



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

Shabbos Daf Tzaddik Aleph

PEREK HAMATZANIA -- PEREK ASIRI

MISHNA

- One who stores less than the amount that is typically stored: of seeds to plant, of an item to use as a sample, or to use for medicinal purposes, and then carries this amount out on Shabbos, he is chayuv. All other people who carry out this amount will not be chayuv unless they carry out the amount that is typically stored.
- If the one who stores that lesser amount took out that amount but changed his mind with regard to using it in the amount that he had originally planned, and therefore brought the item back in, he is not chayuv unless he takes out the amount that is typically stored by people.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna say "One who stores"? Why not say "One who takes out..."? **A: Abaye** says, the Mishna agrees that one who takes it out with intent to use the smaller than usual amount would be chayuv for taking it out even if he had never stored it. The reason the Mishna says "one who stores..." is to teach that if one initially stored an amount less than what is typically stored and then forgot the purpose for which he stored this small amount, but took out this amount on Shabbos, he is chayuv. The Mishna says that he is chayuv because we say that his original intent gives this small amount the significance to make him chayuv for taking it out on Shabbos.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, **R' Meir** would say one is chayuv for taking out even a single kernel of wheat to be planted.
 - **Q:** This is pashut! The Mishna said any minute amount!? **A:** We would think the Mishna means that one could be chayuv for less than the amount of a dried fig, but not for a single kernel.
- **Q: R' Yitzchak the son of R' Yehuda** asks, if the person's intent determines whether he is chayuv for taking out a particular amount, if one decides he wants to empty his entire house into the reshus harabim, he should not be chayuv until he empties the entire house, because anything less than the entire house is not significant to him?! **A:** His intent is disregarded because it goes against the view of the overwhelming majority of people (who consider less than the entire house to be significant).

V'CHOL ADAM EIN CHAYAVIN ALAV ELAH K'SHIURO

- The Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon ben Elazar**. He says in a Braisa, that if Reuvain stores a minute amount and Shimon goes into Reuvain's house and takes out that minute amount, even though Shimon does not consider that amount significant, he is chayuv, because he took that amount from one who stored it and considered it significant.
- **Rava in the name of R' Nachman** said, if one takes out a "grogres" sized piece of food with intention to eat it, and then he changes his mind to use it for planting, or visa-versa, he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** This is pashut! For either intention he has taken out a full shiur!? **A:** We would have thought that the "akira" and the "hanacha" have to have the same intention to combine to make him chayuv. **R' Nachman** teaches us that they don't have to be.
 - **Q: Rava** asks, what if one takes out a half grogres for planting, which then blew up to a full grogres and he then decided that he wants to eat it, not plant it, is he chayuv? Unlike the first case, he did not have the shiur for the later intention at the time of the akirah, so maybe he is not chayuv, but, on the other hand, if he would not have changed his intent he would have been chayuv because he had the required shiur for planting the entire time, so he remains chayuv even though he changes intent along the way?!

- If we will say that he is chayuv because had he kept his original intent he would have been chayuv, what about where he took out an item the size of a groges with intent to eat it, which then shrank to less than a groges and he changed his intent and decided to use it for planting, will he be chayuv? Unlike the last case, here, if would have kept his original intent, he would not be chayuv. On the other hand, at the time of each intent he had the requisite shiur to make him chayuv so he should be chayuv?!
 - If we say that he is chayuv in this last case, what about where he takes out a groges to eat, which shrank to less than a groges and then blew back up to a groges and he then puts it down, is he chayuv? Do we say that at one point in the middle he didn't have the shiur so it negates the akirah and he will no longer be chayuv, or do we say that he had the shiur at the time of the akirah and at the time of the hanacha, and he is therefore chayuv? **TEIKU ON ALL THESE QUESTIONS.**
- **Q: Rava asked R' Nachman**, what is the halacha if one throws a "kezayis" of terumah into a tamei house?
 - **Q:** With regard to what halacha was the question asked? If he is asking regarding transferring from reshus harabim to reshus hayachid on Shabbos, he is not chayuv unless it was the size of a groges! If he is asking whether the kezayis piece will become tamei and will then be able to make other things tamei, the halacha is that only food the size of an egg (larger than a kezayis) can make other things tamei?! **A:** The question is where there was already a little less than the size of an egg of food in the tamei house and he now threw in this kezayis, which combines with the other food and now makes it larger than the size of an egg for tumah purposes. The question is, since this kezayis piece is significant for the tumah (it makes it larger than an egg), maybe we should say that it has overall significance and is considered significant with regard to Shabbos as well, even though it is less than a groges, or maybe one is only chayuv for Shabbos if there is a full groges.
 - **A: R' Nachman** said, we learned in a Braisa, **Abba Shaul** says, one is chayuv for taking out a groges sized piece of the "Lechem Hapanim" or the "Shte Halechem" (brought on Shavuot) on Shabbos. **R' Nachman** says, these breads will become pasul if even a kezayis leaves the Azarah. If so, since the kezayis amount is considered significant for that, it should be considered significant for Shabbos as well!? It must be that for Shabbos we always need the amount of a groges!
 - The Gemara says that this case is very different. Here, it becomes pasul as soon as it leaves the Azarah, but he is not chayuv for Shabbos until he reaches the reshus harabim. Since they don't happen together, two shiurim are apropos. However, in the case of tumah and Shabbos, they both happen at the same time – as it enters the house it becomes tamei and he is chayuv for Shabbos, so maybe it should be the same shiur for both.

