



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

Shabbos Daf Chuf Tes

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, regarding fueling a fire on Yom Tov:
 - **R' Yehuda** says one may fuel a fire with whole keilim, but not with pieces of a keili that broke on Yom Tov (these broken pieces were “created” on Yom Tov from a complete keili and are therefore clearly “nolad”). **R' Shimon** allows fueling even with broken keilim as well (he holds that nolad is not assur).
 - **R' Yehuda** says one may fuel a fire with whole dates, but not with date pits (although they existed before Yom Tov, they were well hidden at the onset of Yom Tov and are now exposed and are therefore nolad). **R' Shimon** allows the fueling with date pits as well (he doesn't hold of nolad).
 - **R' Yehuda** says one may fuel a fire with whole nuts, but not with nut shells (although they were exposed at the onset of Yom Tov as well, since they were considered food for as long as they were protecting food and now they are not, they are considered nolad). **R' Shimon** allows the fueling with nut shells as well (he doesn't hold of nolad).
 - The Gemara says, **R' Yehuda** didn't hear this directly from **Rav**, but rather inferred it from a ma'aseh. **Rav** once ate dates and threw the pits into a fire. **R' Chiya** told him, if today would be Yom Tov, that would be assur. **Rav** did not argue back. **R' Yehuda** felt that this meant that **Rav** agreed that the case of date pits is a case of nolad.
 - **Q:** Is **R' Yehuda** correct that **Rav** agreed to **R' Chiya**? **A:** On Yom Tov, **Rav** would throw his date pits to the animals. If he held they were nolad, he wouldn't be able to do that. We see that he did not agree.
 - **Q:** The dates that **Rav** ate may have been the type that cannot be fully separated from their pits, and the reason it wasn't nolad was because of the fruit that remained on it.
 - **Q:** **R' Shmuel bar bar Chana** asked **R' Yosef**, according to **R' Yehuda** who says that lighting with broken pieces of keilim is assur, how can lighting with complete keilim be mutar? As soon as the keili begins to burn it becomes a broken keili, which would make it assur to the then stoke the fire!? **A:** He would have to add other wood or fuel and be mevatel the keili by making it a minority of the fuel of the fire.
- **R' Hamnuna** explains the machlokes in the Mishna between **R' Eliezer** and **R' Akiva** (whether a beged formed into a wick is mekabel tumah) as follows. The Mishna is discussing a cloth that was less than 3x3 *tefachim*, that was put to an insignificant use (e.g. to plug the pipes of a bathhouse, to use to handle hot pots, or to clean a mill) and was then hung on a peg or the back of a door. **R' Eliezer** says, the fact that he hangs it up shows there is significance and it therefore keeps its beged status and can be mekabel tumah. **R' Akiva** says, the insignificant use makes it lose its beged status and it is therefore not mekabel tumah.

MISHNA

- A person may not fill an egg shell with oil, make a hole in it and place it on top of an oil lamp so that the oil in the eggshell will feed into the lamp on Shabbos, because we are afraid that he may remove some oil from the eggshell on Shabbos and thereby be oiver for extinguishing the fire. **R' Yehuda** permits it (he feels a gezeira is unnecessary). If a potter attaches the two, even the **T”K** agrees that it may be used (since it is one piece he will not come to take oil from it on Shabbos).
- The same machlokes will apply when the upper contraption with the oil and the hole is made out of pottery.

- A person may not fill a bowl with oil, place it next to an oil lamp and stick one part of the wick into that bowl (in that way it wicks in the oil in that bowl as well) because of the same gezeirah as above. **R' Yehuda** permits this case as well.

GEMARA

- All 3 cases are necessary. In the first case the oil doesn't get disgusting, so there is more of a reason to be goizer, and yet **R' Yehuda** is not goizer. In the second case, the oil gets disgusting so one would think that the **T"K** is not goizer. In the third case, the contraption is not above the lamp, so there is more reason to be goizer, so we must be taught that **R' Yehudah** is still not goizer.

V'IHM CHIBRAH HAYOTZER MI'TICHILA MUTAR...

- A Braisa says, even if the owner attaches it himself, it is good enough. When the Mishna says that a "potter" must attach it, it means that it must be attached well, as if a potter had done it.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said his lenient shita is based on a ma'aseh. He was in Nitze's house with **R' Tarfon** for Shabbos, the people made this eggshell contraption, and **R' Tarfon** did not say anything. **R' Yehuda** said, we see that **R' Tarfon** allows this! The **Chachomim** said, that the people of Nitze's house were zrizim and that is why they were not goizer in that case.
- **Avin of Tzipora'ah** dragged a bench on a marble floor in front of **R' Yitzchak ben Elazar** on Shabbos. **R' Yitzchak** said, I must protest or else people will think I am ok with this. This is not allowed, as a gezeirah for a soft floor where the dragging would cause a groove to be made.
- The head of the shul in Batzra dragged a bench in front of **R' Yirmiyah Rabbah**. **R' Yirmiyah Rabbah** said, this may not be done, because even **R' Shimon** who allows dragging when a groove will be made, only allows it for large items which can't be carried, so there is no choice. But, a small item, like this bench, must be carried. **Ulla** disagrees and says that **R' Shimon** allows in all cases.
 - **Rabbah** brings a Mishna which shows that **R' Shimon** allows one to wear sha'atnez as long as he does not intend to benefit from it, even though he has an alternative to actually wearing it. From here we see that **R' Shimon** allows what might be thought of as an aveirah as long as there is no intent, even though there is an alternative. This refutes **R' Yirmiyah Rabbah**. **TEYUFTA**.