



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Shabbos, Daf כק – Daf קו

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

-----Daf כק---120-----

#### MISHNA

- One may save a basket full of loaves of bread from a fire on Shabbos, even if the basket has enough bread for 100 meals. One may save a round cake of pressed figs and a full barrel of wine even though there is a lot more in them than the amount needed for 3 meals.
  - He may even tell other people, “Come and save the food for yourself”. If these other people are smart, they will return the food to him and after Shabbos will ask him for money for the time and effort spent saving the food.
- Food may be saved to a courtyard that has an “eiruv” in place. **Ben Beseira** says it may even be saved to a courtyard that has no eiruv in place as well.
- He may also save all utensils that he needs for Shabbos to this type of courtyard.
- With regard to clothing, he may put on as much clothing as he possibly can and walk out into the courtyard with them, and leave them there. **R' Yose** says he may only wear 18 articles of clothing.
  - The **T”K** says, after he leaves the clothing in the courtyard, he may go back into the house, put on as much clothing as he could again, and bring that into the courtyard as well. He can also tell others, “Come and help me save the clothing”.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The previous Mishna said he may only save 3 meals' worth of food. Here the Mishna says that he can even save 100 meals' worth?! **A1: R' Huna** says, this Mishna is discussing where he takes one complete basket. Since it is all “one effort”, we therefore allow him to take the whole thing. The previous Mishna discusses where the loaves were separate and he must gather them together (in separate baskets) to carry them out. Therefore, each loaf is considered a “separate effort” and only enough for 3 meals may be taken. **A2: R' Abba bar Zavda in the name of Rav** says, both Mishnas are discussing where he had to gather the loaves together. The previous Mishna is discussing carrying it out into a second courtyard, therefore there is a limit on how much may be carried. This Mishna is discussing carrying it out into the immediate courtyard, which requires less effort and more food is therefore allowed to be carried there.
- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asks, if one places many loaves into one bundle, is that considered “one effort” (because it is one bundle) and he may take out any amount, or is it considered more than one effort because they were separate and he had to gather them together? **A:** Since **Rava** said that **R' Shizbi** was wrong when he said, that in the case where one catches wine that is dripping from a broken barrel on the roof, he may not collect more than he needs for 3 meals, it must be that **Rava** feels, that even though it drips in slowly (which is like collecting the loaves and putting them into one bundle), because it is in one bowl, it is considered to be “one effort” and would be permitted. We see that collecting multiple loaves and putting them in one bundle allows the carrying out of more than just 3 meals' worth.
  - **Rava** explained, the Braisa that discusses this case says it is permitted as long as one doesn't use multiple bowls. However, it would seem that using one bowl would be permitted no matter how large the bowl was.

#### V'IGUL SHEL D'VEILAH...

- **Q:** The people who help save the food are saving that food from “hefker” (the owner told them to save for themselves). What does the Mishna mean that if they are smart they will ask for money for their time and effort? If they are smart, they will just keep all the food!? **A:** Although they have a right to keep the food, the Mishna is teaching us that he should return the food as “midas chassidus”.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rava** asks, if this person is worried about “midas chassidus”, he should not be looking to get paid for time and effort spent on Shabbos?! **A:** We are discussing a “Yirei Shamayim” (one who fears Heaven), who is not looking to benefit from others (which is why he returns the food) but he does not want to do things for free either (which is why he wants to get paid for his time). The Mishna is teaching that if he is smart, he will realize that one is permitted to get paid for time spent on Shabbos in this manner and he will ask to get so paid.

### U'LIHEICHAN MATZILIN...

- **Q:** How come when he is saving food he tells them “save for yourselves” and when saving clothing he says “save with me”? **A:** With regard to food, he may only save 3 meals’ worth, so he must tell them to save for themselves. With regard to clothing, he can continue saving as much as he can on his own (by putting them on in the house and taking them off in the courtyard) so he can ask people to help him outright.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** says the person may continue to wear clothing out of the house, drop it in the courtyard and repeat the process. **R’ Yose** says one may only wear 18 articles of clothing and no more.

### MISHNA

- **R’ Shimon ben Nanas** says, one may spread a moist goatskin (which sings but doesn’t burn) on a box or closet that has caught fire (it may be spread on the part that is not yet on fire) to prevent the fire from spreading further.
- One may make a partition of any keilim, whether empty or full, to block the path of an oncoming fire. **R’ Yose** says this may not be done with new earthenware keilim that are full of water because they will burst and extinguish the fire.

### GEMARA

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, if a garment has caught fire, one may put water on the end that has not yet caught, and if the fire gets extinguished when it reaches the water, so be it.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that one may unfold and put on a garment that has caught fire, and one may unroll a Sefer Torah that has caught fire and if the fire gets extinguished, so be it. It seems that anything more direct, like applying water to the garment, would be prohibited?! **A: Rav** holds like **R’ Shimon ben Nanas** in the Mishna that allows placing the goatskin on the box.
  - **Q: R’ Shimon ben Nanas** only allowed the goatskin because it is fireproof and only prevents the fire’s spread. He would not, however, allow the application of water which extinguishes the fire!? **A:** Since **R’ Yose** prohibits using keilim that will burst, it seems the **R’ Shimon** would allow that. We see that **R’ Shimon** allows the indirect extinguishing of a fire.
- A Braisa says, if a lit candle is on a board that one wishes to move, he may shake the candle off the board, and if it extinguishes the fire, so be it.
  - **R’ Yannai** says, this may only be done if the candle was left there accidentally. If it was left there intentionally, the board becomes a base for an item of “muktzeh” and becomes prohibited to move itself.
- A Braisa says, if a candle is behind a door (and the wind of the moving door may blow it out), one may open and close the door and if the fire gets extinguished, so be it. **Rav** “strongly disagreed” with anyone who paskened this way.
  - **Q: Ravina** asked **R’ Acha the son of Rava**, why did **Rav** disagree with this? It can’t be because **Rav** holds like **R’ Yehuda** that an unintentional act (“davar she’eino miskaven”) is prohibited and the **T”K** holds like **R’ Shimon** that it is permitted, because he wouldn’t “strongly disagree” with someone who paskens like **R’ Shimon**?! **A: Rav** felt so strongly because in this case even **R’ Shimon** would agree that it is prohibited, because it is a “psik reisha” (an inevitable consequence).
- **R’ Yehuda** says, a person may open a door which is opposite a bonfire on Shabbos even though the wind coming through the door will fan the fire. **Abaye** “strongly disagreed” with that.
  - **Q:** If we are discussing a case where an ordinary wind is blowing, that would surely not fan the fire, so why would **Abaye** prohibit it? If we are discussing an unusually strong wind, why would **R’ Yehuda** allow

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

it? **A:** We are discussing when an ordinary wind is blowing. **Abaye** says we are goizer in that case for a case when an unusually strong wind is blowing, and **R' Yehuda** says we are not goizer.

OSIN MECHITZA...

