



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf לז – Daf טז

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לז-----43-----

- **R' Yosef** says, the reason **R' Chisda** prohibits placing a keili underneath a chicken laying an egg on an incline, but allows one to place a bowl over an egg on the ground to prevent it from breaking is that **R' Chisda** does not allow one to take a keili and make it become assur to move it (which is what will happen when the muktzeh egg falls into the keili). Placing a bowl over an egg does not prohibit the bowl, because it may still be moved away from the egg on Shabbos.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa says, if a barrel of tevel (which is muktzeh because it can't be eaten) broke on a roof, one may bring a keili and place it underneath the broken barrel, although the keili will then be holding the muktzeh tevel and will become assur to be moved?! **A:** Tevel is not considered muktzeh to prohibit a keili, because if one is oiver on the D'Rabanan and gives terumah and ma'aser from the tevel on Shabbos, it will take effect on Shabbos and will be permitted to be eaten.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says one may place a keili underneath a lamp to catch the sparks?! **A: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, sparks have no substance and therefore don't render the keili immovable.
 - **Q:** A Braisa allows moving a bed or bench to support a broken beam (which is muktzeh)?! **A:** It is only allowed when it is supporting the beam lightly so that the bed or bench can be removed if desired.
 - **Q:** A Braisa allows placing a keili under a leak to catch the water (which is muktzeh)?! **A:** The Braisa refers to a leak in which the water is drinkable and therefore not muktzeh.
 - **Q:** A Braisa allows one to place a basket on the ground so that the birds can climb on and off of it?! **A:** It is mutar to move the basket when the birds go off, and when Braisa says that one may not move it, it is talking about when the birds are still on it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one may not move the basket when the birds are on it or off of it?! **A: R' Avahu** said, that Braisa is discussing when the birds were on the basket the entire bein hashmashos period. Since it is assur B"HM, it remains assur the entire Shabbos.
- **R' Yitzchak** says that one may NOT place a keili (bowl) on top of an egg to protect it. He holds that a keili may only be moved for the sake of a non-muktzeh item.
 - **Q:** All the Braisos we just mentioned allow the moving of a keili for a muktzeh item?! **A:** They are discussing where one needed the place of the keili and had to move it. Once it is anyway being moved, it may be moved in a way that can benefit a muktzeh item as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a bowl may be placed over an egg to protect it?! **A:** This Braisa also discusses where the bowl was moved because its place was needed.
 - **Q:** A Braisa allows placing a mat over stones?! **A:** The Braisa is dealing with sharp stones that can be used for wiping in the bathroom (so they are not muktzeh).
 - **Q:** A Braisa allows placing a mat over bricks?! **A:** The Braisa is dealing with bricks left over from building that can be used on Shabbos for sitting (so they are not muktzeh).
 - **Q:** A Braisa allows placing a mat over a beehive in the summer and the winter as long as one doesn't have in mind to trap the bees?! **A:** The Braisa is discussing where there is honey in the hive and it is therefore not muktzeh.
 - **Q:** In the winter there is no honey and it is therefore muktzeh?! **A:** Even in the winter there are 2 honeycombs which are left in the hive to enable the bees to make it through the winter.
 - **Q:** Those honeycombs are never eaten and are therefore muktzeh?! **A:** We are discussing a case where he had in mind before Shabbos to eat those honeycombs.
 - The chiddush of this Braisa is, that even though he had in mind to eat this honey, he may only put a mat over it if he doesn't have in mind to catch the bees.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Braisa can't follow **R' Shimon**, because he doesn't hold of muktzeh, and it can't follow **R' Yehuda** because he says that even if one doesn't have in mind to catch bees, it would be assur because "davar she'eino miskaven" is assur?! **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Yehuda** and it is only mutar to place the mat on the hive when he leaves room for the bees to escape.
- **R' Ashi** says that the Braisa only permits placing the mat to protect the hive when there is honey inside (so it is not muktzeh). When the Braisa says one may place the mat on the hive "u'vagshamim mipnei hagshamim" (in the rain because of the rain), it does not mean in the winter (like we said before), rather it means in the spring or fall when it rains, one may protect the hive from the rain. In the spring and fall there is honey in the hive and it is therefore not muktzeh.
- **R' Sheishes** says, that **R' Huna** says like **R' Yitzchak**. **R' Huna** says, if there is a "meis" lying in the sun on Shabbos, we may only put up a canopy as shade for a live person, not for the meis. We see that a keili may not be moved for the sake of a muktzeh item (i.e. the meis).
 - The case that **R' Huna** refers to is where a meis is lying in the sun on Shabbos. What we can do is have 2 people sit on the floor, one on each side of the meis. When the floor gets uncomfortable, they can each bring a bed to sit on. When it gets hot in the sun, they can bring a canopy and hold it over their heads. They can then stand up the beds and allow the beds to act as supports for the canopy. They can then each go away and leave the meis protected by the shade of the canopy.
 - If a meis is lying on a bed in the sun, **Shmuel** says one can roll the meis from one bed to the next until the meis is no longer in the sun. **Rav** says one should put a piece of bread or a child on the meis and may then carry the meis away from the sun.
 - **Shmuel** would agree that when bread or a child is available, **Rav's** method is preferable. He just allows rolling the meis when the items are not available. **Rav** does not allow using the method of **Shmuel** even if the non-muktzeh items are not available.
 - **Q:** Maybe this machlokes is the same machlokes as in a Braisa regarding how to move a meis to protect it from a fire. There, the **T"K** says one may not move the meis and **R' Yehudah ben Lakish** says one may move the meis. Maybe they are discussing moving the meis in a roundabout way, and they are arguing about whether that is permitted (just like **Rav and Shmuel**)?! **A:** The Gemara says, it could be that all in the Braisa prohibit moving the meis in a roundabout way. The reason **R' Yehudah ben Lakish** allows moving the meis is because, he feels if we don't allow one to do so, he may come to extinguish the fire to save his meis.
 - **R' Yochanan** paskens like **R' Yehudah ben Lakish**.

