



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Kuf Beis

MISHNA

- If one throws an object b'shogeg, and before it landed he realized that it was Shabbos, and then, instead of landing on the ground, another person stepped in and caught it, or a dog caught it, or it was burned up, he is patur.
- If he threw something with the intent to cause a wound in a person or an animal, and he remembered it was Shabbos before the object caused the wound, he is patur.
- The rule is: one is only chayuv a chatas for performing an aveirah that carries a chatas liability, and only when the beginning and end of the aveirah were done b'shogeg.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The first case of the Mishna is mashma that if the object would have landed on the ground he would be chayuv a chatas. The Mishna is discussing where the person realized it was Shabbos before it landed, so why would he be chayuv a chatas? The end was not done b'shogeg!? **A: R' Kahana** said, since he cannot abort the throw once it leaves his hand, and it was thrown b'shogeg, it is considered to be b'shogeg even if he realized it was Shabbos before it landed. When the Mishna discusses the "rule" with the end of the act not being b'shogeg, it is discussing a case where he threw an object but held onto a string that was attached to the object, and could have pulled it back. If he realizes it is Shabbos and he doesn't pull it back, he is a meizid and would not be chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** If he held onto a string attached to the object, he never left go and therefore will not be chayuv for throwing the object in any case!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he threw it to cause a wound, so he is not chayuv for the throwing, but he is chayuv for inflicting a wound.
 - **Q:** The second part of the Mishna discusses the case of inflicting a wound, so that's not what the "rule" is discussing?! **A: Rava** says, the "rule" is discussing one who carries (not throws) an object 4 amos in RH"R, where he has the ability to stop at any time. Therefore, it is possible to be a shogeg at the start and a meizid at the finish, (i.e. if he realizes it is Shabbos and he continues walking).
 - **Q:** The "rule" seems to be going on the case of throwing. If so, there must be a normal case of throwing where one can be a shogeg at first and then become a meizid!? **A1: Rava** says, the beginning of the Mishna means to say, if one threw it b'shogeg and then he remembered that it was Shabbos before it landed he is patur, and another case is where he did not remember it was Shabbos but another person caught it, **or** a dog ate it, **or** it got burned, he is patur. So, if he remembers after throwing it, he will be patur, because it ended while knowing what he was doing was assur. **A2: R' Ashi** says, the Mishna is missing words and means to say, if he realized that it was Shabbos after the object left his hand and it then landed, he will be chayuv only if he once again forgot it was Shabbos before the object actually landed. However, if he knew it was Shabbos when the object landed, he will be patur.

ZEH HAKLAL, KOL CHAYAVEI CHATAOS...

- If one moves something in the RH"R 2 amos b'shogeg, then 2 amos b'meizid, then another 2 amos b'shogeg, **Rabbah** say he is patur and **Rava** says he is chayuv.
 - **Rabbah** says he is patur, even according to **R' Gamliel** who says a realization after performing half a shiur is not considered to be a realization and if the person forgets again, it would be considered the same period of unawareness and would combine with the previous action, that is only when the full shiur was completed at a time of

unawareness. Here, however, the second 2 amos (which bring to the full shiur of 4 amos) are done b'meizid, so he would not be chayuv a chatas.

- **Rabbah** must be discussing where the object was being carried, because if it was thrown, he would be a shogeg because he could not stop the object from going further, and would therefore be chauv a chatas.
- **Rava** says he is chayuv, even according to the **Rabanan** who typically say a realization after half a shiur is considered to be a realization and prevents another period of unawareness from combining with the first one, that is only where one has control of doing the remaining amount of the shiur. However, here he has no control and is therefore still a shogeg and will be chayuv a chatas.
 - **Rava** must be discussing where the object was thrown and that's why he has no control of stopping it from continuing.
- **Rava** says, if one throws an object and it lands in a dog's mouth or in the opening of an oven, he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says he would be patur in these cases?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the thrower did not intend for it to land there, and since it is not 4 tefachim it is not considered a significant place and not considered a "hanacha". **Rava** is discussing where he intended for it to land there and therefore that place is considered significant and landing there is considered a hanacha.
 - We find a similar concept, where **R' Meir** and the **Rabanan** seem to agree that one would be chayuv for carrying something out in their mouth, although that is not a normal method of carrying. However, since the carrier intended to carry out in his mouth, he is chayuv. Similarly, although an area may be insignificant, the thrower's intent to have the object land there gives it significance.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAZOREIK!!!