- **Q:** From the Mishna it seems that the **Rabanan** are more lenient and seem to allow an indirect extinguishing of the fire and **R' Yose** is more stringent and prohibits an indirect extinguishing of the fire. However, we find a Braisa in which the **Rabanan** prohibit making the partition with earthenware keilim and **R' Yose** allows the use of certain earthenware keilim?! We can't simply say to change the views of the Mishna, because **Rabbah bar Tachlifa in the name of Rav** says that **R' Yose** is the one who prohibits indirect extinguishing of fire?! **A:** The entire Braisa is the view of **R' Yose**, and **R' Yose** is saying that a partition to halt the oncoming fire may only be made of keilim that will not break, such as metal keilim and certain earthenware keilim.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone has a Name of Hashem written on his skin, the **Rabanan** say he may not wash or anoint that area and he may not stand in a dirty place. If he has to go to the mikvah, he must wrap that area in "gemi" (reed grass) and then immerse (presumably this is done to avoid erasing the Name of Hashem even though it is being done indirectly – which means the **Rabanan** prohibit things done in an indirect manner). **R' Yose** says he can go to the mikvah without wrapping the area, as long as he doesn't rub the area (which means that **R' Yose** allows the indirect erasing of Hashem's Name)?!
  - **A: R' Yose** is not contradictory, because regarding erasing Hashem's Name, the pasuk says "Lo sa'asun kein" (you should not **do**) which teaches us that in this case indirect cause is not prohibited.
    - **Q:** With regard to Shabbos the pasuk also says "Lo sa'aseh kol melacha" (you should not **do**), so an indirect extinguishing should be permitted?! **A:** It truly is permitted. The reason **R' Yose** doesn't allow it is because he is goizer that if we allow it in this case, since the person is in a state of chaos from fear of losing his possessions, he may come to extinguish the fire directly.
  - **A:** The **Rabanan** would allow the indirect erasing of Hashem's name. They require the placing of the "gemi" because they hold that one may not stand in front of the Name of Hashem without clothing. Therefore it must be covered.
    - They can't say that the "gemi" is placed there to prevent the erasing, because if the gemi is placed tightly, it would be a "chatzitza", and if it isn't placed tightly, it would not prevent the erasure! (The ink itself must be wet, in which case it is not a "chatzitza").
    - **Q:** How does **R' Yose** allow him to be unclothed without covering the Name of Hashem? **A:** He covers it with his hand.
      - **Q:** The **Rabanan** should also let him cover it with his hand – why do they require the covering with the "gemi"? **A:** He may forget and remove his hand.
      - **Q:** **R' Yose** should also be afraid of that? **A:** **R' Yose** would agree that he should use a "gemi" to cover it. The machlokes is where he does not have a "gemi" at hand. The **Rabanan** say he must go search for a "gemi", even if it means pushing off the immersion in the mikvah. **R' Yose** says he should not push off the immersion, because it is a mitzvah to immerse at the earliest possible time.
    - **Q:** **R' Yose** says in a Braisa, that although a "baal ker" may immerse at any point of the day of Yom Kippur (a baal ker may not daven until he goes to the mikvah, so we allow him to do so on Yom Kippur so that he can daven), he may not do so after Mincha, when there are no more tefillos until nightfall. At that point we would have him wait until nightfall. If **R' Yose** held that immersion at the earliest possible time is a mitzvah, he would allow the baal ker to go to the mikvah even after mincha?! **A:** This Braisa follows **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, who holds that immersion at the earliest possible time is not a mitzvah.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If a goy comes to extinguish a fire in a Jew's house on Shabbos, we may not encourage him to do so, but we need not stop him from doing so either, because we have no responsibility to prevent a goy from doing melachos on Shabbos.
- If a minor comes to extinguish the fire, we must not allow him to do so, because (although he is not obligated in hilchos Shabbos) we are responsible to prevent him from doing melachos on Shabbos.

### GEMARA

- **R' Ami** said, if a Jew has a fire in his house on Shabbos, he may announce (for goyim to hear) "Whoever extinguishes the fire will not lose" (i.e. will get rewarded).
  - Maybe our Mishna is a proof to this, because our Mishna says that we can't tell a goy directly to extinguish the fire, but it would seem that an indirect method, like **R' Ami** suggested, should be allowed. However, the Mishna also has the reverse inference. The Mishna says we don't have to stop the goy from extinguishing the fire. This seems to say that we cannot encourage him, even indirectly. Therefore, our Mishna can't be used as a proof either way.
- A Braisa says, there was once a fire in the courtyard of **Yosef ben Simai** (who was the royal treasurer) on Shabbos. People from the government came to extinguish the fire, but **Yosef** did not allow them to do so. A miracle occurred and it began to rain, which put out the fire. After Shabbos, **Yosef** sent rewards to the people who had wanted to extinguish the fire. When the **Chachomim** heard about the story they said he had no reason to stop them since they came on their own.

### AVAL KATAN SHEBAH LICHABOS EIN SHOM'IN LO MIPNEI SHE'SHVISASO ALEIHEN

- **Q:** It seems from here that if a minor was eating non-kosher meat, Beis Din would be required to stop him from continuing to eat (which is a point of machlokes)?! **A: R' Yochanan** said, in the Mishna we must stop him because it is discussing where he is extinguishing the fire because he believes his father wants him to do so. However, if he would do so truly on his own volition, we would not have to stop him.
  - **Q:** If the case of the minor discusses where he is extinguishing for someone else's sake, the case of the goy must be the same thing (where is extinguishing for the sake of the Yid). If so, how is it permitted to allow him to do so? **A:** A goy only acts in his own interests (he does so to get paid or otherwise benefit himself).

### MISHNA

- We may place a bowl over: a candle so that the beams do not catch fire, the excrement of a child, or over a scorpion so that it does not sting.
- **R' Yehuda** said, when someone trapped a scorpion like this on Shabbos in front of **R' Yochanan ben Zakkai**, he said, I think this person may be chayuv a chatas for trapping (since the scorpion wasn't chasing him – Rashi)

### GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda, R' Yirmiyya bar Abba and R' Chanan bar Rava** went to visit **Avin of Nashikiya**. **Avin** had couches brought out for **R' Yehuda** and **R' Yirmiyya** to sit on, but not for **R' Chanan bar Rava** (who was forced to sit on the ground). **R' Chanan bar Rava** heard **Avin** teaching our Mishna to his son. **Avin** explained that one may cover the excrement of a child because of the children (so that they don't touch it and get dirty). **R' Chanan** (who was slighted by being seated on the floor) said to **Avin**, "The foolish **Avin** teaches foolish things to his son", because the excrement of children is fit for eating by dogs, and therefore one would not have to cover it, and he can simply move it away. Even if you want to say it should still be muktzeh because it wasn't available to be eaten by a dog before Shabbos, that would not make it muktzeh, just like the flowing water from a river is not muktzeh even though the water that is here now was not here yesterday. The Mishna should be taught as referring to excrement of chickens, not children.
  - **Q:** The chicken excrement should be allowed to be moved just like any keili containing wastes is allowed to be moved (because it is so disgusting)?! Don't try to answer that it may only be moved when in a keili, because we find that **R' Ashi** allowed the removal of a mouse by grabbing its tail, even without a

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

keili?! **A:** It refers to chicken wastes in a garbage heap. Since people don't hang out there and are therefore not disgusted by it, it is muktzeh and must be covered, not moved.

- **Q:** What is a child doing in the garbage heap? **A:** The waste was lying in a courtyard.
- **Q:** Waste in a courtyard may be moved because people find it disgusting?! **A:** The wastes were in a garbage heap in the courtyard.

