shirt cannot become tamei?! **A:** He was referring to rings worn on the fingers.
 - **Q:** We learned that a metal ring with a wooden signet can become tamei, but a wooden ring with a metal signet cannot?! **A:** He was referring to metal rings.
- The Braisa continues that the talmid also asked: I heard there is a halachic difference between one type of needle and another, but I don't know what that difference is. **R' Eliezer** answered, you must have heard that there is a difference in halacha regarding Shabbos (a needle with a hole (a sewing needle) may not be worn into reshus harabim, but a decorative pin may be worn), because there is no difference with regard to tumah.
 - **Q:** We learned that a needle missing its eye or its point cannot become tamei, otherwise it can become tamei?! **A:** He was referring to complete needles.
 - **Q:** We learned that a needle that is rusty to the point that it can't be used for sewing cannot become tamei?! **A:** He was referring to needles that are not rusty.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a needle without an eye cannot become tamei?! **A:** That Braisa refers to an unfinished needle and **R' Eliezer** was referring to finished needles.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 11---53-----

MISHNA

- A donkey may go out with a cloth that is kept on it for warmth, as long as it is tied to the donkey.
- Rams may go out “levuvin”, sheep may go out “shechuzos”, “kivulos”, and “kivunos”.
- Goats may go out with their udders tied with a pouch (sometimes this is done to stop them from producing milk, and sometimes this is done to save milk from leaking and going to waste).
- **R' Yose** says all these are prohibited except for the case of sheep going out “kivunos”. **R' Yehuda** allows goats to go out with tied udders if he wants to dry them up (they are tied tightly and there is no fear that the pouch will fall off and get carried in reshus harabim), but if he is trying to catch the milk it is assur (because the pouch is not tightly tied and it may fall off).

GEMARA

- **Shmuel** says the cloth must be tied onto the donkey from Friday.
 - **R' Nachman** brings a proof from the next Mishna which prohibits the donkey from going out with a cloth if it wasn't tied on. Now, this can't refer to where it wasn't tied on at all, because that would be obviously prohibited, since it can easily fall off. Rather, it must be saying that it is prohibited where it wasn't tied on from Friday. **SHEMAH MINAH**.
 - Another Braisa is a proof as well. The Braisa says that a donkey may go out with the cloth if it was tied on from Friday, and may not go out with a saddle even if it was tied on from Friday. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says it may go out with a saddle tied on from Friday as long as it is not tied down in the front or the back (which is what is done when it will be carrying a load).
- **R' Assi bar Nassan asked R' Chiya the son of R' Ashi**, may one put the cloth on the donkey on Shabbos (not to go out with it, but to wear in the reshus hayachid)? He answered that one may. He then asked, why is that permitted if even moving a saddle is assur? We see from a Braisa that even removing a saddle is assur?! He didn't answer.
 - **R' Zeira** answered, **R' Chiya** holds like his rebbi, **Rav**, who even allows one to hang a feed bag on an animal on Shabbos (which is done for pleasure to make it easier to eat), so for sure he would allow one to put the cloth on the donkey which is for the cold (which helps to alleviate a suffering).
 - **Shmuel** says, putting on the cloth is mutar, but putting on a feed bag is assur.
 - **Q: Rav and Shmuel** agree that one may put on the cloth. Why is removing a saddle assur? **A1:** The saddle will fall off by itself if you walk the animal around, so we don't permit taking it off. **A2:** **R' Pappa** says, putting on the cloth is to alleviate suffering (to warm the animal), removing the saddle is not to alleviate suffering (it cools the animal which is for pleasure).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says an animal may not go out with its feed bag. This suggests that it may be put on the animal if it is staying in the reshus hayachid, because it brings the animal pleasure. This is not like **Shmuel** said!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing young animals for which it is a “tzar” to eat off the floor (their knees are high and their necks are short).
 - **Q:** The Braisa said an animal may not go out wearing a “kemaya” even it is has been proven to be effective. Another Braisa says it is only a problem if it hasn't been proven effective!? **A:** The Braisa here means it is not proven effective either. Although it says it is proven, it means it is proven effective on a person, but not on an animal and therefore cannot be worn by an animal outside on Shabbos (a person has a Malach that protects and helps him, while an animal does not, so something that is effective on a person may not be effective on an animal).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, a person may smear oil on a wound and scrape a scab on Shabbos, but may not do so for an animal. We see that even to alleviate “tzar” one may not do so for an animal on Shabbos?! **A:** That case is talking about where it is done for pleasure, not to alleviate “tzar”.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person has a blood ailment, he may stand in cool water to cure it. An animal with the same condition may not stand in cool water to cure it. We see that even to alleviate “tzar” it may

