



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Shabbos, Daf טז – Daf קה

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 טז---99-----

SH'TEI GEZUZRIRA'OS...

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

MISHNA

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

GEMARA

- Why does the Mishna mention the case of a mound of dirt around the ditch, which is essentially the same as the case of a rock? The Mishna should say “a ditch and a rock” where one is teaching about an above ground structure and the other is teaching about one below ground?! From the fact that the Mishna mentions this, the Mishna seems to be a proof to **R' Yochanan** who says that the ditch and the mound around it can combine to make the necessary height of 10 tefachim to classify the ditch as a RH”Y.
  - A Braisa says like **R' Yochanan** as well. The Braisa says, if there is a ditch which is 10 tefachim deep with an area of 4x4 in the RH”R and the ditch is filled with water, one may not draw water from it on Shabbos unless he places partitions around the adjacent area to make that area a RH”Y as well. One may also not lean over and drink over the ditch unless he leans his head and most of his body over the ditch (in which case the **Rabanan** were not goizer that he may carry the water out of the airspace of the ditch). The Braisa ends off by saying, a ditch and its mound of dirt around it combine to make the necessary dimensions for a RH”Y.
- **Q:** **R' Mordechai** asked **Rava**, if one throws an object from the RH”R onto a board which is 4x4 tefachim and 10 tefachim high (clearly a RH”Y), is he chayuv because he has transferred an object from a RH”R to a RH”Y or is he patur, because the object landed onto the RH”Y from a “makom petur” (from an area above 10 tefachim in the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

RH”R)?! **A: Rava** said this can be answered from our Mishna. **R’ Mordechai** then asked **R’ Yosef** and then **Abaye** and both gave him the same answer. He was not convinced. **Abaye** said to him, our Mishna says, if one places an object onto the area that is 10 tefachim high with an area of 4x4 he is chayuv even though the object had to go through a “makom petur” to land on the rock! **R’ Mordechai** responded, our Mishna may be discussing a needle, whose height is so small that it is not considered to have entered into a “makom petur”.

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

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 7-----100-----

- **Abaye** says, if one throws a reed mat from the RH”R into a ditch that is 10 tefachim deep and 8 tefachim wide, he is chayuv. If he stands it up in middle of the pit (thereby splitting the pit into 2 pits which are less than 4 tefachim wide each (each “half” is less than 4 to accommodate for the thickness of the mat itself) he is patur.
  - According to **Abaye** who says that a mat (which is less likely to be abandoned in the ditch) can cancel the ditch’s status as a RH”Y, he would surely agree that throwing dirt into a ditch (which will be abandoned in the ditch) to decrease the depth to below 10 tefachim will surely change the status as it is thrown. According to **R’ Yochanan** who is unsure with regard to the case of throwing the dirt, he would certainly say that the placement of the mat will not make the ditch lose its RH”Y status.
- **Abaye** says, if there is a ditch 10 tefachim deep with an area of 4x4 tefachim full of water in the RH”R, one would be chayuv for throwing an object from the RH”R into it. If the same ditch would be full of fruit instead of water, one would be patur for throwing an object from the RH”R into it (it is as if the ditch is full with earth, in which case it would not be a RH”Y).

## MISHNA

- If one throws an item in the RH”R at a wall 4 amos away, but above 10 tefachim off the ground, it is as if he threw it in the air, and he is patur. If he throws it at the wall below 10 tefachim, it is as if he threw the item on the ground, and he is chayuv. If one throws an item 4 amos on the ground, he is chayuv.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** When the object hits the wall it bounces back and therefore never travels the necessary 4 amos! If so, why is he chayuv? **A: R’ Yochanan** said, the Mishna is discussing a sticky cake of figs that sticks to the wall and does not bounce back.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav in the name of R’ Chiya** said, if one throws an object from the RH”R and it lands in a crevice (which is not 4x4) in a wall which is above ten tefachim, **R’ Meir** says, if the wall is large enough that it can be carved out to make the crevice into an area that is 4x4, we view the crevice as being 4x4 and he is chayuv (**R’ Meir** says this concept with regard to a doorway having the minimum shiur for a mezuzah), and the **Rabanan** say, currently the crevice is not 4x4 and therefore he is patur.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, if a mound in the RH”R slopes to a height of 10 tefachim within 4 amos (and has an area of 4x4 tefachim), it will have a din of a RH”Y, with the slopes treated as walls because of their steepness.
  - A Braisa says the same thing in the name of **R’ Chanina ben Gamliel**.

## MISHNA

- If one throws an object less than 4 amos in a RH”R, and before it lands a wind pushes it beyond 4 amos, he is patur.
- If one throws an object beyond 4 amos in the RH”R and before it lands a wind comes and blows it back to within 4 amos, he is chayuv.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** How can he be chayuv if the item never came to rest beyond 4 amos?! **A: R’ Yochanan** says, the case is that it came to rest on a tiny area (or it was held stationary in the air below 3 tefachim by the wind) beyond 4 amos before it was blown back within 4 amos.
- **Rava** said, the **Rabanan** say that an object, even within 3 tefachim to the ground, is only considered to have come to rest if it rests on something, of any minute size.
  - **Ravina** asked **Mareimar**, this is exactly what **R’ Yochanan** said, so why does **Rava** need to repeat it? **A: R’ Yochanan** was discussing a case where the object was being carried by the wind, and there is therefore no expectation of it landing there. We would think that it is only in that case that **R’ Yochanan** says it must come to rest. However, when it is within 3 tefachim to the ground, and not being carried by the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

wind, we would think that it is considered to have rested without actually resting. That's why **Rava** said that even in that case it is not considered to have landed.