EIN NEI'OSIN HEIMENU L'FI SHE'EINO MIIN HAMUCHAN

- A Braisa says, the oil is assur even after the flame has gone out (it was assur bein hashmashos and therefore remains assur all Shabbos). **R' Shimon** says, once the flame has gone out the oil is mutar.

-----Daf 72-----44-----

MISHNA

- One may move a new lamp (that was never used and is therefore not disgusting) on Shabbos, but not one that was previously used (it is disgusting and therefore has no other use).
- **R' Shimon** says, all lamps may be moved on Shabbos, except for a lamp that is currently burning.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says: **R' Yehuda** says, one may move a new lamp on Shabbos, but not an old one (he holds of "muktzeh machmas mius" – something disgusting is muktzeh). **R' Meir** says, any lamp may be moved unless it was burning bein hashmashos (he holds of "muktzeh machmas issur" – something that is a non-permitted use is muktzeh). **R' Shimon** says, any lamp may be moved unless it is currently lit (he doesn't hold of any muktzeh and is only concerned that moving a lit lamp will extinguish it). However, once the fire is extinguished, it may be moved.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“Aval” (but), a cup, bowl or large glass cup that were filled with oil and lit may not be moved even after their fire was extinguished. **R’ Eliezer the son of R’ Shimon** says, one may take oil from a lamp that is in the process of going out, and may use oil that dripped out of a lamp even while the lamp is still burning.

- **Abaye** said, **R’ Eliezer the son of R’ Shimon** holds like his father in that he doesn’t hold of muktzeh. He disagrees with his father in that his father allows use of the oil only after the flame has been extinguished and **R’ Eliezer** allows use of the oil even before the flame is extinguished.
- **Q:** Why may a cup, bowl or large glass cup used as a lamp not be moved even after the flame goes out?
A: **Ulla** said, this is said according to **R’ Yehuda** (although it is stated in the Braisa after **R’ Shimon**) who prohibits moving any lamps.
 - **Q:** **Mar Zutra** asked, if so, what does the word “Aval” (but) mean?! **A:** Rather, **Mar Zutra** said that this was said according to **R’ Shimon**. The reason why these lamps are assur is because they hold a large amount of oil and are expected to burn the entire Shabbos, and therefore no one has in mind to use them the entire Shabbos.
 - **Q:** According to **Mar Zutra**, **R’ Shimon** says a lamp in a bowl is assur even after the fire goes out, but another Braisa says that **R’ Shimon** says that the oil in a “ner” or bowl used as a lamp is mutar to use after the flame goes out!? **A:** **Mar Zutra** refers to a large bowl and the Braisa refers to a small bowl (which is not expected to burn through Shabbos).
- **R’ Zeira** says, in the case of a metal candlestick (which doesn’t get disgusting) which was burning when Shabbos began, but whose fire has since extinguished, **R’ Meir** would say it may not be moved (he holds of “muktzeh machmas issur”), and **R’ Yehuda** would say it may be moved (he doesn’t hold of “machmas issur”, only “machmas mius”).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Yehuda** does not allow one to move a metal candlestick which was burning when Shabbos began and went out!? **A:** We must learn that **R’ Zeira** said, that if the candle was burning when Shabbos began, all would agree (**R’ Meir and R’ Yehuda**) that the candlestick may not be moved on Shabbos.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a bed that was designated to be used to store money may not be moved on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, a new lamp, whose only use is to be lit, may be moved on Shabbos, so a bed, which was only designated for storage of money, but not yet used for that purpose, should for sure be mutar to be moved!? **A:** **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** must have meant, if a bed is designated for storage of money AND money was put there at some point, it is assur to move it on Shabbos. If money was never put there, it is mutar to move on Shabbos. If a bed was not designated for that use, if there is money on the bed, it is assur to move it on Shabbos. If there is no money there, it is mutar as long as there was no money on the bed during bein hashmashos.
 - **Q:** **R’ Elazar** asked, a Mishna says, if a wagon has a detachable wheel, and there is money on the wheel, the wagon may not be moved on Shabbos. This suggests that there is only a problem if there is money on the wheel ON Shabbos, but if there is money on the wheel bein hashmashos it doesn’t seem that there would be a problem!? **A:** This Mishna follows **R’ Shimon** who doesn’t hold of muktzeh. **Rav** holds like **R’ Yehuda** and therefore holds of muktzeh.
 - We see that **Rav** holds like **R’ Yehuda**, because **Rav** allows placing a lamp on a tree on Shabbos (since the lamp is muktzeh and therefore assur to move, it will not lead one to remove it from the tree which would be assur since the person would be using the tree), but prohibits placing a lamp on a tree on Yom Tov (the lamp may be moved and therefore he will end up removing it from and using the tree). Obviously, **Rav** holds of muktzeh.
 - **Q:** **Rav** allowed moving a Chanuka menorah on Shabbos after the flames go out so that certain violent goyim shouldn’t see it (they had decreed against it and would lash out if they saw the decree being violated)?! **A:** **Rav** only permitted that in a time of desperate need (“sha’as hadchak”). **Rav** himself said, we can rely on **R’ Shimon** in this case because of the desperate need to move the menorah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf דף---45-----