CHAZAR V'HICHNISO EINO CHAYUV ELAH K'SHIURO

- **Abaye** explains, the chiddush here is that the person threw the seeds back into his storehouse in a way that they these seeds are recognizable. We may think that because the seeds are recognizable they retain their earlier distinction as something that was set aside to be used in a minute amount. The Mishna tells us that it loses its status as such.

MISHNA

- If one takes food from his house and puts it on the threshold between his house and the reshus harabim, and he or someone else then takes it off the threshold and brings it out into the reshus harabim, all are patur because the melacha was not done at one time.
- If one takes a box full of fruit from the house and placed it on the threshold adjacent to the reshus harabim in a such a way that most of the basket and fruit are in the reshus harabim, he is patur unless he takes out the entire box from the reshus hayachid to the reshus harabim.

GEMARA

- This threshold that the Mishna refers to can't be a reshus harabim (because then the one who brought it there from the house should be chayuv) and it can't be a reshus hayachid (because

then the one who takes it from there into the reshus harabim should be chayuv). It must be that it is a karmelis. The Mishna is teaching us that he is patur because he put it down onto the karmelis. However, had he merely passed through the karmelis on his way from the house into the reshus harabim, he would be chayuv.

- This argues on **Ben Azzai** who says the person would be patur in that case as well.

KUPAH SHEHI MILAY'AH...

- **Chizkiya** says the Mishna is referring to a basket full of cucumbers that are long, and therefore the fruit themselves have not completely left the reshus hayachid. However, if the basket contained small items, like mustard seeds, he would be chayuv for carrying out the items that are completely in the airspace of the reshus harabim. **Chizkiya** obviously holds that being in the basket doesn't accomplish anything, because the items are considered to be out of the basket and in the reshus harabim. **R' Yochanan** says, even if the basket is full of mustard seeds, he is patur. **R' Yochanan** holds, being in the basket accomplishes that it is considered to be in the basket (and we don't view them as separate than the other items in the basket), and as long as part of the basket is still in the reshus hayachid, it is considered as if the items inside have not left the reshus hayachid either.
 - **R' Zeira** says, the Mishna is problematic according to **Chizkiya** and according to **R' Yochanan** for the following reasons:
 - The Mishna says, when one takes out a box of fruit, he is not chayuv until he takes out the *entire* box. It is mashma, even if all the fruits are out of the reshus hayachid, since part of the basket is not, he is patur. This means that being in the basket *does* accomplish something, not like **Chizkiya** said!?
 - **Chizkiya** will explain the Mishna to be referring to a box of cucumbers. It is only then that the entire box must be removed for him to be chayuv, but if the box is full of mustard seeds, he would be chayuv without the entire box being removed, because being in the box doesn't accomplish anything.
 - The Mishna says, when one takes out a box of fruit, even though most of the fruit is in the reshus harabim, he is patur. It is mashma, that if *all* of the fruit was in the reshus harabim he would be chayuv, even though the basket was still partly in the reshus hayachid. This means that being in the basket accomplishes nothing, not like **R' Yochanan** said!?
 - **R' Yochanan** says the Mishna means to say, not only is one patur when most of the fruit is in reshus hayachid, he is patur even if all of the fruit has left the reshus hayachid, until the entire box has left the reshus harabim as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one takes a peddler's box and puts it on the threshold, he is patur even if most of the fragrant spices are in the reshus harabim, until he takes the entire box out. This is problematic according to **Chizkiya**?! **A:** The Braisa is not talking about small bundles of spices, it is talking about long sticks of spices, and is therefore like the case of a basket full of cucumbers, for which one is patur until he removes the entire basket.
 - **Q: R' Bibi bar Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, one who steals a purse on Shabbos is chayuv to pay back the money even though he is also chayuv misah for carrying the purse into the reshus harabim, because he is chayuv for stealing before he is chayuv for Shabbos (he is chayuv for stealing as soon as he lifts the purse and is not chayuv for Shabbos until he removes it into the reshus harabim). However, if he didn't lift the purse, but rather dragged it into the reshus harabim, he is patur from paying back because in that case the chiyuv for stealing and Shabbos come at the same time (because he did not lift it, he is not chayuv for stealing until it leaves the reshus hayachid of the victim). **R' Bibi bar Abaye** asks, if being in the box accomplishes something, then he is not chayuv until the entire purse leaves the reshus hayachid, but he is chayuv for stealing from the time the opening of the purse (which thereby gives access to the items in the purse) and the coins in the purse reach the reshus harabim, even if part of the purse is still in the reshus hayachid (that is the halacha of when one acquires by "meshicha" – dragging out of the reshus of the owner into a new reshus). This must mean that he is chayuv for Shabbos as soon as the coins leave the reshus as well, even though the purse is still in the reshus hayachid. This is problematic according to **R' Yochanan**?! **A:** The Braisa is discussing where the purse

was dragged out bottom first, so the opening was the last part to leave the reshus hayachid. This means there was no access to the coins and therefore he is not chayuv for stealing until the entire purse left the reshus hayachid.

- **Q:** Even if it went out bottom first, since the stitching on the bottom could be ripped open, it is as if the thief has access to the coins and he should be chayuv for stealing as soon as the coins leave the reshus hayachid?! **A:** The Braisa is discussing long pieces of silver which take up the entire space of the purse and don't fully leave the reshus until the purse does.
- **Q:** Presumably, the purse has drawstrings. If so, he is not chayuv for Shabbos until even the drawstrings are taken out of the reshus, but he is chayuv for stealing as soon as the body of the purse leaves the reshus?! **A:** The Braisa is discussing a case where there are no drawstrings, or where the drawstrings were wrapped around the purse, so it leaves at the same time as the body of the purse.