### MISHNA

- One who throws an object 4 amos in the sea is patur (the sea is a karmelis).
- A shallow pool of water, which is less than 10 tefachim deep, that has a RH"R going through it is considered to be a RH"R.
- The Mishna says a second time, a shallow pool of water that has a RH"R going through it, is considered to be a RH"R.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** It is understandable why the Mishna repeated twice that the RH"R passes through it, to teach us that if the public can walk through something, although it may be inconvenient to walk through, is still considered to be a RH"R. This is opposed to using something, which if the public can only use it in an inconvenient way (e.g. a ditch that is too deep to use conveniently to store things in) it loses its din of a RH"R. However, why does the Mishna use the same example of a "shallow pool of water" for both cases?
  - **A: Rava** answers one case is discussing the summertime and one is discussing the winter. If we would only discuss the summer, we would think it is only then that a pool has a din of RH"R because people walk through it to cool off. If we would only discuss the winter, we would think it is only then that people walk through it because their shoes and clothing are anyway dirty from the mud so they don't mind walking through.
  - **A: Abaye** says if only mentioned once, we would think it refers to where the pool is not 4 amos wide. However, if it were 4 amos wide we would say that people would walk around it rather than through it. That's why we mention it again to include that case as well.
  - **A: R' Ashi** says, if mentioned only once, we would think that if it is 4 amos wide people walk through it, but if it is less than 4 amos people jump over it and don't walk through it. That's why we mention it again to include that case as well.

### MISHNA

- One who throws an object from the sea onto the shore or visa-versa, from the sea onto a ship or visa-versa, or from one ship to another, he is patur.
- One may carry between ships that are tied together, but not between ships that are not tied together even if they are very close to each other.

### GEMARA

- If one is on a ship on Shabbos and wants to draw water from the sea (which is a karmelis) for use on the ship, **R' Huna** says he stick out a small pole (as a symbol) and can then draw water. (He holds that the karmelis begins on the sea floor, and ten tefachim above that is a makom petur. Therefore, he truly can draw water freely. The pole is there as a reminder that one may not transfer from a karmelis to a RH"Y). **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna** say, he should enclose an area of 4x4 tefachim above the water and then draw from that area (that becomes a RH"Y like the ship). (They hold that a karmelis gets measured from the top of the water. Therefore, one cannot take water from the karmelis onto the ship which is a RH"Y without making an area into a RH"Y as well).
  - **Q: R' Nachman** asked, according to **R' Huna**, one should not be allowed to take water as a gezeirah for a case where he is in an area where there is less than 10 tefachim to the seabed?! **A: Rabba bar Avuha** answered, a ship will not travel in water that is less than 10 tefachim deep.
    - **Q: R' Nachman** asked, but the front of the ship lifts above the water and can sail in less than 10 tefachim deep?! **A: R' Safra** answered, sailors stay at the front of the ship with long poles that they use to measure the depth of the water and prevent even the front of the ship from entering such shallow water.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, according to **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna**, how do they dispose of their waste water? They would not throw it into the area that they draw from, because that would make the water disgusting to them?! **A: R' Chiya bar Avin** answered, they would pour it on the side of the ship and let it roll into the sea.
  - **Q:** Their spilling is indirectly causing the water to go from the ship into a karmelis and that should be assur?! **A:** Causing the indirect transfer to a karmelis is mutar. We see this concept in a Braisa that allows transferring from a ship that is sitting low in the water to the sea, but not from the sea onto that ship. The difference must be because the Braisa is allowing the pouring onto the side of the ship, and that's why it is allowed. We see that indirect transfer to a karmelis is permitted.

### -----Daf נ"ז---101-----

- **R' Huna** says, a small canoe-like boat which has a sloped bottom that comes to a point is considered to be a karmelis because the area within 3 tefachim of the bottom of the boat is less than 4 tefachim wide, so the walls enclosing the significant area (which is 4x4) cannot be said to have a floor to them (the walls are "suspended" in mid-air with no floor). If the boat was 4 tefachim wide within 3 tefachim to the bottom, it would be considered a RH"Y. Also, if one filled the bottom of the boat with branches or the like, thereby raising the floor to a point where the boat is 4 tefachim wide within 3 tefachim to the floor, it would likewise be a RH"Y.
  - **Q: R' Nachman** asks, why can't we just say that the walls are viewed as continuing straight down ("gud achis") and are therefore not "suspended" in the air? We find that this concept exists with a basket of 4x4 tefachim which is placed atop a pole in RH"R, we view the walls of the basket as continuing downward and creating a RH"Y!
    - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, the **Chachomim** argue in that case and say that the basket does NOT create a RH"Y, so how can you ask from that case? **A: Abaye** said to **R' Yosef**, even the **Chachomim** generally agree to the principle of "gud achis". We see this in a Braisa which says that a post in the RH"R which is 10 tefachim tall and 4x4 on the top, but less than 4x4 closer to the ground, is considered to be a RH"Y (even according the **Rabanan**) because we say "gud achis". The reason they argue in the case with the basket is because it is atop a very narrow pole and small animals can easily fit between the pole and the imaginary wall, thus treating the imaginary wall as non-existent. However, in this case of the post, the post is less than 4x4 closer to the ground, but it is considerably thicker than a simple pole and therefore does not leave enough room for an animal to get by. In our case of the boat, there are no small animals which will go by and therefore the **Rabanan** would agree that we should say "gud achis"!?
      - **R' Ashi** explains that fish swimming in the area around the imaginary wall does not create a problem, because we find elsewhere that fish do not nullify a wall.

