



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf צב – Daf צה

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 צב---92-----

- **Rava** held like **Chizkiya** (that being in the box doesn't accomplish anything) and **Abaye** held like **R' Yochanan** (that being in the box accomplishes that they are considered to be wherever the box is considered to be). Ultimately, **Abaye** ended up holding like **Rava** and **Rava** ended up holding like **Abaye**.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, one who takes out fruit to the reshus harabim on Shabbos, **Abaye** says, if the person remains in the reshus hayachid and sticks his hand with the fruit into the reshus harabim, he is chayuv. If he takes the fruit out in a box, but the box does not fully leave the reshus hayachid, he is patur. **Rava** says, by hand he is patur, with the box he is chayuv. This is at odds with how the Gemara said they ultimately held?! **A:** Switch the order of the names in the Braisa.
 - **Q:** How can anyone say he is chayuv for sticking his hand out into the reshus harabim with the fruit? The first Mishna of the Mesechta says, that if one does so he is patur?! **A:** That Mishna was referring to where the item was carried above 3 tefachim to the ground, and it therefore is never considered to have come to rest in the reshus harabim. This Braisa is talking about where it was within 3 tefachim to the ground and therefore is considered to have had a hanacha in the reshus harabim.

MISHNA

- If one carries the minimal amount of any item out with his right hand, left hand, in his chest, or on his shoulders, he is chayuv because these are all considered to be normal methods of carrying. (We find that the Bnei Kehas carried the keilim of the Mishkan on their shoulders).
- However, one is not chayuv for carrying out any item in an unusual manner – with his feet, in his mouth, armpit, ear, hair, in an upside down money belt, between his belt and his shirt, in the hem of his shirt, in his shoe or sandal.

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** says, one who carries something from reshus to reshus, but keeps it above 10 tefachim off the ground, is chayuv, because that is how the Bnei Kehas carried their items.
 - **Q:** How do we know that they did so? **A1:** We know they carried the Mizbe'ach on their shoulders via poles. From a comparison in the pasuk, we learn that just as the Mishkan was 10 amos tall, so too was the Mizbe'ach. The pasuk tells us that Moshe spread the coverings on the Mishkan, which means that he must have been 10 amos tall. The Gemara assumes, that Moshe was representative of all the Levi'im, so the rest of the Levi'im were 10 amos tall as well. We know that anything carried via poles was carried with 1/3 of the keili above the poles and 2/3 below the poles. This means that the Mizbe'ach hung down 6 and 2/3 amos below the poles, which, given the height of the Levi'im, was considerably higher than 10 tefachim off the ground. **A2:** We can also learn this from the Aron, which was only 10 tefachim tall. This means that 6 and 2/3 tefachim of the Aron were below its poles. This is clearly more than 10 tefachim off the ground (even if the Levi'im were of average height, not like Moshe).
- **Rav in the name of R' Chiya** says, one who carries out something on his head is chayuv, because in Hutzal people carry items like this.
 - **Q:** Hutzal is a minority of people of the world. How can their standard be applied to everyone else? **A:** **Rav** meant that if the people of Hutzal carry things out on their heads they are chayuv, because for them that is considered usual.
 - **Q:** They are a minority, and therefore what is usual only for them should not create liability even for them! "Usual" should have to get its meaning from the majority of people!? **A:** **Rav** meant to

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

say, if someone carries something out on his head he is **patur**. Although the people of Hutzal do so, it is not considered usual for most people and therefore creates no liability.

MISHNA

- If one intended to carry something in front of him and inadvertently carried it behind him, he is patur. However, if one intended to carry an item behind him and inadvertently carried it in front of him, he is chayuv.
- “In truth they said”, a woman who carries something in an article of clothing that she wears under her clothing for “tznius” purposes, is chayuv whether she intended to carry it in the front or in the back and whether or not she carried it the way she intended to, because this article of clothing constantly shifts from side to side, so it was expected that the item being carried would shift as well.
- **R’ Yehuda** says, letter carriers are also chayuv for carrying even if the letters do not get carried out as intended.

GEMARA

- **Q:** In the first part of the Mishna he is patur because his intention was not fulfilled. In the next part of the Mishna his intention was also not followed, so why is he chayuv? **A: R’ Elazar** said, the Tanna who said the first halacha is not the Tanna who said the second halacha.
 - **Q: Rava** asks, why must we say that it is 2 Tanna'im? In the first case of the Mishna he intended for a better watching (by keeping it in front) and ended up with a lower degree of watching (it was carried in the back), and that's why he is patur. However, in the second case, he intended for a lesser watching and ultimately had a better watching, so he is chayuv! **A:** What **R’ Elazar** found unanswerable was the contradictory inferences from the 2 parts of the Mishna. The first case of the Mishna says if he intended to carry in front and carried in back he is patur. It is mashma that if he intended to carry in the back and actually carried in the back he will be chayuv. The second part of the Mishna says that if one intended to carry in the back and carried in the front he is chayuv. It is mashma, if he intended to carry in the back and carried in the back he will be patur!? This is why **R’ Elazar** said it must be 2 different Tanna'im.
 - **Q: R’ Ashi** asks, maybe it is one Tanna, and he is saying, not only is one chayuv for carrying in the back when he intends to carry in the back, he is also chayuv for carrying in the front when he intended to carry in the back. The chiddush is, that even though his intention was not fulfilled, he ultimately carried it out with a higher degree of watching and is therefore chayuv.
- It is possible to say that whether one is chayuv for carrying an item out in the back when he intended to do so is actually a machlokes Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if one carries out money in a money belt worn right side up, he is chayuv. However, if the opening is facing downward, **R’ Yehuda** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur. **R’ Yehuda** said to the **Chachomim**, don't you agree that if one intends to carry out something in the back, and does in fact do so, that he is chayuv, so the same should be with the upside down money belt!? The **Chachomim** said to **R’ Yehuda**, don't you agree that if someone carries something in an unusual way that he is patur, this too is unusual and should be patur!? **R’ Yehuda** said, I had a point that they couldn't answer and they had a point that I couldn't answer. From the fact that **R’ Yehuda** said “don't you agree that one who intends to, and actually carries, in the back is chayuv”, it seems that **R’ Yehuda** is saying that the **Chachomim** actually don't agree. That would mean that whether one is chayuv for intending to, and then actually, carrying out in the back is a machlokes between **R’ Yehuda** and the **Chachomim**.
 - According to this understanding, it would mean that the **Chachomim** are saying that **R’ Yehuda** does not agree that carrying out in an unusual manner is patur. But we find no one who argues on that concept? Rather, all agree that one is chayuv for carrying in the back when that was intended, and all agree that one is patur for carrying in an unusual way. The machlokes is whether carrying in an upside down money belt is like carrying in the back and is therefore chayuv, or whether it is like carrying in an unusual manner, and is patur.

