



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

### Shabbos Daf Kuf Chuf Hey

- A Braisa says, the broken pieces of an old oven (an oven that was heated up at least once, which is the final process of making an oven): **R' Meir** says they have a din like all other keilim that may be moved around a courtyard. **R' Yehuda** says they may not be moved. **R' Yose** testified in the name of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** that these pieces may be moved on Shabbos, and that the cover of an oven does not need a handle to be considered non-muktzeh.
  - **Q:** What is the base of the machlokes?
  - **A1: Abaye** says, **R' Meir** says the broken pieces are mutar when they can perform any function, and **R' Yehuda** says they are mutar only when they can perform a function similar to the original keili.
    - **Q: Rava** asks, if this is correct, why do they argue about the broken pieces of an oven, they should argue about the broken pieces of any keilim?!
  - **A2: Rava** says they are arguing regarding the broken pieces of a very specific oven discussed in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if an oven is placed over a ditch (typically, an oven is built as a cylinder attached to the ground, where the fire is lit on the ground in this cylinder and the pot is placed on top of the cylinder or the bread is placed on the wall of the cylinder) in a way that the fire which would be lit on the floor of the ditch will be able to heat up the entire oven, **R' Yehuda** says, the oven can be mekabel tumah (**R' Yehuda** says that an oven must be attached to the ground in order for it to be mekabel tumah, and in this situation it is considered to be attached to the ground). The **Chachomim** say, even if the fire in that case will not heat the oven effectively, the oven can be mekabel tumah (the **Chachomim** say an oven can be mekabel tumah even if it is not attached to the ground). The machlokes in the Braisa is about pieces from an oven not attached to the ground. **R' Yehuda** says they are muktzeh since the oven never became an "oven". The **Chachomim** say the broken pieces are considered keilim since they came from the oven which the **Chachomim** consider to be a keili.
    - They argue in how to expound a pasuk. The pasuk says, if an oven becomes tamei, it must be "demolished". **R' Yehuda** says the pasuk is teaching that only an oven that can be "demolished" can be mekabel tumah, and only something that is attached to the ground can be said to be "demolished". Therefore, to be mekabel tumah the oven must be attached to the ground. The **Chachomim** say, the pasuk continues and says "They are tamei and shall remain tamei to you". These seemingly extra words teach that any oven is mekabel tumah – whether or not it is attached to the ground.
      - The **Chachomim** say the word "demolished" teaches that *even if* it is attached to the ground it is mekabel tumah. We would think that if it is attached to the ground it is like the ground and therefore not mekabel tumah at all.
      - **R' Yehuda** says that extra words in the pasuk teach that the oven needs to be attached to the ground only during the first time it is heated (which makes it into an "oven"). Once that is done, it can be mekabel tumah even if it is a portable oven.
      - **Ulla** explains, the **Rabanan** would hold that even the first heating need not be done while attached to the ground.
    - **Q: R' Ashi** asks, if this is the machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and the **Chachomim**, why do they argue about the broken pieces? They should argue about the oven itself!?

- **A3: R' Ashi** said, the machlokes is like we said originally, whether to be non-muktzeh the broken pieces can serve any function or they must serve a similar function to the original oven, and we are discussing where the broken pieces (by being heated from underneath) can serve as heating tiles on top of which something can be baked or cooked. **R' Meir** is saying to **R' Yehuda**, I really hold that as long as the broken pieces serve any purpose, they are not muktzeh. But you, who require a similar function to the oven, must at least agree with me that broken pieces that can serve as heating tiles are considered a similar function and therefore are not muktzeh! **R' Yehuda** says, I do not agree. Heating tiles do not serve in the same function. Ovens are heated from within and these are heated from underneath. Ovens bake bread when they are attached to their walls vertically. These bake bread when the bread is lying on them horizontally.
- **Ravina** said, we in the city of Mechasya, who allow the moving of an oven cover that does not have a handle, follow the shita of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** in the Braisa.

#### MISHNA

- A stone that is placed in a hardened shell which is being used as a pail to draw water (the shell is too light and needs the weight of the stone to bring it under the water to allow it to fill up with water), if the stone will not fall out when drawing water (it is attached to the shell), it has a din of a keili as well and is not muktzeh. If the stone would fall out when drawing water, the stone and the shell are muktzeh (the stone is not considered a keili and the shell is a base for the stone).
- If a branch is attached to a pitcher used to draw water, it may be used to draw water on Shabbos.
- **R' Eliezer** says, a window shutter may be placed to close the window on Shabbos if the shutter is attached to the building and does not drag on the floor when it hangs. The **Chachomim** say, the shutter may be placed to close the window even if it is not attached at all.