### S'FINOS K'SHUROS...

- **Q:** Since the ships are tied together, it is pashut that one may carry from one to the other!? **A: Rava** says, the Mishna is allowing carrying from one ship to the next via a small canoe-like boat that is wedged in between them.
  - **Q: R' Safra** asks, but the Mishna says one may carry from "one to the other" – with no mention of a small boat in between?! **A:** He says that the chiddush is that if the boats are owned by different people, one may make an "eiruv" and carry from one to the other (i.e. the halachos of "eiruv" apply to boats as well).
    - A Braisa agrees and says that one may carry between ships that are tied together if an "eiruv" was made. If the ships became untied, one may not carry between them. If they are retied on Shabbos (which shouldn't be done) whether b'shogeig, b'meizid, unwillingly or mistakenly, one may again carry between them. Similarly, if one hung mats to make enclosed areas in the RH"R for people to use, and then made an "eiruv" between them, one may carry from one area to the other. If the mats are rolled up, one may no longer carry from one to the other. If they are rolled

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

back down, whether b'shogege, b'meizid, unwillingly or mistakenly, he may once again carry among them.

- **Q: R' Nachman** said that if mats are rehung on Shabbos they do not permit one to carry?! **A:** He only disallowed carrying when the mats were rehung b'meizid (the **Rabanan** were goizer to prevent people from purposely hanging them on Shabbos, and even the Braisa doesn't mean that one can carry if they were rehung b'meized, it means that they are considered a RH"Y and one who throws into the area from the RH"R would be chayuv – Rashi).
- **Shmuel** says, the ships are considered tied together even if they are only tied with sewing threads.
  - **Q:** If this string holds the boats together, it is obvious that they are considered tied together. If it doesn't, then why are they considered tied together? **A:** The string can hold the ships together. **Shmuel** says this to exclude something else he said about a ship becoming tamei when it is being held in place by "string" that is partly under the same roof as a meis. **Shmuel** says that the "string" in that case must be a metal chain. The reason is, metal retains the same level of tumas meis as the item that is giving it the tumah. Therefore, if under the same roof as a meis, the chain becomes an "avi avos" of tumah which then makes the ship an av hatumah which then makes the cargo a rishon l'tumah. If the "string" is not metal, the string would only become an av itself, the ship would become a rishon which could then not make the cargo tamei. However, for purposes of Shabbos, as long as the ships are held together, it makes no difference what type of string it is.

### -----Daf דף---102-----

#### MISHNA

- If one throws an object b'shogege, and before it landed he realized that it was Shabbos, and then, instead of landing on the ground, another person stepped in and caught it, or a dog caught it, or it was burned up, he is patur.
- If he threw something with the intent to cause a wound in a person or an animal, and he remembered it was Shabbos before the object caused the wound, he is patur.
- The rule is: one is only chayuv a chatas for performing an aveirah that carries a chatas liability, and only when the beginning and end of the aveirah were done b'shogege.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The first case of the Mishna is mashma that if the object would have landed on the ground he would be chayuv a chatas. The Mishna is discussing where the person realized it was Shabbos before it landed, so why would he be chayuv a chatas? The end was not done b'shogege!? **A: R' Kahana** said, since he cannot abort the throw once it leaves his hand, and it was thrown b'shogege, it is considered to be b'shogege even if he realized it was Shabbos before it landed. When the Mishna discusses the "rule" with the end of the act not being b'shogege, it is discussing a case where he threw an object but held onto a string that was attached to the object, and could have pulled it back. If he realizes it is Shabbos and he doesn't pull it back, he is a meizid and would not be chayuv a chatas.
  - **Q:** If he held onto a string attached to the object, he never left go and therefore will not be chayuv for throwing the object in any case!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he threw it to cause a wound, so he is not chayuv for the throwing, but he is chayuv for inflicting a wound.
  - **Q:** The second part of the Mishna discusses the case of inflicting a wound, so that's not what the "rule" is discussing?! **A: Rava** says, the "rule" is discussing one who carries (not throws) an object 4 amos in RH"R, where he has the ability to stop at any time. Therefore, it is possible to be a shogege at the start and a meizid at the finish, (i.e. if he realizes it is Shabbos and he continues walking).
  - **Q:** The "rule" seems to be going on the case of throwing. If so, there must be a normal case of throwing where one can be a shogege at first and then become a meizid!? **A1: Rava** says, the beginning of the Mishna means to say, if one threw it b'shogege and then he remembered that it was Shabbos before it

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

landed he is patur, and another case is where he did not remember it was Shabbos but another person caught it, or a dog ate it, or it got burned, he is patur. So, if he remembers after throwing it, he will be patur, because it ended while knowing what he was doing was assur. **A2: R' Ashi** says, the Mishna is missing words and means to say, if he realized that it was Shabbos after the object left his hand and it then landed, he will be chayuv only if he once again forgot it was Shabbos before the object actually landed. However, if he knew it was Shabbos when the object landed, he will be patur.

ZEH HAKLAL, KOL CHAYAVEI CHATAOS...