- **Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, if one actively showed that he has no intention of using something on Shabbos (e.g., he plants kernels of wheat or puts an egg to warm under a chicken), would the item be muktzeh according to **R' Shimon** since he showed his intent not to use these items on Shabbos? He answered, the only thing **R' Shimon** considers to be muktzeh is the oil of a lamp while it is burning, because it is set aside for the mitzvah (“huktzeh l'mitzvaso”) AND set aside because it is a prohibited use (“huktzeh l'isuro”).
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Shimon** says that “huktzeh l'mitzvaso” is alone enough to make something muktzeh!? A Braisa says that one may not use succah decorations during all 7 days of Succos (because it is huktzeh l'mitzvaso). This Braisa is the view of **R' Shimon**, because we find elsewhere that **R' Shimon** says that one may not take wood from a succah for all 7 days of Succos (because it is huktzeh l'mitzvaso)!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** meant, that **R' Shimon** says there is din of muktzeh when something is huktzeh l'mitzvaso, but only for as long as the mitzvah lasts (e.g., the oil lamp is assur only while the lamp is lit, but once it goes out it is no longer assur). Once the mitzvah is completed, it is no longer assur (even though it was assur bein hashmashos).
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, the only food that is muktzeh according to **R' Shimon** is dried figs and raisins that were put on the roof to dry before Shabbos and are not yet dry. They are inedible and therefore muktzeh.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that all fruit put out to dry are muktzeh!? This must be following **R' Shimon**, because according to **R' Yehuda** there is no chiddush that they are muktzeh!? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Yehuda**. The chiddush is, since he was eating these fruits and took the leftovers to the roof to dry, one would think that it would not become muktzeh (since he was eating from them). The Braisa teaches us, that since they were taken to the roof to dry, they become muktzeh.
- **R' Shimon bar Rebbi** asked **Rebbi**, according to **R' Shimon**, are unripe dates muktzeh? The person did not actively show that he has no intention of eating them on Shabbos, so is it muktzeh or not? **Rebbi** answered, the only foods that are muktzeh according to **R' Shimon** are dried figs and raisins.
 - **Q:** From the fact that **Rebbi** was asked about and answered for **R' Shimon**, it must be that he holds like **R' Shimon**. That is problematic to say, because we find that **Rebbi** does not allow the “shechting” of wild animals on Yom Tov, because they are muktzeh. That means that **Rebbi** holds like **R' Yehuda**!? **A1:** He holds like **R' Shimon**, and **R' Shimon** agrees that wild animals are muktzeh. **A2:** **Rebbi** holds like **R' Yehuda**, but was answering his son according to **R' Shimon** although he doesn't hold like him. **A3:** **Rebbi** holds like **R' Shimon**, and in the case of shechting the animals he was answering according to the **Rabanan** who don't hold of muktzeh.
- **Rabba bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, “they said” the halacha follows **R' Shimon**.
 - **Q:** Does **R' Yochanan** really hold like **R' Shimon**? **R' Yochanan** said that a chicken coop is muktzeh, which means that he holds like **R' Yehuda**!? **A:** He was discussing a coop that had a dead chic, which even **R' Shimon** agrees is muktzeh.
 - **Q:** That is ok according to the view that **R' Shimon** says a dead chic is muktzeh, but what about according to those who say that **R' Shimon** says it is not muktzeh?! **A:** **R' Yochanan** is discussing where a new egg was laid in the coop and therefore it is nolad, which even **R' Shimon** holds is assur.
 - **Q:** What about according to those who say that **R' Shimon** says nolad is mutar? **A:** **R' Yochanan** is discussing a coop that has an egg with a chic in it that has yet to hatch. That is assur even according to that view of **R' Shimon**. So, it is possible that **R' Yochanan** follows **R' Shimon**.
 - **R' Yitzchak the son of R' Yosef** said that **R' Yochanan** paskens like **R' Yehuda**, and **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** paskens like **R' Shimon**. **R' Yosef** said, that must be what **R' Yochanan** meant that “they said” the halacha follows **R' Shimon**. He was referring to **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, but **R' Yochanan** himself hold like **R' Yehuda**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** asked **R' Yosef**, even without that it is clear that **R' Yochanan** follows **R' Yehuda**, because **R' Assi** (a talmid of **R' Yochanan**) didn't move a menorah that fell on his clothing, because he felt it was muktzeh, which he must have learned from his rebbi, **R' Yochanan!** **R' Yosef** replied, that we find a machlokes between **Reish Lakish** and **R' Yochanan** regarding whether one may move a lightweight menorah. However, they both hold, that a heavyweight menorah is assur to move even according to **R' Shimon**. Therefore, the fact that **R' Assi** would not move the menorah could have even been following **R' Shimon**.
 - **Rabbah and R' Yosef** explain that the reason a heavy menorah is assur to move is because a person sets a specific place for a large menorah and doesn't intend for it to be moved. Therefore, it is assur to move it.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked **R' Yosef**, we find other things with set places (like a canopy over a bed) that may be moved, so that can't be why a menorah is assur?! **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, **R' Shimon** only prohibits moving a menorah made of pieces, because moving it may break it apart which will cause someone to put it back together and thereby "make" a keili on Shabbos, which is forbidden.
 - **Q:** Why is a lightweight menorah permitted? The same concern should apply?! **A:** **R' Shimon** prohibits moving a large menorah that *looks like* it is made of pieces, but is truly one piece, because if we were to allow it, people would think they could move a menorah that is truly made of pieces as well, which can lead to it breaking and putting it back together. There was no such gezeirah made for a small menorah that only looks like it is made of many pieces.

