



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf 70 – Daf 71

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

-----Daf 70---64-----

- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that sackcloth is more stringent than material in that it can become tamei as a woven material. The Gemara now asks, a regular material also becomes tamei when woven?! **A:** The Braisa meant to say that sackcloth of a minimal size becomes tamei even though it is NOT woven.
 - **R' Yochanan** explains, this is so because even a few strings of this it is fit to be used as a necklace for a poor girl.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that sackcloth can become tamei from a sheretz. From where do we know that the straps used around the animal's chest and belly can also become tamei from a sheretz? We learn it from the extra word "**Oy sak**". One would think we should include other strings as well, the pasuk therefore says "Sak" – just like sackcloth is made from spun and woven threads, so too other things included in the pasuk must have spun and woven threads. This excludes other strings.
 - The Braisa then says, by tamei meis the pasuk says "**v'chol** kli ohr". The extra word teaches that the chest and belly straps can become tamei from a meis. One would think to include other strings in this tumah as well (although strings don't become tamei from a sheretz, one would think that they become tamei from a meis which is a more stringent tumah). The Torah teaches us a gezeirah shava to sheretz which teaches, that just as only spun and woven threads become tamei from a sheretz, the same limitation will apply to tamei meis, and just like the chest and belly straps become tamei from a meis, so too they become tamei from a sheretz. The word "**Oy sak**" teaches that even horse tail and cow tail hairs become tamei from a sheretz.
 - Even though we used these extra words earlier to teach about the chest and belly straps, we only used it for that before we knew of the gezeirah shava.
 - The Braisa continues and asks, how do we know that the tail hairs also become tamei from a meis? Although you can say that sackcloth is tamei from a meis and from a sheretz, so just like when sackcloth becomes tamei from a sheretz, the tail hairs become tamei as well, so too when it becomes tamei from a meis, the tail hairs are tamei as well, that is not a good way to learn this, because we can say that sheretz is a form of tumah that only lasts until evening and that form of tumah is much more common than tumas meis, which is a 7-day tumah. Maybe that's why the tail hairs are tamei by a sheretz. Therefore, the Torah teaches a gezeirah shava ("begeg v'ohr"), that just like the tail hairs are tamei from a sheretz, they are tamei from a meis as well.
 - The words used in this gezeirah shava are "extra" words. If they weren't, we would be allowed to refute the gezeirah shava. We would refute it by saying that sheretz tumah is more stringent in that it makes something tamei even if the sheretz is only the size of a lentil. But, because the words are extra, we can't refute it.
 - The words are extra because it says those same words by tumah associated with "shichvas zera", which is written immediately before the tumah of a sheretz. We could have learned the din of "begeg" and "ohr" from there. The Torah wrote it again by sheretz to make it "extra" for use in the gezeirah shava.
 - The "begeg" and "ohr" by tumas meis is also extra, because a tumas meis is compared in a pasuk to tumah from shichvas zera and could be learned from there. The Torah repeats it by tumas meis to make it "extra" for the gezeirah shava. Now the words of the gezeirah shava are "extra" on both sides and therefore cannot be refuted.
- The Torah tells us that the Yidden took the jewelry of the Midyanim and gave it to Hashem. Some of the jewelry that they gave were called "Agil", which were worn over the chest of the women, and the "kumaz" which were worn over the private parts of the women.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The pasuk says that Moshe got angry when he saw them giving the jewelry to Hashem. **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** explained, Moshe thought that they were mezaneh with the Midyanim and were offering this as an atonement. They explained to Moshe that they were not mezaneh, but were offering it as an atonement in case they had even thought about doing an aveirah with them.
 - In the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** they taught, that the Yidden of that time needed an atonement because they looked at the Midyanim women with lust.
 - **R' Sheishes** said, the pasuk lists the outside jewelry (rings) with the inside jewelry (the “kumaz”) to teach that one who stares at the small finger of a woman is as if he stared at the private area of a woman.

MISHNA

- A woman may go out with strands of hair braided into her hair, whether they are from her own hair, another woman’s hair, or an animal’s hair.
- She may go out with a “totefes” or “sarvatin” when they are sewn into her hat.
- She may go out with a kavul (woolen hat) or a wig in the courtyard.
- She may go out with material (e.g. cotton) in her ear, or in her shoe, or to protect her clothing when she is a niddah.
- She may go out with pepper, a clump of salt, or anything else that was put in her mouth, as long as she doesn’t place it into her mouth on Shabbos or return it to her mouth on Shabbos.
- A false, golden tooth, **Rebbi** says is mutar for her to go out with it, and the **Chachomim** say is assur.

GEMARA

- The Mishna needed to mention all 3 types of hair, because if it would have only mentioned her own hair, we would have said only her own hair is mutar because it is not considered disgusting, but someone else’s hair may not be allowed because it is disgusting (and people may make fun of it which would cause her to remove it and carry it). That’s why the Mishna had to say that another’s hair is permitted. If we would have said that, we would think that an animal’s hair is not permitted because it is not human hair and therefore more at risk to be made fun of and removed.
- A Braisa says, a young girl may not go out with hair of an older woman (it is disgusting to her to have white hairs) and an older woman may not go out with the hair of a young girl (although people may like that, others may still make fun of it). There is no real reason to mention the first case once we mention the second case, but once we mention one we mention the other.