- If one moves something in the RH"R 2 amos b'shogeig, then 2 amos b'meizid, then another 2 amos b'shogeig, **Rabbah** say he is patur and **Rava** says he is chayuv.
  - **Rabbah** says he is patur, even according to **R' Gamliel** who says a realization after performing half a shiur is not considered to be a realization and if the person forgets again, it would be considered the same period of unawareness and would combine with the previous action, that is only when the full shiur was completed at a time of unawareness. Here, however, the second 2 amos (which bring to the full shiur of 4 amos) are done b'meizid, so he would not be chayuv a chatas.
    - **Rabbah** must be discussing where the object was being carried, because if it was thrown, he would be a shogeig because he could not stop the object from going further, and would therefore be chayuv a chatas.
  - **Rava** says he is chayuv, even according to the **Rabanan** who typically say a realization after half a shiur is considered to be a realization and prevents another period of unawareness from combining with the first one, that is only where one has control of doing the remaining amount of the shiur. However, here he has no control and is therefore still a shogeig and will be chayuv a chatas.
    - **Rava** must be discussing where the object was thrown and that's why he has no control of stopping it from continuing.
- **Rava** says, if one throws an object and it lands in a dog's mouth or in the opening of an oven, he is chayuv.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says he would be patur in these cases?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the thrower did not intend for it to land there, and since it is not 4 tefachim it is not considered a significant place and not considered a "hanacha". **Rava** is discussing where he intended for it to land there and therefore that place is considered significant and landing there is considered a hanacha.
  - We find a similar concept, where **R' Meir** and the **Rabanan** seem to agree that one would be chayuv for carrying something out in their mouth, although that is not a normal method of carrying. However, since the carrier intended to carry out in his mouth, he is chayuv. Similarly, although an area may be insignificant, the thrower's intent to have the object land there gives it significance.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAZOREIK!!!**

**PEREK HABONEH -- PEREK SHNEIM ASAR**

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for even the slightest amount of building, of chiseling a stone, of striking the final blow ("makeh b'patish") with a hammer or with a metal hammer, or for drilling a hole (into which something will be placed).
- The rule is: if one performs a melacha on Shabbos that lasts and is useful as is, he is chayuv.
- **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, one who strikes an anvil with a hammer (even if not striking another object) is chayuv.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the slightest amount of building fit for?
  - **R' Yirmiya** says a poor person digs a tiny hole to hide his coins (when done in a house this is considered "building"). We find this was done in the Mishkan, where the sewers dug tiny holes to hide their needles.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** says, the sewers would not have done that, because that would have made the needles rusty. Rather a poor person makes a tiny stand to hold one pot that he wants to cook. In the Mishkan this was done when a small amount of additional dye was needed, and they would make this stand to cook up the little amount that was needed.
- **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says, they would not have acted like paupers in the Mishkan. Rather, a homeowner fills even a tiny hole that has formed in his house. In the Mishkan this was done if one of the boards had a worm hole, they would fill it with lead.
- **Shmuel** says, one who sets a stone down into the ground is chayuv.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that only one who cements a stone in place is chayuv?! **A:** The end of that Braisa brings **R' Yosef** who says that if one places stones on top of another row of stones he is chayuv. Obviously, there are 3 stages of building a wall, each one for which a person who does it would be chayuv. The bottom row of stones is set in the ground without cement. The middle rows are set with cement. The upper row is simply placed there.

### V'HAMISATEIS

- **Q:** Why is one who chisels a stone chayuv (for which av melacha)? **A: Rav** says for “building”, and **Shmuel** says for “makeh b'patish”.
  - Similarly, one who makes holes in a chicken coop (for ventilation) is chayuv: **Rav** says for “building”, and **Shmuel** says for “makeh b'patish”.
  - Similarly, one who puts a peg to keep the wooden stick in the metal shovel is chayuv: **Rav** says for “building”, and **Shmuel** says for “makeh b'patish”.
  - All 3 cases are necessary, because we would say **Rav** only says the first one is chayuv for building because that is something needed for typical building, but making holes in a chicken coop is not building. If we would not say the last case, we would say **Rav** says making holes in the coop is building because making ventilation holes is still “building”, but wedging the peg into the shovel is not called “building”. If we would just say this last case, we would think that **Shmuel** only argues in this last case because it is truly not building, but in the other cases, maybe he agrees with **Rav**. That's why we need all these cases.
- **R' Yochanan** was asked why one who chisels is chayuv. He pounded his fist into his palm to show it is for “makeh b'patish”. **R' Nosson bar Oshaya** asked, our Mishna lists chiseling as separate from “makeh b'patish”? He answered, read this to mean that chiseling *is* “makeh b'patish” (it is one case, not 2 separate cases).
- **Q:** Our Mishna says, one who drills is chayuv. According to **Rav** who says that one who makes holes in a coop is chayuv for building, that's why the Mishna says he is chayuv, because he is chayuv for building here as well (although something will still be put into this hole, creating the hole is itself significant as “building”). **Shmuel** had said making holes is “makeh b'patish”, so why would he be chayuv here when he is making a hole that is not yet the “final blow”, because he still must place something in that hole?! **A:** The Mishna is talking about where someone made a hole in the wall with a large metal nail that he will leave there to hang things on. Therefore, it is the “final blow”.

-----Daf לך---103-----

### ZEH HAKLAL

- The “rule” comes to include where one carved out an item to 75% of its useful capacity. Although he may complete this carving another time, since at this point it is useful, he is chayuv now as well.

### R' SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL OMER, HAMAKEH B'KURNUS AHL HASADUN...

- **Q:** What melacha did he do by hitting the hammer on the anvil?
  - **Rabbah and R' Yosef** say, he is teaching his hands the proper hitting technique
    - **Q: The sons of Rachva** asked, if one watches and learns a craft on Shabbos, will he be chayuv? (No! So here is no different!)



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye and Rava** say, in the Mishkan they would do this as they were pounding gold to make it into thin sheets to cover the boards (they would hit the gold 3 times and then once straight on the anvil to smooth the hammer to make sure it wouldn't damage the thin gold).