-----Daf 17---46-----

- **Q:** How could **R' Yitzchak** say that **R' Yochanan** holds like **R' Yehuda**? We know that **R' Yochanan** always follows a "stam" (anonymous) Mishna, and we brought down a "stam" Mishna a couple of blatt back that deals with a wagon with a removable wheel, and the Mishna said that if there is money on the wheel on Shabbos, one may not move the wagon. This suggest that if there was money on the wheel bein hashmashos, one would be allowed to move the wagon on Shabbos, if the money has since been removed. This follows shitas **R' Shimon!**? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, we must say that the Mishna is discussing a case where there was no money on the wheel for the entire bein hashmashos. In this way, the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda** as well and can fit according to **R' Yochanan**.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that **Rebbi** paskened "for a menorah like **R' Shimon** by a ner".
 - **Q:** Does that mean he allowed moving a menorah just as **R' Shimon** allows moving a ner, or does it mean that he disallowed moving a menorah but allowed moving a ner like **R' Shimon**? **TEIKU**.
- **R' Malkiya** moved a lamp in front of **R' Simlai**, and **R' Simlai** objected. **R' Yosef** moved a lamp in front of **R' Yosef the son of R' Chanina**, who also objected. **R' Avahu** would move a lamp when by **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, but would not move a lamp when by **R' Yochanan**. He held it may be moved (like **R' Shimon**), but out of respect for **R' Yochanan**, would not move a lamp in front of him.
- **Rav Yehuda** said, although an oil lamp may be moved, a lamp fueled by "neift" may not be moved (even according to **R' Shimon**), because it smells so bad and will therefore not be used for anything besides a lamp. **Rabbah and R' Yosef** say that even a lamp fueled by "neift" may be moved.
 - **R' Avya** went to **Rava's** house with dirty shoes and put them on a bed. **Rava** was upset and asked the following question to try and bother **R' Avya**. He asked, why do **Rabba and R' Yosef** allow one to move a lamp fueled with "neift"? **R' Avya** answered that the lamp may be used to cover a keili, and is therefore permitted to be moved. **Rava** asked, then every stone should be permitted to be moved because it too may be used to cover a keili? **R' Avya** answered, the lamp is a keili and may therefore be moved, whereas the stones are not keilim.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, Boruch Hashem, that **Rava** did not embarrass **R' Avya**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, in a Braisa **R' Shimon** allows using the leftover oil of the lamp (he doesn't hold of muktzeh), so why does he pasken that if a bechor animal (which must be given to a Kohen and which may only be eaten once it gets a permanent "mum", which is deemed permanent by an expert in the area of "mumin") gets a "mum" on Yom Tov, it is still muktzeh because there was no thought to use this animal before Yom Tov began?! **Rabbah** answered, a candle will surely go out and the person therefore intends to use the lamp when it does go out. With regard to a bechor; first, who says it will get a "mum"; second, even if it does, who says it will be a permanent "mum"; third, even if it does, who says he will find an expert to examine and permit it?
 - **Q: Rami bar Chama** asks, a Mishna says, a husband may annul his wife's promises on Shabbos and one may be "matir neder" (get a release of a promise from a chochom) on Shabbos for something needed on Shabbos (e.g., if he promised that he won't eat, he can be matir neder on Shabbos to allow him to eat). Since, the wife doesn't know if the husband will annul the promise, the subject of her promise should be muktzeh (like a bechor)?! **A:** A woman only promises subject to her husband's consent. Therefore, when a woman promises she thinks that her husband may annul the promise and she doesn't give up hope from using the subject of her promise.