B’KAVUL UVIPAYAH NACHRIS L’CHATZER

- **Rav** said, anything that a woman may not walk out with into the reshus harabim is similarly assur to walk out with into the chatzer, except for the kavul (woolen hat) and the wig. **R' Anani bar Sasson in the name of R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, all the items may be worn in a chatzer.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says that the kavul and wig may be worn in a chatzer. This suggests that the other items may not be worn into a chatzer!? **A:** **R' Anani** said his statement in the name of **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose**, who is a Tanna and can argue on the Mishna.
 - **Ulla** explains that **Rav** allows these 2 items to be worn in the chatzer so that she should be allowed to wear some form of accessory and thereby not become disgusting to her husband.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, any time that something is assur because of “maros ayin”, the prohibited act is assur even in private.
 - This is actually a machlokes Tannaim. A Braisa says if one’s clothing becomes wet on Shabbos, the **T”K** says he may lay them out in the sun to dry, but not in front of people. **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** prohibit him to do so even not in front of people.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rami bar Yechezkel** taught a Braisa that says that the material must be tied to her ear, so that there is no risk of it falling out and being carried.

U'VIMUCH SHEBI'SANDALA

- **Rami bar Yechezkel** taught a Braisa that says that the material must be tied to her shoe, so that there is no risk of it falling out and being carried.

U'VIMUCH SHE'HISKINA LAH L'NIDASA

- **Rami bar Chama** thought to say that this needs to be tied to her body. **Rava** said, even if it is not tied to her it is mutar, because even if it were to fall out it would never be picked up (it is disgusting).
 - **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Abba**, what if the “moch” has a handle, so it is not so disgusting to carry it? Does such a “moch” have to be tied down? He answered that it is still mutar because it is still disgusting.
- **R' Yochanan** went to shul with a “moch” in his ear (without tying it down) and the other **Chachomim** in the Yeshiva disagreed with his doing that. **R' Yannai** went out with a “moch” into a “karmelis” and all the **Chachomim** of the generation disagreed with him.
 - **Q: Rami bar Yechezkel** taught a Braisa that it must be tied!? **A: R' Yochanan** had the “moch” pressed in tightly. The Braisa is discussing where it wasn't pressed in tightly.

B'PILPEL U'VIGALGAL MELACH

- Pepper is kept in the mouth to combat bad breath. Salt is kept in the mouth to fight a tooth disease.

V'CHOL DAVAR SHE'NOSENES L'TOCH PIHAH

- Examples of other items that may be kept in her mouth are ginger and cinnamon.

SHEIN TOSEVES SHEIN SHEL ZAHAV REBBI MATIR V'CHACHOMIM OSRIN

- **R' Zeira** said, this machlokes is only if the tooth is gold. If the tooth is silver, all agree that it is mutar, because she will not remove it to show it off. **Rebbi** says, even a gold tooth she will not show off, because it is embarrassing to her that she is missing a tooth.
- **Abaye** said, **Rebbi**, **R' Eliezer**, and **R' Shimon ben Elazar** say the same thing (that something that is embarrassing will not be taken off and shown to friends). **Rebbi's** shita is here in the Mishna. **R' Eliezer's** shita is in a Braisa where he says that a woman may go out wearing flasks of besamim to combat her bad smell. **R' Shimon ben Elazar's** shita is in a Braisa where he says that a woman may go out with anything that is under her hat, because to take that thing off she will have to remove her hat, which she will not do in public.

MISHNA

- A woman may go out with a sela coin on a “tzinis”.
- Young girls may go out with strings or pieces of wood (e.g. toothpicks) in their ears (to prevent their piercings from closing).
- Arabian women may go out with cloths wrapped around their heads. Madai women may go out with their clothing closed with a stone or a nut. This applies for all people, but the **Chachomim** spoke in terms of the people's usual customs.
- A woman may close her clothing on a stone, a nut, or a coin, as long she doesn't close it for the first time on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- “Tzinis” is the sole of the foot. A sela coin is placed there to heal wounds. The coin is beneficial because it is hard, the metal provides moisture, and the form on the coin.

HABANOS YOTZOS B'CHUTIN

- **Shmuel's** father did not let his daughters go out with strings in their ears (his daughters wore fancy, colored strings, so he was afraid that they would remove them to show their friends), he did not let them sleep next to each other (so that they should not get used to lying next to other people and thereby arouse their desire to be with men), and he would make mikvaos for them in the spring (so that they shouldn't be toivel in the river, since after the winter most of the river water is from rain, and he held it is not kosher to be a mikvah) and mats for them in the fall (so that when they are toivel in the river their feet will not become muddy and be a chazitzta).