### V'AL AKRAV SHELO TISHACH

- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, anything that can kill, may be killed on Shabbos.
  - **Q:** **R' Yosef** asked, a Braisa says 5 things may be killed on Shabbos: the Egyptian fly, the Ninveh hornet, the Chadyav scorpion, the Israeli snake, and a wild dog from any location. This must follow **R' Shimon** (because according to **R' Yehuda** he would be chayuv because this is a "melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa") and it's only these 5 that may be killed, nothing else!? **A:** **R' Yosef** says, the Braisa is talking about where the creatures are not chasing a person. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** is talking when the creatures are chasing a person.
- A Braisa was taught to **Rava bar R' Huna** that said, the spirit of the "chassidim" are not happy with one who kills snakes and scorpions on Shabbos. **Rava bar R' Huna** responded, the spirit of the **Chachomim** are not happy with those "chassidim" who say that.
  - **R' Huna** himself seemed to disagree with his son, because he voiced displeasure when he saw someone kill a bee on Shabbos.
- A Braisa says, if one happens upon snakes and scorpions and he kills them, this means they were sent to him by Hashem so that he should do a good deed by killing them (and not allowing them to harm other people). If he doesn't end up killing them, it means that Hashem sent them to kill him, but he was saved through a miracle. **Ulla** says, this last statement is only true if the snakes were hissing at him, ready to attack.
- **R' Abba bar Kahana** said, one time a snake fell into the Beis Medrash on Shabbos and a Nevasi Yid killed it. **Rebbi** said, it was killed by someone like it.
  - **Q:** Did **Rebbi** mean that this person did a good thing or a bad thing? **A:** We find that **R' Yannai** said he had killed wasps on Shabbos, so he definitely would allow killing a snake. Based on that, it must be that **Rebbi** thought this person had done a good thing.
    - **Q:** It could be that **R' Yannai** only allowed killing if he does so "lefi tumoi", in the course of his normal walking (if he steps on a snake as he is walking and kills it is permitted, because the **Rabanan** were not goizer in that case), but maybe he never allowed killing under another set of circumstances?! We find that **R' Yehuda** allowed stepping on saliva "lefi tumoi", **R' Sheishes** allowed stepping on a snake "lefi tumoi", and **R' Katina** allowed stepping on a scorpion "lefi tumoi".
  - **Abba bar Marsa** owed money to the members of the Reish Galusa. They brought him to the house of the Reish Galusa to pressure him to pay. It was Shabbos and there was some saliva on the ground. The Reish Galusa said, bring a keili and cover the saliva. **Abba bar Marsa** said, there is no need for that, because **R' Yehuda** said one can step on saliva "lefi tumoi". Upon hearing this, the Reish Galusa said, this person (**Abba bar Marsa**) is a talmid chochom. Do not pressure him.
- **R' Abba bar Kahana in the name of R' Chanina** said, the candelabra of **Rebbi's** house may be moved on Shabbos.
  - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, was this a small one able to be carried with one hand or a large one that needs two hands to be moved? **A:** He answered, they were small.
- **R' Abba bar Kahana in the name of R' Chanina** said, the wagons of **Rebbi** may be moved on Shabbos.
  - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, does this refer to large wagons that need 2 people to be moved or small ones that can be moved by one person? **A:** He answered, it refers to small ones.
- **R' Abba bar Kahana** said, **R' Chanina** allowed the people of **Rebbi's** house to drink wine transported by goyim, based on the fact that the wine had one seal. However, he did not know if **R' Chanina** permitted it because he holds like **R' Eliezer** that one seal is always enough or because he held that in this case it is enough because the goyim were afraid of the Nasi and would therefore never touch the wine.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf קכב---122-----

## MISHNA

- If a goy lights a candle for himself on Shabbos, a Yid may use the light. If it was lit for the Yid, the Yid may not use the light.
- If a goy drew water to give his animals to drink, a Yid may use that water for his animals. If the water was drawn for the Yid, he may not use it.
- If a goy makes himself a ramp to use to get off a ship, a Yid may use it as well. If it was made for the Yid, he may not use it.
  - **R' Gamliel** and the Elders were once on a ship and a goy made himself a ramp to get off the ship and **R' Gamliel** and the Elders used the ramp as well.

## GEMARA

- The Mishna needed to teach all 3 cases. If only the first one would have been taught, we would say that only in the case of a candle may the Yid use it because one candle serves many people (the goy did nothing extra for the Yid), but in the case of drawing water we would think that the **Rabanan** did not allow it because maybe the goy will draw more water than he needed, just for the sake of the Yid. The last case of the Mishna (with the ramp) was truly unnecessary and was taught as an introduction to the story with **R' Gamliel** and the Elders.
- A Braisa says: if a goy gathers grass for his animals on Shabbos, a Yid may use that grass for his own animals after the goy. If the goy gathered the grass for a Yid, the Yid may not use the grass. If a goy drew water to give his animals to drink, a Yid may use that water for his animals after him. If the goy drew the water for the Yid, the Yid may not use it. We only say that the Yid may use the grass or the water if the goy does not know the Yid. However, if the goy knows him, he may not use the grass or water.
  - **Q:** The grass that is gathered by the goy on Shabbos is muktzeh, and **R' Huna in the name of R' Chanina** said that one may stand his animal on attached grass on Shabbos (we are not afraid that the owner will rip out grass to give to the animal because that would be an issur D'Oraisa), but he may not stand his animal on muktzeh grass (because we are afraid that he will pick some up to feed the animal). If so, how do we allow the Yid to use the goy's grass for his animal? It was gathered today and is therefore muktzeh!? **A:** The Yid does not stand near the animal in a way that he can help it with the grass, therefore there is no reason to be goizer.
  - **Q:** **R' Gamliel** presumably knew the goy on the ship who made the ramp and yet he used it. According to the Braisa, since he knew him he should not have used it?! **A:** **Abaye** says the ramp was made when **R' Gamliel** was not there, so the goy would not have had him in mind. **Rava** says, even if **R' Gamliel** was there it would be permitted for him to use it, because the goy did nothing extra for **R' Gamliel**. The same plank that he needed for himself was used by **R' Gamliel**. No extra work was done (like the light of a candle).
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Gamliel** said to the Elders, since we weren't there when he made the ramp, we can use it as well?! **A:** **Rava** says, the Braisa should be changed to say that **R' Gamliel** said, since the goy made the ramp, we can use it as well.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says, if there is a city that has both Yidden and goyim living there, and there is bathhouse that heats its water on Shabbos for the people to use on Motzei Shabbos, if most of the population are goyim, a Yid may use the bathhouse immediately after Shabbos. If most of the population are Yidden, it is as if the goyim warmed it up for them and a Yid may not use the bathhouse until enough time has passed after Shabbos that the water could have been heated after Shabbos. Heating water is like lighting a candle – once it's heated for one person it's heated for all. So why is it assur?! **A:** The people who heat the water do so with the majority of the population in mind.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a goy lights a lamp on Shabbos for a gathering of people, if most of the people are Yidden, the Yidden may not use the light?! **A:** There too, when the goy lights the candle, he lights it to benefit the majority of the people who come.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Shmuel** once went to **Avin's** house on Shabbos and a goy lit a candle. **Shmuel** turned around so as not to benefit from the light. He then saw the goy reading a document by the light of the candle. He realized that the goy lit the candle for his own benefit. **Shmuel** therefore turned back towards the light (and allowed himself to use the light as well).

## HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL KISVEI!!!

### PEREK KOL HAKEILIM -- PEREK SHIVAH ASAR

#### MISHNA

- All keilim may be moved on Shabbos along with their doors, even if the doors are detached. These doors are different than house doors, which are not considered to be prepared for use from before Shabbos if they are not attached to the house.
- One may use a hammer to crack open nuts, an ax to cut a cake of pressed figs, a saw to slice cheese, a shovel to pick up dried figs, a winnowing shovel or pitchfork to use to give food to a child, weaving utensils to stick into fruit, a sewing needle to remove a thorn, and a needle used for making sackcloth to use to open a lock on a door.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that the doors of the keilim may be moved if they fell off on Shabbos, and certainly if they fell off during the week. It is understandable that if they fell off on Shabbos they are not muktzeh because they were not muktzeh when Shabbos arrived (since they were attached). However, if they fell off before Shabbos, they had no use when Shabbos arrived and they should therefore be muktzeh, so that is the bigger chiddush and that is the one that the Mishna should stress?! **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna means to say that all keilim along with their doors may be moved on Shabbos, even if the doors fell off before Shabbos.
- A Braisa says that the door of a box or closet may be taken off on Shabbos, but not reinstalled. The door of a chicken coop may not be taken off or reinstalled.
  - **Q:** The halacha about the chicken coop is consistent, because the Tanna must hold, that since it is attached to the ground, attaching the door is considered “building” and detaching it is considered “demolishing” and that is why both are assur. However, with regard to the box and the closet (which are keilim), if the Tanna feels one can be chayuv for “building” (which is why the door cannot be reinstalled), then he should be chayuv for “demolishing” as well (and should not be allowed to take the door off)?! **A: Abaye** said, the Tanna says there would be a problem of “building” and “demolishing” even if done to keilim. The Tanna does not permit the removing of the door. The Tanna is saying, if the door becomes detached, one may not reattach it.
    - **Q: Rava** asks: 1) The Tanna said the door “may be removed”?! 2) The Tanna says “but it may not be returned”. That means it may be taken off!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the Tanna says there is no problem of building and demolishing when it comes to keilim. The reason it may not be reattached is because of a gezeirah that he may put it in very tightly and be “makeh b’patish”.