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

not be done?! **A: Ulla** said, this cure may not be done because people will then think all cures are mutar on Shabbos, including grinding herbs for medicine. A person doing this cure is not a problem because it looks like he is standing in the water to cool down, not for a cure. An animal doesn't normally stand in the water like that to cool down.

- **Q:** We find that we are not goizer when it comes to an animal by the din of "techumin" (a person may call an animal into the techum and we are not goizer that the person may walk out to go get the animal), so why are we goizer by an animal's cure?! **A: Ravina** said, we are not goizer in that case because the animal is out of its own techum, but within the person's techum. However, we typically are goizer by animals in the same way as we are for people.
- It is actually a machlokes in a Braisa whether we prohibit doing a cure to an animal as a gezeirah for preventing the grinding of herbs. The **T"K** prohibits it and **R' Yoshiya** allows it.
- **Q:** The Braisa we quoted earlier said that goats may NOT go out with pouches tied to their udders. Another Braisa says that it is permitted?! **A1: R' Yehuda** says the first Braisa discusses where it is not tied well and the second where it is tied well. **A2: R' Yosef** says it is a machlokes Tana'im like in our Mishna, where the **T"K** allowed it, **R' Yose** prohibited it, and **R' Yehuda** said it depends on the purpose of the placing of the pouch. **A3:** Both Braisos are said according to **R' Yehuda**. The first Braisa discusses a pouch put there to catch the milk, and the second Braisa discusses where the pouch was put there to prevent milk production.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, there was a story where people put pouches on goats with oversized udders to prevent them from getting cut on the thorns they passed over.
- A Braisa brings a story about a widower who was left with an infant but did not have enough money to hire a woman to nurse the baby. A miracle occurred and he was able to nurse his baby.
 - **R' Yosef** said, he must have been a great man to merit such a miracle. **Abaye** said, if he was truly great, he would have been given money from Hashem instead of that miracle.
- A Braisa brings a story with a woman missing a hand who died. Her husband never realized she was missing a hand.
 - **Rav** said, her modesty was so great that he never noticed. **R' Chiya** said, HIS modesty was so great that he never even noticed.

ZECHARIM YOTZIN LEVUVIN

- **R' Hunu** says, "Levuvin" means in pairs. Rams would be tied into pairs to prevent them from running away. **Ulla** says it means a piece of leather that is tied over their hearts so that wolves should not attack them (wolves attack the hearts of animals). Wolves only attack the males (rams), not the females (sheep), because males walk with a stance that the wolves find to be confrontational and look as if they want to attack the wolves. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, it means a piece of leather that is tied under their reproductive organs to prevent them from mating. We see it means this, since the next part of the Mishna says a female (sheep) may go out "shechuzos", which means with their tails tied up so that males should mate with them. It makes sense that the Mishna preceding this piece is discussing something done to prevent mating from happening.

-----Daf 7]---54-----

HA'RECHEILIM YOTZOS KIVULOS

- "Kivulos" means that the sheep have their tails tied down to prevent a male from mating with them.

KIVUNOS

- "Kivunos" means that the sheep have a covering over their wool to keep it especially white to make a higher quality wool.

V'HA'IZIM YOTZOS TZERUROS

- **Rav** paskens like **R' Yehuda**, **Shmuel** paskens like **R' Yose**, and **R' Yochanan** paskens like the **T"K** of our Mishna.
 - Others said that **Shmuel** paskened like **R' Yehuda ben Beseira**, who says that although he agrees with **R' Yehuda** that goats may go out with pouches on their udders if the intent is to prevent production of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

milk, but not if the intent is to catch the leaking milk, since it is impossible to know what one's intent is, he is goizer and says that it is assur in either case.

