



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

Shabbos Daf Tzaddik Tes

SH'TEI GEZUJTIRA'OS...

- **Rav says in the name of R' Chiya**, the areas underneath the wagons, in between the wagons, and on the "sides" of the wagons (from the side wall of the wagon to the wagon wheel) have a din of RH"R.
- **Abaye** says, the space between the 2 parallel wagons was equal to the length of a wagon – which was 5 amos.
 - **Q:** Why did the wagon have to be 5 amos long? If the boards were piled on their width (which were 1.5 amos wide), the maximum number of piles could be 3, for a total wagon length of 4.5 amos needed. If they were piled on their depth (which was one amah) there could be up to 4 piles (some room was needed for the rings, so a fifth pile would be impossible). In either case, a total length of 4 and a half amos would have been enough!? **A:** It was important for the boards not be pressed up against each other and to have some space. Therefore, 4 and a half amos would not have been enough.
- **Rava** says, the 2 sides of the wagon together, were as wide as the wagon itself – which was 2 and a half amos.
 - **Q:** A width of 1 and a half amos for the wagon would have been enough!? The boards were placed with their length over the wagon's width, so wider didn't help for that. For the chance that they would need to place the length of the board on the length of the wagon, the board would then be placed on its width or depth, for which 1 and a half amos is sufficient!? **A:** The wider base of 2 and a half amos helped to keep the boards more sturdy with less risk of falling off.
- **Q:** We learn from the travelling of the wagons that a RH"R is 16 amos wide. However, the width of the 2 wagons with the space in between was only 15 amos wide. How do we get to a RH"R being 16 amos wide?! **A:** The "16th amah" was added as a half amah to each outer side of the wagon to allow a Levi to walk next to the wagon and straighten a board that was at risk of falling as it travelled.

MISHNA

- A ditch that was dug in RH"R, around which the dirt that was dug up was placed as a mound, and a rock in the RH"R, either of which are 10 tefachim tall with an area of 4x4 tefachim, if one takes something from them and brings it into the RH"R, or places something from the RH"R onto them, he is chayuv. If the mound or the rock are smaller than these dimensions, he is patur.

GEMARA

- Why does the Mishna mention the case of a mound of dirt around the ditch, which is essentially the same as the case of a rock? The Mishna should say "a ditch and a rock" where one is teaching about an above ground structure and the other is teaching about one below ground?! From the fact that the Mishna mentions this, the Mishna seems to be a proof to **R' Yochanan** who says that the ditch and the mound around it can combine to make the necessary height of 10 tefachim to classify the ditch as a RH"Y.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Yochanan** as well. The Braisa says, if there is a ditch which is 10 tefachim deep with an area of 4x4 in the RH"R and the ditch is filled with water, one may not draw water from it on Shabbos unless he places partitions around the adjacent area to make that area a RH"Y as well. One may also not lean over and drink over the ditch unless he leans his head and most of his body over the ditch (in which case the **Rabanan** were not goizer that he may carry the water out of the airspace of the ditch).

The Braisa ends off by saying, a ditch and its mound of dirt around it combine to make the necessary dimensions for a RH"Y.

- **Q: R' Mordechai** asked **Rava**, if one throws an object from the RH"R onto a board which is 4x4 tefachim and 10 tefachim high (clearly a RH"Y), is he chayuv because he has transferred an object from a RH"R to a RH"Y or is he patur, because the object landed onto the RH"Y from a "makom petur" (from an area above 10 tefachim in the RH"R)?! **A: Rava** said this can be answered from our Mishna. **R' Mordechai** then asked **R' Yosef** and then **Abaye** and both gave him the same answer. He was not convinced. **Abaye** said to him, our Mishna says, if one places an object onto the area that is 10 tefachim high with an area of 4x4 he is chayuv even though the object had to go through a "makom petur" to land on the rock! **R' Mordechai** responded, our Mishna may be discussing a needle, whose height is so small that it is not considered to have entered into a "makom petur".
 - **Q:** Even a needle has some height and therefore, however small, has nonetheless entered into the "makom petur"?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the rock has a ledge that is less than 10 tefachim off the ground, but because it is part of the rock, it too gets a din as a RH"Y. Or we can say that the Mishna is discussing a rock that has a crevice and it is therefore possible that the needle reached the top of the rock via this crevice, without ever making it into the "makom petur".
- **Q: R' Yochanan** asks, does the top of a wall that encloses an area and makes the area into a RH"Y automatically have a din of a RH"Y as well, or is it a makom petur unless it is 4x4 tefachim on its own? **A: Ulla** answered, it is a kal v'chomer! If it has made the enclosed area into a RH"Y, it certainly becomes a RH"Y as well.
- **Q: R' Yochanan** asks, if there is a ditch that is only 9 tefachim deep and someone digs out an additional tefach of dirt and throws that dirt into the adjacent RH"R, is he chayuv because at this moment the ditch is 10 tefachim deep and therefore a RH"Y, or is he patur because the ditch was not a RH"Y before the dirt was lifted? **Q2:** If we say that he is patur because it was not a RH"Y before lifting the dirt, what about if the ditch is 10 tefachim deep and he takes dirt from the RH"R and throws it into the ditch thereby making it less than 10 tefachim? Is he chayuv because he threw dirt from a RH"R into a RH"Y, which doesn't lose its status until after the hanacha has already taken place, or do we say that it loses its status as a RH"Y as the hanacha takes place and he is therefore not chayuv? **A:** The Gemara says we can answer the second question from an explanation that **R' Yochanan** gave elsewhere. A Mishna says, if one throws an item below 10 tefachim at a wall 4 amos away in the RH"R, he is chayuv. **R' Yochanan** explained, the Mishna is discussing where a cake of figs is thrown, so that it does not bounce off the wall and back within 4 amos of the thrower, rather it sticks to the wall exactly 4 amos away. According to **R' Yochanan**, this means that the figs never actually go the full 4 amos. They stick to the wall and protrude back into the 4 amos, and yet he is chayuv. His throwing makes the "wall" less than 4 amos away and he is still chayuv for it. This seems to be the same case as where he throws dirt into the 10 tefachim deep ditch and he should be chayuv!
 - The Gemara says, this case is different because the figs are not meant to be left and become abandoned to the wall. The dirt that is thrown into the ditch is meant to be left and abandoned there, and that's why it may be considered to become part of the ditch.
- **Q: Rava** asks, if there are poles 10 tefachim high in the RH"R and one throws a board that is 4x4 tefachim on top of the poles (thereby creating a RH"Y), is he chayuv for throwing the board up or not?
 - **Q:** This seems to be the same question as **R' Yochanan**, whether one is chayuv for an action that creates the reshuv?! **A: Rava** is asking where one threw up the board with another object already on that board. His question is, even if we say that one is patur for throwing up the board alone, is he chayuv for the object on top of the board? Maybe, since they are thrown together, if he is patur for the board he is patur for the object as well. On the other hand, since it is impossible that the object does not bounce off the board when it lands, it is as if the RH"Y is created with placement of the board and the object is then placed into an established RH"Y when it lands?! To that question, the Gemara says **TEIKU**.
- **Q: Rava** said, it is clear that taking water off of water is considered an akira, because that is its natural state of resting. It is also clear that a nut floating in the water is not considered to be

resting. **Rava** asks, if a nut is in a keili which is floating on water, is the nut “at rest” because it sits in the keili, or is it not at rest because the keili is floating? **TEIKU**.

- Oil on top of water is subject to a machlokes between **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** and the **Rabanan** as to whether the oils is one with the water and therefore “at rest” or, because it doesn't mix, it is considered to be floating on the water.