



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

Shabbos Daf Tzaddik Vuv

- **R' Assi** says, a Braisa says that the smallest hole that affects the keili status of an earthenware keili is one that is large enough to let liquids in (that would make it passul to use for parah adumah purposes). A hole smaller than that (i.e. one that only lets liquids out) will not affect the status of a complete keili. It will only affect the status of a "gistira" (a broken piece of an earthenware keili that is used to place under a complete, dripping keili). Typically, the gistira can become tamei for its being a gistira. However, if it itself is leaking, it loses its status as a gistira. **Mar Zutra the son of R' Nachman** explained, the reason is, one would not use a second gistira to place under a leaking gistira. He would just throw out the leaking gistira.
- **Ulla** says, there is a machlokes in Eretz Yisroel between **R' Yose the son of R' Avin and R' Yose bar Zavda** regarding how large a hole must be for the seeds planted in that pot to be considered attached the ground and therefore unable to be susceptible to tumah. One says the hole must be the size of a pomegranate, and the other says the size of a small root.
- **R' Chininah bar Kahana in the name of R' Eliezer** said, an earthenware keili with a hole large enough for olives to pass through loses its full tumah status. **Mar Kashisha the son of Rabbah in the name of R' Eliezer** adds, that such a keili would have the same din as a keili of animal waste, stone or clay, which are totally not susceptible to tumah – either D'Oraisa or D'Rabanan. (He argues and says that even if the earthenware keili is designated for holding pomegranates, it would still not become tamei, and when the Mishna says that a keili designated as such is susceptible to tumah until it forms a hole large enough for pomegranates to pass through, that is discussing wood keilim, not earthenware). With regard to saving the contents of the keili from tumas meis by placing a seal over the intended opening, that would work until most of the keili is missing.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMATZNIA!!!

PEREK HAZOREK -- PEREK ACHAD ASSAR

MISHNA

- If one throws an object from a reshus hayachid (RH"Y) to a reshus harabim (RH"R), or visa-versa, he is chayuv.
- If one throws an object from one RH"Y to another RH"Y and there was a RH"R in the middle, **R' Akiva** says he is chayuv, the **Chachomim** say he is patur.
 - The case would be as follows: If there are 2 balconies on either side of the RH"R, one who hands an object or throws an object from one to the other (over the RH"R), is patur. If the balconies are on the same side of the RH"R, and one hands something from one to the other, he is chayuv. If he throws from one to the other, he is patur – because this is how the Levi'im did their carrying of the Mishkan. The wagons (which had a din of a RH"Y) carrying the boards would line up in 2 rows of 2 each and the Levi'im would hand the boards from the front wagon to the back one (not across the RH"R), but they would not throw them.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Where do we find a melacha of carrying *out* (from a RH"Y to a RH"R) written in the Torah? **A:** **R' Yochanan** says, the pasuk tells us that Moshe told the Yidden not to bring donations to the "Machaneh Leviyah" (which had a din of a RH"R) from their tents (which were a RH"Y).
 - **Q:** Maybe he told them not to bring any donations because no more were needed for the Mishkan, but it had nothing to do with Shabbos?! **A:** There is a gezeirah shava of "havara, havara" from Yom Kippur to this announcement of Moshe, which teaches that

just like Yom Kippur is a day of forbidden melachos, so too the day of announcement was Shabbos, a day of forbidden melachos.