B'EMES AMRU, HA'ISHA...

- A Braisa says, whenever it says “In truth...”, it means we pasken the halacha that way.

R' YEHUDA OMER, AHF MIKABLEI PISAKIN

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa explains, the royal scribes would intend to send with one letter carrier and often settle on another. Therefore, it is considered usual for this to happen and he is chayuv for carrying on Shabbos although he intended to give it to a different mail carrier.

MISHNA

- If one takes out a loaf of bread to the reshus harabim, he is chayuv. If 2 people carry out the loaf of bread, they are patur.
- If an item cannot be carried by one person alone and 2 people carry it out together, they are chayuv. **R' Shimon** says they are patur.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if two people together carry out something that they each could have carried alone, **R' Meir** says they are chayuv. **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** say they are patur. If they each individually could not have carried it out, **R' Yehuda and R' Meir** say they are chayuv and **R' Shimon** says they are patur. If one was able to carry it by himself and the other could not, all hold he is chayuv (the Gemara will explain which one).

-----Daf ל"ט-----93-----

- A Braisa says, if two people together carry out something that they each could have carried alone, **R' Meir** says they are chayuv. **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** say they are patur. If they each individually could not have carried it out, **R' Yehuda and R' Meir** say they are chayuv and **R' Shimon** says they are patur. If one was able to carry it by himself and the other could not, all hold he is chayuv (the Gemara will explain which one). What is the point of machlokes between these Tanna'im?
 - A Braisa says, a pasuk says, "Ba'asosah" ("by his committing it") teaches that one is only chayuv for performing an entire act, not for less than an entire act. A Braisa explains, this means, an act that can be done by one person which is performed by 2 people will not lead to a chiyuv chatas. **R' Yehuda** says, if an act cannot be performed by one person and it is therefore done by 2 people, they are both chayuv. If it could be performed by one and is performed by 2, they are patur. **R' Shimon** says, even if one cannot do the act alone, if 2 people perform an act together, they are patur.
 - The point of machlokes is as follows. The pasuk of "Ba'asosah" has 3 exclusionary words. **R' Shimon** says the 3 exclusions teach there is no chiyuv: 1) when one person makes the akirah and another makes the hanacha, 2) when 2 people carry something that each alone could have carried, 3) when 2 people carry something that each alone could not have carried. **R' Yehuda** says the 3 exclusions teach that there is no chiyuv: 1) when one person makes the akirah and another makes the hanacha, 2) when 2 people carry something that each person could have carried alone, 3) when one does an aveirah because Beis Din had mistakenly told him it was permitted, he does not have to bring a chatas (**R' Shimon** says that he would have to bring a chatas). **R' Meir** says, the pasuk only has 2 exclusionary words. He says, these 2 exclusions teach that there is no chiyuv: 1) when one person makes the akirah and another makes the hanacha, 2) when one does an aveirah because Beis Din had mistakenly told him it was permitted, he does not have to bring a chatas. Therefore, he says when 2 people carry something together they are always chayuv.
 - **Q:** The earlier Braisa said, if one person can carry the item alone and another person cannot, and these 2 people carry it together, "he is chayuv". Which one is chayuv? **A: R' Chisda** says it is the one who can carry it on his own who is chayuv, because the other person is not really doing anything.
 - **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked, the other person is helping, so maybe he should be chayuv? **A: R' Chisda** answered, "helping" is not significant and does not lead to a chiyuv.
 - **R' Z'vid in the name of Rava** said, a Mishna is also mashma that "helping" is not significant. The halacha is, a keili that supports the weight of a zav becomes tamei. A Mishna says, if there are cloaks under the feet of an animal upon which a zav is sitting, the cloaks are NOT tamei, because

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

an animal can stand on 3 legs, so each leg is considered to only be “helping” the other 3 legs and not bearing the weight of the zav. We see from here that “helping” is not considered to be significant.

- **Q: R’ Yehuda of Diskarta** said, this is no proof to the concept of “helping”. The leg of an animal is different than a second person helping to carry, because the animal often doesn’t even put down the 4th leg altogether, and it is not even considered to be “helping” and that’s why it is considered insignificant and the cloaks are tahor. However, “helping” may be considered significant!? **A:** If “helping” is significant, then the cloaks should be tamei, since the leg that is lifted is not always the same leg. A Mishna says, if a zav lies along the length of benches or belts, they become tamei (because his weight is placed on them). If he lies on the width of the benches or belts, they do not become tamei (they are not supporting his weight). If he sleeps on the benches or belts, even on the widths, they become tamei because he may have turned himself around on them in his sleep. We see, that for a possibility, we consider them tamei. If so, we should make the cloaks tamei for the possibility that the leg will not be the one lifted! Rather, the reason the cloaks are tahor is because they are considered “helping” which is thought to be insignificant.
- **R’ Pappi in the name of Rava** says, a Mishna is also mashma that “helping” is not significant. **R’ Yose** says in a Mishna that a stationary horse that is carrying a zav is metameh the keilim under its front legs, whereas a similarly situated donkey is metameh via its hind legs (in each case, those are the legs that actually support the stationary animal, and the other 2 legs merely “help” the animal). We see from here that “helping” is not considered to be significant.
- **R’ Ashi** says, a Braisa is also mashma that “helping” is not significant. **R’ Eliezer** says in a Braisa, if a Kohen does the “avodah” with one foot on the floor and one foot on a keili or a stone (a Kohen may not have a chatzitza between his feet and the floor of the Beis Hamikdash while doing the avodah), the avodah is pasul. If one foot is on a keili or a stone, but if the keili or stone was to be taken away, the Kohen would be able to remain standing on the foot which is on the floor, the avodah is valid. This must be because the foot on the keili or the rock was only “helping”, which we see from here is considered to be insignificant.
- **Ravina** says, a Braisa is also mashma that “helping” is not significant. The avodah must be done using the Kohen’s right hand. A Braisa says, if the Kohen received the blood in his right hand, but the left hand was helping, it is valid. We see that “helping” is not considered to be significant.
- **Q:** The earlier Braisa said, if 2 people carry out something that each could have carried out on his own, **R’ Meir** says they are chayuv. According to **R’ Meir or R’ Yehuda**, for the 2 people carrying to be chayuv, does there need to be a minimum shiur for each person carrying or one shiur for both combined? **A:** There is a machlokes between **R’ Chisda and R’ Hamnuna**. One says that one shiur is enough. The other says that there must be a minimum of 2 shiurim for them both to be chayuv.
 - **R’ Pappa in the name of Rava** said, there is proof from a Mishna that only one shiur is needed. A Mishna says, if there are cloaks under each leg of a bed that a zav is sitting on, they all become tamei because each leg is absolutely necessary for the bed to stand, and therefore is considered to be carrying the weight of the zav. The Mishna does not require the full weight of the zav on each leg, so you see that one shiur is enough for all 4! So too by us, one shiur should be enough for both people.
 - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** brings a proof from a Mishna which says, if two people trap an animal that they couldn’t trap alone, they are chayuv. The Mishna does not require them to trap 2 animals (2 shiurim) to be chayuv. We see that one shiur is enough for both people.
 - **Ravina** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that 2 people who together steal and slaughter a sheep or an ox, are chayuv to pay the penalty of 4x or 5x. The Mishna does not require each to steal and slaughter a separate animal. We see that one shiur is enough for both of them.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ashi** brings a proof from a Braisa which says that 2 people who carry out the reed of a weaver are chayuv. Presumably that is only big enough for one shiur of carrying. We see that only one shiur is required to cause 2 people to be chayuv.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked, maybe the reed was big enough to be used to cook 2 easily cooked eggs, and that's why they are both chayuv?! **A:** If so, why did the Braisa specify a weaver's reed? It should have just mentioned a regular reed.
 - **Q:** Still, maybe we are dealing with a weaver's reed that is large enough to weave 2 things and is therefore considered to be 2 shiurim!?
- A Tanna told R' Nachman, if 2 people carry out a weaver's reed, they are patur, but **R' Shimon** says they are chayuv.
 - **Q:** R' Shimon always says that 2 people who do a melacha together are patur!? **A:** The proper reading should be that the **T"K** says they are chayuv and **R' Shimon** says they are patur.