#### NOTEL ADAM KURNAS...

- **R' Yehuda** says, one may use a hammer meant for nut cracking to crack nuts, but not a blacksmith's hammer. **R' Yehuda** holds that an object typically used for a prohibited melacha may not be used on Shabbos, even for a permitted use.
  - **Q: Rabbah** asked, according to **R' Yehuda**, how does the Mishna allow the use of a winnowing shovel or a pitchfork? That is not meant to be used for feeding a child!? **A: Rabbah** therefore says, even a blacksmith's hammer maybe used to crack nuts. He holds that an object typically used for a prohibited melacha may be used in a permitted way on Shabbos.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa says that a grinder may only be moved if there is some garlic in it. It seems that it may not be moved even for a permissible purpose?! **A: Rabbah** said, that Braisa follows **R' Nechemia** who says that a keili may be moved on Shabbos only for its primary purpose.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that **B" S** and **B" H** agree that a grinder that was used for chopping meat may not be used for any other purpose. This doesn't fit according to **Rabbah**!? **A: Rabbah** answered that people are particular about their grinders being used for any other purpose and they store them away in a designated place. Therefore, they are muktzeh.

### -----Daf קכג-----123-----

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the hammer referred to in the Mishna is a goldsmith's hammer (although he is somewhat particular about its use, because it must remain smooth to use on the gold, he allows other uses because he can smooth it out on an anvil and therefore it is not muktzeh). **R' Shemen bar Abba** said, the hammer referred to in the Mishna is the hammer used to crush spices (which can be disgusting through use on other items, but they allow its use on other items and it therefore is not muktzeh).
  - **R' Shemen bar Abba**, who allows use of a spices hammer will surely allow use of a goldsmith's hammer (because the goldsmiths are less particular than the spice crushers). **R' Yochanan** may only allow a goldsmith's hammer, but not a spice hammer.

#### V'ES HAKUSH V'ES HAKARKAR...

- A Braisa says, if an unripe fig is buried in straw to ripen, or if a cookie is buried in coals to bake, if part of the fig or cookie is exposed, one may grab onto that part and remove it from the straw or coals on Shabbos. If not, it may not be moved. **R' Elazar ben Tadaï** says, one may stick the fig or cookie with a weaver's utensil, pull out the food and have the straw or coals fall off on their own.
  - **R' Nachman** paskened like **R' Elazar ben Tadaï**.
  - **Q: R' Nachman** says elsewhere, if someone stuck a radish into the ground to ripen before Shabbos, on Shabbos he may pull it out only if it was stuck in right side up, since it is more narrow on the bottom than on the top, no earth would be moved when he would pull it out. If it was stuck in upside down it would be assur to pull out. We see that **R' Nachman** allows no moving of the earth!? **A: R' Nachman** retracted his ruling about the radish.

#### MACHAT SHEL YAD LITOL BAH...

- **Q: Rava the son of Rabbah** asked **R' Yosef**, if a needle loses its eye or its point, does it become muktzeh? **A:** He said, we learned in our Mishna that a needle is not muktzeh because it can be used to remove a thorn. That use exists with or without the eye. We see that loss of the eye will not make it muktzeh.
  - **Q:** He asked, but a Mishna says that a needle that loses its eye or its point loses its tumah status (because it is no longer considered a keili, and it should therefore follow that it becomes muktzeh as well)?! **A: Abaye** answered, for tumah purposes, it loses its din of a keili if it is not the same keili that it was created to be. With regard to Shabbos, it is not muktzeh as long as there is some use (which this has, even without the eye).
    - **Rava** said, the one who asked the question asked well, because if it is not considered a keili for tumah purposes, it is not considered a keili for Shabbos either and it should therefore be muktzeh.
      - **Q:** A Braisa says that a needle with or without an eye may be moved on Shabbos, and an eye only plays a role in determining its tumah status!? **A: Abaye** answered for **Rava**, that this Braisa is talking about unfinished needles, whose eyes were not made yet. For purposes of tumah, since it is not yet completed, it does not have a din of a keili. However, since it does have a use (to remove thorns and it may end up being left without the eye and used for this purpose), it will not be muktzeh for Shabbos. However, when the eye of a needle breaks off, the owner discards it and it therefore is considered muktzeh.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Nachman** says it is prohibited to straighten and set the limbs of a newborn into place on Shabbos. **R' Sheishes** says it is mutar.
  - **R' Nachman** brings a proof from a Mishna that prohibits one from taking a drink that will induce vomiting, because it is considered to be fixing his body (it allows him to eat more). The same prohibition would exist for fixing the body of the baby. **R' Sheishes** says, straightening the baby is as normal as giving it to eat and drink and it is therefore permitted. Inducing vomiting is not normal and therefore prohibited.
  - **R' Sheishes** brings a proof from our Mishna which allows use of a needle to remove a thorn, thereby fixing the person. **R' Nachman** says removing a foreign object from the skin (i.e. the thorn) is not considered fixing. Straightening the limbs is considered fixing.

### MISHNA

- If the rod used to turn over the olives in the vat to see if they are ripe has a knot on the end, it is “mekabel tumah”. If it does not, it is not. In either case, it may be moved on Shabbos.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it mekabel tumah, it is a flat rod with no receptacle (which is what is needed for a keili to be “mekabel tumah”)?! **A:** It was taught in the name of **R' Nechemia**, if there is a knot on the end, when he turns over the olives, some oil collects at the knot and he looks at that to determine whether they are ready to be pressed. That collection of oil is in a “receptacle” and it is therefore “mekabel tumah”.

### MISHNA

- **R' Yose** says, all keilim may be moved on Shabbos except for a large saw and the part of the plowing machine that makes the grooves (people are very particular about the use of these items and therefore place them in a designated area not to be used).

### GEMARA

- **R' Nachman** said, a certain device used when laundering clothes may also not be moved (because people are particular about its use). **Abaye** said, the knife used by tanners, a butcher’s knife, and a carpenter’s tool are likewise not to be moved on Shabbos.
- A Braisa says, originally they said that 3 keilim may be moved on Shabbos: the knife used for cutting pressed figs, the large spoon used for skimming the foam from a pot, and a regular table knife. They then permitted more, and then again more, and then again more, until they finally said that all keilim may be moved on Shabbos except for a large saw and the part of the plowing machine that makes the grooves.
  - **Q:** What does the Braisa mean that they permitted more, and then again more, and then again more, until they finally said... etc.?
  - **A1: Abaye** says they first permitted an object whose primary use is a permitted use, to be used for that use on Shabbos. They then further permitted that object to be moved when its place was needed. They then further permitted an object whose primary use is a non-permitted use, to be used for a permitted use, but was still not allowed to be moved if its place was needed. All these allowances were only given for keilim that were small enough to be moved with one hand. They then finally said, that keilim which could only be moved by two hands may also be moved (as long as they fit the reasons given by **Abaye** for their movement) except for a large saw and the part of the plowing machine that makes the grooves.
    - **Q: Rava** said, if they permitted an object, why would they differentiate between needing its use or its place? Therefore, **Rava** understands the Braisa in a different way.
  - **A2: Rava** says they first permitted an object whose primary use is a permitted use, to be used for that use or to be moved when its place is needed on Shabbos. They then further permitted that object to be moved to protect the object, as when it needed to be moved from the sun to the shade. They then further permitted an object whose primary use is a non-permitted use, to be used for a permitted use, or to be moved when its place is needed on Shabbos, but such an object could not be moved to protect the object. All these allowances were only given for keilim that were small enough to be moved by one

