



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

Shabbos Daf Kuf Yud Zayin

- **R' Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva** said, the **Rabanan** said, our Mishna allows the saving of the encasement along with the sefer even if there is money in the encasement. We see that since we allow the saving for honor of the sefer, we allow the person to benefit as well by saving the money. The same should be with skinning the animal. Since the skinning serves the purpose of doing the mitzvah in the best possible way (discussed yesterday), we allow it even though it also helps the person by removing all the skin and giving full access to all the meat.
 - **Q:** Moving the money is an issue of muktzeh – only a D'Rabanan. Skinning the animal is a true melacha D'Oraisa, and therefore cannot be compared to the case of our Mishna?!
A: **R' Ashi** said, **R' Yishmael** and the **Rabanan** argue regarding both aspects – whether one may skin the entire animal although it involves an actual melacha, and second, whether, if the skin was not fully removed, may one move the partially skinned animal from the sun to the shade to prevent spoilage of the meat (**R' Yishmael** says it may not be moved because the skin is muktzeh and therefore the animal may not be moved on account of the skin, and the **Rabanan** say that it may be moved). It is about this second aspect (of muktzeh) that the **Rabanan** bring a proof from our Mishna's allowing the encasement with the money to be moved for the sake of the sefer. They say, that here too, the skin should be allowed to be moved for the sake of the meat.
 - **Q:** The encasement is acting as a base for a permitted item (the sefer) and that is why it may be moved. However, the skin is acting as a base for the meat, which itself is muktzeh, since it will be not be eaten until after Shabbos (Tosfos explain it is muktzeh because before it was slaughtered it was muktzeh, although at this point it would not be muktzeh)!? **A:** The Gemara explains, the **Rabanan** are saying, since one may take an encasement which has money in it and move it with the sefer in it to carry it out to safety (the encasement is not acting as a base solely for a permitted item), the skin should likewise be allowed to be moved for the sake of the meat to prevent it from spoiling.
 - **Q:** The encasement is a base for a prohibited as well as a permitted item, and that's why it may be moved. The skin is a base for only a prohibited item – the meat!? **A:** The **Rabanan** are saying, since we are allowed to bring an encasement with money in it to place the sefer in it to carry it to safety, we see that one can move the encasement which (at that time) is a base for only a prohibited item, and yet it may be moved for the sake of saving the sefer. Similarly, the skin should be allowed to be moved with the meat, although it is only a base for a prohibited item, because doing so will save the meat from spoiling.
 - **Q:** Where do we see that an encasement with money may be moved to place a sefer in it? We can't say that since we can save the encasement with the money if it already had a sefer in it, we can also bring an encasement with money to place a sefer in it, because the reason if the sefer is in the encasement we don't require removal of the money is we are afraid that will cause a delay and risk burning the sefer. However, if one is bringing an encasement which does not yet have a sefer in it, he can shake out the money as he is bringing it to the sefer?! **A:** **Mar bar R' Ashi** says, the machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and the **Rabanan** is, like we said originally, only regarding whether the animal may be fully skinned. Although we asked that the proof from our Mishna is flawed because our Mishna discusses a D'Rabanan and skinning an animal is a D'Oraisa, we are discussing a case

where the person doesn't want the skin (so it is a "melacha she'eino tzricha l'gufah") and therefore the skinning is only assur D'Rabanan as well.

- **Q:** Although he doesn't want the skin, he is inevitably skinning (it is a "psik reisha") in which case all agree that it would be assur D'Oraisa?! **A:** The case is where he cuts off the skin in thin strips, which is an unusual way of skinning and therefore only assur D'Rabanan.

U'LIHEICHAN MATZILAN OSAN...

[The houses of those times would open up into a "chatzer" (courtyard). A number of courtyards would then open up into a "mavui", which in turn would open into the reshus harabim.]