MISHNA

- If one takes out less than the full shiur of food in a keili, he is patur for carrying the food and the keili because the keili is subordinate to the food.
- If one carries out a live person in a bed, he is patur for carrying out the person ("a live person carries himself") and for the bed, because the bed is subordinate to the person.
- If one carries out a meis on a bed, he is chayuv. He would similarly be chayuv for carrying out a kezayis from a meis, or from a neveilah, or a lentil sized piece of a sheretz. **R' Shimon** says he is patur in these cases (he is taking out these sources of tumah, not because he needs them elsewhere, but because he wants to remove them from where they are, which is a "melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufah" – a melacha that is done for a purpose other than the one that the melacha is meant to accomplish).

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one takes out a full shiur of food in a keili, he is chayuv for carrying out the food, but patur for carrying out the keili. If he needed the keili to be taken out for another use as well, then he is chayuv for carrying the keili as well.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said, that although both acts of carrying are done in one period of unawareness, he is chayuv two chataos. It would seem from here that if one ate 2 kezaisim of cheilev in one period of unawareness he will be chayuv 2 chataos! **A: R' Sheishes** said that the Braisa may be discussing where he was a shogeg regarding the food (and is chayuv a chatas for that) and is a meizid regarding the keili (and is chayuv kares or misah for that). So although he is chayuv on both, there is no proof that one can be chayuv 2 chataos for the same aveirah in one period of unawareness.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, the Braisa says "ahf ahl hakli" – he is chayuv "also" on the keili. This suggests that he is chayuv on both of them the same way – i.e. with a korbon chatas?! **A: R' Ashi** said, the Braisa is discussing where he was a shogeg on the food and the keili, and he first found out about one of the aveiros and then later found out about the other aveirah, in which case he would be chayuv 2 chataos (which is the basis of the machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** we discussed some time ago).

-----Daf 73-----94-----

ES HACHAI B'MITAH, PATUR AHF AHL HAMITAH

- **Q:** A Braisa says that if one carries a live or dead animal out on Shabbos he is chayuv. **R' Nosson** says he is only chayuv for carrying a dead animal, not a live one, because a live animal "carries itself". Should we say that our Mishna follows only **R' Nosson** (which is a minority view) and not the **Rabanan**? **A: Rava** said, our Mishna may follow the **Rabanan**. The **Rabanan** only argue regarding a live animal, since when it is carried it fights and makes itself "heavy", trying to escape the grip of the one who carries it. The **Rabanan** would agree that a live person "carries himself" and one would therefore not be chayuv for carrying a live person out on Shabbos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked **Rava**, how can you say the **Rabanan** agree regarding a live person? A Mishna prohibits the sale of certain animals to goyim because that may lead to renting and lending animals to goyim over Shabbos, with the goy performing melacha with the animal on Shabbos, which is prohibited. **Ben Beseirah** allows the sale of a horse, because a horse carries people, which if done on Shabbos is not prohibited D'Oraisa because a “live person carries himself”, so we don't have to be gozer in that case. **R' Yochanan** explained, that **Ben Beseirah** and **R' Nosson** say the same principle (that a live person carries himself). If **Rava** is correct that the **Rabanan** agree that a live person carries himself, why does **R' Yochanan** limit **Ben Beseirah** to agreeing only with **R' Nosson**?! **A: R' Yochanan** was referring to a horse that was designated to carry birds, in which case the **Rabanan** would not agree. We find that bird hunters would use a horse to carry the birds that helped them catch other birds.
- **R' Yochanan** said, **R' Nosson** would agree that a live person or animal that is tied up is not considered to be able to “carry itself”.
 - **Q: R' Adda bar Masna** asked **Abaye**, the Persians ride their horses in a way that they are basically tied up, and yet **R' Yochanan** said that **Ben Beseira** and **R' Nosson** say the same thing that the person on the horse “carries himself”?! **A:** The Persian is not truly tied up. He could move and run if he wanted to (like we find a story with a Persian officer who ran 3 “parsah” on foot to escape the king). He just chooses not to, and therefore they are not considered to be tied up.

ES HAMEIS B'MITAH CHAYUV, V'CHEIN KIZAYIS MIN HAMEIS...