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

person. They then finally said, that keilim which could only be moved by at least two people may also be moved (as long as they fit the reasons given by **Rava** for their movement) except for a large saw and the part of the plowing machine that makes the grooves.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, a grinder may only be moved if there is garlic on it, if not it may not be moved. **Abaye** can say this is talking about needing its place and that's why it can't be moved. But, according to **Rava**, why would it be assur to move it? **A: Rava** says the Braisa is discussing moving it to protect the object, which may not be done for such a keili.
- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that **B" S** and **B" H** agree that a grinder may not be moved after he is done chopping meat on it. **Abaye** can say this is talking about needing its place and that's why it can't be moved. But, according to **Rava**, why would it be assur to move it? **A: Rava** says the Braisa is discussing moving it to protect the object, which may not be done for such a keili.
- **R' Chanina** explains, that in the days of Nechemia ben Chachalya the Yidden were very lax with regard to observing Shabbos. This caused the **Rabanan** to be goizer muktzeh on all but 3 keilim. As observance became stronger, the **Rabanan** removed most of the gezeirah, piece by piece. This background is the basis for the discussion of this Braisa.

### -----Daf דק--124-----

- **R' Elazar** said, the halachos taught about: pipes, poles, knobs and a grinder, were all taught before movement of keilim was permitted.
  - **Pipes:** A Mishna says that the moving of the half pipes on which the "lechem hapanim" rested on the "Shulchan" was not allowed on Shabbos (these pipes had a permitted use, and still the Mishna says it was assur, because it was in the time of the gezeirah).
  - **Poles:** A Mishna says that when skinning the Korbon Pesach, they would hang it on a pole which they would carry on their shoulder and the shoulder of a friend, and the animal would be skinned when hanging like that. **R' Elazar** says, if Erev Pesach was on Shabbos, they could not move these poles, so the 2 people would put their arms on the other's shoulder and the animal would hang from their arms (these poles had a permitted use, and still the Mishna says it was assur, because it was in the time of the gezeirah).
  - **Knobs:** A Mishna says, **R' Yehoshua** says, a knob used to lock a door may only be moved indirectly, by dragging it (the knob has a permitted use, and still the Mishna says it was assur, because it was in the time of the gezeirah).
  - **Grinder:** The Braisa forbids moving a grinder unless there is garlic in the grinder (even with a permitted use, the Mishna says it was assur, because it was in the time of the gezeirah).
- **Rabbah** said, it could be that all these prohibitions were taught after the gezeirah was already removed. The reason each case is assur is:
  - **Pipes:** The "lechem hapanim" would not get moldy if they sat on top of each other without the pipes during Shabbos. Therefore, there is absolutely no reason to move them on Shabbos and they were simply taken away on Friday.
  - **Poles:** Since the people can use their arms in the place of the poles, there is no reason to move the poles on Shabbos
  - **Knobs:** The Mishna is discussing a courtyard which has no eiruv. **R' Yehoshua** holds that the doorway is considered like the inside of the house, and therefore transferring from door to door would be carrying from the house into the courtyard. Therefore it must be done in an indirect way.
  - **Grinder:** This Braisa follows the opinion of **R' Nechemia** who says that an object may only be moved for its primary purpose.

#### MISHNA

- All keilim may be moved for a need and for no need. **R' Nechemia** says they may only be moved for a need.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## GEMARA

- **Q:** What does it mean “for a need” and “for no need”?
- **A1: Rabbah** says, the **T”K** holds keilim whose primary use is a permitted use may be moved to be used for its permitted use (“for a need”) and may be moved if its place is needed (“for no need”). A keili whose primary use is a prohibited use may only be moved for a permitted use, but may not be moved for use of its place. **R’ Nechemia** argues and says that even a keili with a permitted primary use may only be moved to be used for its permitted use, not for its place.
- **A2: Rava** says, moving something for its place is considered “a need”. Therefore, the Mishna must mean as follows: The **T”K** holds keilim whose primary use is a permitted use may be moved to be used for its permitted use and may be moved if its place is needed (“for a need”). It may also be moved “from the sun to the shade” to protect the object (“for no need”). A keili whose primary use is a prohibited use may be moved to be used for a permitted use and may be moved if its place is needed (“for a need”), but it may not be moved “from the sun to the shade” to protect the object (“for no need”). **R’ Nechemia** argues and says even a keili with a permitted primary use may only be moved to be used for its permitted use or for its place, but may not be moved for protection.
  - **R’ Safra, R’ Acha bar Huna, and R’ Huna bar Chanina** said, according to **Rabbah’s** understanding of **R’ Nechemia**, how may one remove dirty dishes from a table? **R’ Safra** answered, it is like a keili of excrement which may be moved because it is so disgusting.
    - **Abaye** asked this same question to **Rabbah**, and **Rabbah** answered him with **R’ Safra’s** answer.
  - **Abaye** asked **Rava**, the Braisa prohibits moving a grinder with no garlic on it (**Rabbah** can say this refers to moving it because one needs its place)? **Rava** answered, the Braisa is discussing moving it for its protection.
  - **Abaye** asked **Rava, B”S** and **B”H** agree that a grinder may not be moved once one is done chopping meat on it (**Rabbah** can say this refers to moving it because one needs its place)? **Rava** answered, the Braisa is discussing moving it for its protection.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, one may not use a piece of wood to prop up a pot or a door on Yom Tov. A piece of wood is an item with a permitted use on Yom Tov, because one may use it to burn to cook food, and yet it is assur to use for a permitted use and would certainly be assur to move for use of its place (this is problematic for **Rabbah** and **Rava**)?! **A:** Since a piece of wood is not a permitted object on Shabbos and is therefore assur to move, we were goizer that it cannot be moved on Yom Tov as well.
    - Although we allow moving an item with a prohibited use on Shabbos, that only applies to a keili with a prohibited use, not to an object that is not even considered to be a keili.
  - **Q:** We find that we do not prohibit performing activities on Yom Tov just because they are assur on Shabbos. A Mishna allows lowering produce from the roof through a skylight on Yom Tov (to prevent a financial loss) even though it is assur to do on Shabbos?! We also find that we do prohibit performing activities on Yom Tov just because they are assur on Shabbos, because a Mishna says the only difference between Shabbos and Yom Tov is that food preparation is mutar on Yom Tov, but all else is assur just like Shabbos?! **A: R’ Yosef** said, the Mishna that allows performing the activity on Yom Tov follows **R’ Yehoshua** and the Mishna which does not allow it follows **R’ Eliezer**, as can be seen in a Braisa. A Braisa says, if an animal and her child (which may never be slaughtered on the same day) fall into a ditch (where there is a risk they may get harmed if left there) on Yom Tov, **R’ Eliezer** says he may lift one animal out of the ditch in order to slaughter it, but the second one must be left in the ditch (since it can’t be slaughtered that day). **R’ Yehoshua** says he may lift the first one out of the ditch in order to slaughter it. He may then use a “trick” and decide that he rather slaughter the second animal instead and lift the second animal out of the ditch. He may then slaughter whichever one he wants.
    - **Q:** Maybe **R’ Eliezer** doesn’t permit lifting the second animal because it is possible to minimize the financial risk by providing the animal with food in the ditch, but in the case of the produce on the roof, since there is no way to mitigate the financial loss, he may allow lowering it through the roof!? Also, maybe **R’ Yehoshua** allows lifting the second animal because you have a “trick” that you can use. However, in the case of produce on the roof, where use of a “trick” is not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

available, he may prohibit lowering it through the skylight?! **A: R' Pappa** therefore says, the Mishna which prohibits actions on Yom Tov like on Shabbos follows **B"S**. The Mishna that allows lowering the produce follows **B"H**. For a Mishna says, **B"S** say one may not carry a child, a lulav or a Sefer Torah from a reshus hayachid to a reshus harabim on Yom Tov (because l'chatchila, one may not carry on Yom Tov more than on Shabbos). **B"H** allow one to do so (similarly he would allow lowering the produce through the skylight).