POREFES AHL HA'EVEN...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The beginning of the Mishna says that it may be done, and the next part of the Mishna limits this to having been done on Erev Shabbos?! **A: Abaye** said, the latter part of the Mishna refers to where she is closing it with a coin. In that case it must be done on Erev Shabbos because the coin is muktza and can't be handled on Shabbos.
- **Q: Abaye** asked, may a woman close her clothing with a nut as a method of carrying the nut outside? Even according to the one who allows this method of carrying to save clothing from a fire (by putting on multiple sets of clothing and walking them outside), it could be that that is allowed in that case, because if we wouldn't allow it, the person would come to extinguish the flame, but over here maybe we wouldn't allow it. Also, even according to the one who does not allow one to save clothing from a fire in that fashion, maybe he doesn't allow it because he wears the clothing in a normal way, and allowing that may lead to carrying in circumstances when there is no fire. In the case of "wearing" the nut, that is not the normal way to carry a nut and maybe therefore it is allowed!? **A: TEIKU.**

-----Daf 10---66-----

MISHNA

- If one is missing a foot, **R' Meir** says he is allowed to go out with a wooden foot (it is considered to be a shoe). **R' Yose** says he may not. If the wooden foot has a receptacle where material is placed as a cushion, it can become tamei (the receptacle makes it into a keili).
- One who is missing both feet may go out with the leather that he places under his legs for support. They are also "mekabel tumas medras" because he fully leans on these. One may also enter the "Azarah" with them (they are not considered to be shoes because they are not worn on the bottom of his legs).
- One who has no use of his legs may not go out with the chair and supports that he uses to get around. They are "mekabel tumas medras" because they fully support him. They may not be worn into the "Azarah" because they are considered to be shoes (they are worn at the bottom of his legs/stumps).
- "Lokitmin" (which Rashi says are masks used to play with children) are not keilim and are therefore not mekabel tumah, and one may not go out with it on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, in the first case of the Mishna, did **R' Meir** allow it and **R' Yose** prohibit it or is it the other way around? He answered that he doesn't know. **Rava** then asked, who does the halacha follow? He again answered that he does not know.
 - **Shmuel, R' Huna and R' Yosef** all say that **R' Meir** prohibited it. **Rava bar Shira** says that **Rav** said **R' Meir** is the one who permitted it.
 - **Shmuel** changed his view and held like **Rav** as well, because a Mishna says that chalitzta performed on a wooden shoe is a good chalitzta (i.e. a wooden shoe is considered to be a shoe). **Shmuel** says that Mishna follows **R' Meir** of our Mishna.
 - **R' Huna** also changed his view and held like **Rav**. **R' Huna** said that **R' Meir** agrees that a sandal made of straw may be used for chalitzta and may be worn on Shabbos.
 - **R' Yosef** says that **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** agrees with **R' Yose** that a keili (e.g. a shoe or a mat) made of straw is not mekabel tumah, because it doesn't have a din of a keili.
 - The Braisa said that the straw shoes used by one who plasters is mekabel tumas medras. Although he doesn't use these as regular shoes, **R' Acha bar R' Ulla** explains, that since he wears them until he reaches his house it is mekabel tumah.

V'IHM YEISH LO BEIS KIBBUL K'SISIN TAMEI

- **Abaye** said it is mekabel tumas meis only (he doesn't support himself on it often enough to be considered a medras, so it is like a cane which is not a medras). **Rava** says it is mekabel tumas medras as well (just like the wagon of a child that is considered to be a medras because he supports himself on it, not like a cane which is not leaned on for support but only helps to straighten a person's posture).

T'MEYIN MEDRAS, V'EIN YOTZIN BAHEN B'SHABBOS, V'EIN NICHNASIN BAHEN L'AZARAH

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Tanna said in front of **R' Yochanan** that one may walk into the Azarah with this. **R' Yochanan** said, "I say it may be used for chalitzah and you say he may walk into the Azarah with it?!"

LOKITMIN TEHORAH

- **R' Avahu** says this is a (fake) donkey carried on the shoulders of a clown. **Rava bar Pappa** says they are sticks that are walked on in muddy areas. **Rava bar R' Huna** says they are masks.

MISHNA

- Young boys may go out with "kesharim", and princes may go out wearing bells on their clothing. In truth all people may go out wearing bells, but the Mishna is talking in terms of what was customary.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda** says "kesharim" are parts of a plant that were worn for refuah purposes.
 - **Abaye** said, wearing 3 contains the sickness from worsening, wearing 5 removes sickness, wearing 7 is even effective against sheidim.
 - **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says, wearing this plant is only effective if the plant has not been exposed to sun or moonlight, to rain, to the clanking of metal, to the sound of a rooster, or to the sound of footsteps. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, based on this, the plant is useless (because this is virtually impossible to do).
- **Q:** If this is what "kesharim" means, why is it limited to boys, and why to young boys? **A:** Rather, "kesharim" refers to when a boy misses his father terribly, what can be done to heal that is for the father to take his right shoelace and tie it onto the boy's left arm. Doing the opposite creates a sakana.
- **Avin bar Huna in the name of R' Chama bar Gurya** said, one may place a hot cup on his stomach to relieve pain on Shabbos.
 - He also said, one may smear oil and salt on the palms of his hands and feet to relieve the symptoms of being drunk.
 - He also said, it is mutar to fix a displaced neck bone on Shabbos (they would hang themselves by the head and the bone would move back into place).
 - He also said, one may swaddle a baby to straighten out its bones on Shabbos.
- **Abaye** said, his "mother" told him, to be effective, all "spells" must be said using the mother's name of the one who needs the help of the spell.
 - **Abaye** said further, if a spell says how many times to be said, it should be said that many times. If there is no stated amount of times, it should be said 41 times.
- A Braisa says, a woman may go out on Shabbos with a stone that prevents miscarriages. **R' Meir** said that even a stone which was weighed against this stone prevents miscarriages as well and may be worn on Shabbos. And this may be worn by a woman who has never even had a miscarriage and by a woman who is not yet even pregnant.
 - **R' Yeimar bar Shlamya in the name of Abaye** said, what was weighed against the stone is only effective if it was the exact weight without having to add or subtract from it.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, what about something that is weighed against the thing that was weighed against that stone? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Abaye** said, to combat a daily fever, one takes a white "zuz" and weighs it against sea salt. He takes that amount of salt and ties it to the neck of his shirt with a strand of hair.
 - If that can't be done, he should sit at the crossroads and find an ant carrying a load. He should put the ant in a copper tube, seal it with lead and 60 other seals, shake the tube, hold it and say "My burden should go on you and your burden should go on me". **R' Acha the son of R' Huna** said to **R' Ashi**, that is dangerous because maybe someone else already put his sickness on that ant and now the person is taking it on himself. Rather, he should say, "My burden and your burden should go on you".
 - If that can't be done, he should take a new pitcher, go to the river and say a "lachash" (incantation) as follows: "River, river, lend me a pitcher of water to heal the condition that I have". He should then twirl the pitcher full of water 7 times around his head and throw it behind him back into the river and say "River, river, take back the water because the condition that I had came today and left today".