- **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** say, **R' Shimon** said one is patur for carrying out a meis even if he carried him out to bury him. Although there is a purpose in doing so, it is still considered to be a “melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufah” because it is not needed for the person doing the melacha. **Rava** said, **R' Shimon** would agree that one who takes out a shovel to dig with or a sefer Torah to read from is chayuv.
 - **Q:** Obviously he would be chayuv in this case, since he took it out for his own use!? **A:** One would think that **R' Shimon** would only say one is chayuv when there is a purpose for the person doing the melacha and a purpose for the item of the melacha – i.e. if one takes out a shovel to fix it and to dig with it, or if one takes out a sefer Torah to fix it and to read from it. **Rava** tells us that as long as there is a use for the one performing the melacha, **R' Shimon** would say he is chayuv.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** allowed a meis to be taken out to a karmelis. **R' Yochanan, the brother of Mar the son of Ravana** asked, even **R' Shimon** said one is patur for carrying out a meis, but he didn't allow it l'chatchila, so why did you allow it? He answered, I only allowed the meis to be taken out into a karmelis, not a reshus harabim. Even **R' Yehuda** would allow this l'chatchila for the purpose of human dignity.
- If “tzara'as” has 2 white hairs growing out of it, it is a sign that it is tamei. A Mishna says, if one pulled out one of the 2 white hairs, thereby rendering it not tamei, he is chayuv malkus for being “oiver” a lav. If there are 3 white hairs and he pulls out one, **R' Nachman** says he is chayuv (because he has just brought himself one step closer to rendering the tzara'as not tamei) and **R' Sheishes** says he is patur (because he has done nothing to change the tumah status right now).
 - **R' Sheishes** proves his point from a contradiction regarding carrying a piece of a meis. Our Mishna said that one is chayuv for carrying out a kezayis of a meis. It is mashma that he would not be chayuv for half of a kezayis. A Braisa says that one is chayuv for carrying out even a half of a kezayis of a meis. It must be that the Braisa is talking about where he took a half of a kezayis from a piece that was a kezayis. He therefore changed the status to make it unable to give off tumah and that's why he is chayuv. The Mishna must be talking about where there was a kezayis and a half. When he takes the half of a kezayis, he left over a full kezayis and he is therefore patur. This is similar to the case of 2 white hairs and 3 white hairs.
 - **R' Nachman** would say in both these cases (where he takes a half kezayis from either a full kezayis or from a kezayis and a half) he would chayuv for taking out a half of a kezayis. When the Mishna is mashma that he is patur it is referring to where he took a half of a kezayis from a large

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

meis. In that case, his half of a kezayis doesn't bring him even close to losing the tamei status, and that's why he is patur. However, taking one hair of 3 is significant.

MISHNA

- If one removes his nails with his other nails, or with his teeth, or he rips out hair of his head, of his mustache, or of his beard, or a woman who braids her hair, or paints her eyes, or combs her hair, **R' Eliezer** says they are chayuv and the **Chachomim** say these acts are assur D'Rabanan.

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** says, the machlokes is removing the nails by hand. However, all would agree that one who removes nails with a utensil would be chayuv.
 - **Q:** This is obvious – that's what the Mishna says! **A:** One could say that the **Rabanan** say he is patur when using a keili as well, and they argue regarding removing with the hands to inform us how strict **R' Eliezer** is.
- **R' Elazar** says, the machlokes is one who removes his own fingernails. However, all would agree that one who takes off someone else's nails with his hands is patur.
 - **Q:** This is obvious – the Mishna says "his" nails?! **A:** One would think that **R' Eliezer** says he would be chayuv in this case as well, and the Mishna says "his" fingernails to teach that even in that case the **Rabanan** say he is patur.

V'CHEIN S'ARO...

- A Braisa says, if one removes a scissors' full of hair he is chayuv. **R' Yehuda** explains this to mean 2 hairs. This is the same amount that would make one chayuv for tearing out hair in mourning.
 - A Braisa says the **Chachomim** agree with the amount of 2 hairs, but **R' Eliezer** says one is chayuv for even one hair. The **Chachomim** agree that plucking one white hair from among the black hairs is enough to make someone chayuv. Doing so is even prohibited during the week (because it is "dressing" like a woman).
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, if a nail or cuticle is mostly detached, it may be removed by hand but one is chayuv a chatas for removing it with a utensil.
 - **Q:** How can it be mutar l'chatchila if done by hand and chayuv a chatas if done with a keili? It should be assur D'Rabanan if done by hand! **A:** The Braisa should say, if it is mostly detached, it is mutar to detach by hand and assur to do by utensil. If it is not mostly detached, it is assur to do by hand and if done with a keili, he is chayuv a chatas.
 - **R' Yehuda** says, the halacha follows **R' Shimon ben Elazar**. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that is only if it detached from the top down. That is typically associated with pain, and because of that pain, one may remove the detached piece with his hands.

-----Daf ז"ה-----95-----

V'CHEIN HAGODELES...

- **Q:** For which melacha is a woman chayuv when she braids her hair, paints her eyes or combs her hair? **A: R' Avin in the name of R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, braiding is chayuv for weaving, painting is chayuv for writing, and combing is chayuv for spinning.
 - **Q:** The **Rabanan** asked, this is not the normal performance of any of these melachos?! **A: R' Avahu** says painting is chayuv for dyeing. Braiding and combing are chayuv for building. This is called building like we find that **R' Shimon ben Manasya** says, the pasuk says Hashem "built" Chava, and he explains that to mean that Hashem braided her hair.
- **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, a woman who braids, paints or combs her own hair and eyes is patur, but a woman who does this for another woman is chayuv (she does a much better job on someone else).
 - He also says in the name of **R' Eliezer** that a woman may not apply blush on Shabbos because it is assur under the melacha of dyeing.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, one who milks an animal, strains milk, or makes cheese, in each case in the amount of a dried fig, is chayuv. If one sweeps a floor, sprinkles water to keep the dust settled, or removes honeycombs from a hive: **R' Eliezer** says he is chayuv D'Oraisa. The **Chachomim** say it is assur D'Rabanan.
 - **R' Nachman bar Gurya**, when asked, explained that milking is chayuv for the melacha of milking, straining milk for the melacha of straining milk, and making cheese for the melacha of making cheese. They told him, your rebbi did not explain that to you well. He went to Beis Medrash and was told, milking is chayuv for “mefarek” (extracting), straining the milk is chayuv for “borer” (choosing), and making cheese is chayuv for “boneh” (building, because the cheese is pressed together and “built”)
 - **Q:** Why does **R' Eliezer** say that one is chayuv for removing a honeycomb? **A:** **R' Elazar** says, the pasuk compares a forest to honey to teach that just like one who removes a tree from a forest is chayuv for reaping, so too is one who removes a honeycomb from a hive.
 - **Ameimar** allowed sprinkling to settle the dust in Mechuza. The reason it is normally assur is because by doing so one fills in the holes in the floor. However, in Mechuza the floors were made of stone, and therefore this reason didn't apply.
 - **Rabbah Tosfa'ah** saw that **Ravina** was suffering from the floating dust. He asked him, why don't you do like the Braisa suggests: wash your face in one corner, your hands in another corner and your feet in another corner, and have the splashing and dripping settle the dust? He answered, I was not aware of this (or I don't hold of this – Rashi).
 - A Braisa says, the wife or daughter of a talmid chachom can settle the dust by washing the dishes all around the house.
 - Since we pasken like **R' Shimon**, that an unintended act is permitted, we can sprinkle directly to settle the dust, and we are not concerned that the holes may get filled.