### MISHNA

- One is chayuv for doing even the slightest amount of plowing, weeding, pruning the dry branches, or pruning the new branches.
- If one cuts branches off a tree with intent to improve the tree or the surrounding ground, he is chayuv for cutting off even the slightest amount. If he cuts off the branches for firewood, he is chayuv if he cuts off enough to cook (a grogres sized piece of) an easily cooked (i.e. chicken) egg.
- If one rips out grass, if he does so with intent to improve the ground, he is chayuv for even the slightest amount. If he does so to feed to an animal, he is chayuv for collecting enough grass to fill the mouth of a goat.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What is slightest amount of plowing useful for? **A:** One can plant one pumpkin seed in it. This was done in the Mishkan where they would plant each stalk of the herb needed for dyes in a separate hole.

### HAMINAKEISH, V'HAMIKARSEIM, V'HAMIZAREID

- A Braisa says, if one rips out grass or prunes reeds (which, when young are even fit for human consumption), if this was done for human consumption, he is chayuv for doing so in the amount of a grogres. If for animal feed, it needs to be in the amount to fill a goat's mouth. If for fueling fires, it needs to be in the amount to roast a grogres sized piece of a chicken egg. If to improve the land, even the slightest amount will make him chayuv.
  - **Q:** Doing it for any of these reasons ultimately improves the land?! **A1: Rabbah and R' Yosef** say the Braisa is discussing where this was done in a swamp, so there is no improvement to the land. **A2: Abaye** says it is discussing a regular field, but since he did not have in mind to improve the land, he is not chayuv for having done so.
    - **Q:** It will inevitably ("psik reisha") improve the field, so he should be chayuv even without intent?! **A:** He did this in his friend's field, so he does not intend nor even care to improve the land.

### MISHNA

- One is chayuv for writing 2 letters: whether with his right or left hand, whether the same letter or 2 different letters, whether or not the same ink was used, and irrespective of which language it was written in.
- **R' Yose** says, one is chayuv for writing 2 letters only because they are recognizable markings, which is what was done in the Mishkan to recognize the proper placement of each board of the Mishkan.
- **R' Yehuda** says, if one intends to write a larger word but stopped after writing 2 letters, which themselves create a word, he is chayuv as well.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Writing with the left hand is not normal "ksivah", so why is he chayuv? **A: R' Yirmiya** says we are discussing a lefty.
  - **Q:** So why is he chayuv for writing with his right hand? **A: Abaye** says we are discussing an ambidextrous person. **A2: R' Yaakov the grandson of Yaakov** said the Mishna (even in the beginning) follows **R' Yose** who says that one is chayuv for mere markings, which can be made just as well with a righty's left hand.

### AMAR R' YEHUDA, MATZINU

- **Q: R' Yehuda** gives examples of writing 2 letters from a larger word, but in each example they are 2 different letters. It seems that **R' Yehuda** would say that one is not chayuv for writing the same letter twice. In a Braisa, **R' Yehuda** clearly says that one would be chayuv for writing the same letter twice when it comes from a larger word!? **A: R' Yehuda** in the Braisa is what he said in the name of his rebbi **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.
  - **Q:** In the Braisa just quoted, **R' Shimon** says one is chayuv for writing 2 letters of a larger word, even if they are the same letter. This is exactly what **R' Yehuda** said in the Braisa?! We can't answer that **R'**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Shimon** means to say he is chayuv even if he writes two “alephs”, which by themselves don’t spell a word, because that would mean **R’ Shimon** is more “machmir” and we find that **R’ Shimon** is more “meikel” regarding the amount needed to be chayuv for a melacha?! **A: R’ Shimon** means to say that one is only chayuv for writing the entire word that he intended to write. Although he seems to say that one need not write the “whole thing”, he means that one need not write the whole **pasuk** to be chayuv, but he must write the entire word.

- In the Braisa, **R’ Yose** darshened the pasuk “V’asa m’achas m’heina”. **R’ Yose the son of R’ Chanina** explains the drasha: the entire word “Achas” is extra, the “mem” in front of the word is also extra, and the “mem” of “m’heina” is extra as well. **R’ Yose** says: “Achas” refers to one being chayuv for writing a complete word (e.g. the word “Shimon”). “M’achas” teaches that he is chayuv for writing the word “shem” at the beginning of the word “Shimon” and stops there. “Heina” teaches one is chayuv for avos. “M’heina” teaches one is chayuv for toldos. “Achas she’hi heina” (one that are many) teaches that if he is a meizid with regard to one halacha – Shabbos, but a shogeg with regard to all the melachos, he will be chayuv a separate chatas for each av melacha group that he does. “Heina she’hi achas” (many that are one) teaches that if he is a shogeg regarding Shabbos but a meizid regarding the melachos he is only chayuv one chatas.

### AMAR R’ YEHUDA MATZINU SHEM KATAN M’SHEIM GADOL

- **Q:** The “mem” of the word “shem” needs to be a closed “mem” (an “endeh mem”), but the “mem” which he wrote for the name “Shimon” will be a regular, open “mem”?! **A: R’ Chisda** says, this teaches us, if one writes an open “mem” instead of a closed “mem”, it is considered properly written.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one writes an open “mem” instead of a closed “mem” or visa-versa, it is pasul?! **A: R’ Chisda** follows a Braisa which brings a source for the “nisuch hamayim” which is done on Succos from an extra “mem”, “yud” and “mem” written in the korbanos of Succos, which spells the word “mayim” (water). The 2 extra “mems” are both closed “mems”, but the Braisa still uses it to spell “mayim” which needs one open “mem”. We see that this Braisa holds the two types of “mems” are interchangeable.
    - **Q:** Substituting an open “mem” for a closed “mem” is ok, because that is going to a higher standard. We find that the closed “mem” was used in the “luchos” because **R’ Chisda** tells us that the middle of that letter remained standing via a miracle. We also find that only one form of “mem” was used because **R’ Yirmiya** says that the other form of the “mem” was given to us by the nevi’im. However, maybe one may not substitute a closed “mem” for an open one, which is what the writer did according to **R’ Yehuda**?! **A:** Both forms of the letter “mem” existed at the time of Moshe as well. It was forgotten which one belonged in middle of a word and which belonged at the end of a word. The nevi’im reestablished the proper use of the 2 types of letters. Therefore, based on the drasha regarding “nisuch hamayim”, if an open “mem” can be switched for a closed “mem”, a closed “mem” can likewise be switched for an open “mem” as well.