#### GEMARA

- A Mishna says, if one placed a stone on a barrel as a cover and he wants to remove that stone on Shabbos, he must tilt the barrel to the side and have the stone fall off (he can't simply lift the stone and remove it).
  - **Rabbah says in the name of R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan**, one may tilt the barrel only if he forgot the stone on the barrel before Shabbos. However, if he left it there intentionally, the barrel becomes a base for the muktzeh stone and may not be moved. **R' Yosef says in the name of R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan**, one must tilt the stone off only if he forgot it there. However, if he left it there intentionally before Shabbos, it is considered a cover to the barrel and may be removed by simply lifting it.
    - **Q: Rabbah** says, we see from our Mishna that the stone becomes a keili along with the shell. According to **Rabbah's** version of **R' Yochanan**, why doesn't the stone become a keili with the barrel as well? **A: Rabbah** answers, the Mishna discusses where the stone is securely fastened to the shell. Here, the stone was simply placed on top of the barrel.
    - **Q: R' Yosef** says, we see from our Mishna that if the stone is not attached to the shell, it is muktzeh. According to **R' Yosef's** version of **R' Yochanan**, why does the unattached stone get a din of a keili? **A: R' Yosef** answered, placing a stone in the shell without attaching it makes the shell unusable to draw water. Therefore, the shell becomes nothing more than a place to store the stone. However, the mere placing of a stone on a barrel makes it useful as a cover and therefore is considered a keili.
    - The machlokes between **Rabbah in the name of R' Ami**, and **R' Yosef in the name of R' Assi** is based on whether a significant act is needed to designate something as a keili. **Rabbah** says it is needed and therefore, the mere placing of a stone on the barrel will not give it the status as a keili. **R' Yosef** says that even a small act is enough, and the act of placing the stone on the barrel is enough of an act to classify it as a keili.

- We find that **R' Ami and R' Assi** argue regarding this elsewhere as well. **Rebbi** was once walking on Friday and he found a row of stones and that were meant to be used for building (which would make them muktzeh on Shabbos). Some say that **Rebbi** told his talmidim, have in mind that we will sit on these tomorrow (to remove them from being muktzeh), but he did not require that any action be taken. **R' Yochanan** says that **Rebbi** required the talmidim to do an act: **R' Ami** said **Rebbi** required them to set up the stones so that they would not have to be moved on Shabbos (since there is no significant act that could be done to them, they would remain muktzeh and would not be allowed to be moved on Shabbos), and **R' Assi** said **Rebbi** required the students to wipe the stones (a very minor act, which was enough to make them non-muktzeh)
  - **R' Yose ben Shaul** said, the story with **Rebbi** happened with a stack of beams (not a row of stones). **R' Yochanan ben Shaul** said the story happened with a long wooden pole that sailors use to test the depth of the water at a given place.
  - If one says **Rebbi** allowed the use of the sailors' pole with an insignificant act, **Rebbi** would certainly allow use of a stack of beams with an insignificant act. However, if one says **Rebbi** allowed use of the beams with an insignificant act, it could be that he would not have allowed use of the sailors' pole with an insignificant act because sailors are very particular that it not be used for anything else, and it therefore would remain muktzeh until a significant act is done.

#### ZEMORAH SHE'HI KESHURA...

- The Mishna says that the branch was tied to the pitcher. It seems that if it was not tied it would not be permitted.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one had palm branches that he was going to use for firewood (which is muktzeh on Shabbos) and then decided he wanted to use them to sit on (which is not muktzeh), the **T"K** says, he must tie a bundle together before Shabbos to show that he is no longer using it for firewood. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, all he needs to do is intend to use it for sitting, and he need do no more. Does our Mishna (which says the branch must be tied before Shabbos) not follow **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, our Mishna is talking about where the branch is still attached to the tree. In that case, even **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** would agree that it must be tied before Shabbos to be considered non-muktzeh.
    - **Q:** If it is still attached to the tree, how can he use it? **A1:** We are discussing a branch that is within 3 tefachim to the ground, which is considered like the ground itself and is not a problem. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said we are discussing a branch that is detached. The reason it must be tied is because we are afraid that if it is not tied one may end up cutting it down to the size that he needs.

#### PIKAK HACHALON...

- **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan** said, all agree that one is not allowed to erect even a temporary roof on Yom Tov, and surely not on Shabbos. They only disagree with regard to making a temporary addition to an existing structure. **R' Eliezer** says one may not do so on Yom Tov, and certainly not on Shabbos, and the **Rabanan** say one may do so on Shabbos, and certainly may do so on Yom Tov.