MISHNA

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

GEMARA

- **Abaye** asked **Rava**, from here it seems that **R' Shimon** says there is no difference between a flowerpot with a hole and one without a hole. However, in a Braisa **R' Shimon** says, the only difference between these 2 flowerpots is that the seeds in a pot without a hole are considered totally detached from the ground and can therefore become susceptible to tumah (“muchshar lekabel tumah”) if they get wet. The seeds in a pot with a hole are considered attached to the ground for this purpose and are therefore not susceptible to tumah even if made wet. We see that **R' Shimon** says there is a difference between the two, not like he says in our Mishna?! **A:** **Rava** answered, **R' Shimon** says that the seeds and plant in a perforated pot are considered totally detached, except for this din of tumah, which **R' Shimon** learns from a pasuk, to treat differently.
- **R' Zeira** was asked, if the root of a plant in a perforated pot is directly opposite the hole, what will **R' Shimon** hold? **R' Zeira** remained quiet and did not answer. The one who asked **R' Zeira** later heard **R' Zeira** say that if the pot had a hole large enough to make it lose its status of tumah (to do so, it typically needs to have a hole large enough for olives to pass through), even **R' Shimon** would agree that the plant is considered to be attached to the ground. He therefore asked **R' Zeira**, if you were unsure about how **R' Shimon** would pasken when the root was directly opposite the hole (with no keili in between), how can you say that **R' Shimon** would say that if there is a hole large enough to make it not be considered tamei, that even the roots not opposite the hole in the pot are considered attached to the ground?!
 - **Abaye** said, what **R' Zeira** meant was, if the pot has a hole that will prevent it from being able to hold a revi'is of liquid, then it is considered fully attached to the ground, because it is no longer considered to be a keili on any level.
- **Rava** said, there are 5 stages of holes in an earthenware keili:

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If it has a hole that only lets out liquid, it cannot become tamei as a broken keili (which is used as a drip tray under a leaking keili), but otherwise is considered to be a full-fledged keili (it can even be used for parah adumah purposes).
- If it has a hole large enough to let in liquids, it can no longer be used for parah adumah purposes, but seeds that are planted in it are still considered detached from the ground and can become susceptible to tumah if they become wet.
- If it has a hole as large as a small root, seeds planted in it are considered attached to the ground and are not susceptible to tumah, but the keili can still be mekabel tumah because it is fit to hold olives.
- If it has a hole large enough to fit olives through, it can no longer become tamei (and loses its tumah status if it was tamei) unless it is now designated (or was previously designated) to hold pomegranates.
- If it has a hole large enough to fit pomegranates through, it can no longer become (or remain) tamei. However, even with such a large hole, if its intended opening is covered with a sealed cover, the contents in this keili will not become tamei from a meis unless most of the keili is broken off.
- **R' Assi** said, I heard that the size of a hole that will cause an earthenware keili to lose tumah status is the size of a pomegranate. **Rava** said, maybe you heard that once the hole is the size of a pomegranate, sealing the intended opening with a cover will no longer save its contents from tumas meis?
 - **Q: Rava** himself said that sealing with a cover prevents tumas meis until most of the keili is missing?! **A: Rava** said that a seal helps until most is missing by a large keili. With regard to a smaller keili, once there is a hole large enough to fit a pomegranate through, sealing the intended opening will not help to prevent tumas meis from effecting the contents.

-----Daf 13---96-----

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

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMATZANIA!!!

PEREK HAZOREK -- PEREK ACHAD ASSAR

MISHNA

- If one throws an object from a reshus hayachid (RH"Y) to a reshus harabim (RH"R), or visa-versa, he is chayuv.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

GEMARA

- **Q:** Where do we find a melacha of carrying *out* (from a RH"Y to a RH"R) written in the Torah? **A:** **R' Yochanan** says, the pasuk tells us that Moshe told the Yidden not to bring donations to the "Machaneh Leviyah" (which had a din of a RH"R) from their tents (which were a RH"Y).
 - **Q:** Maybe he told them not to bring any donations because no more were needed for the Mishkan, but it had nothing to do with Shabbos?! **A:** There is a gezeirah shava of "havara, havara" from Yom Kippur to this announcement of Moshe, which teaches that just like Yom Kippur is a day of forbidden melachos, so too the day of announcement was Shabbos, a day of forbidden melachos.
- **Q:** Where do we find that carrying *in* (from a RH"R to a RH"Y) is assur? **A:** It's based on a "s'vara". The Torah prohibited transferring from one reshus to another. The same way it is assur to carry out, it is assur to carry in. There is no reason to say that one is more assur than the other. The difference would be that carrying out would be an "av melacha" and carrying in would be a "toldah".
 - **Q:** Carrying in and carrying out are both assur and make one chayuv a chatas. If so, with regard to what is carrying out an "av melacha" and carrying in a "toldah"? Calling one an "av" and the other a toldah makes it that they are under the same umbrella melacha, which then means that if one performs both of these melachos in one period of unawareness, he will only be chayuv one chatas.
 - **Q:** **R' Eliezer** says that if one performs an "av" and its toldah he is chayuv 2 chataos. According to him, why is carrying out an "av" and carrying in the toldah? **A:** There is truly no legal significance in the titles. The melachos that were significant in the Mishkan are called an "av", the melachos which were of less significance are called a toldah. Or, the melachos that are mentioned in the Torah are called an "av" and those not listed in the Torah are called a toldah.
- **Q:** Where do we know the din that one who throws an item 4 amos in RH"R is chayuv? **A:** **R' Yoshiya** says, the weavers would throw their needles to each other.
 - **Q:** Weavers don't use needles?! **A:** The sewers of the curtains would throw their needles to each other.
 - **Q:** Maybe they sat next to each other? **A:** If that was so, they would have hit each other with their needles as they worked.
 - **Q:** Maybe they sat apart, but within 4 amos of each other? **A:** **R' Chisda** explains, the weavers would throw the spool of thread back and forth across the weaving machine. Although they held onto the string as it was thrown, so they never totally left go, at the end of the spool, the spool was let go and was thrown across the machine.
 - **Q:** The area within the weaving machine is considered to be a "makom petur", and one would therefore not be chayuv for throwing across such an area?! **A:** We learn out throwing 4 amos from the weavers who would throw the spools 4 amos to another weaver who needed another spool.
 - **Q:** Maybe they sat next to each other? **A:** They couldn't be near each other, because if they were they would get in the way when they each would have to pull the end of the curtains tight.
 - **Q1:** Maybe they were within 4 amos (from east to west), but were pulled apart a little (north to south) so that they didn't get in each other's way?! **Q2:** Also, **Luda** taught in a Braisa that each craftsman had his own supplies and didn't need to take from another!? **Q3:** Even if we accept this last answer, that only teaches us regarding throwing 4 amos, it doesn't teach us regarding one who simply carries something 4