- **Q:** Where do we find that carrying *in* (from a RH"R to a RH"Y) is assur? **A:** It's based on a "s'vara". The Torah prohibited transferring from one reshus to another. The same way it is assur to carry out, it is assur to carry in. There is no reason to say that one is more assur than the other. The difference would be that carrying out would be an "av melacha" and carrying in would be a "toldah".
 - **Q:** Carrying in and carrying out are both assur and make one chayuv a chatas. If so, with regard to what is carrying out an "av melacha" and carrying in a "toldah"? Calling one an "av" and the other a toldah makes it that they are under the same umbrella melacha, which then means that if one performs both of these melachos in one period of unawareness, he will only be chayuv one chatas.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** says that if one performs an "av" and its toldah he is chayuv 2 chataos. According to him, why is carrying out an "av" and carrying in the toldah? **A:** There is truly no legal significance in the titles. The melachos that were significant in the Mishkan are called an "av", the melachos which were of less significance are called a toldah. Or, the melachos that are mentioned in the Torah are called an "av" and those not listed in the Torah are called a toldah.
- **Q:** Where do we know the din that one who throws an item 4 amos in RH"R is chayuv? **A: R' Yoshiya** says, the weavers would throw their needles to each other.
 - **Q:** Weavers don't use needles?! **A:** The sewers of the curtains would throw their needles to each other.
 - **Q:** Maybe they sat next to each other? **A:** If that was so, they would have hit each other with their needles as they worked.
 - **Q:** Maybe they sat apart, but within 4 amos of each other? **A: R' Chisda** explains, the weavers would throw the spool of thread back and forth across the weaving machine. Although they held onto the string as it was thrown, so they never totally left go, at the end of the spool, the spool was let go and was thrown across the machine.
 - **Q:** The area within the weaving machine is considered to be a "makom petur", and one would therefore not be chayuv for throwing across such an area?! **A:** We learn out throwing 4 amos from the weavers who would throw the spools 4 amos to another weaver who needed another spool.
 - **Q:** Maybe they sat next to each other? **A:** They couldn't be near each other, because if they were they would get in the way when they each would have to pull the end of the curtains tight.
 - **Q1:** Maybe they were within 4 amos (from east to west), but were pulled apart a little (north to south) so that they didn't get in each other's way?! **Q2:** Also, **Luda** taught in a Braisa that each craftsman had his own supplies and didn't need to take from another!? **Q3:** Even if we accept this last answer, that only teaches us regarding throwing 4 amos, it doesn't teach us regarding one who simply carries something 4 amos in reshus harabim?! **A:** All forms of transferring 4 amos in reshus harabim are learned via a Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the "Mekosheish" (the one who was mechalel Shabbos in the Midbar and was therefore put to death by stoning) was put to death for carrying wood 4 amos in the reshus harabim. A Braisa says he cut wood from the ground. **R' Acha the son of R' Yaakov** said he gathered wood (the melacha of "me'amer").
 - The difference between these opinions is relevant to a statement made by **Rav. Rav** found a hidden scroll of **R' Chiya** in which was written that **Issi ben Yehuda** said there are 39 avos melachos, and there is one among them which does not carry the death penalty. According to this, **R' Yehuda** is certain that this one melacha is not carrying, the Braisa is certain that it is not detaching from the ground, and **R' Achah bar Yaakov** is certain that it is not "gathering" (because they each believe that that is the one that caused the Mekosheish to be put to death).
- A Braisa says, **R' Akiva** said, based on a gezeirah shava we can learn that the Mekosheish was Tzela'fchad. **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah** said to him, you are going to have to answer for what you just said, whether you are correct or not. If you are incorrect, you have just spoken falsely and

derogatorily about the tzadik Tzela'fchad! Even if you are correct, the Torah purposely hid his identity and you exposed it!

- **Q: R' Akiva** has a gezeirah shava, so the Torah didn't conceal his identity?! **A: R' Yehuda** didn't learn this gezeirah shava from his Rebbi.
- **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda**, if Tzela'fchad wasn't the Mekosheish why did he deserve to die? **A:** He was from the people who went up to fight Kina'an after Moshe told them not to go, and they were then defeated by the goyim.
- After Miriam and Aharon spoke lashon harah about Moshe, the pasuk says that Hashem got angry at "them" and He left, and Aharon turned to Miriam and saw that she had tzara'as like snow. **R' Akiva** says, Aharon also got tzara'as, because the pasuk says Hashem got angry at "them". **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah** said to him, you are going to have to answer for what you just said, whether you are correct or not. If you are incorrect, you have just spoken falsely and derogatorily about the tzadik Aharon! Even if you are correct, the Torah purposely hid this and you exposed it!
 - **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah** says, the "them" just tells us that Hashem was angry at Aharon, but not that he got tzara'as.
 - A Braisa also says that Aharon got tzara'as. The pasuk says Aharon "turned to Miriam and saw she had tzara'as". This means he turned from his own tzara'as.