

Shabbos Daf Pey Beis

- **R' Huna** asked his son **Rabbah** why he didn't go learn by **R' Chisda**. **Rabbah** replied that **R' Chisda** doesn't teach Torah, he discusses mundane matters. For example, he taught that when going to the bathroom, one should not sit down and force out the wastes quickly, one should also not strain himself when in the bathroom, because doing so may cause the "teeth" (the muscles) around that area to become dislocated and would put the person in a "sakanah". **R' Huna** said to **Rabbah**, **R' Chisda** is dealing with things that effect life itself, and you call it "mundane" matters? For sure you should go and learn by **R' Chisda**!
- If one has a choice to use a stone or broken pottery in the bathroom on Shabbos, **R' Huna** says he should use a stone (although it is muktzeh, it is better than putting oneself into a sakanah), **R' Chisda** says he should use the pottery (better than using something that is muktzeh).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that, if given the choice, one should use broken pottery rather than a stone, in the bathroom on Shabbos?! **A:** **Rafraim bar Pappai** explained, that can be discussing the broken rim of a keili, which is smooth and therefore not dangerous to use.
- If one has a choice to use a stone or grass, **R' Chisda** and **R' Hamnuna** argue. One says to use a stone (because moist grass is sharper and more dangerous, or because using the grass while attached to the ground may end up detaching it from the ground) and the other says to use grass (without detaching it, rather than to use a stone which is muktzeh).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, using a flammable thing to clean oneself in the bathroom leads to the "teeth" of that area to fall out?! **A:** The one who says to use grass is talking about moist grass, which is not flammable.
- One who holds himself back from going to the bathroom, **R' Chisda** and **Ravina** argue. One says it causes bad breath. One says it causes bad smelling perspiration.
 - A Braisa says that one who eats when he needs to use the bathroom is like an oven which is lit without first clearing the ashes, and it leads to bad smelling perspiration.
- If one needs to use the bathroom, but can't (e.g. constipation), **R' Chisda** says he should repeatedly stand up and sit down. **R' Chanana** from **Naharda'a** says he should move from place to place and try to relieve himself. **R' Hamnuna** says, he should rub a stone around that area. The **Rabanan** say he should not think about it.
 - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked, if he doesn't think about it, he certainly will not be able to relieve himself!? **A:** **R' Ashi** explained, the **Rabanan** mean, he should not think of anything *else*, but that.
 - **R' Yirmiya M'Difti** saw an Arab who repeatedly stood and sat and ultimately was able to fully relieve himself.
- A Braisa says, if one is planning on entering a long meal (and doesn't want to have to leave in middle to go to the bathroom), he should walk 4 amos, ten times, after each 4 amos checking to see if he can relieve himself. Some say he should walk 10 amos, four times and check after each 10 amos. When done, he should go and begin his meal.

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for taking out earthenware that is large enough: **R' Yehuda** says, to be used to place in between beams of wood that are being piled up (the earthenware is placed as a space filler to prevent warping of the wood); **R' Meir** says, to be used to pick up a burning coal with it; **R' Yose** says, to be used to hold a revi'is of liquid.
 - **R' Meir** says a pasuk, although not a full proof, may lend support to his view. In the pasuk, the Navi tells the Yidden that their hope for protection by trusting in the Egyptian king will crumble like a wall whose crumbled pieces will be so small to the point of no use. The pasuk says one will not even find a piece large enough to pick up fire.

- **R' Yose** said, that is not a proof to **R' Meir**, because the pasuk ends off that one will not even be able to find a piece large enough to hold water.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Logic would say that **R' Yose's** shiur is a larger one, but from the fact that the pasuk first says one will not find a piece large enough to hold a coal and then says, or a piece large enough to hold water, it would seem that **R' Yose's** shiur is smaller!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Meir** is referring to a piece large enough to take a coal from a large bonfire. Therefore, his shiur *is* larger than **R' Yose's** shiur.

R' YOSE OMER MISHAM RA'AYA

- **Q: R' Yose** has a valid point, that his shiur is also mentioned in the pasuk, which would mean that his shiur is also considered to be a significant piece!? **A: R' Meir** explains the pasuk to mean, not only will there be no useful pieces (like the size needed to hold a coal), there will not even be smaller pieces. The pasuk, however, does not mean to say that the smaller piece is significant and should lead to a chiyuv chatas for carrying it out into the reshus harabim.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMOTZI YAYIN!!!

PEREK AMAR R' AKIVA -- PEREK TESI'I

MISHNA

- **R' Akiva** asked, from where do we know that an idol is metameh one who carries it (even without touching it) just like a nidah? He answers, the pasuk says about idols that they should be "cast away like a nidah". Just like a nidah is metameh one who carries her, so too an idol is metameh one who carries it as well.

GEMARA

- A Mishna says, one whose house shares a common wall with an avodah zarah, and that common wall falls down, he may not rebuild it, because he is thereby benefitting the avoda zarah. What he must do is build a new wall 4 amos into his own property (he fills the empty space that is left with garbage or thorns so as not to benefit the avodah zarah). If the wall was on shared property, he begins counting the 4 amos from the halfway point of the wall. The stones, wood and dirt from the wall: the **T"K** says are metameh like a sheretz (through touching, but not through carrying), because in regard to avoda zarah the pasuk says "Shakeitz T'shaktzenu", which we are darshening to mean that it should be treated like a sheretz. **R' Akiva** says they are metameh like a nidah (through carrying as well as touching), because in regard to avodah zarah the pasuk says, "Throw them away like a nidah", and he darshens, just like a nidah is metameh through carrying, so too avodah zarah is metameh through carrying as well.
 - **Rabbah** says that the Torah tells us to totally distance ourselves from avodah zarah ("Tizreim" – throw them away, and "Tzei tomar lo" – tell them to go out) which means we must be very stringent with regard to avodah zarah. Therefore, **Rabbah** explains the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Akiva** as follows. He says all agree that an avodah zarah is metameh through carrying, because the pasuk compares it to a niddah. They argue in whether there is also a more stringent form of tumah on avodah zarah – namely the tumah of "Ehven Mesameh" (this means that if, for example, a niddah sits on a rock that is supported on pegs, and there is a pillow underneath that rock, even though the rock is not leaning on the pillow, the pillow becomes tamei). **R' Akiva** says this type of tumah exists by an avodah zarah in the same way as it does for a niddah (since the pasuk compares the two). The **T"K** says that it does not exist by avodah zarah just as it does not exist by a sheretz (since the pasuk compares the two).
 - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva**, why does the pasuk compare avodah zarah to sheretz? **A:** The comparison is for the service items of the avodah zarah, which are only metameh like a sheretz.
 - **Q:** According to the **T"K**, why does the pasuk compare it to nidah? **A:** To teach that avodah zarah is metameh through carrying like a nidah.