- **Q: B"S** only don't allow carrying, but they may allow moving items?! **A:** Prohibiting movement is only meant to prevent carrying, so they are one and the same.
- **Rav** seems to hold like **Rava**, because **Rav** says, moving a shovel to prevent it from getting stolen is considered moving it "for no need". It seems that **Rav** would say that moving something for a permissible use or for use of its place would be mutar.
  - **Q: R' Kahana** once visited **Rav** and **Rav** instructed that a trap (used for catching animals) be brought for **R' Kahana** to use as a chair to sit on. Presumably he specified that the trap was being used for a permissible use as opposed to it being moved for use of its place (because it would not be allowed to be moved for use of its place)?! **A1: Rav** actually instructed for them to remove the trap so that **R' Kahana** could sit in its place (this would mean that **Rav** allowed moving the trap for use of its space). **A2: Rav** was asking them to move the trap from the sun into the shade (which is where **R' Kahana** was sitting). He wanted to be clear to all that he allowed that because it was being used as a seat, not because he allowed it to be moved for protection of the trap.
- **R' Mari the son of Rachel** had a pillow that was lying in the sun on Shabbos. He went to **Rava** to ask if he could bring it in to the shade. **Rava** said it may be brought in to the shade (which follows **Rava's** shita). **R' Mari** said, I have other pillows and don't need the ones out in the sun. **Rava** answered, you may need them for guests. **R' Mari** said, I have other ones for guests and don't need the ones in the sun. **Rava** said, you obviously hold like **Rabbah**, and if so, you should not carry these in to the shade.
- **Rav** said, one may move a cloth broom (used to sweep crumbs off a table) on Shabbos, but not a broom of palm leaves (used to sweep the floor which was assur in those times because the floors were made of dirt). **R' Elazar** says, even brooms of palm leaves may be moved.
  - **Q:** What case is being discussed? If the broom is needed for a permitted use or for its place, **Rav** (who holds like **Rava**) would agree that even the broom of leaves can be moved! If they are discussing moving it to the shade for protection, **R' Elazar** would not say it could be moved for that purpose, because no one says that it can be moved for that purpose!? **A:** What is being discussed is moving it from the sun to the shade. The words of **R' Elazar** should be "V'chein omar **R' Elazar**" – he doesn't argue, but rather says exactly like **Rav**.

### MISHNA

- Any keilim that may be moved on Shabbos, broken pieces from them may be moved as well, as long as the pieces serve some function. For example, a piece of a broken mixing bowl being used to cover a barrel, or a piece of broken glass used to cover a bottle.
- **R' Yehuda** says, the broken pieces may be moved if they can serve in somewhat of the same function that the unbroken keili used to serve. For example, a piece of a broken mixing bowl being used to pour thick porridge into (it is thick and dough-like, which is what the mixing bowl used to hold), or a broken piece of glass used to pour oil into (similar use to the original glass).

### GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the machlokes is regarding when the keili broke on Friday. In that case **R' Yehuda** says that if it retains a similar use to the original keili it may be moved, but if it does not, it is not considered a useful keili unless someone specifically designated it for that purpose. The **T"K** holds that if there is any use it retains its din as a keili and may be moved on Shabbos. However, if the keili broke on Shabbos, all agree that the broken pieces with any use may be moved, because they were part of a keili at the start of Shabbos.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Zutrai** asks, a Braisa says that we may fuel a fire on Yom Tov with keilim, but not with pieces of broken keilim. When did the keilim in this Braisa break? If they broke before Yom Tov, then these broken pieces are simply firewood, so why can't they be used to fuel a fire? It must be that the keilim broke on Yom Tov, and we see that the Tanna of this Braisa says, that although it broke on Yom Tov, they may not be moved! According to **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel**, the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** agree that pieces from a keili that broke on Shabbos may be moved! If so, who is the Tanna of this Braisa?! **A:** The understanding of the machlokes in our Mishna must be as follows. **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, the machlokes is when the keili broke on Shabbos. In that case, the **T"K** says it is not muktzeh since it was part of a keili at the onset of Shabbos and is still useful. **R' Yehuda** says, if it has a similar function to the original keili then it is not muktzeh. However, if it does not, it is considered "nolad" and therefore may not be moved. However, if the keili broke on Friday, all would agree that as long as there is any use for the broken pieces they would not be muktzeh on Shabbos, because they were useful items at the onset of Shabbos.
- There are 3 contradictory Braisos. One says we may fuel a fire on Yom Tov with keilim, but not with broken keilim. A second Braisa says, just as we may fuel a fire on Yom Tov with keilim, we may do so with broken keilim as well. A third Braisa says, we may not fuel a fire on Yom Tov with keilim or with broken keilim. The Braisos can be understood as follows: The first Braisa follows **R' Yehuda** who holds of muktzeh and "nolad" (which is why the broken pieces are assur). The second Braisa follows **R' Shimon** who doesn't hold of muktzeh or "nolad" (which is why even broken pieces may be used). The third Braisa follows **R' Nechemia** who says a keili may only be moved for its primary use (which is why even a keili cannot be used to fuel a fire).
- **R' Nachman** said, bricks that are left over from a building project are not muktzeh because they are now used to sit on. However, if one piled them up (in preparation to be used for another building project) they are muktzeh as building material.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, a broken piece of pottery can be used to cover keilim and therefore it itself has a din of a keili in a courtyard, where keilim needing covers can be found. However, in a karmelis, where one would not find keilim needing covers, the broken pottery will not have a din of a keili and cannot be moved (even within 4 amos). **R' Nachman** himself says, it retains its din of a keili in a karmelis, because people sit in a karmelis and would use the pottery to cover saliva. However, in a reshus harabim it would not have a din of a keili and may not be moved at all. **Rava** says, the pottery retains its din of a keili even in the reshus harabim – since it has a din of a keili in a courtyard, it retains that status of a keili wherever it may be.
  - **Rava** was walking in the reshus harabim on Shabbos and his shoes became dirty from the mud. His attendant took a piece of pottery from the ground and began cleaning **Rava's** shoes with it. The **Rabanan** yelled at the attendant to stop. **Rava** said, it's not enough that they did not learn, they even try to teach others something that they don't know. **Rava** said, since the pottery is considered a keili in a courtyard, because it can be used to cover keilim, it retains that status even in the reshus harabim.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the cover of a broken barrel may be moved on Shabbos because it is fit to be a cover for another barrel.
  - A Braisa says, the cover of a broken barrel and the pieces of the barrel may be moved on Shabbos. However, one should not smooth out the edges of a broken piece because that would be considered "makeh b'patish" for completing a new keili. If one throws the cover into the garbage, it loses its status as a keili.
    - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, if one throws out a garment, does it lose its status as a garment? Of course not! So why would the cover lose its status as a keili just because it was thrown into the garbage?! **A:** The Braisa means, if he threw it into the garbage before Shabbos it loses its status as a keili because he is showing before Shabbos that he has no intention of using it.
- **Bar Hamduri in the name of Shmuel** said, pieces of a mat may be moved on Shabbos. **Rava** said, **Bar Hamduri** explained, these pieces serve the same purpose as the mat. The mat is used to cover dirt that is prepared to be used to cover excrement, or the mat is used keep the dust on the ground settled. The pieces of a mat can accomplish the same goal.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Zeira in the name of Rav** said, remnants of a tallis may not be moved on Shabbos. **Abaye** said, this is referring to pieces that are smaller than 3x3 fingers, which are not fit for use by paupers or wealthy people and therefore serve no purpose.