 - **Q:** What about the next case of the Mishna, where someone must find a chochom to be matir neder? The subject of the promise should remain muktzeh because he doesn't know if he will find a chochom to be matir neder on Shabbos (just like he doesn't know if he will find an expert to permit his bechor)!? **A:** One can have 3 regular people be matir neder for him and he need not wait for a chochom.
- **Abaye** asked **R' Yosef**, we learned that **R' Shimon** does not allow moving a lamp while it is lit because doing so may cause the fire to extinguish. **R' Shimon** holds that a "davar she'eino miskaven" is mutar. If so, since he doesn't intend to extinguish the flame, it should be mutar!? **A: R' Yosef** answered, if an act is only prohibited D'Rabanan, **R' Shimon** says an act that may cause the prohibited act may be done if the result is not intended. However, if the act is prohibited D'Oraisa, **R' Shimon** does not allow an act to be done which may result in the prohibited act, even if the result is not intended.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, **R' Shimon** allows one to wear sha'atnez if he is wearing it to try and sell it and if he does not intend to have hana'ah from it. Sha'atnez is prohibited D'Oraisa, so why does **R' Shimon** allow this act even though he doesn't intend to have hana'ah?! **A:** The reason why **R' Shimon** says a lit lamp may not be moved is because the lamp becomes a "bosis l'davar ha'asur" – it becomes a base which supports a prohibited item (the flame itself is prohibited and the wick, oil and lamp act as a base for the flame), and even **R' Shimon** prohibits moving something which is a base for a prohibited item.

-----Daf 47-----

- **R' Zeira** in the name of **R' Assi** in the name of **R' Yochanan** in the name of **R' Chanina** in the name of **R' Rumnus** said, **Rebbi** allowed him to move a shovel that was used for burning incense, even though it still had ashes (which serve no purpose and are muktzeh) in it, on Shabbos.
 - **R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, could **R' Yochanan** have said this? A Mishna says that on Shabbos one may carry a basket with a rock in it, and **R' Yochanan** said, this is only true if the basket is full of fruit as well (so the basket is not a "bosis l'davar ha'assur" alone, there is mutar fruit which is more valuable than the muktzeh item there as well). So, how could **R' Yochanan** have allowed moving a shovel that is a base for the muktzeh ashes alone?! **A: R' Assi** said, the case was where there was still some leftover incense, so the shovel was a base for the incense as well as the ashes and that is why it was mutar to move.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, this took place in **Rebbi's** house. **Rebbi** was the Nasi and very wealthy. This leftover incense had little value and was of no significance and therefore should themselves be considered muktzeh (the fact that poor people would attach significance to these leftovers doesn't change the fact that in **Rebbi's** house they were insignificant and muktzeh). If so, the shovel is still a base for muktzeh only!? **A: Abaye** says, the reason the shovel was allowed to be moved is because it was like a keili used for excrement, which may be moved and emptied because it is disgusting. Same is with this shovel of ashes.
 - **Q: Rava** asked: 1) a shovel of ash is not disgusting like a keili of excrement; 2) a shovel of ash is covered and a keili of excrement is uncovered. How can **Abaye** say that one is like

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the other?! **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the ashes in the shovel are not muktzeh because they are used to cover dirt. **Rebbi's** chiddush was, that although there were small chips of wood (which are muktzeh) on the shovel, the shovel was mutar to move because of the non-muktzeh ashes that were there as well (which are considered more significant than the wood chips).