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 10---67-----

- **R' Huna** said, for a fever that comes every 3 days, one should bring 7 small branches from 7 palm trees, and 7 wood chips from 7 beams, and 7 pegs from 7 bridges, and 7 types of ash from 7 ovens, and 7 types of dirt from 7 door sockets, and 7 types of pitch from 7 ships, and 7 seeds of cumin, and 7 hairs from the beard of an old dog, and tie these to the neck hole of his shirt with a strand of hair.
- **R' Yochanan** said, for a full body fever, one should take a knife made of iron and go to a bush (“sneh”) and tie a strand of hair on it. He should go there for 3 days. The first day he should cut into the bush a little and say a pasuk (that tells how Moshe saw the burning bush). The second day he should again cut into the bush and say another pasuk (where Moshe says that he will go look at the bush). The third day he should again cut into the bush and say another pasuk (that Hashem saw that Moshe turned to see the bush – so too the fever should turn away from him).
 - **R' Acha the son of Rava** said, the first day he says the first 2 psukim mentioned before. The second day he says the third pasuk mentioned before. The third day he says another pasuk (where Hashem tells Moshe not to come closer to the bush – so too the fever should stay away from him).

When the fever leaves, he should go to the bush, bend down, cut the bush off and say “Bush, bush, Hashem did not rest His Shechina on you because you are the highest of all trees. It is because you are the humblest of all trees that Hashem rested His Shechina on you. Just like the fire ran away from Chananya, Mishael and Azarya when they were thrown into it, so too should the fire run away from so-and-so.

- For boils one says “Baz Bazya, Mas Masya, Kas Kasya, Sharlai V’Amarlai, these are the Malachim sent from Sedom to heal painful boils. Bazach bazich bazbazich, masmasich, kamon kamich. Your color should stay the same, your color should stay the same, your place should stay the same, your offspring should be like one who can’t have children and like a mule who can’t increase and multiply. So too you should not increase and multiply on the body of so-and-so”.
- For other boils one says “An unsheathed sword and a ready slingshot, its name is not Yochav painful illness”.
- For sheydim one says, “You were stopped up, stopped up you were. Cursed, broken, in cheirem, bar tit, bar tamei, bar tina, like Shamgaz, Merigaz and Istamai”.
- For sheydim of the bathroom one says, “On the head of a lion, on the nose of a lioness, is found the sheid Bar Shirika Panda. On a leek field I hit him with the cheekbone of a donkey”.

U’BNEI MELACHIM B’ZAGIN

- **R' Oshaya** says that this follows **R' Shimon** who says that all Yidden are like princes. **Rava** says the Mishna is discussing where the bells are woven into the garment, so all would agree (even those who argue on **R' Shimon**) that it is permitted.

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says, for refuah purposes, one may go out with a grasshopper egg, with a fox’s tooth, or with the nail on which one was hanged.
- The **Chachomim** say that one is not permitted to do so even during the week because it is following in the ways of the Emori.

GEMARA

- The grasshopper egg is hung by the ear to heal an earache. A fox’s tooth is used for sleep disorders. A tooth from a live fox heals one who is too sleepy. A tooth from a dead fox helps one who has trouble sleeping.

UV’MASMER MIN HATZALUV

- This is used to heal the swelling of a wound.