- **Q:** What is an "open mavui" and what is a "closed mavui"?
- **A: R' Chisda** says, if the mavui is enclosed with walls on 3 sides and the remaining side has 2 "lechis" (vertical posts, one on each end of the opening to the reshus harabim), that is called a "closed mavui" (which all permit the sefer to be carried into). If there is only one "lechi" on the open side, it is called an "open mavui" (which **Ben Beseirah** allows the sefer to be brought into).
 - There is a machlokes how a mavui with 3 walls must be adjusted to permit carrying within it. **B" S** say there must be a "lechi" (vertical pole at the edge of the opening) and a "korah" (horizontal pole across the top of the opening). **B" H** say it needs *either* a lechi or a korah. **R' Eliezer** says it needs two "lechis".
 - According to **R' Chisda**, the **Rabanan** and **Ben Beseira** follow **R' Eliezer**. The **Rabanan** say no leniency was allowed for saving a sefer and the 2 "lechis" are necessary. **Ben Beseirah** says that we allowed saving the sefer into the mavui even if there is only one lechi.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asks, 1) although it would not typically be permitted by **R' Eliezer** unless there are two "lechis", a mavui with three walls and one lechi cannot be said to be "open"! 2) According to the way the **Rabanan** were explained, there are no leniencies for the sefer, so why can one only save a sefer, he should be allowed to carry whatever he wants into that mavui?!
- **A2: Rabbah** therefore says, a mavui with 2 parallel walls and a lechi on each open side is a "closed mavui". A mavui with 2 parallel walls and a lechi on only one of the open sides is an "open mavui".
 - According to **Rabbah**, the **Rabanan** and **Ben Beseira** follow **R' Yehuda** who says that one may carry in a mavui with 2 parallel walls and a lechi on each open side. The **Rabanan** say that a sefer may be saved into such a mavui. **Ben Beseira** says we are even more lenient when it comes to saving a sefer and even if there is only one lechi, one may save a sefer into it.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, according to the **Rabanan** there are no leniencies for the sefer, so why can one only save a sefer? He should be allowed to carry whatever he wants into that mavui?!
- **A3: R' Ashi** therefore says, a mavui with 3 walls and one lechi is a "closed mavui". A mavui with 3 walls and no lechis is an "open mavui".
 - According to **R' Ashi**, the **Rabanan** and **Ben Beseira** follow **R' Eliezer**. They both say that although **R' Eliezer** requires 2 lechis to permit carrying, to save a sefer a leniency will apply. The **Rabanan** say that leniency allows the absence of one lechi. **Ben Beseira** says the leniency allows the absence of both lechis.

MISHNA

- One may save the amount of food needed for the 3 Shabbos meals from a fire on Shabbos – food fit for humans may be saved for humans and food fit for animals may be saved for the animals.
- If the fire breaks out before the Friday night meal, he may save enough for 3 meals. If it breaks out in the morning before the daytime meal, he may save enough for two meals. If it breaks out before the 3rd meal, he may save enough for one meal.
- **R' Yose** says, no matter when the fire breaks out one may always save 3 meals worth of food. (Food may only be saved into a fully adjusted mavui with no leniencies (unlike a sefer). Food is

also not muktzeh. In truth, much more food could be saved if not for a gezeirah to be explained in the Gemarah. Therefore, the minimum of 3 meals is always allowed).