- **Q:** A Braisa says that even **R' Shimon** agrees that if an extinguished lamp has pieces of the wick left in it, it may not be moved because the wick is muktzeh and the lamp becomes a base for it (even though the leftover oil is presumably more valuable than the leftover wick)?! **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa was taught in the Galil, where flax was scarce and therefore valuable. That's why the leftover wick was not considered insignificant compared to the leftover oil.
- **Levi bar Shmuel** asked **R' Abba and R' Huna bar Chiya** if one may put together a modular bed on Shabbos. They said that it is allowed. He then repeated this psak to **R' Yehuda** who told him that **Rav and Shmuel** paskened that one who puts together a modular bed on Shabbos is chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one puts together a modular menorah he is chayuv a chatas?! **A: R' Abba and R' Huna** said their psak in regard to a modular bed that fit together loosely, and they follow the shita of **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in another Braisa, who says that if a modular keili fits together loosely, it is mutar to put together on Shabbos.

MISHNA

- One may put a keili underneath a lamp to catch the sparks, but may not fill that keili with water, because that would extinguish the sparks on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Placing the keili there is removing the keili's usefulness for the remainder of Shabbos, which is assur?! **A: R' Huna in the name of R' Yehoshua** said, sparks have no substance, and so the keili may be moved even after the sparks have fallen.

V'LO YITEIN L'TOCHO MAYIM MIPNEI SHEHU MICHABEH

- **Q:** Shall we say that this "stam" Mishna only follows **R' Yose**? **R' Yose** is the one who says that on Shabbos it is prohibited to ward off oncoming fire with barrels of water, because the barrels may break resulting in the water extinguishing the flames. We see that **R' Yose** is the one who is concerned with indirect extinguishing of flames?! **A: R' Yose** only prohibits doing so on Shabbos itself. A Braisa says (and our Mishna presumably agrees) that it is assur to place the keili with water to catch the sparks even on Friday. **R' Ashi** says, the Mishna could even follow the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Yose**. The reason it is assur here is because this is a lot more of a direct extinguishing of the fire.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KIRA!!!

PEREK BAMEH TOMNIN -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- With which materials may we insulate foods for Shabbos and with which may we not?
 - One may NOT insulate with the following, whether moist or dry: "gefes" (leftover pulp in the oil press after the oil has been pressed out), manure, salt, lime or sand.
 - One may NOT insulate with the following, when moist: straw, grape skins, "muchin" (soft materials like cotton, soft wool, worn out clothing), or grass.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Which "gefes" is referred to in the Mishna and is assur because it increases heat – only olive pulp or even sesame seed pulp? **A: R' Zeira in the name of one in the Yeshiva of R' Yannai** said, one may not take food that is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

insulated and place it on top of olive pulp (because that will cause it to increase the temperature). We see that olive pulp is what increases temperature.

- The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It could be that only olive pulp will increase the temperature of something put on top of it, but even sesame seed pulp will increase the temperature of something that it insulates.

-----Daf פ"ד---48-----

- **Rabbah and R' Zeira** were at the house of the Reish Galusa on Shabbos and saw a servant placing a jug of cold water on top of the hot water kettle, attempting to heat the water. **Rabbah** yelled at him to stop. **R' Zeira** asked **Rabbah**, why do you feel that is different than putting a hot water kettle on top of another hot water kettle, which is allowed? **Rabbah** answered, in that case the person is attempting to maintain heat. This servant was trying to heat up cold water!
 - They then saw the servant take his turban and put it over the opening of a jug and put a ladle on it. **Rabbah** yelled at him to stop again. **R' Zeira** asked why **Rabbah** yelled to stop him. **Rabbah** said, wait and see. The servant eventually took the turban and squeezed out the water that it had absorbed (which is assur to do on Shabbos). **Rabbah** explained, using a turban is different than using a cloth made to be spread over a jug, because that other cloth is made for that and therefore will not be squeezed out (it is meant to get and be wet).

