



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

### Shabbos Daf Tzaddik Hey

V'CHEIN HAGODELES...

- **Q:** For which melacha is a woman chayuv when she braids her hair, paints her eyes or combs her hair? **A: R' Avin in the name of R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, braiding is chayuv for weaving, painting is chayuv for writing, and combing is chayuv for spinning.
  - **Q:** The **Rabanan** asked, this is not the normal performance of any of these melachos?!  
**A: R' Avahu** says painting is chayuv for dyeing. Braiding and combing are chayuv for building. This is called building like we find that **R' Shimon ben Manasya** says, the pasuk says Hashem "built" Chava, and he explains that to mean that Hashem braided her hair.
- **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, a woman who braids, paints or combs her own hair and eyes is patur, but a woman who does this for another woman is chayuv (she does a much better job on someone else).
  - He also says in the name of **R' Eliezer** that a woman may not apply blush on Shabbos because it is assur under the melacha of dyeing.
- A Braisa says, one who milks an animal, strains milk, or makes cheese, in each case in the amount of a dried fig, is chayuv. If one sweeps a floor, sprinkles water to keep the dust settled, or removes honeycombs from a hive: **R' Eliezer** says he is chayuv D'Oraisa. The **Chachomim** say it is assur D'Rabanan.
  - **R' Nachman bar Gurya**, when asked, explained that milking is chayuv for the melacha of milking, straining milk for the melacha of straining milk, and making cheese for the melacha of making cheese. They told him, your rebbi did not explain that to you well. He went to Beis Medrash and was told, milking is chayuv for "mefarek" (extracting), straining the milk is chayuv for "borer" (choosing), and making cheese is chayuv for "boneh" (building, because the cheese is pressed together and "built")
  - **Q:** Why does **R' Eliezer** say that one is chayuv for removing a honeycomb? **A: R' Elazar** says, the pasuk compares a forest to honey to teach that just like one who removes a tree from a forest is chayuv for reaping, so too is one who removes a honeycomb from a hive.
  - **Ameimar** allowed sprinkling to settle the dust in Mechuza. The reason it is normally assur is because by doing so one fills in the holes in the floor. However, in Mechuza the floors were made of stone, and therefore this reason didn't apply.
  - **Rabbah Tosfa'ah** saw that **Ravina** was suffering from the floating dust. He asked him, why don't you do like the Braisa suggests: wash your face in one corner, your hands in another corner and your feet in another corner, and have the splashing and dripping settle the dust? He answered, I was not aware of this (or I don't hold of this – Rashi).
  - A Braisa says, the wife or daughter of a talmid chachom can settle the dust by washing the dishes all around the house.
  - Since we pasken like **R' Shimon**, that an unintended act is permitted, we can sprinkle directly to settle the dust, and we are not concerned that the holes may get filled.

MISHNA

- If one pulls a plant out of a perforated flowerpot, he is chayuv (it nourishes from, and is therefore considered attached to, the ground). If he pulls a plant out of a flowerpot with no hole, he is not chayuv. **R' Shimon** says he is patur in either case.

GEMARA

- **Abaye** asked **Rava**, from here it seems that **R' Shimon** says there is no difference between a flowerpot with a hole and one without a hole. However, in a Braisa **R' Shimon** says, the only difference between these 2 flowerpots is that the seeds in a pot without a hole are considered

totally detached from the ground and can therefore become susceptible to tumah (“muchshar lekabel tumah”) if they get wet. The seeds in a pot with a hole are considered attached to the ground for this purpose and are therefore not susceptible to tumah even if made wet. We see that **R’ Shimon** says there is a difference between the two, not like he says in our Mishna?! **A: Rava** answered, **R’ Shimon** says that the seeds and plant in a perforated pot are considered totally detached, except for this din of tumah, which **R’ Shimon** learns from a pasuk, to treat differently.

- **R’ Zeira** was asked, if the root of a plant in a perforated pot is directly opposite the hole, what will **R’ Shimon** hold? **R’ Zeira** remained quiet and did not answer. The one who asked **R’ Zeira** later heard **R’ Zeira** say that if the pot had a hole large enough to make it lose its status of tumah (to do so, it typically needs to have a hole large enough for olives to pass through), even **R’ Shimon** would agree that the plant is considered to be attached to the ground. He therefore asked **R’ Zeira**, if you were unsure about how **R’ Shimon** would pasken when the root was directly opposite the hole (with no keili in between), how can you say that **R’ Shimon** would say that if there is a hole large enough to make it not be considered tamei, that even the roots not opposite the hole in the pot are considered attached to the ground?!
  - **Abaye** said, what **R’ Zeira** meant was, if the pot has a hole that will prevent it from being able to hold a revi’is of liquid, then it is considered fully attached to the ground, because it is no longer considered to be a keili on any level.
- **Rava** said, there are 5 stages of holes in an earthenware keili:
  - If it has a hole that only lets out liquid, it cannot become tamei as a broken keili (which is used as a drip tray under a leaking keili), but otherwise is considered to be a full-fledged keili (it can even be used for parah adumah purposes).
  - If it has a hole large enough to let in liquids, it can no longer be used for parah adumah purposes, but seeds that are planted in it are still considered detached from the ground and can become susceptible to tumah if they become wet.
  - If it has a hole as large as a small root, seeds planted in it are considered attached to the ground and are not susceptible to tumah, but the keili can still be mekabel tumah because it is fit to hold olives.
  - If it has a hole large enough to fit olives through, it can no longer become tamei (and loses its tumah status if it was tamei) unless it is now designated (or was previously designated) to hold pomegranates.
  - If it has a hole large enough to fit pomegranates through, it can no longer become (or remain) tamei. However, even with such a large hole, if its intended opening is covered with a sealed cover, the contents in this keili will not become tamei from a meis unless most of the keili is broken off.
- **R’ Assi** said, I heard that the size of a hole that will cause an earthenware keili to lose tumah status is the size of a pomegranate. **Rava** said, maybe you heard that once the hole is the size of a pomegranate, sealing the intended opening with a cover will no longer save its contents from tumas meis?
  - **Q: Rava** himself said that sealing with a cover prevents tumas meis until most of the keili is missing?! **A: Rava** said that a seal helps until most is missing by a large keili. With regard to a smaller keili, once there is a hole large enough to fit a pomegranate through, sealing the intended opening will not help to prevent tumas meis from effecting the contents.