PEREK HABONEH -- PEREK SHNEIM ASAR

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for even the slightest amount of building, of chiseling a stone, of striking the final blow ("makeh b'patish") with a hammer or with a metal hammer, or for drilling a hole (into which something will be placed).
- The rule is: if one performs a melacha on Shabbos that lasts and is useful as is, he is chayuv.
- **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, one who strikes an anvil with a hammer (even if not striking another object) is chauv.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the slightest amount of building fit for?
 - **R' Yirmiya** says a poor person digs a tiny hole to hide his coins (when done in a house this is considered "building"). We find this was done in the Mishkan, where the sewers dug tiny holes to hide their needles.
 - **Abaye** says, the sewers would not have done that, because that would have made the needles rusty. Rather a poor person makes a tiny stand to hold one pot that he wants to cook. In the Mishkan this was done when a small amount of additional dye was needed, and they would make this stand to cook up the little amount that was needed.
 - **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says, they would not have acted like paupers in the Mishkan. Rather, a homeowner fills even a tiny hole that has formed in his house. In the Mishkan this was done if one of the boards had a worm hole, they would fill it with lead.
- **Shmuel** says, one who sets a stone down into the ground is chayuv.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that only one who cements a stone in place is chayuv?! **A:** The end of that Braisa brings **R' Yose** who says that if one places stones on top of another row of stones he is chayuv. Obviously, there are 3 stages of building a wall, each one for which a person who does it would be chayuv. The bottom row of stones is set in the ground without cement. The middle rows are set with cement. The upper row is simply placed there.

V'HAMISATEIS

- **Q:** Why is one who chisels a stone chayuv (for which av melacha)? **A:** **Rav** says for “building”, and **Shmuel** says for “makeh b’patish”.
 - Similarly, one who makes holes in a chicken coop (for ventilation) is chayuv: **Rav** says for “building”, and **Shmuel** says for “makeh b’patish”.
 - Similarly, one who puts a peg to keep the wooden stick in the metal shovel is chayuv: **Rav** says for “building”, and **Shmuel** says for “makeh b’patish”.
 - All 3 cases are necessary, because we would say **Rav** only says the first one is chayuv for building because that is something needed for typical building, but making holes in a chicken coop is not building. If we would not say the last case, we would say **Rav** says making holes in the coop is building because making ventilation holes is still “building”, but wedging the peg into the shovel is not called “building”. If we would just say this last case, we would think that **Shmuel** only argues in this last case because it is truly not building, but in the other cases, maybe he agrees with **Rav**. That’s why we need all these cases.
- **R’ Yochanan** was asked why one who chisels is chayuv. He pounded his fist into his palm to show it is for “makeh b’patish”. **R’ Nosson bar Oshaya** asked, our Mishna lists chiseling as separate from “makeh b’patish”? He answered, read this to mean that chiseling is “makeh b’patish” (it is one case, not 2 separate cases).
- **Q:** Our Mishna says, one who drills is chayuv. According to **Rav** who says that one who makes holes in a coop is chayuv for building, that’s why the Mishna says he is chayuv, because he is chayuv for building here as well (although something will still be put into this hole, creating the hole is itself significant as “building”). **Shmuel** had said making holes is “makeh b’patish”, so why would he be chayuv here when he is making a hole that is not yet the “final blow”, because he still must place something in that hole?! **A:** The Mishna is talking about where someone made a hole in the wall with a large metal nail that he will leave there to hang things on. Therefore, it is the “final blow”.