MISHNA

- A camel may not go out with a "mitulteles" (either a cloth like the one discussed regarding a donkey, or a cushion that prevents the straps from harming the camel's skin), nor may it or any other animal go out "akud" or "ragul".
- Camels cannot be tied one to another and then led in procession.
 - However, one may take all the leashes in his hand and lead them as a group as long as he does not wrap them around his hand.

GEMARA

- A Braisa explained that the "mitulteles" is only assur to go out with when it is tied to the tail alone. However, if it is tied to the tail and the hump, it is mutar (it won't fall off).
 - **Rabbah bar R' Hunu** allowed a camel to go out with a "mitulteles" that was attached to the camel's placenta.

LO AKUD V'LO RAGUL

- **R' Yehuda** explains "akud" to mean a front leg tied to a back leg "like Yitzchak ben Avrohom" (at the "akeidah"), and "ragul" to mean the bottom part of the foot to be tied up against the leg
 - Although there are 2 Braisos that explain "akud" to mean tying the 2 front or back feet together, **R' Yehuda** has another Braisa to rely on that explains as he did.

V'LO YIKSHOR GEMALIM

- **R' Ashi** explains, camels cannot be tied together and led in procession because it looks like they are being led to the marketplace to be sold.

AVAL MACHNIS

- **R' Ashi** says, wrapping them around the hand would be a "kilayim" (i.e. "shatnez") issue (if some leashes are made of wool and others of linen), not a Shabbos issue.
 - **Q:** Wrapping these materials around one's hand would not be a shatnez problem because they must be more securely attached to cause any problem?! **A:** The Mishna means to say that it is a problem if he knots them together and then wraps them around his hand.
- **Shmuel** says, the end of the ropes cannot hang even a tefach out of the bottom of his hand (it looks like he is carrying the ropes that are sticking out of his hand).
 - **Q:** **Shmuel** says elsewhere that it may be up to 2 tefachim that may hang out? **A:** **Abaye** said, **Shmuel** held it can be up to 2 tefachim, but he would pasken only one tefach, as a gezeirah.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the leashes must be a tefach above the ground, but makes no mention of limiting the amount that it can hang out of the hand?! **A:** That Braisa is talking about the rope that is in between the animal and the person, not the piece that is hanging out of the person's hand.

MISHNA

- A donkey may not go out: with the cloth used to warm it if it is not tied to the donkey; with a bell even if it stuffed so that it won't make noise; with a ladder on its neck; or with a strap on its leg.
- Chickens may not go out with strings, or with straps on their legs.
- Rams may not go out with wagons under their tails, sheep may not go out "chanunos".
- Calves may not go out with a "gimon", cows may not go out with prickly animal skin on their udders, or with a strap in between their horns.
 - **R' Elazar ben Azarya's** cow went out with a strap between its horns against the will of the **Chachomim**.

GEMARA

- A donkey's cloth must be strapped, as explained previously, (if it was not tied on from Friday, it shows that it is an unnecessary piece of clothing and is therefore a "burden").

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

V'LO B'ZUG AHF AHL PI SHEHU PAKUK

- Walking with a bell looks like one is taking the animal to the market to be sold.

V'LO B'SULEM SHE'BITZAVARO

- **R' Hunu** said, this refers to a ladder shaped splint/brace that is placed by the animal's cheek and prevents the animal from turning its head and irritating a wound that exists there.

V'LO BIRTZU'AH SHE'BIRAGLO

- This refers to a contraption that was made for an animal with short steps which would knock its feet into each other and hurt itself. This brace prevented this knocking together.

V'EIN HATARNIGOLIN YOTZIN B'CHUTIN

- This refers to strings that were put on the chickens to identify them as belonging to a particular owner.

V'LO BIRTZU'AH

- This refers to a strap that held the chicken's feet together to prevent it from kicking pebbles and breaking items.

V'EIN HAZICHARIM YOTZIN BA'AGALA

- This refers to a small wagon that would go behind the ram to carry its tail so that it should not drag on the floor and get injured .