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

amos in reshus harabim?! **A:** All forms of transferring 4 amos in reshus harabim are learned via a Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai.

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the “Mekosheish” (the one who was mechalel Shabbos in the Midbar and was therefore put to death by stoning) was put to death for carrying wood 4 amos in the reshus harabim. A Braisa says he cut wood from the ground. **R’ Acha the son of R’ Yaakov** said he gathered wood (the melacha of “me’amer”).
 - The difference between these opinions is relevant to a statement made by **Rav. Rav** found a hidden scroll of **R’ Chiya** in which was written that **Issi ben Yehuda** said there are 39 avos melachos, and there is one among them which does not carry the death penalty. According to this, **R’ Yehuda** is certain that this one melacha is not carrying, the Braisa is certain that it is not detaching from the ground, and **R’ Achah bar Yaakov** is certain that it is not “gathering” (because they each believe that that is the one that caused the Mekosheish to be put to death).
- A Braisa says, **R’ Akiva** said, based on a gezeirah shava we can learn that the Mekosheish was Tzela’fchad. **R’ Yehuda ben Beseirah** said to him, you are going to have to answer for what you just said, whether you are correct or not. If you are incorrect, you have just spoken falsely and derogatorily about the tzadik Tzela’fchad! Even if you are correct, the Torah purposely hid his identity and you exposed it!
 - **Q: R’ Akiva** has a gezeirah shava, so the Torah didn’t conceal his identity?! **A: R’ Yehuda** didn’t learn this gezeirah shava from his Rebbi.
 - **Q: According to R’ Yehuda**, if Tzela’fchad wasn’t the Mekosheish why did he deserve to die? **A:** He was from the people who went up to fight Kina’an after Moshe told them not to go, and they were then defeated by the goyim.
- After Miriam and Aharon spoke lashon harah about Moshe, the pasuk says that Hashem got angry at “them” and He left, and Aharon turned to Miriam and saw that she had tzara’as like snow. **R’ Akiva** says, Aharon also got tzara’as, because the pasuk says Hashem got angry at “them”. **R’ Yehuda ben Beseirah** said to him, you are going to have to answer for what you just said, whether you are correct or not. If you are incorrect, you have just spoken falsely and derogatorily about the tzadik Aharon! Even if you are correct, the Torah purposely hid this and you exposed it!
 - **R’ Yehuda ben Beseirah** says, the “them” just tells us that Hashem was angry at Aharon, but not that he got tzara’as.
 - A Braisa also says that Aharon got tzara’as. The pasuk says Aharon “turned to Miriam and saw she had tzara’as”. This means he turned from his own tzara’as.

-----Daf תצ-----97-----

- **Reish Lakish** says, one who suspects innocent people of wrongdoing gets punished by having his body stricken. We see this when Moshe said to Hashem, I will tell the Yidden that You sent me to redeem them, but they will not believe me. Hashem knew that they would believe him. Hashem told Moshe, the Yidden are believers (they believed Moshe) the children of believers (the pasuk says that Avrohom believed in Hashem), whereas you (Moshe) will ultimately fail to believe (Moshe hit the rock instead of speaking to it). Moshe got punished for suspecting the Yidden would not believe, as the pasuk says, Hashem told him to stick his hand into his shirt and it came out full of tzara’as.
- **Rava** says, when good is sent by Hashem, it happens quicker than when bad is sent. We see this when Moshe got tzara’as on his hand. The tzara’as didn’t come until he pulled his hand out of his shirt. The tzara’as was gone as he returned his hand back into his shirt (it didn’t wait until he started pulling the hand back out).
- The pasuk says that Aharon’s stick swallowed the sticks of the Egyptian magicians. This was a double miracle. Not only did it swallow their sticks, it did so after it turned back into a stick.

MEI’RESHUS HAYACHID L’RESHUS HAYACHID...

- **Q: Rabbah** asks, is the machlokes between **R’ Akiva** and the **Chachomim** regarding an object that is thrown below 10 tefachim in the RH”R, where **R’ Akiva** says, we say it is as if it came to rest in the RH”R and the **Chachomim** say we don’t say that, but if the object is thrown above 10 tefachim all would agree that he is not chayuv; or is the machlokes when something is thrown above 10 tefachim, in which case **R’ Akiva** says, we say

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that just like one is chayuv for handing over in the area above 10 tefachim, he is similarly chayuv for throwing an object through the RH"R above 10 tefachim whereas the **Chachomim** say that handing over would make one chayuv, not throwing; however, if something is thrown below 10 tefachim, all would agree that it is as if it had come to rest and he is chayuv? **A: R' Yosef** says that **R' Hamnuna** answers from a Braisa that says, if one transfers an item from one RH"Y to another and passes through the RH"R "itself", **R' Akiva** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur. "Itself" refers to the actual confines of the RH"R, which is below 10 tefachim. We see they argue regarding the RH"R below 10 tefachim. They must be arguing about an object that was thrown, because we have already said previously, that one who carries through the RH"R, even above 10 tefachim, is chayuv. They obviously argue whether the object in the airspace of the RH"R is considered to have landed in it.