### -----Daf 77-----104-----

- **R’ Chisda** said, the “mem” and “samach” in the luchos stood via a nes (the middle piece stood unattached to anything on all sides). **R’ Chisda** also said, that the luchos were carved through and through. One side was read properly and the back side was the mirror-image of the front.
- The **Rabanan** said to **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**, young students came to Beis Medrash today and said things that were not said even in the days of Yehoshua Bin Nun.
  - “Aleph Beis” – learn wisdom (Torah). “Gimel Daled” – help those in need.
    - The leg of the gimel leans to the daled because it is proper for the giver to chase after those in need. The leg of the daled leans to the gimel, because the needy person should make himself available for the giver to find him. The “face” of the daled faces away from the gimel to teach that the giver should give in a hidden manner so as not to embarrass the needy person.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- “Heh, Vuv” – refers to the name of Hashem. If one learns Torah and helps the needy, Hashem will “Zayin, Ches, Tes, Yud, Kaf, Lamed” – Hashem will sustain him (“zan”), favor him (“chein”), benefit him (“meitiv”), give him an inheritance (“yerusha”), and will give him a crown in Olam Habah (“keser”, “L’olam Habah”).
- “Open Mem and Closed Mem” – some parts of Torah should be revealed and others should remain hidden. “Curved Nun and Straight Nun” – a faithful, humble person in this world will stand tall in the Next World. “Samach, Ayin” – support the poor; or make “simanim” for the Torah as memory aids. “Curved (closed) Pey and Straight (open) Pey” – sometimes a person should speak and other times he should remain quiet. “Curved Tzadik and Straight Tzadik” – a bent over (humble) tzadik will stand tall in the Next World. Although we’ve said this concept already regarding a “nun”, this teaches that a tzadik must be extremely humble.
- “Kuf” – Kadosh (i.e. Hashem). “Reish” – rasha. The “kuf” and “reish” don’t face each other, because Hashem says He does not want to look at a rasha. However, the crown on the “kuf” leans toward the “reish” because Hashem says, if the rasha does teshuva, I will give him a crown like Mine. The leg of the “kuf” is not attached to the top of the letter so as to allow a passage in, as if to say that the rasha can do teshuva and enter in an easy way, without having to go all the way around the leg. Like **Reish Lakish** says, when one wants to purify himself, Hashem helps him.
- “Shin” – sheker (falsehood). “Tav” – Emes (truth). The word “sheker” is spelled with 3 consecutive letters in the aleph beis whereas the word “emes” is spread out from beginning to end because “sheker” is common whereas “emes” is not. All the letters of the word “sheker” stand on one leg, whereas the letters of the word “emes” are sturdy like bricks because truth remains and falsehood does not.
- They then gave an explanation of the aleph beis based on the “at bash” system where the first and last letter are paired, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> to last, etc.
  - “Aleph Tav” – Hashem says regarding the rasha, he made Me disgusting, shall I desire him? “Beis Shin” – he did not desire Me, shall I rest my name on him? “Gimmel Reish” – he made his body tamei, shall I have mercy on him? “Daled Kuf” – he closed my doors, shall I not cut down his pride?
  - This can be darshened for tzadikim as well: “Aleph Tav, Beis Shin” – if you are embarrassed to sin, “Gimmel Reish, Daled Kuf” – if you do so, you will live in the Heavens near My Throne. “Hey Tzadik, Vuv Pey” – there will be a separation between you and Anger, “Zayin Ayin, Ches Samach, Tes Nun” – and you will not tremble from the Satan.
- The next drasha completes the “at bash” method and moves onto another method where the aleph beis is split into 3 groups with the first of each group combining, then the 2<sup>nd</sup> of each group, etc.
  - “Yud Mem, Kaf Lamed” – the malach in charge of Gehinnom said to Hashem, I want to put all the world into Gehinnom, even the Yidden. “Aleph Ches Samach, Beis Tes Ayin, Gimmel Yud Pey” – Hashem says, I have mercy on the Yidden because they rejected adultery, “Daled Kaf Tzadik” – they are innocent, honest and righteous, “Hey Lamed Kuf” – therefore you have no part of the Yidden. “Vuv Mem Reish, Zayin Nun Shin Tav” – the malach says to Hashem, feed me from the children of Sheis, who is the father of the Yidden as well.
- The drasha continues in the last method of combining the letters. This time the aleph beis is split into 2 groups, with the corresponding letters of each group combining.
  - “Aleph Lamed, Beis Mem, Gimmel Nun, Daled Samach” – Hashem says, I will take the Yidden to Gan Eden. “Hey Ayin, Vuv Pey” – the malach of Gehennom says to Hashem, I am weak because I don’t have enough people for Gehinnom. “Zayin Tzaddik, Ches Kuf” – Hashem says, the Yidden are the children of Yitzchak, so you cannot have them, “Tes Reish, Yud Shin, Kaf Tav” – Wait, there are groups of goyim that I will give you.