MISHUM REFUAH, DIVREI R' MEIR

- **Abaye** and **Rava** both say that if something is used for refuah, there is no issue with following in the ways of the Emori.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** It seems that if it is not for refuah there is an issue with following in their ways. However, a Braisa says, if one has a tree whose fruit fall off prematurely, he should paint it red and put stones on its branches. Stones on the branches can help to slow down the process and prevent the premature shedding of the fruit, but painting the tree red should not be allowed!? **A:** That is done so that people should see it and daven that it should not do so anymore.
 - We see this concept when a metzora yells out to people that he is tamei, so that they should daven for him.
 - **Ravina** said, this is also the reason people hang a bunch of dates on a date tree that sheds its fruits prematurely.
- **R' Chiya bar Avin** said there are only 2 Emori practices which are allowed to be done: 1) If one has a bone stuck in his throat, he puts that type of bone on his head and says “chad chad nachis bala, bala nachis chad chad”; 2) If a fish bone is stuck in his throat he says: “Ninatzta k'machat, ninalta k'tris, shaya shaya”.
- The Gemara now gives a list of a number of practices which may NOT be done because doing them is considered following in the ways of the Emori:
 - One who says that his constellation (“gad”) should bring him mazel and should not get tired day or night. **R' Yehuda** says “gad” is the name of an avoda zara.
 - If a man and his wife switch names at night as a form of spell, or some metaphysical reason.
 - One who says that his barrels should be strengthened (“donu dani”). **R' Yehuda** says “dan” is the name of an avoda zara.
 - One who tells a male raven to call out, or a female raven to shriek, and to turn their tails to him for good.
 - One who says to slaughter a rooster that calls out late or calls out like a raven, or to slaughter a chicken that calls out like a rooster.
 - One who says, “I will drink and leave over. I will drink and leave over” (he believes this will bring bracha into his wine).
 - If one breaks eggs on a wall in front of chicks, stirs in front of chicks, dances in front of them, or counts 71 of them so that they should not die.
 - If one dances in front of “kutach” to make it strong, or makes sure there is silence for lentils so that they cook, or yells in front of beans so that they cook.
 - If one urinates in front of a pot so that it cooks better. However, one may put a piece of berry wood or glass into a pot to make it cook quicker. The **Chachomim** don't allow putting glass into a pot because of the sakana that someone may eat the glass.
- A Braisa sayas, one may put a fistful of salt into a “ner” so that it burns better, and mud or clay under a “ner” so that it burns slower.
- **R' Zutra** said, one who covers and oil lamp or opens a “naphta” lamp is “oiver” on the sin of “bal tashchis”.
- When drinking wine one is permitted to say “Wine and life to the mouths of the Rabanan”.
 - When **R' Akiva** made a party for his son, he said this every time he brought a cup of wine.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK BAMEH ISHA!!!

-----Daf פד--68-----

PEREK KLAL GADOL -- PEREK SHEVI'1

MISHNA

- A “klal gadol” (“great rule”) was said regarding Shabbos:
 - One who forgets about the establishment of Shabbos and therefore does many melachos on many Shabbosos, is chayuv only one chatas.
 - One who knows about the establishment of Shabbos and did many melachos on many Shabbosos (he forgot it was Shabbos), he is chayuv one chatas for each Shabbos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- One who knows that it is Shabbos and did many melachos on many Shabbosos, he is chayuv one chatas for each “av melacha” (all toldos of a particular av are included as one av melacha) that he did (even if he did the av melacha many times, he is only chayuv one chatas on it, since there was never a period of awareness of the aveira).
- If one does many melachos of the same category (all under the umbrella of one av melacha) he is only chayuv one chatas.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does the Tanna call these rules a “klal gadol”? You can try and answer that the reason is because we have another Mishna that mentions another “klal” about Shabbos which only has 2 rules, so therefore, the “klal” in our Mishna, which has more rules, is the “klal gadol”. This would also explain why the Mishna about Shmita also says “klal gadol” because there too there is another “klal” stated with less rules than the first one. However, this is problematic, because regarding Ma’aser there are two “klal”s, and the one with more rules is NOT referred to as “klal gadol!?” **A: R’ Yose bar Avin** said, Shabbos and Shmita, which have avos and toldos, can be said to have a “klal gadol”. Ma’aser which does not have avos and toldos is not said to have a “klal gadol”.
 - **Q: Bar Kappara** had a version of a Braisa which said “klal gadol” by Ma’aser as well. Since there are no avos and toldos by Ma’aser, why is it called a “klal gadol”? **A:** The Gemara gives a new reason why it is called klal gadol. Shabbos is called klal gadol because the punishment of Shabbos is greater than the punishment of Shmita: hilchos Shabbos apply to things attached and detached from the ground, whereas Shmita applies only to items attached to the ground. Shmita is called a klal gadol because its punishment is greater than the punishment of Ma’aser: hilchos Shmita apply to food of people and food of animals, whereas Ma’aser applies only to food of people. **Bar Kappara**, who says that Ma’aser is also called klal gadol says that the punishment of Ma’aser is greater than that of Pe’ah, because Hilchos Ma’aser apply to figs and vegetables, whereas Pe’ah does not.
- **Rav and Shmuel** say, that when our Mishna says one “forgot about the establishment of Shabbos” it refers to a child who was raised among goyim or a convert who lives among goyim, both of who were never aware of the concept of Shabbos (although the Mishna says “forgot”, it doesn’t actually mean that). However, if someone was initially aware of the establishment of Shabbos and then forgot about the establishment of Shabbos, he would be chayuv a separate chatas for each Shabbos.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that if one *forgot* about the establishment of Shabbos he is chayuv only one chatas?! **A:** It means that he never knew about Shabbos.
 - **Q:** If this is true, why does the next part of the Mishna say that if knows of the establishment of Shabbos (but forgot the day was Shabbos), if he does many melachos on many Shabbosos he is chayuv one chatas for each Shabbos? The Mishna should say a bigger chiddush, that one who had originally known of the establishment of Shabbos and has since forgotten the entire concept of Shabbos is chayuv a chatas for each and every Shabbos (even though the intervening weekdays don’t act as a period of knowing because he isn’t even aware of the concept of Shabbos), and surely one who knows of the establishment of Shabbos would be chayuv one chatas for each and every Shabbos (because the intervening weekdays act as a period of knowing that it was Shabbos, because he knows that once a week Shabbos arrives)?! **A:** When the Mishna says that one knows of the establishment of Shabbos, it actually means that he knew about it *and then forgot about it*, which is exactly what we asked that the Mishna should say.
 - **Q:** If this is true, it would mean that if someone remembers the establishment of Shabbos and forgot that the day was Shabbos, and did many melachos, he should be chayuv a chatas for each and every melacha that he did. If so, why does the next part of the Mishna that says one is chayuv a chatas for each melacha say that we are referring to where the person remembered it was Shabbos on that day but did many melachos? It should say a bigger chidush that he is chayuv a chatas for each and every melacha even if he didn’t remember that the day was Shabbos (as long as he knew of the establishment of Shabbos)?! **A:** The Gemara changes the whole explanation of the Mishna and says like we thought originally, that the first part of the Mishna is discussing where one originally knew of the establishment

