

Shabbos Daf Tzaddik Gimmel

- A Braisa says, if two people together carry out something that they each could have carried alone, **R' Meir** says they are chayuv. **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** say they are patur. If they each individually could not have carried it out, **R' Yehuda and R' Meir** say they are chayuv and **R' Shimon** says they are patur. If one was able to carry it by himself and the other could not, all hold he is chayuv (the Gemara will explain which one). What is the point of machlokes between these Tanna'im?
  - A Braisa says, a pasuk says, "Ba'asosah" ("by his committing it") teaches that one is only chayuv for performing an entire act, not for less than an entire act. A Braisa explains, this means, an act that can be done by one person which is performed by 2 people will not lead to a chiyuv chatas. **R' Yehuda** says, if an act cannot be performed by one person and it is therefore done by 2 people, they are both chayuv. If it could be performed by one and is performed by 2, they are patur. **R' Shimon** says, even if one cannot do the act alone, if 2 people perform an act together, they are patur.
    - The point of machlokes is as follows. The pasuk of "Ba'asosah" has 3 exclusionary words. **R' Shimon** says the 3 exclusions teach there is no chiyuv: 1) when one person makes the akirah and another makes the hanacha, 2) when 2 people carry something that each alone could have carried, 3) when 2 people carry something that each alone could not have carried. **R' Yehuda** says the 3 exclusions teach that there is no chiyuv: 1) when one person makes the akirah and another makes the hanacha, 2) when 2 people carry something that each person could have carried alone, 3) when one does an aveirah because Beis Din had mistakenly told him it was permitted, he does not have to bring a chatas (**R' Shimon** says that he would have to bring a chatas). **R' Meir** says, the pasuk only has 2 exclusionary words. He says, these 2 exclusions teach that there is no chiyuv: 1) when one person makes the akirah and another makes the hanacha, 2) when one does an aveirah because Beis Din had mistakenly told him it was permitted, he does not have to bring a chatas. Therefore, he says when 2 people carry something together they are always chayuv.
  - **Q:** The earlier Braisa said, if one person can carry the item alone and another person cannot, and these 2 people carry it together, "he is chayuv". Which one is chayuv? **A: R' Chisda** says it is the one who can carry it on his own who is chayuv, because the other person is not really doing anything.
    - **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked, the other person is helping, so maybe he should be chayuv? **A: R' Chisda** answered, "helping" is not significant and does not lead to a chiyuv.
    - **R' Z'vid in the name of Rava** said, a Mishna is also mashma that "helping" is not significant. The halacha is, a keili that supports the weight of a zav becomes tamei. A Mishna says, if there are cloaks under the feet of an animal upon which a zav is sitting, the cloaks are NOT tamei, because an animal can stand on 3 legs, so each leg is considered to only be "helping" the other 3 legs and not bearing the weight of the zav. We see from here that "helping" is not considered to be significant.
      - **Q: R' Yehuda of Diskarta** said, this is no proof to the concept of "helping". The leg of an animal is different than a second person helping to carry, because the animal often doesn't even put down the 4<sup>th</sup> leg altogether, and it is not even considered to be "helping" and that's why it is considered insignificant and the cloaks are tahor. However, "helping" may be considered significant!? **A:** If "helping" is significant, then the cloaks should be tamei, since the leg that is lifted is not always

the same leg. A Mishna says, if a zav lies along the length of benches or belts, they become tamei (because his weight is placed on them). If he lies on the width of the benches or belts, they do not become tamei (they are not supporting his weight). If he sleeps on the benches or belts, even on the widths, they become tamei because he may have turned himself around on them in his sleep. We see, that for a possibility, we consider them tamei. If so, we should make the cloaks tamei for the possibility that the leg will not be the one lifted! Rather, the reason the cloaks are tahor is because they are considered “helping” which is thought to be insignificant.