V'LO B'TEVEN

- **Q: R' Ada bar Masna** asked **Abaye**, “muchin” which are used for “hatmanah”, are they still muktzeh like other “muchin”, or does their use for hatmanah make it as if they have been designated for that purpose and they are no longer muktzeh? **A: Abaye** answered, a one-time use of “muchin” for hatmanah will not make it designated as such and it will remain muktzeh.
 - A proof to **Abaye** can be brought from a Braisa that says, one may use “muchin” for hatmanah, but they may not be moved. The Gemara says that is no proof, because the Braisa could be saying two, distinct halachos: 1) “muchin” may be used for hatmanah; 2) “muchin” which are *not* used for hatmanah are assur to be moved.
 - **Q:** If so, what is the chiddush? **A:** One would have thought that “muchin” should not be muktzeh, because they can be used as a mat to lay on. The Braisa tells us that they are muktzeh.
- **R' Chisda** allowed the putting back of stuffing into a pillow on Shabbos.
 - **Q: R' Chanan bar Chisda** asked, a Braisa says, “one may open the neck hole of clothing that was closed by the launderer, but may not create a neck hole in a garment for the very first time on Shabbos. One may also not put stuffing into a pillow or mattress on Yom Tov or Shabbos”?! **A:** The Braisa is discussing putting the stuffing in for the very first time. **R' Chisda** permitted returning stuffing to a pillow which previously had stuffing.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, one who creates a neck hole in a garment for the very first time on Shabbos is chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q: R' Kahana** asked, why is this different than cutting the top off of a barrel, which is allowed?! **A: Rava** answered, the barrel cover is made of a separate piece, is considered to be open, and is therefore allowed to be opened. The cloth is fully closed and when an opening is cut in it, a true opening is deemed to have been *created* at that time.
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**: one Mishna says, pieces of clothing that are loosely sewn together by a launderer for washing, are considered to be connected for tumah (if tumah touches one of them, they all become tamei) until one begins to untie them. From here we see that they are considered connected even when work is not being done (even not during the washing). Another Mishna says that if one puts a stick into an ax blade as a handle, they are considered connected for tumah only while work is being done with the ax?! **A: R' Zeira** answered, with the ax, when work is not being done, he takes the stick and throws it with the other pieces of wood. With the sewn clothing, the person is happy to keep it that way in case he needs to wash it again.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, who is the Tanna who holds that when one thing is attached to another it takes on the din of that item? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, we see from a Mishna that it is **R' Meir**. **R' Meir**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

says, if an oven has a small compartment attached to it to hold oil, spices, a lamp or other items, the compartment becomes tamei if the oven becomes tamei through being touched by a tamei item, but the compartment will not become tamei if the oven becomes tamei from a tamei item entering its airspace without touching it (earthenware keilim become tamei in this manner).

- The Gemara explains that **R' Meir** says that D'Rabanan we are goizer that the compartments should become tamei like the oven they are attached to. However, the **Rabanan** were not goizer tumah when the oven becomes tamei from its airspace, because if they would do that, people would think the compartments become tamei D'Oraisa, and would burn terumah based on that tumah.
- A Braisa says, a scissors that comes apart and a carpenter's tool that comes apart, when the pieces are together, they are considered connected for tumah (if one piece is touched by tumah the other piece becomes tamei as well), but are not considered connected for the din of being sprinkled by the "parah adumah" ashes (if one of the pieces is sprinkled upon, it doesn't help for the other piece).
 - **Q:** If they are considered connected, it should be so considered for tumah and sprinkling. If they are not considered connected, it should be so for tumah and sprinkling!? **A: Rava** explains, D'Oraisa they are considered connected for everything while work is being done with them, and considered connected for nothing when work is not being done with them. The **Rabanan** were goizer l'chumrah and said, when together, they are always (during use and not during use) considered connected for tumah, and always not considered connected (whether during use or not) for "parah adumah" purposes.

-----Daf 49-----

B'ZMAN SHEHEIN LACHIN

- **Q:** Are these materials prohibited only when they are naturally moist, or even if one moistens them on his own?
A: The Mishna said, "muchin" are prohibited to use only when moist. This must be that they were made moist, because how can "muchin" be naturally moist?!
 - The Gemara says this is not a proof, because it can refer to the wool in between the animal's legs which is naturally moist due to the sweat of the animal.
 - **Q: R' Oshaya** taught, clothing may not be used for hatmanah when moist. This must be that they were made moist, because how can clothing be naturally moist?! This proves that it is assur even when not naturally moist! **A:** The Gemara says, this can also refer to clothing made from the wool in between the animal's legs, which is naturally moist due to the sweat of the animal.

MISHNA

- One may do hatmanah with clothing, produce (wheat, beans), dove's feathers, sawdust, or fine pieces of flax that are separated during the combing process. **R' Yehudah** prohibits using the fine ones, but allows using the thick ones (the Gemara will explain this statement).