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of Shabbos and later *forgot* it. **Rav and Shmuel** are adding, that one who *never knew* of the establishment of Shabbos has the same din as one who knew about Shabbos and then forgot it.

- **R' Yochanan and R' Shimon ben Lakish** say, that our Mishna is referring *only* to where one originally knew of the establishment of Shabbos and then forgot about it. However, if one never knew of the establishment of Shabbos, he is fully patur from bringing any chatas.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says: "There is a "klal gadol" regarding Shabbos: one who forgets about the establishment of Shabbos and does many melachos on many Shabbosos is only chayuv one chatas. An example of such a person is a child who was raised among goyim or a convert who lives among goyim, both of who were never aware of the concept of Shabbos. **Munbaz** argues and says that such a person (who never knew of the establishment of Shabbos) would be patur from having to bring any chatas. He explains that one is only chayuv a chatas as a "shogeg" when he had some knowledge prior to committing the prohibited act." We see the Braisa says NOT like **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**?! **A:** They hold like **Munbaz** who says that such a person is patur from bringing any chatas.
 - **Q:** Why does Munbaz hold this way? **A:** The Torah teaches a "hekeshe" from one who does avodah zarah "b'shogeg" to one who does so "b'meidid". The Torah teaches that just like one who does so "b'meidid" had knowledge of the aveirah, so too one who must bring a chatas for doing so "b'shogeg" must have had knowledge of the aveirah at some point.
 - **Q:** What do the **Rabanan** who argue on **Munbaz** learn from this hekeshe? **A:** They say the hekeshe comes to teach that just like avodah zarah is an aveirah that one is chayuv kares for violating it b'meidid and is chayuv a chatas for violating it b'shogeg, so too, all other aveiros in the Torah (the pasuk says "Torah Achas" to say that this should be compared to all other halachos in the Torah), one is only chayuv to bring a chatas for violating it b'shogeg if a b'meidid violation would carry the kares punishment.

-----Daf װׁ--69-----

- **Q:** According to **Munbaz**, who says that one brings a chatas even if he had knowledge of the halacha while he was violating it, in what way is he a "shogeg"? The Torah says that a chatas is only brought for a shogeg?! **A:** He is a "shogeg" in the respect that he didn't know that this aveirah carries a chatas obligation with it for a shogeg violation. That lack of knowledge is enough to label him as a shogeg. The **Rabanan** say, lack of knowledge of this aspect does not render one a shogeg.
- **Q:** According to the **Rabanan**, in regard to what halacha does the person have to be unaware so that he be labeled a "shogeg"? **A:** **R' Yochanan** says if he is unaware of the kares punishment for the particular aveirah, even though he is aware that the aveira is a "lav", he is labeled as a shogeg. **Reish Lakish** says he is a shogeg only if he was not aware that the act was prohibited.
 - **Rava** explains that **Reish Lakish's** shita is based on a pasuk that says "Asher lo sei'asenah v'asheim". Which he says means that the chatas must be brought only if he was unaware that the act was prohibited.
 - **R' Yochanan** uses that pasuk like **R' Shimon ben Elazar** in a Braisa, to teach that only someone who would have stopped doing the aveirah if he was told that it is prohibited brings a chatas for doing the aveirah b'shogeg. However, one who would continue doing the aveirah, even when told that it is prohibited, does not bring a chatas for having done the aveirah b'shogeg.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that there are 39 "avos melachos". The Gemara explains the reason the Mishna stated the number 39 (we could just count the list of avos melachos that the Mishna goes on to mention) is to teach that, although there are many more than 39 prohibited melachos, they all fit into 39 groups (avos melachos) and therefore, the maximum number of chatas that can potentially have to be brought is 39 (if someone is oiver each of the 39 melachos groups). The only way this can happen is if someone knows it is Shabbos and he does all of the melachos b'shogeg. This makes sense according to **R' Yochanan**, because the person can be aware of Shabbos by knowing that all 39 melachos are prohibited, and can still be chayuv a chatas by not realizing that these melachos carry a kares penalty. However, according to **Reish Lakish**, that one is only chayuv a chatas if he was unaware that the act was prohibited, how is it possible that someone is aware of Shabbos but unaware of all 39 melachos? In what regard is he aware

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of Shabbos? **A:** He holds like **R' Akiva** who says that the halacha of techumin is D'Oraisa, although not one of the 39 melachos. So he is aware of Shabbos with regard to the din of techumin, but not with regard to any of the 39 melachos.