V'EIN HARICHELIM YOTZOS "CHANUNOS"

- **R' Acha bar Ulla** explains this to mean, that after the animal is sheared, a soft cloth is soaked in oil and placed on its forehead to warm it until it grows wool again.
 - **R' Chisda** said, if this is done, this sheep is being treated like **Mar Ukva** (i.e. no animal is treated this way and this can't be the meaning of "chanunos")!?
- **R' Pappa bar Shmuel** explains, when a sheep is giving birth, 2 soft cloths are soaked in oil, one is placed on its forehead and one on its womb to keep the sheep warm.
 - **R' Nachman** said, if this is done, this sheep is being treated like **Yalta** (i.e. no animal is treated this way and this can't be the meaning of "chanunos")!?
- **R' Hunu** says, this means that we take a chip of "chanun" wood and put it in the sheep's nostrils. It makes the sheep sneeze and rids it of the worms in its head (the process is called "chanunos" for the name of the wood).
 - Males (rams) don't need this, because they constantly bang heads with one another, and the worms fall out without our assistance.
 - **Shimon Nezira** says "rosem" wood was used for the sheep. The process is called "chanunos" because we are doing an act of mercy (chanun) for the animal.

V'EIN HA'EGEL YOTZEH B'GIMON

- **R' Hunu** says this refers to a small yoke that is put on a calf to train it bend its head down when it gets older.

V'LO PARAH B'OR HAKUPAR

- A prickly leather animal skin was placed over the cow's udders to prevent animals from coming and sucking milk from the cow.

V'LO BIRTZUAH SHE'BEIN KARNEHAH

- According to **Rav** this is assur whether the strap is for decorative or control purposes. According to **Shmuel** it is only assur if it is there for decorative purposes.

PARASO SHEL R' ELAZAR BEN AZARYA

- A Braisa says, this refers to the cow of **R' Elazar's** neighbor, and because he didn't protest her doing this, the Mishna calls it his cow.
 - **Rav, R' Chanina, R' Yochanan, and R' Chaviva** taught, one who has the power to protest the actions of his household and does not, is punished for their sins. One who has the power to protest the actions of the people of his city and does not, is punished for their sins. One who has the power to protest the actions of the entire world and does not, is punished for their sins.
 - **R' Pappa** said, the Reish Galusa is a person with the power to protest the actions of the entire world.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 71---55-----