- This argues on **R' Elazar**, who said that they truly argue even regarding something thrown above 10 tefachim. The reason why the Braisa discusses below 10 tefachim is to teach that the **Chachomim** say one is patur even below 10 tefachim.
- **R' Chilkiya bar Tovi** says like **R' Hamnuna**, because he says, if one throws an item within 3 tefachim to the ground, all hold he is chayuv. If it is thrown above 10 tefachim, all agree he is patur. Between 3 and 10 tefachim is a machlokes between **R' Akiva** and the **Chachomim**.
- A Braisa says, if an item is thrown within 3 tefachim to the ground, all agree he is chayuv. Above 10 tefachim, all agree he is patur; but if he owns both of the Rishuyos (the RH"Y being thrown from and the one it is landing in), it is mutar. If it is thrown between 3 and 10 tefachim off the ground, **R' Akiva** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said, if thrown above 10 tefachim and he owns both reshuyos, it is mutar. This argues on **Rav**, because **Rav** says it is assur to throw from one RH"Y to another across the RH"R. **Shmuel** says it is mutar. They must be talking about where he owns both, because **Shmuel** says it's mutar, and still **Rav** says it's assur!? **A: Rav** is talking about a case where the 2 RH"Y are at different heights, and because of that, **Rav** is afraid that he may miss his target and throw it into the RH"R and thereby be chayuv. Therefore he says it is assur. However, if that weren't the case, he would agree with the Braisa that it would be mutar.
- **Q: R' Chisda** asked **R' Hamnuna** from where do we know this concept of "lavud" – that less than 3 tefachim of space is considered to be an extension of the area (e.g. within 3 tefachim of the ground is considered to be on the ground)? **A:** He answered that it is impossible for the ground to be perfectly straight. There are always going to be bumps on the ground, which usually go 3 tefachim high. Therefore, anything less than 3 tefachim to the ground is thought of as part of the ground.
 - **Q1:** If so, if it is 3 tefachim it should also be considered as part of the ground (not just if *less* than 3 tefachim)?! **Q2:** This reason can explain why bumps in the ground are considered part of the ground. It doesn't explain why we would say "lavud" in other situations, such as the wall of a succah that reaches within 3 tefachim to the ground is considered a complete wall!? **A:** This last question can be answered by explaining that the reason the succah wall within 3 tefachim to the ground is considered a complete wall is because once the open space is less than 3 tefachim, small animals will not be able to slip through there, thereby giving the wall a use as a true wall.
 - **Q:** This answer makes sense when we apply "lavud" to the bottom of a wall. It doesn't explain why we can apply the din of "lavud" to the top of a wall?!
 - **A:** The din of "lavud" is something that is taught to us as a Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai.
- A Braisa says, if one throws an object from one RH"R to another with a RH"Y in between, **Rebbi** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur.
 - **Rav and Shmuel** say, **Rebbi** says he is chayuv only when the RH"Y is a roofed structure. We then view it as if the RH"Y is filled to the roof and that the object came to rest in the RH"Y.
 - **R' Chana in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, **Rebbi** means that he is chayuv two chataos: one for going in to the RH"Y and one for then going out to the RH"R.
 - **Q: R' Chana** asked, that would mean that **Rebbi** says he is chayuv for the av melacha and separately for the toldah. We find that **Rebbi** says one is chayuv only one chatas if he performs

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

an “av” with its toldah?! **A: R’ Yosef** answered, we learned that **R’ Yehuda** said the statement in the name of **Shmuel** regarding something that **R’ Yehuda** said, not **Rebbi**. Therefore, **Rebbi’s** statement will not be problematic. **R’ Yehuda** had said, if one carries from a RH”Y out into a RH”R and continues carrying for 4 amos in the RH”R, he is chayuv. The **Chachomim** say he is patur. On that machlokes, **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, **R’ Yehuda** means that he is chayuv 2 chataos: one for carrying out into the RH”R and one for carrying 4 amos in the RH”R. It must be that he means he is chayuv 2 chataos, because if **R’ Yehudah** means to say he is chayuv one chatas, that would mean that the **Rabanan** argue and say he is patur from even one chatas. That can’t be, because at the very least, he has carried something from RH”Y to RH”R!

- **Q:** It could be that **R’ Yehuda** says he is only chayuv one chatas and the **Rabanan** say he is patur from any chatas. The **Rabanan** say he is patur because the case being discussed is where he intends for the object to land immediately as it enters the RH”R, but instead, it travelled another 4 amos. The **Rabanan** say, being in the airspace is not considered as if it landed, and since it didn’t land where he intended, it is an unintended result, which is patur. **R’ Yehuda** says that it is as if it landed, and it therefore fulfilled his intention, and that’s why he is chayuv that one chatas!?
- **Q:** We find that **R’ Yehuda** seems to say one is chayuv 2 chataos for performing an av and its toldah. **R’ Yehuda** in a Braisa adds “Shoveit and Midakdeik” to the list of melachos. The **Chachomim** said to him, those are already included in other melachos! It must be that **R’ Yehuda** would be mechayuv for those melachos even though they are toldos and were done together with the actual avos! (If so, it would make sense that he is mechayuv 2 chataos in the previous case as well!) **A: R’ Yehuda** “adds” those 2 melachos in the Braisa, which would mean he adds them as avos, so they would be totally separate melachos, not a toldah of the same av.
- **Rabbah and R’ Yosef** both say that **R’ Yehuda** says one is chayuv one chatas for performing an av and its toldah.
- **Q: Ravina** asked **R’ Ashi**, according to **R’ Yosef**, that **R’ Yehuda** says he is chayuv 2 chataos: one for transferring out to the RH”R and one for moving it 4 amos in RH”R, how can that be right? If he intended it to land immediately inside the RH”R, then he never intended it to go 4 amos, and visa-versa. So how can he be chayuv for both? **A: R’ Ashi** answered, the case is where he says, I want it to land wherever it lands.
- **Q:** If one intends to throw an object 8 amos and it goes 4 amos, it is obvious that he is chayuv. It is as if he wrote 2 letters of a larger word (he wrote “shem” when he intended to write the word “Shimon”). What about where he intends to throw it 4 amos and it goes 8 amos, is he chayuv? On the one hand, his intention was not fulfilled. On the other hand, it did move 4 amos as he had intended?! **A:** This should be answered based on what **R’ Ashi** answered above. Since here he had a specific intention and it was not fulfilled, he should not be chayuv. In fact, in **both** cases of this question, he should not be chayuv. The reason why the first case of the question is different than writing the word “Shem” when he intended to write the word “Shimon” is because when writing “Shimon”, he necessarily must write the word “shem” and then continue. When throwing 8 amos, he need not throw 4 amos, have it rest, and then continue another 4 amos. It can be thrown direct, with no stop.