GEMARA

- **R' Yannai** says, wearing tefillin requires a "clean body" like "Elisha Ba'al Kinafayim".
 - A "clean body" means: **Abaye** – one may not pass gas while wearing tefillin, **Rava** – one may not fall asleep in his tefillin.
 - The Romans decreed to prohibit the wearing of tefillin. Elisha wore tefillin and was seen by a Roman officer. The officer gave chase and Elisha removed his tefillin and hid them in his hands. When asked by the officer as to what was in his hands, Elisha responded that he had "dove's wings". He opened his hands and saw that his tefillin had turned into dove's wings. This story is what earned him the name "Elisha Ba'al Kinafayim".
 - He said it was "dove's wings" because Klal Yisrael are compared to a dove. Just like a dove is protected by its wings, so too Klal Yisrael is protected by its mitzvos.

BINSORES SHEL CHARASHIM...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Does **R' Yehuda** prohibit fine sawdust or fine flax combings? **A:** In a Braisa **R' Yehuda** says that fine flax combings are like manure (i.e. it increases the temperature when it insulates). We clearly see that he prohibits fine flax combings.

MISHNA

- One may do hatmanah with animal skins, and animal skins may be moved on Shabbos (whether used for hatmanah or not because they can be used to lay on).
- One may do hatmanah with raw wool, but it may not be moved on Shabbos. What one must do is remove the pot's cover and have the wool fall off.
- If one insulated a pot with raw wool in a box (the pot is surrounded by the wool which loosely lines the box), **R' Elazar ben Azarya** says he should tilt the entire box and spill out the food and should not remove the pot (because the wool will then fall into the place where the pot needs to be returned to and the wool cannot be moved to make place for the pot). The **Chachomim** say he may remove the pot and return it.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Does the Mishna only permit moving the animal skins of a private individual, because he would use them to lay on, but not the animal skins of a seller (one who holds them for sale), because he would not allow his skins to be laid upon, or are the animal skins of a seller mutar to be moved as well? **A:** **R' Yonasan ben Elazar** says, it would seem that only the skins of a private individual are mutar to be moved, because a seller would not allow them to be laid on. **R' Chanina bar Chama** disagreed and said, **R' Yose** would tan and sell skins and would still use them for sitting upon.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that boards of a private individual may be moved on Shabbos, but the boards of a seller may not?! **A:** Sellers are very particular about using their boards and therefore they are muktzeh (but possibly not as particular with regard to their skins).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, animal skins, whether tanned or not, may be moved on Shabbos. Tanned skins only make a difference in that they can become tamei. The Braisa seems to include a private individual and a seller, and says that skins are not muktzeh?! **A:** The Braisa is only discussing a private individual.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't the Braisa differentiate and say, "this is the halacha for a private individual, but a seller's tanned skins are muktzeh"?! **A:** The Braisa did not want to begin discussing the case of a seller.
 - A Braisa says that it is machlokes Tana'im – the **T"K** says the skins of a seller are muktzeh, and **R' Yose** says the skins of a seller are not muktzeh.
- **Q:** What do the 39 Avos Melachos correspond to? **A:** **R' Chanina bar Chama** said they correspond to the 39 melachos that were done for the construction of the Mishkan. **R' Yonasan ben Elazar** said, they correspond to the 39 times in the Torah that it says the words "melacha", "melachto", or "melechtes".
 - **R' Yosef** asked, when the pasuk regarding Yosef says, "Vayavo habaisa la'asos melachto", is that included as one of the 39 times? **Abaye** said, let's bring a Sefer Torah and count to see whether this is one of the 39 or not. **R' Yosef** explained, there is another pasuk regarding the donations of the Mishkan that says "V'hamelacha huysa dayum". One of these two psukim are not included in the count of 39. (Maybe the pasuk by Yosef refers to z'nus, and maybe the other pasuk refers to donations). **TEIKU**.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Chanina bar Chama**. It says, they planted for the Mishkan, so we may not plant on Shabbos. They cut, so we cannot cut. They passed the walls of the Mishkan from the ground to the wagons and from the wagons to the ground, so we may not transfer from a reshus harabim to a reshus hayachid or visa-versa. They passed the walls from one wagon to another with the reshus harabim in between, we may not transfer from one reshus hayachid to another with a reshus harabim in between.

B'GIZEI TZEMER V'EIN MITALTELIN

- **Rava** said, they are only muktzeh if they are not used for hatmanah. If they are used for hatmanah, they are not muktzeh.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says, if the raw wool is used for hatmanah, one must lift the pot cover and let the wool fall off (because it is muktzeh)!? **A1:** **Rava** must mean, the wool is only muktzeh if it is not **designated** to

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be used for hatmanah. If it is so designated, it is not muktzeh. **A2: Ravina** says, using the wool for hatmanah even once removes it from the category of muktzeh. The Mishna is discussing wool that was taken from stock that was held for sale. In that case, even if it was used for hatmanah, it will be put back into stock for sale and therefore is not designated for hatmanah, and remains muktzeh.