### MISHNA

- If one writes two letters in one period of unawareness, he is chayuv a chatas.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- He is chayuv whether he wrote it in “doyi”, “sam”, “sikra”, “kumus”, “kankantoim”, or anything else that can create a mark. He is chayuv whether he writes them on 2 walls that come together in a corner or on 2 parts of a storekeeper’s ledger in a way that they are meant to be read together.
- If one writes on his skin, he is chayuv. If he scratches letters into his skin, **R’ Eliezer** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur.
- If he wrote with liquids (dark berry juice), with fruit juice, with dust (mud) from the road, with dust from a scribe (left over in the inkwell), or anything that does not last, he is patur.
- If he writes with the back of his hand, his foot, his mouth, or his elbow, or if he writes one letter next to an existing letter, or traced an existing letter, or if he meant to write a “ches”, but didn’t attach the tops and therefor wrote two “zayins”, or if he wrote one letter on a wall and another on a beam, or on two walls of the house (not near each other) or on two parts of a storekeeper’s ledger in a way that they cannot be read together, he is patur.
- If he writes one letter that is an abbreviation for a word, **R’ Yehoshua ben Beseirah** says he is chauv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur.

### GEMARA

- “Doyi” is black ink; “Sam” is paint; “Sikra” is red dye; “Kumus” is sap from a tree; “Kankantoim” is shoe polish.

### UV’CHOL DAVAR SHEHU ROSHEM

- This comes to include writing with rain water (some say a fruit juice – Rashi) or gallnut juice, which are ok to use when writing a “get”, therefore it is considered writing.
  - **R’ Chiya** says a “get” may be written with lead, charcoal or shoe polish, which would mean that one would be chayuv for writing with these on Shabbos as well.

### HAMISARET AHL BISARO

- A Braisa says, **R’ Eliezer** asked the **Chachomim**, we find an individual who smuggled “kishuf” information out of Mitzrayim by scratching it into his hand (so we see it is a method of writing)? They answered, that this person was a “shoteh” and no proof can be brought from him.

### KASAV OIS ACHAS SUMACH LA’KSAV

- This doesn’t follow **R’ Eliezer** because he says if one adds one stich to an existing stich of weaving he is chayuv as if he had done 2 stitches.

### KASAV AHL GABEI KSAV

- This does not follow **R’ Yehuda**, because he says, if one was supposed to write Hashem’s name, but instead intended to write the name “Yehuda”, but he made a mistake and left out the “daled” so that in actuality Hashem’s name was written, **R’ Yehuda** says he should trace the letters and have in mind for Hashem’s name and it will be good. This means he says tracing is like writing.
- A Braisa says, if one writes one letter that completes an entire sefer, or does one stich that completes the entire garment, he is chayuv.
  - **Rava bar R’ Huna** says this follows **R’ Eliezer** who says that adding a stich to an existing stich will make one chayuv. **R’ Ashi** says this may even follow the **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Eliezer**. The Braisa’s case is different because his writing or stitching completes the entire book or garment.
- **R’ Ami** says, if one writes one letter on a paper in one city and a second letter on a paper in another city, he is chayuv. This is different than our Mishna where he wrote on 2 walls, because there he has to take down the walls to read them together. Here he just has to bring the papers together.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if one fixes a letter, he is chayuv. If he must write 2 letters to be chayuv, how can he be chayuv for correcting one letter? **A: R’ Sheishes** said, the Braisa is discussing where he took the roof off of a “ches” and thereby made it into two “zayins”, so it is like he wrote 2 letters. **Rava** said the Braisa is discussing where he changed a “daled” into a “reish” and thereby made the Sefer kosher, therefore it is considered significant.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if one intended to write one letter but wrote two (he wanted to write a “ches” and ended up with 2 “zayins”), he is chayuv. The Mishna says he would be patur in this case?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he still needs to add crowns to the letters and therefore he is patur. The Braisa is discussing where crowns are not needed and therefore he is chayuv.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf תי"ד--105-----

KASAV OIS ACHAS NOTRIKIN, R' YEHUDA BEN BESEIRA M'CHAYUV, V'CHACHOMIM POTRIN

- **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yose ben Zimra** said, we find that the Torah uses abbreviations as well. Hashem told Avraham "Ki Av Hamon Goyim Nisatich", which is an abbreviation for "I have made you a father among the nations, the chosen among the nations, the beloved among the nations, the king over the nations, the distinguished among the nations and the trusted among the nations".
- **R' Yochanan** says the word "Anochi" at the start of the Aseres Hadibros is an abbreviation of "I myself have written and given the Torah". The **Rabanan** say it is an abbreviation for "A pleasant statement was written and given". **Others** say the word can be an abbreviation when read backwards to mean, "It was given in writing, and its statements are truthful".
- **R' Nosson's Yeshiva** said the word "Yarat" which was said by the malach to Bilam regarding why the donkey veered to the wall, is an abbreviation for "She was afraid, she saw and she veered to the side".
- **R' Yishmael's Yeshiva** said "karmel" is an abbreviation for "a full grain"
- **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says that Dovid said, Shimi ben Geira cursed him a "klala *nimretzes*". That is an abbreviation to mean he called Dovid an adulterer, a Moavi, a murderer, an enemy and disgusting.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, when Yehuda said to Yosef, "Nitztaduk" it was an abbreviation to say, we are upright, we are righteous, we are tahor, we are innocent, we are holy.

MISHNA

- If one writes 2 letters in 2 different periods of unawareness, or one in the morning and one in the afternoon, **R' Gamliel** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur.