GEMARA

- **Rava** explains, in truth much more food should be allowed to be saved. The reason we only allow 3 meals worth is because if he can save whatever amount he wants, he will get very caught up in his effort, will forget it is Shabbos and will extinguish the fire. To prevent that from happening, we only allow 3 meals to be saved. That will remind him that it is Shabbos and he will not come to extinguish the fire.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa says if one has a barrel of wine that broke on a rooftop, he is allowed to place a bowl on the ground of the courtyard to catch the dripping wine, but he may not hold the bowl to catch the wine midair or hold the bowl at the edge of the roof to catch the wine as it drips off. Why don't we let him save the wine in those ways? What melacha are we trying to prevent from happening? **A:** If we allow him to save however he wants, he may forget it is Shabbos and bring additional bowls from the reshus harabim. Limiting the way in which he can save the wine will prevent him from forgetting it is Shabbos.
- The Braisa (partially quoted above) says: if one has a barrel of wine that broke on a rooftop, he is allowed to place a bowl on the ground of the courtyard to catch the dripping wine, but he may not hold the bowl to catch the wine midair or hold the bowl at the edge of the roof to catch the wine as it drips off. If he has guests that he needs wine for, he can even use a bowl to catch the wine midair or at the edge of the roof. However, he must have guests before he does that. He can't do that and then invite guests, rather he should first invite guests and then save the wine in that manner. He may not make a "trick" by inviting guests who he knows have already eaten and will therefore not drink all the wine he is saving (and in that way try and save more wine). **R' Yose bar Yehuda** says one may employ this "trick".
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if an animal and her child (which may never be slaughtered on the same day) fall into a ditch (where there is a risk it may get harmed if left there) on Yom Tov, **R' Eliezer** says he may lift one animal out of the ditch in order to slaughter it, but the second one must be left in the ditch (since it can't be slaughtered that day). **R' Yehoshua** says he may lift the first one out of the ditch in order to slaughter it. He may then use a "trick" and decide that he rather slaughter the second animal instead and lift the second animal out of the ditch. He may then slaughter whichever one he wants. Maybe we can say that **R' Yehoshua** who allows using the "trick" holds like **R' Yose bar Yehuda**, and **R' Eliezer** holds like the **T"K**? **A:** It could be that **R' Eliezer** doesn't allow using a "trick" in this Braisa because he can still feed the animal in the ditch and there is no serious financial loss. However, in the case of the wine, maybe he would allow using a "trick". And, it could be that **R' Yehoshua** only allows using a "trick" in this case because the animal is in pain ("tzar balei chaim"), but would not allow using a "trick" in the case of the wine.
- A Braisa says: if one saved high quality bread from the fire, he cannot now go back and save another 3 meals worth of low quality bread by saying that he rather have the low quality bread (because no one would want that). However, if he saved low quality bread, he may go back and save 3 meals worth of high quality bread. If a fire breaks out on a Yom Kippur which fell on a Friday, he may save food for the coming Shabbos. However, if a fire breaks out on Shabbos and the next day is Yom Kippur, one may not save food for after the fast. Certainly one may not save food from Shabbos for a Yom Tov or even for the following Shabbos.
- A Braisa says: if one forgot to take bread out of the oven, and Shabbos has already begun, he may take out enough bread for 3 meals, and may tell others to come and take 3 meals worth for themselves as well. However, he should not remove the bread with the flat shovel that is typically used, rather he must remove it from the oven walls with a knife.
 - **Q:** Why can't he use the flat shovel? **R' Yishmael** taught in a Braisa that using the shovel to remove bread from an oven wall is not a melacha, it is a skill. If so, why can't it be used? **A:** Although it is not a melacha itself, since it is a weekday activity, the **Rabanan** felt that one should perform it as differently as possible because it is Shabbos.

- **R' Chisda** says, the pasuk teaches us that one should wake up early on Friday to prepare for Shabbos.
- **R' Abba** says, the pasuk says "lechem mishneh" ("double bread"), which teaches that one should cut open two breads at each Shabbos meal. **R' Ashi** saw **R' Kahana** make the bracha on two breads but only cut open one, because the pasuk says "laktu" ("they gathered a double portion", so having 2 is enough, without cutting both open).
- **R' Zeira** would cut an initial piece of bread for himself that would be large enough for what he would need for the entire meal (this showed honor for the Shabbos meal by showing that he wanted to eat a lot in honor of Shabbos).
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, doing so is ravenous and improper?! **A:** He answered, since he only did this on Shabbos, it was apparent that this was done for the honor of Shabbos and for no other reason.
- When **R' Ami** and **R' Assi** would have the bread used for an eiruv, they would use that bread to make the bracha for the Shabbos meal. They said, since one mitzvah was done with this bread, let another mitzvah be done with it as well.