- **R' Yehuda** was sitting in front of **Shmuel** when a woman came in crying that she was wronged by someone. **Shmuel** did not pay attention to her. **R' Yehuda** said to him, the pasuk says that one who doesn't listen to the cries of the oppressed will not be listened to by Hashem! **Shmuel** explained, that he did not have the power to right the wrong and there was therefore nothing he could do. The people who are punished are those who have the power to do something and don't do anything.
- **R' Zeira** said to **R' Simon**, you should give "mussar" to the Reish Galusa for the things they are doing wrong! He answered, they will not listen to me, so there is no point. **R' Zeira** responded, even so, you should give "mussar" anyway, because **R' Acha the son of R' Chanina** said, never does Hashem change a good decree to a bad decree except for failing to give "mussar".
 - We see this in Yechezkel's vision, where before Hashem sent angels of destruction to destroy Yerushalyim, Hashem commanded Gavriel to place the letter "taf" in ink on the foreheads of the tzadikim, to save them from being destroyed. "Midas Hadin" complained to Hashem that the tzadikim are no better than the resha'im because the tzadikim should have given "mussar"! Hashem responded that the "mussar" would have never been accepted. The Midas Hadin responded, the tzadikim had no way of knowing that and they therefore should have given "mussar". Because of that argument, the tzadikim were destroyed along with the resha'im, although they were originally supposed to be saved.
 - The pasuk says, Hashem told the angels to begin the destruction "U'mikdashi tacheilu" (begin at the Beis Hamikdash). **R' Yosef** explained that can be read as "Mekudashai" – begin with the holy ones (i.e. the tzadikim)
 - **Q:** Why was the letter "taf" used as a mark? **A: Rav** says it is the first letter in "tichyeh" (live) and "tamus" (die). **Shmuel** says "tamah zchus avos" (the zchus of the avos has ended). **R' Yochanan** says "tachon zchus avos" (the zchus avos brings grace). **Reish Lakish** says, "taf" is the last letter of the "seal of Hashem" which is the word "Emes". **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** says the people marked were people who kept the entire Torah – from "aleph to taf".
 - **Q:** When did the zchus avos lose its ability to save us? **A: Rav** says in the time of Hoshea ben Be'eri. **Shmuel** says in the days of Chazael. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says in the days of Eliyahu. **R' Yochanan** says in the days of Chizkiyahu.
- **R' Ami** said, psukim suggest that death only comes from aveiros and suffering only comes from aveiros.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the Malachim asked Hashem, why did Adam die? Hashem answered, because he sinned. The Malachim then asked, so why did Moshe and Aron die? Hashem answered that death comes to the tzadik and the rasha. We see that death comes without sin!? **A: R' Ami** holds like the Braisa where **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, Moshe and Aron sinned by not being "mekadesh Shem Shamayim" by the story with bringing forth the water from the rock. So they did die because of a sin.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that 4 people died without sin: Binyamin, Amram, Yishai and Kilav (the son of Dovid). This is not going according to the first Braisa, because according to the first Braisa, Moshe and Aron didn't sin, so there should be 6 people. It must go according to **R' Shimon ben Elazar**, and we see that even he holds that death comes without sin (at least for these 4 people)?! **TIYUFTA D'RAV AMI TIYUFTA.**
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** said, whoever says that Reuven sinned (the pasuk says that he was mezaneh with Bilhah) is mistaken. At the end of the story with Reuven moving his father's bed the pasuk says "Vayihiyu bnei Yaakov shneim asar" – all the shevatim were equal, without sin. Reuven had moved his father's bed from Bilhah's tent into Leah's tent, and the Torah considered it as if he was mezaneh with her, but in fact he was not.
 - A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, Reuven never committed the sin of z'nus. It is not possible that Reuven, whose children would stand on Har Eival and say "Cursed is the man who is mezaneh with his father's wife", would transgress that very sin. Reuven felt, that after Rachel's death, his mother deserved for Yaakov to sleep in her tent. He therefore went and moved Yaakov's bed into Leah's tent. **Others** say, Yaakov had a bed for the Shechina in his tent as well. Therefore, Reuven disturbed his father's bed and the bed of the Shechina by moving the beds around.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara brings down that it is actually a machlokes among the Tana'im whether Reuven was mezaneh with Bilhah.
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** said, whoever says the sons of Eli sinned (the pasuk says they were mezaneh with women who came to bring korbanos in the Beis Hamikdash), are mistaken. **R' Yonasan** holds like **Rav** who says that Pinchas didn't sin (a pasuk says that Pinchas had a grandson who served as a Kohen, and we learn from another pasuk that a Kohen who is mezaneh will not have a descendant who serves as a Kohen), and the pasuk groups Chafni with Pinchas as "the 2 sons of Eli" to tell us, that just like Pinchas didn't sin, so too Chafni didn't sin either. What Chafni did is, he delayed in bringing the korbanos of the women. That delay caused the women to remain away from their husbands, which the Torah considered as if he was mezaneh with those women. The fact that Pinchas did not protest to this is what caused the Torah to consider Pinchas as having sinned as well.
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** said, whoever says the sons of Shmuel sinned (the pasuk says they took bribes and judged improperly), are mistaken. The pasuk says that they did not follow in the "path of their father", which means that although they did not follow in his path, they did not sin. Shmuel would travel all around to be available to judge the people. His sons would stay at home to be able to tend to their private business needs and make the people come to them to get judged. The Torah considers this as if they accepted bribery.
 - There is a machlokes Tana'im as to whether they sinned. **R' Meir** said they asked for their ma'aser (they were Levi'im) from people (this is wrong, but not bribery). **R' Yehuda** said they had dealings with individuals and treated them better when they came to be judged (they judged improperly). **R' Akiva** said they took more ma'aser than was proper. **R' Yose** said they took the pieces of a slaughtered animal that were supposed to go to the Kohanim.