### -----Daf קכ"ה---125-----

- A Braisa says, the broken pieces of an old oven (an oven that was heated up at least once, which is the final process of making an oven): **R' Meir** says they have a din like all other keilim that may be moved around a courtyard. **R' Yehuda** says they may not be moved. **R' Yose** testified in the name of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** that these pieces may be moved on Shabbos, and that the cover of an oven does not need a handle to be considered non-muktzeh.
  - **Q:** What is the base of the machlokes?
  - **A1: Abaye** says, **R' Meir** says the broken pieces are mutar when they can perform any function, and **R' Yehuda** says they are mutar only when they can perform a function similar to the original keili.
    - **Q: Rava** asks, if this is correct, why do they argue about the broken pieces of an oven, they should argue about the broken pieces of any keilim?!
  - **A2: Rava** says they are arguing regarding the broken pieces of a very specific oven discussed in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if an oven is placed over a ditch (typically, an oven is built as a cylinder attached to the ground, where the fire is lit on the ground in this cylinder and the pot is placed on top of the cylinder or the bread is placed on the wall of the cylinder) in a way that the fire which would be lit on the floor of the ditch will be able to heat up the entire oven, **R' Yehuda** says, the oven can be mekabel tumah (**R' Yehuda** says that an oven must be attached to the ground in order for it to be mekabel tumah, and in this situation it is considered to be attached to the ground). The **Chachomim** say, even if the fire in that case will not heat the oven effectively, the oven can be mekabel tumah (the **Chachomim** say an oven can be mekabel tumah even if it is not attached to the ground). The machlokes in the Braisa is about pieces from an oven not attached to the ground. **R' Yehuda** says they are muktzeh since the oven never became an "oven". The **Chachomim** say the broken pieces are considered keilim since they came from the oven which the **Chachomim** consider to be a keili.
    - They argue in how to expound a pasuk. The pasuk says, if an oven becomes tamei, it must be "demolished". **R' Yehuda** says the pasuk is teaching that only an oven that can be "demolished" can be mekabel tumah, and only something that is attached to the ground can be said to be "demolished". Therefore, to be mekabel tumah the oven must be attached to the ground. The **Chachomim** say, the pasuk continues and says "They are tamei and shall remain tamei to you". These seemingly extra words teach that any oven is mekabel tumah – whether or not it is attached to the ground.
      - The **Chachomim** say the word "demolished" teaches that *even if* it is attached to the ground it is mekabel tumah. We would think that if it is attached to the ground it is like the ground and therefore not mekabel tumah at all.
      - **R' Yehuda** says that extra words in the pasuk teach that the oven needs to be attached to the ground only during the first time it is heated (which makes it into an "oven"). Once that is done, it can be mekabel tumah even if it is a portable oven.
      - **Ulla** explains, the **Rabanan** would hold that even the first heating need not be done while attached to the ground.
    - **Q: R' Ashi** asks, if this is the machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and the **Chachomim**, why do they argue about the broken pieces? They should argue about the oven itself!?
  - **A3: R' Ashi** said, the machlokes is like we said originally, whether to be non-muktzeh the broken pieces can serve any function or they must serve a similar function to the original oven, and we are discussing where the broken pieces (by being heated from underneath) can serve as heating tiles on top of which something can be baked or cooked. **R' Meir** is saying to **R' Yehuda**, I really hold that as long as the broken pieces serve any purpose, they are not muktzeh. But you, who require a similar function to the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

oven, must at least agree with me that broken pieces that can serve as heating tiles are considered a similar function and therefore are not muktzeh! **R' Yehuda** says, I do not agree. Heating tiles do not serve in the same function. Ovens are heated from within and these are heated from underneath. Ovens bake bread when they are attached to their walls vertically. These bake bread when the bread is lying on them horizontally.

- **Ravina** said, we in the city of Mechasya, who allow the moving of an oven cover that does not have a handle, follow the shita of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** in the Braisa.

### MISHNA

- A stone that is placed in a hardened shell which is being used as a pail to draw water (the shell is too light and needs the weight of the stone to bring it under the water to allow it to fill up with water), if the stone will not fall out when drawing water (it is attached to the shell), it has a din of a keili as well and is not muktzeh. If the stone would fall out when drawing water, the stone and the shell are muktzeh (the stone is not considered a keili and the shell is a base for the stone).
- If a branch is attached to a pitcher used to draw water, it may be used to draw water on Shabbos.
- **R' Eliezer** says, a window shutter may be placed to close the window on Shabbos if the shutter is attached to the building and does not drag on the floor when it hangs. The **Chachomim** say, the shutter may be placed to close the window even if it is not attached at all.

### GEMARA

- A Mishna says, if one placed a stone on a barrel as a cover and he wants to remove that stone on Shabbos, he must tilt the barrel to the side and have the stone fall off (he can't simply lift the stone and remove it).
  - **Rabbah says in the name of R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan**, one may tilt the barrel only if he forgot the stone on the barrel before Shabbos. However, if he left it there intentionally, the barrel becomes a base for the muktzeh stone and may not be moved. **R' Yosef says in the name of R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan**, one must tilt the stone off only if he forgot it there. However, if he left it there intentionally before Shabbos, it is considered a cover to the barrel and may be removed by simply lifting it.
    - **Q: Rabbah** says, we see from our Mishna that the stone becomes a keili along with the shell. According to **Rabbah's** version of **R' Yochanan**, why doesn't the stone become a keili with the barrel as well? **A: Rabbah** answers, the Mishna discusses where the stone is securely fastened to the shell. Here, the stone was simply placed on top of the barrel.
    - **Q: R' Yosef** says, we see from our Mishna that if the stone is not attached to the shell, it is muktzeh. According to **R' Yosef's** version of **R' Yochanan**, why does the unattached stone get a din of a keili? **A: R' Yosef** answered, placing a stone in the shell without attaching it makes the shell unusable to draw water. Therefore, the shell becomes nothing more than a place to store the stone. However, the mere placing of a stone on a barrel makes it useful as a cover and therefore is considered a keili.
    - The machlokes between **Rabbah in the name of R' Ami**, and **R' Yosef in the name of R' Assi** is based on whether a significant act is needed to designate something as a keili. **Rabbah** says it is needed and therefore, the mere placing of a stone on the barrel will not give it the status as a keili. **R' Yosef** says that even a small act is enough, and the act of placing the stone on the barrel is enough of an act to classify it as a keili.
    - We find that **R' Ami and R' Assi** argue regarding this elsewhere as well. **Rebbi** was once walking on Friday and he found a row of stones and that were meant to be used for building (which would make them muktzeh on Shabbos). Some say that **Rebbi** told his talmidim, have in mind that we will sit on these tomorrow (to remove them from being muktzeh), but he did not require that any action be taken. **R' Yochanan** says that **Rebbi** required the talmidim to do an act: **R' Ami** said **Rebbi** required them to set up the stones so that they would not have to be moved on Shabbos (since there is no significant act that could be done to them, they would

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

remain muktzeh and would not be allowed to be moved on Shabbos), and **R' Assi** said **Rebbi** required the students to wipe the stones (a very minor act, which was enough to make them non-muktzeh)

- **R' Yose ben Shaul** said, the story with **Rebbi** happened with a stack of beams (not a row of stones). **R' Yochanan ben Shaul** said the story happened with a long wooden pole that sailors use to test the depth of the water at a given place.
- If one says **Rebbi** allowed the use of the sailors' pole with an insignificant act, **Rebbi** would certainly allow use of a stack of beams with an insignificant act. However, if one says **Rebbi** allowed use of the beams with an insignificant act, it could be that he would not have allowed use of the sailors' pole with an insignificant act because sailors are very particular that it not be used for anything else, and it therefore would remain muktzeh until a significant act is done.