- There is Braisa that says: If one knows it is Shabbos and that the melacha that he did is prohibited, he is a meizid. If he doesn't know it is Shabbos or that the melacha he did is prohibited, he is a shogeg. If he is aware of one but not the other, or if he is aware that it is Shabbos and that the melacha is prohibited, but he is not aware that the melacha can lead to a chatas obligation, he is also a shogeg and is chayuv a chatas. This Braisa clearly follows **Munbaz**.
- **Abaye** says, even **R' Yochanan** agrees, that with regard to the chatas that is brought for swearing falsely, the chatas is brought only if he was unaware that he had made the oath at the time that he was violating the oath (it's not enough that was not aware of the chatas obligation when he violated the oath).
 - **Q:** This is obvious that **R' Yochanan** would agree in this case. He only argues that if one is not aware of the *kares* penalty the person is a shogeg. Here, there is no *kares* penalty!? **A:** We would have thought that since this chatas is different than all others (there is no *kares* liability for swearing falsely), maybe he is considered to be a shogeg for not knowing about the chatas penalty as well. That's why **Abaye** felt is necessary to tell us that **R' Yochanan** would agree in this case.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the case of shogeg for swearing falsely about the past is where someone swore and wasn't sure whether his swearing falsely carries a chatas penalty. This is contrary to what **Abaye** just said!? **A1:** This Braisa follows **Munbaz**. **A2:** This follows the **Rabanan** and this refutes what **Abaye** just said - **TEYUFTA**.
- **Abaye** says, even **R' Yochanan** agrees, that with regard to a non-Kohen having eaten Terumah, he is only obligated to add a fifth if he was unaware of the prohibition during his eating (e.g. he didn't know that he was eating Terumah). However, if he knew he was eating Terumah and was unaware that this aveirah carries a "death by the hands of Heaven" penalty, he need not give the additional fifth.
 - **Q:** This is obvious that **R' Yochanan** would agree in this case. He only argues that if one is not aware of the *kares* penalty the person is a shogeg. Here, there is no *kares* penalty!? **A:** We would have thought the death penalty takes the place of the *kares* penalty, and just like **R' Yochanan** says one who is unaware of the *kares* penalty is considered a shogeg, the same should be when he is unaware of the death penalty. That's why **Abaye** felt is necessary to tell us that **R' Yochanan** would agree in this case.
 - **Rava** disagrees with **Abaye** and says that **R' Yochanan** would say that the death penalty takes the place of the *kares* penalty and paying the additional fifth takes the place of bringing a chatas. Therefore, if he is unaware of the death penalty, he would have to give the additional fifth (which takes the place of a chatas).
- If one was traveling in the desert and does not know what day Shabbos is: **R' Huna** says, he counts 6 days and holds the 7th day as Shabbos (like when Hashem created the world, first came 6 days then came Shabbos). **Chiya bar Rav** says, he observes the next day as Shabbos and then counts six days (like Adam Harishon who first had Shabbos and then counted 6 days).
 - **Q:** There are 2 Braisos which seem to say that one first counts 6 days and then observes Shabbos!? **A:** **TEYUFTA of Chiya bar Rav, TIYUFTA**.
 - **Rava** said, if a person is in this situation, every day he may only do enough work to keep him alive (because each day may be the true Shabbos) and on his Shabbos he can do no work at all.
 - **Q:** If he can do no work, should he be left to die on his Shabbos?! **A:** The day before his Shabbos he can do enough work for 2 days.
 - **Q:** Maybe the day before his Shabbos is the true Shabbos?! **A:** Every day, including his Shabbos, he is allowed to do enough work to survive. The way he makes that day recognizable as Shabbos is by making Kiddush and Havdalah.
 - **Rava** says, if he knows how many days ago he set out on his journey, but doesn't remember what day of the week that was, he may do melacha that entire day of every week, since he surely did not set out on a journey on Shabbos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The chiddush is, that one would think that people don't set out to travel on a Friday either, and therefore he should be able to do work all day on the day of the week that he left and the following day. **Rava** teaches us that sometimes people do set out on Friday (if the caravan is leaving then).

HAYODE'AH IKUR SHABBOS

- **Q:** From where do we know the halacha that sometimes one is chayuv only one chatas for doing melachos on many Shabbosos and sometimes he is chayuv a chatas for each Shabbos individually? **A: R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuhah** explains, one pasuk says "V'shamru Bnei Yisroel es HaShabbos" – a singular observance for many Shabbosos. Another pasuk says "V'es Shabbosai Tishmoru" – one observance for each Shabbos.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says that the psukim should be expounded in the opposite way. The first pasuk refers to one observance for each Shabbos, and the second pasuk refers to a singular observance for many Shabbosos.

-----Daf 70-----

HAYODE'AH SHEHU SHABBOS

- **Q:** Why, in the first case of the Mishna, where he is unaware that it is Shabbos and does many melachos is he chayuv only one chatas, but, in this case, when he is unaware that these melachos are assur he is chayuv a chatas for each av melacha? **A: R' Safra** explains, when he is unaware about Shabbos, and he is told that it is Shabbos, he will stop doing the melachos that he is doing, but if he is told that the particular melachos are assur on Shabbos, he will not stop doing them because he thinks it is not Shabbos. Therefore, he brings one chatas because he is making only one mistake – regarding the day being Shabbos. On the other hand, if he knows that it is Shabbos but doesn't know the melachos are assur, if he is told that they are, he will stop. If he is told that it is Shabbos, he will not, because he doesn't think he is doing anything wrong. Therefore, he must bring a chatas for each av melacha group that he does, because he is making a separate mistake regarding each melacha.
 - **Q: R' Nachman** asks, what **R' Safra** says is not right. There is truly no difference between the two. One stops doing melacha when he finds out it is Shabbos because he knows the melachos are assur. It's not just about Shabbos. It's about the day being Shabbos and the melacha being assur! **A: R' Nachman** therefore says, when he is unaware of Shabbos he has made one mistake and therefore brings one chatas. When he is unaware of the melachos, he has made several mistakes and therefore brings several chataos.