GEMARA

- **R' Gamliel** says a period of awareness only separates actions (so that they are considered to be separate acts) when the awareness happened after having done a full shiur of the melacha. Here, the awareness happened after writing only one letter. The **Chachomim** say the awareness separates the actions even when it was less than the minimum shiur needed to be chayuv.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK HABONEH!!!**

**PEREK HA'OREG -- PEREK SHLOSHA ASSAR**

MISHNA

- **R' Eliezer** says, if one begins to weave a new fabric, he is chayuv for weaving 3 threads. If he is adding to an existing, woven piece, he is chayuv for adding even one thread. The **Chachomim** say, in either case he is only chayuv for having woven 2 threads.
- If one sets up the loom (by setting the threads into the frame), whether in "nirin", or "keiros" of a fine sifter, or a coarse sifter or a basket, he is chayuv.
- One is chayuv for sewing 2 stitches. One is likewise chayuv for tearing something in order to sew 2 stitches.

GEMARA

- **R' Yitzchak** taught a Braisa that says that **R' Eliezer** says one is chayuv for weaving two threads when beginning a new fabric.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said he requires 3 threads? **A1:** The Mishna is referring to thick threads that will unravel unless there are 3 together, whereas the Braisa is talking about thin threads that won't unravel even if there are only 2 threads. **A2:** The Mishna is referring to thin threads, and less than 3 three is not noticeable. The Braisa is referring to thick threads, and therefore he is chayuv even for 2 threads.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if one weaves 3 threads when beginning a fabric or adds one to an existing fabric he is chayuv. The **Chachomim** say, in either case, adding 2 threads will make him chayuv. With regard to the weaving on the border, if he weaves 2 threads for the amount of space needed for the width of three places where he threads the loom, he is chayuv. This is the same size that is needed for a small belt.
  - The **T”K** of this Braisa follows **R’ Eliezer**.
- Another Braisa says, if one weaves 2 threads onto an existing or a new fabric, he is chayuv. **R’ Eliezer** says he is chayuv for adding even 1 thread to existing fabric. With regard to the weaving on the border, if he weaves 2 threads for the amount of space needed for the width of three places where he threads the loom, he is chayuv. This is the same size that is needed for a small belt.
  - The **T”K** of this Braisa follows the **Chachomim**.

### HA’OSEH SHNEI BATEI NIRIN...

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean in “nirin”? **A: Abaye** says it is a loom where two threads are wrapped around the contraption that holds the threads in place and once around the threads that are passed through that contraption.

### BAKEIROS

- This is a foot powered loom used by weavers of curtains.

### V’HATOFER SHTEI TEFIROS

- **Q:** We already learned this in the Mishna that lists the 39 avos melachos!? **A:** The chiddush is in the next part of the Mishna, regarding ripping a garment in order to sew it together.
  - **Q:** That was also learned in the earlier Mishna?! **A:** The chiddush is in the next part of the Mishna (the next Mishna) which discusses one who tears out of anger or in mourning.

### V’HAKOREYA AHL MENAS LITFOR SHTEI TEFIROS

- This would be done when someone sewed unevenly and wants to tear it to sew it again in the proper manner.

### MISHNA

- One who tears out of anger or in mourning for his meis, or anyone else who acts in a destructive manner is patur.
  - One who destroys with intent to repair it, the amount he needs to destroy to be chayuv is the same amount he needs to be chayuv for doing the repair.
- One who whitens wool, separates it, dyes it, or spins it is chayuv if he does double the amount that fits between the index finger and thumb when they are spread apart.
- One is chayuv for putting 2 threads (the threads that are not attached and are put in between the threads attached to the loom) through the loom, in the amount of the distance between the index finger and the thumb when spread apart.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** A Braisa says that one is chayuv for ripping out of anger and in mourning his meis?! **A:** The Braisa refers to one who rips for his own meis (a relative for whom he must tear his clothing) and by ripping for such mourning, he is doing a chiyuv and in that way accomplishing something. That’s why he is chayuv. In the Mishna, because the meis is not one of his relatives, the ripping is purely a destructive act.
  - **Q:** The Mishna says one who ripped for “his meis”?! **A:** It is a relative for whom his is busy with the burial (i.e. “his meis”), but it is not one of his very close relatives.
  - **Q:** If the meis is a chochom, all are treated as his close relatives?! **A:** This meis was not a chochom.
  - **Q:** If the meis is an “adam kasher” all must rip their clothing?! **A:** The meis was not an “adam kasher”.
  - **Q:** If he was there as the “neshama” was departing, he must rip his clothing?! **A:** He was not there when the “neshama” departed.
- **Q:** We have answered the question about the case of ripping in mourning, what about where one rips in anger – the Mishna said he is patur and the Braisa said he is chayuv!? **A:** The Braisa follows **R’ Yehuda** who says a melacha done for other than its typically understood purpose is chayuv, and the Mishna follows **R’ Shimon** who says that a melacha done in such a way is patur.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Yehuda** only says he would be chayuv when something constructive is done. This ripping is destructive!? **A: R' Avin** said, this is also constructive because it cools off his anger.
- **Q:** One may not do so! **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** says, one who rips his clothing in anger is as if he worships idols!? **A:** We are discussing where one is pretending to be angry to instill fear in his household. It is not true anger, and is done for a purpose and is therefore permitted and constructive.
- **Bar Kappara** says, one who cries in mourning over an “adam kasher”, Hashem counts those tears and stores them in His storehouse.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, one who acts lazy when it comes to eulogizing a chochom, it is apropos for him to be buried alive.
- **R' Yochanan** says, one who acts lazy when it comes to eulogizing a chochom will not merit long life.
- **R' Yochanan** said, if one brother dies, the other brothers should worry that they may die as well. If a member of a group dies, the other members should worry that they may die as well.
  - Some say this refers to when the greatest brother or group member died. Others say it refers to when the smallest brother or group member died.