-----Daf 79-----98-----

- A Braisa says, if one throws an object from one RH”R to another, with a RH”Y in between, if the object travelled a total of 4 amos in the 2 RH”R combined, he is chayuv. If not, he is patur.
 - The chiddush is, that we don’t say passing through the airspace is if it had landed, and we do say that the amount travelled in each RH”R combines to reach the 4 amos minimum.
- **Rav** says, if one carries an item for 4 amos in a RH”R with a roof he is patur, because they did not carry in such a RH”R in the Midbar.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The wagons that carried the boards of the Mishkan acted as a roof for the areas directly beneath them, and **Rav said in the name of R' Chiya** said, the areas beneath the wagons had the status of a RH"R!? **A:** There were 4 wagons that were used to carry the boards of the Mishkan, that travelled as 2 pairs of parallel wagons (==). The boards overhung each side of each wagon. The boards were placed on the wagons in piles (with the length of the boards being placed across the width of the wagons), each pile taking up less than the full length of the wagon, so there was a space between the piles of boards on each wagon. It is regarding this space that **Rav** said there was a din of RH"R, because that space had no roof over it.
 - **Q:** Each wagon was 5 amos long. The boards were piled up with the length of the boards across the width of the wagon (or the width of the boards along the length of the wagons). The width of the boards were 1 and a half amos. That meant they would make 3 piles of boards (they would make the maximum amount of piles so that they wouldn't have to pile them too high) which would take up 4 and a half amos. Assuming the piles were spread out evenly over the wagon, that left ¼ amah of space between the piles. That is less than 3 tefachim, so the din of "lavud" would apply, meaning even the spaces would be considered to have a roof!? **A:** The boards weren't placed on their width, they were placed on their depth, which was only one amah, thereby leaving wider gaps between the piles.
 - **Q:** If they were stacked on their depth, then they were stacked in 4 piles, which leaves 1 amah of space to be divided among 3 empty spaces – again less than 3 tefachim and therefore, due to "lavud" will be considered to have a roof on the space as well!? **A1:** If you follow the view that the boards got gradually thinner from bottom to top, that would mean that although they were one amah wide each on the bottom, they were a lot less than that on top, and the space between the piles at the top of the boards was more than 3 tefachim. So **Rav** was referring to those spaces. **A2:** If you follow the view that the boards were 1 amah thick throughout the entire length of the board, **R' Kahana** explains, that to give support and stability to the piles, the piles were made in groups, with 2 piles per group, which were put together so that each group had a joint thickness of 2 amos. One group was placed on one end of the wagon and the other group on the other end. That left a full amah of space in the middle. It is regarding that space that **Rav** said there is a din of a RH"R.
 - **Q:** There were no boards over that middle amah, but the floor of the wagon created a roof over the area beneath it!? **A: Shmuel** says, there was no floor to the wagon. The 2 sides of the wagon were held together by crossbars, without a floor.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, the boards of the Mishkan were an amah thick on the bottom and got gradually thinner from bottom to top, as the pasuk says they should be "Samim" at the top, which means they should come to a point. **R' Nechemya** says they were an amah wide throughout, as the pasuk says "Yachdav".
 - **R' Nechemya** says "samim" teaches that they should be made from one piece of wood. **R' Yehuda** says "yachdav" teaches that they should be perfectly even when placed together with all the other boards.
 - **Q:** The pasukim explain that the 2 end boards of the western wall of the Mishkan were not fully visible on the inside of the Mishkan, because they covered the thickness of the last boards of the north and south side of the Mishkan. That makes sense according to **R' Nechemya**, but according to **R' Yehuda**, the walls got thinner towards the top, so a full board was not needed to cover the thickness?! **A:** These end boards were sloped on both sides (like a mountain – Rashi) and therefore covered the thickness of the north and south walls but remained flush with the other boards.
 - A pasuk tells us that a pole was placed inside the boards that went across all the boards of the Mishkan. A Braisa says, this was done through a miracle, because the pole actually bent into the "ches" shape of the Mishkan every time it was placed into the boards.
 - The bottom covering of the Mishkan was made of 10 panels. Each panel was 28 amos long and 4 amos wide. When they were all attached (along their widths), the entire cover was 40 amos long and 28 amos wide. When placed over the Mishkan, the 28 amos was placed over the width of the Mishkan. The Mishkan itself was 10 amos wide. That leaves 18 amos. According to **R' Yehuda**, who says the boards

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

were the width of a finger at the top, the full 18 amos overhung the boards (9 amos on each side of the Mishkan) and covered the boards up until the sockets in which they stood (the boards were 10 amos high, the bottom amah of which was placed in the “Adanim” – sockets). According to **R’ Nechemya**, the cover covered the amah thickness of the boards on each side. That left 16 amos remaining which overhung 8 amos of the boards on either side of the Mishkan (leaving the sockets and one amah of board uncovered). The width of the panels (which, when put together was 40 amos) was placed over the length of the Mishkan, which was 30 amos. That left 10 amos remaining. According to **R’ Yehuda**, the full 10 amos covered the boards and the sockets of the western wall. According to **R’ Nechemya**, one amah covered the thickness of the boards and the 9 remaining amos covered the boards up to the sockets.

- The second covering of the Mishkan was made of 11 panels of goat hairs. Each panel was 30 amos long and 4 amos wide. When attached by the width, the entire covering was 2 amos wider and 4 amos longer than the first covering. The 30 amos was placed over the width of the Mishkan. Using the measurements used above, this covering covered one extra amah on each side of the length of the Mishkan. According to **R’ Yehuda** it covered the sockets, and according to **R’ Nechemya** it covered the board up to the sockets. The 44 amos were placed over the length of the Mishkan. Two of those extra amos were hung down at the eastern side (the entrance) and were then folded back up onto the roof. The remaining 2 extra amos were let to hang on the back of the western wall. According to **R’ Yehuda** it dragged 2 amos on the floor, and according to **R’ Nechemya** it dragged one amah on the floor.
 - **R’ Yishmael** says, the Mishkan looked like a woman walking in the marketplace, with her dress trailing behind her.
- A Braisa says: 1) the boards were chiseled out on the bottom to create 2 arms (the wood was chiseled all around so that the arms were not flush with the rest of the board on any side) and then placed into hollow places in the sockets, which held the arms and thereby stood up the board. The sockets were made so that the thickness around the hollowed out area were completely flush with the boards; 2) The 10 panels discussed above were sewn together in 2 groups of 5. The end of each group facing the middle then got 50 loops made of blue wool. Each loop of one group was connected to the loop of the other group that was opposite it, with a golden hook. The sparkle of the gold looked like stars in the sky.
- A Braisa says, the first covering was made of blue wool, purple wool, red wool and linen. The second covering was made of goat hair. This second covering required a lot more expertise than the lower covering. **R’ Nechemya** explains, this is so because the hair had to be washed and spun while still on the goat.