CHAYUV AHL KOL MELACHA U'MELACHA

- **Q:** From where do we know that each melacha necessitates its own chatas (even when they are performed in one period of unawareness)? **A: Shmuel** says, the pasuk says "Michalilehah mos yumas". Although this pasuk refers to a melacha done b'mezid, it is not needed for that case and we can use it to teach us something about a shogeg. The double lashon – "mos yumas" – teaches that there may be many punishments (i.e. many chataos) needed for a single shogeg.
 - **Q: R' Nosson** learns this concept from the fact that the melacha of lighting a fire is singled out by the pasuk from all the other melachos. Why doesn't **Shmuel** learn it from there as well? **A: Shmuel** says lighting a fire was singled out to teach that there is no death penalty for the melacha of lighting a fire, like **R' Yose** says. Therefore, it is not available for **R' Nosson's** drasha.
 - **Q: R' Yose** learns this concept from the words of the pasuk "V'asah mei'achas mei'heina". He says this teaches that one can be oiver on one Shabbos and be chayuv many chataos because he performed many melachos. Why doesn't **Shmuel** learn this from here like **R' Yose**? **A: Shmuel** says those words are not to be expounded like **R' Yose** expounds them.
- **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, what if someone is unaware that the day is Shabbos and *also* unaware that the melachos are assur on Shabbos, is he chayuv only one chatas or multiple chataos? **A: R' Nachman** answered, since he was unaware that it was Shabbos, he only has to bring one chatas.
 - **Q:** He was also unaware with regard to the melachos, so he should need a separate chatas for each!? **A: R' Ashi** says, we look to see if he stops doing the work when he is told it is Shabbos or when he is told

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that the act is a melacha. Based on his behavior we can decide if he should bring one chatas for Shabbos or many chatas for the melachos.

- **Q: Ravina** asked, he doesn't stop for one reason over the other! He stops for both reasons – it is Shabbos and these melachos are assur on Shabbos!? **A:** Rather, he holds that there is no difference, and therefore, in either case, he will only be chayuv one chatas.
- **Q:** A Mishna says that there are 39 “avos melachos”. The Gemara explains, the reason the Mishna stated the number 39 (we could just count the list of avos melachos that the Mishna goes on to mention) is to teach that although there are many more than 39 prohibited melachos, they all fit into 39 groups (avos melachos) and therefore, the maximum number of chatas that can potentially have to be brought is 39 (if someone is over each of the 39 melachos groups). This makes sense if we say that one who is unaware of Shabbos and the melachos is chayuv a chatas for each melacha, then this Mishna is discussing exactly this case. But, if we say that only one chatas must be brought in that situation, that would mean the only way he would have to bring 39 chatas is where he knows it is Shabbos and he does all of the melachos b'shogeg. This makes sense according to **R' Yochanan**, because the person can be aware of Shabbos by knowing that all 39 melachos are prohibited, and can still be chayuv a chatas by not realizing that these melachos carry a kares penalty. However, according to **Reish Lakish**, who says that one is only chayuv a chatas if he was unaware that the act was prohibited, how is it possible that someone is aware of Shabbos but unaware of all 39 melachos? In what regard is he aware of Shabbos? **A:** He holds like **R' Akiva** who says that the halacha of techumin is D'Oraisa, although not one of the 39 melachos. So he is aware of Shabbos with regard to the din of techumin, but not with regard to any of the 39 melachos.
- **Rava** says, if one cut produce off the land, and then ground the produce, each melacha having been done to produce the size of a dried fig (which is the minimum size needed to be over the melacha), because he was unaware that the day was Shabbos, although he was aware the melachos are assur on Shabbos; and then he did those same two melachos, but this time he was aware that it was Shabbos but was unaware that the melachos were assur; and he then became aware of the mistake he made by doing the first set of melachos and separated a chatas for that (he only needs one chatas because he was mistaken about Shabbos, not about the melachos), and then became aware of the second set of melachos that he mistakenly did, the halacha is that the chatas he brings for the first set of melachos exempts him from needing a pair of chatas for the second set of melachos that he did (the chatas for the first cutting and grinding exempts the second cutting and grinding even though that second set really should need 2 chatas). However, if he first became aware of the second set of melachos that he did and separated 2 chatas for that, the chatas for the second cutting will exempt BOTH melachos that were done in the first group, but the grinding of the second group will need its own chatas.
 - **Abaye** says, that where he becomes aware of the second set of melachos first, the chatas for the cutting exempts the first set of cutting and grinding, and once it exempts that first grinding, IT EXEMPTS THE SECOND GRINDING AS WELL. The second grinding gets “pulled along” together with the first grinding (which itself had been pulled along by the first cutting), since they are the same named melacha.