-----Daf 11---56-----

- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** says, whoever says Dovid sinned (the pasuk seems to say that he was mezaneh with Bas Sheva while she was still married to Uri) is mistaken. The pasuk says "Vayehi Dovid....V'Hashem Emo" – if Dovid truly sinned, the Shechina would not have been with him. Rather, Dovid wanted to do the aveirah, but ultimately did not do it.
 - **Rav** said, **Rebbi**, who came from Dovid, interpreted all these psukim in favor of Dovid. He said, the pasuk says Dovid did bad – "La'asos harah". Typically it would say "Vaya'as". It is written this way here because Dovid *wanted* to do the aveirah, but did not.
 - The pasuk seems to blame Uri's death on Dovid and seems to fault him for taking Uri's wife. **Rebbi** explains, the pasuk means to say that Dovid could have had Uri killed in Beis Din (he was chayuv misah because he was "mored b'malchus", refusing to go home to his wife when Dovid told him to do so) and was *allowed* to marry Bas Sheva (because all soldiers in Dovid's army would write a conditional "get" which would be effective if they never returned from war, and because Uri was killed, Bas Sheva was already divorced when she was with Dovid).
 - **Rebbi** explains, that Nassan Hanavi told Dovid, he is as guilt-free with regard to the death of Uri as he is with regard to the deaths caused by the Ammonites in war.
 - **Rav** says, the only aveirah Dovid ever did was indirectly causing Uri's death.
 - **Q: Rav** says elsewhere that Dovid accepted lashon harah?! **A: KASHEH**
 - **Rav** says Dovid accepted lashon harah about Mefiboshes (Yehonasan's son). Mefiboshes's slave, Tziva, told Dovid that Mefiboshes was alive and that he was unlearned in Torah. Dovid went and found that Mefiboshes was learned in Torah. Tziva then told Dovid that Mefiboshes was happy when Dovid was running away from his rebelling sons and Mefiboshes was hoping to be crowned as king. Dovid accepted that lashon harah and he gave all of Mefiboshes's possessions to Tziva.
 - **Shmuel** says that Dovid did not accept lashon harah. The reason Dovid believed what Tziva said, although he had already proven that Tziva lied to him in the past, was because Mefiboshes's actions corroborated what Tziva had told him (he was barefoot and unkempt and based on the way he spoke to Dovid, it sounded as if he was upset that Dovid recaptured the throne).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, when Dovid told Mefiboshes, “You and Tziva will split your possessions”, a bas kol said, “Rechavam and Yeravam will split the kingdom”.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, had Dovid not accepted lashon harah, the kingdom would not have been split, Klal Yisrael would not have worshipped idols, and we would not have been exiled from our land.
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** said, whoever says Shlomo sinned (the pasuk says that Shlomo worshipped idols) is mistaken. Although the pasuk says that Shlomo’s heart was not as complete with Hashem like that of his father Dovid, it does not mean that he sinned. The pasuk that refers to Shlomo worshipping idols means to say that his wives tried to turn his heart away from Hashem, but he did not go after their idols.
 - Although the pasuk says that Shlomo built a “mizbeach” for the idol, the pasuk attributes it to him, but he in fact did not actually build it. The reason it is attributed to him is because he didn’t protest the actions of his wives (when they worshipped idols).
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, it would have been better for Shlomo to be an attendant for idols rather than to have the pasuk say about him that he did “bad in the eyes of Hashem”.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, when Shlomo married Pharaoh’s daughter, she brought him 1,000 musical instruments and described to him how to worship idols. Shlomo did not protest her actions.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, when Shlomo married Pharaoh’s daughter, Gavriel came down and stuck a reed into the sea. Land began to form around it and this eventually became Rome (the tormentors of Klal Yisrael).
 - A Braisa says, on the day that Yeravam placed the 2 idols (in Beis-Kel and in Dan), the first hut was built, in what would eventually become Italia of Yavan (and later Rome).
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** said, whoever says that King Yoshiyahu sinned (the pasuk says that he completely returned to Hashem, which means that he must have sinned) is mistaken. What the pasuk means is that, with regard to all monetary cases that he judged as king from when he was 8 years old to 18 years old (he became king at 8 years old) he returned the money to the one that he judged against, and he did so from his own money.
 - This argues on **Rav**, who says that there is no greater “baal teshuva” than Yoshiyahu in his generation and one other in our generation. This person is “our generation” is **Abba** (the father of **R' Yirmiya bar Abba**). Some say it was **Acha**, who was **Abba’s** brother.
 - **R' Yosef** adds that there is another great “baal teshuva” in “our generation”, and it is **Ukvan bar Nechemya**, the Reish Galusa. **R' Yosef** said that he once fell asleep while learning and saw a Malach come and accept the “teshuva” of **Ukvan**.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK BAMEH BEHEIMAH!!!