- **R’ Pappi in the name of Rava** says, a Mishna is also mashma that “helping” is not significant. **R’ Yose** says in a Mishna that a stationary horse that is carrying a zav is metameh the keilim under its front legs, whereas a similarly situated donkey is metameh via its hind legs (in each case, those are the legs that actually support the stationary animal, and the other 2 legs merely “help” the animal). We see from here that “helping” is not considered to be significant.
- **R’ Ashi** says, a Braisa is also mashma that “helping” is not significant. **R’ Eliezer** says in a Braisa, if a Kohen does the “avodah” with one foot on the floor and one foot on a keili or a stone (a Kohen may not have a chatzitza between his feet and the floor of the Beis Hamikdash while doing the avodah), the avodah is pasul. If one foot is on a keili or a stone, but if the keili or stone was to be taken away, the Kohen would be able to remain standing on the foot which is on the floor, the avodah is valid. This must be because the foot on the keili or the rock was only “helping”, which we see from here is considered to be insignificant.
- **Ravina** says, a Braisa is also mashma that “helping” is not significant. The avodah must be done using the Kohen’s right hand. A Braisa says, if the Kohen received the blood in his right hand, but the left hand was helping, it is valid. We see that “helping” is not considered to be significant.
- **Q:** The earlier Braisa said, if 2 people carry out something that each could have carried out on his own, **R’ Meir** says they are chayuv. According to **R’ Meir or R’ Yehuda**, for the 2 people carrying to be chayuv, does there need to be a minimum shiur for each person carrying or one shiur for both combined? **A:** There is a machlokes between **R’ Chisda and R’ Hamnuna**. One says that one shiur is enough. The other says that there must be a minimum of 2 shiurim for them both to be chayuv.
  - **R’ Pappa in the name of Rava** said, there is proof from a Mishna that only one shiur is needed. A Mishna says, if there are cloaks under each leg of a bed that a zav is sitting on, they all become tamei because each leg is absolutely necessary for the bed to stand, and therefore is considered to be carrying the weight of the zav. The Mishna does not require the full weight of the zav on each leg, so you see that one shiur is enough for all 4! So too by us, one shiur should be enough for both people.
  - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** brings a proof from a Mishna which says, if two people trap an animal that they couldn’t trap alone, they are chayuv. The Mishna does not require them to trap 2 animals (2 shiurim) to be chayuv. We see that one shiur is enough for both people.
  - **Ravina** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that 2 people who together steal and slaughter a sheep or an ox, are chayuv to pay the penalty of 4x or 5x. The Mishna does not require each to steal and slaughter a separate animal. We see that one shiur is enough for both of them.
  - **R’ Ashi** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that 2 people who carry out the reed of a weaver are chayuv. Presumably that is only big enough for one shiur of carrying. We see that only one shiur is required to cause 2 people to be chayuv.
    - **Q: R’ Acha the son of Rava** asked, maybe the reed was big enough to be used to cook 2 easily cooked eggs, and that’s why they are both chayuv?! **A:** If so, why did the Braisa specify a weaver’s reed? It should have just mentioned a regular reed.

- **Q:** Still, maybe we are dealing with a weaver's reed that is large enough to weave 2 things and is therefore considered to be 2 shiurim!?
- A Tanna told R' Nachman, if 2 people carry out a weaver's reed, they are patur, but **R' Shimon** says they are chayuv.
  - **Q:** R' Shimon always says that 2 people who do a melacha together are patur!? **A:** The proper reading should be that the **T"K** says they are chayuv and **R' Shimon** says they are patur.

#### MISHNA

- If one takes out less than the full shiur of food in a keili, he is patur for carrying the food and the keili because the keili is subordinate to the food.
- If one carries out a live person in a bed, he is patur for carrying out the person ("a live person carries himself") and for the bed, because the bed is subordinate to the person.
- If one carries out a meis on a bed, he is chayuv. He would similarly be chayuv for carrying out a kezayis from a meis, or from a neveilah, or a lentil sized piece of a sheretz. **R' Shimon** says he is patur in these cases (he is taking out these sources of tumah, not because he needs them elsewhere, but because he wants to remove them from where they are, which is a "melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufah" – a melacha that is done for a purpose other than the one that the melacha is meant to accomplish).

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one takes out a full shiur of food in a keili, he is chayuv for carrying out the food, but patur for carrying out the keili. If he needed the keili to be taken out for another use as well, then he is chayuv for carrying the keili as well.
  - **Q:** The Braisa said, that although both acts of carrying are done in one period of unawareness, he is chayuv two chataos. It would seem from here that if one ate 2 kezaisim of cheilev in one period of unawareness he will be chayuv 2 chataos! **A: R' Sheishes** said that the Braisa may be discussing where he was a shogeg regarding the food (and is chayuv a chatas for that) and is a meizid regarding the keili (and is chayuv kares or misah for that). So although he is chayuv on both, there is no proof that one can be chayuv 2 chataos for the same aveirah in one period of unawareness.
    - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, the Braisa says "ahf ahl hakli" – he is chayuv "also" on the keili. This suggests that he is chayuv on both of them the same way – i.e. with a korbon chatas?! **A: R' Ashi** said, the Braisa is discussing where he was a shogeg on the food and the keili, and he first found out about one of the aveiros and then later found out about the other aveirah, in which case he would be chayuv 2 chataos (which is the basis of the machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** we discussed some time ago).