### ZEMORAH SHE'HI KESHURA...

- The Mishna says that the branch was tied to the pitcher. It seems that if it was not tied it would not be permitted.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one had palm branches that he was going to use for firewood (which is muktzeh on Shabbos) and then decided he wanted to use them to sit on (which is not muktzeh), the **T"K** says, he must tie a bundle together before Shabbos to show that he is no longer using it for firewood. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, all he needs to do is intend to use it for sitting, and he need do no more. Does our Mishna (which says the branch must be tied before Shabbos) not follow **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, our Mishna is talking about where the branch is still attached to the tree. In that case, even **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** would agree that it must be tied before Shabbos to be considered non-muktzeh.
    - **Q:** If it is still attached to the tree, how can he use it? **A1:** We are discussing a branch that is within 3 tefachim to the ground, which is considered like the ground itself and is not a problem. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said we are discussing a branch that is detached. The reason it must be tied is because we are afraid that if it is not tied one may end up cutting it down to the size that he needs.

### PIKAK HACHALON...

- **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan** said, all agree that one is not allowed to erect even a temporary roof on Yom Tov, and surely not on Shabbos. They only disagree with regard to making a temporary addition to an existing structure. **R' Eliezer** says one may not do so on Yom Tov, and certainly not on Shabbos, and the **Rabanan** say one may do so on Shabbos, and certainly may do so on Yom Tov.

## -----Daf דק---126-----

### VA'CHACHOMIM OMRIM BEIN KACH U'BEIN KACH POKIKIN BO

- **Q:** What do the **Chachomim** mean when they say, "Either way the shutter can be used to close the window"? Do they mean it can be used whether its attached to the building or not, or do they mean it must be attached to the building, but it may be used whether it drags on the floor or not? **A:** **R' Abba in the name of R' Kahana** says, they mean whether or not it is even tied to the building, it may be used as long as it was prepared for use as a shutter.
  - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, maybe the **Chachomim** mean to say it must be attached to the building but may be used whether or not it drags on the floor? This would make sense, because **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** says, the same machlokes that exists regarding the window shutter also exists regarding a door bolt that drags on the floor. A Mishna says, the **T"K** says if a bolt is attached to the door with a string, but it hangs and drags on the ground, one may use such a bolt to lock a door in the Beis HaMikdash (it would be a gezeirah of the **Rabanan** not to allow using this and we don't apply gezeiros in the Beis HaMikdash), but not anywhere else. If the bolt is not even attached to the door at all, it would be assur to use even in the Beis Hamikdash. **R' Yehuda** says, an unattached bolt may be used in the Beis

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

HaMikdash and one that is attached but drags may be used even elsewhere. **R' Yehoshua bar Abba in the name of Ulla** says that the **T"K** is **R' Eliezer** of our Mishna who prohibits using a shutter that drags on the ground. He similarly prohibits a bolt that drags on the ground. This would mean that **R' Yehuda** of that Mishna is the **Chachomim** of our Mishna, and we see that **R' Yehuda** only allows using the bolt (or the shutter) when it is attached to the building!? **A: R' Abba** says that the **Chachomim** is not **R' Yehuda**, it is **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** who says in a Braisa that a pole may be used to lock a door even if it is not attached to the door, as long as one had in mind to use it on Shabbos (so that there is no muktzeh issue). **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** would similarly hold that a shutter may be used even if it is not attached to the building, as long as one had in mind to use it on Shabbos.

- **R' Yehuda bar Shilas in the name of R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** says the halacha follows **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.
  - **Q: R' Yochanan** says in a Mishna that covers of keilim may only be moved if they have the status of keilim in their own right. However, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** allows moving the pole even though it does not have keili status (we see elsewhere that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** does not require an object to have keili status to allow it to be moved, so we can't say that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** requires the pole to have status of a keili to be moved)?! **A: R' Yochanan** agrees with **R' Shimon** that the pole may be used even if it is not attached to the door, but he disagrees with **R' Shimon** and says that it may only be moved if it has the status of a keili.
- **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** said the halacha follows **R' Eliezer** (that the shutter may be used only if it is attached to the building and not dragging on the floor).
  - **R' Amram** asked, a Mishna later in the Mesechta says, we learn from a story that took place, that we may use a shutter even if it is not attached?! **Abaye** asked, you find it difficult to pasken like **R' Eliezer** because that Mishna is an anonymous Mishna which follows the **Chachomim**, but the Mishna with the door bolt was an anonymous Mishna which follows **R' Eliezer**!? The Gemara explains, **R' Amram's** question is a good one, because a Halacha based on the way the **Rabanan** actually conducted themselves is the strongest proof as to how we should conduct ourselves. Therefore, the Mishna with the shutter is a stronger proof.

### MISHNA

- Keilim covers that have handles may be moved on Shabbos. **R' Yose** says, only covers of holes in the ground need a handle in order to be allowed to be moved, but covers of keilim may be moved even if they don't have handles.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda bar Shila in the name of R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the cover must have keili status in its own right to be allowed to be moved on Shabbos.
  - Based on this, the machlokes in the Mishna is as follows: All agree that covers of holes in the ground may only be moved if they have a handle. All further agree that covers of keilim may be moved even if they have no handle. The machlokes is regarding keilim that have been attached to the ground. The **T"K** says that the **Chachomim** were goizer that the cover needs a handle in this case as well, and **R' Yose** says there is no gezeirah and they may be moved even though it doesn't have a handle.
    - **Others** say the machlokes is regarding the cover of an oven. The **T"K** says it is treated like the cover of a hole in the ground and **R' Yose** says it is treated like the cover of a keili.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HAKEILIM!!!**

**PEREK MAFNIN -- PEREK SH'MONAH ASAR**

### MISHNA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If one needs room for guests or for talmidim to learn, he may move away even 4 or 5 boxes of straw or produce (and we are not concerned that he is performing tasks that require a lot of physical effort on Shabbos), but he may not empty the “storehouse” (to be explained).
- One may only move items that have a use on Shabbos, such as terumah which is tahor, demai, ma’aser rishon from which the Levi separated the “terumas ma’aser” that he must give to a Kohen, ma’aser sheini or hekdesch that were redeemed (all these items will be explained in the Gemara), and dry “turmus” beans because it is fit to be eaten by goats. However, one may not move tevel, ma’aser rishon from which the terumah was not removed, ma’aser sheni or hekdesch that were not redeemed, “luf” (a bean which is not fit for any consumption), or mustard seeds. **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** allows moving “luf” because it is the food of ravens.
- One may move bundles of straw, of soft twigs, or of soft reeds that were set aside for animal feed. If they were not set aside for that, they may not be moved.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** If 5 boxes may be moved, certainly 4 boxes may be moved, so why does the Mishna need to list that separately?
  - **A: R’ Chisda** says, the Mishna means that one may move 4 out of 5 boxes – meaning that one may not totally empty the area because we are afraid that he will expose holes in the ground and will smooth them out (which one may not do on Shabbos) – and may remove a maximum of 5 boxes from a large storehouse (because more than 5 boxes is considered to be too much physical effort to be allowed on Shabbos). When the Mishna says he may not empty the storehouse, it means that one may only move straw and produce from a storehouse that he has already begun to take from for his needs. However, he may not move things from a storehouse from which straw or produce has yet to be used, because the produce in that storehouse is muktzeh and our Mishna follows **R’ Yehuda** who holds of muktzeh
  - **A: Shmuel** says, “4 or 5 boxes” is a manner of speech and was not meant to limit anything. In fact, one may move as many boxes as necessary. When the Mishna says he may not empty the storehouse, it means that one may not totally empty the area because we are afraid that he will expose holes in the ground and will smooth them out (which one may not do on Shabbos). However, one *may* move straw or produce from a storehouse that was never yet touched, because our Mishna follows **R’ Shimon** who does not hold of muktzeh.
- A Braisa says although one may not move straw or produce from an untouched storehouse, he may clear himself a path to walk through.
  - **Q:** If one may not move things from the storehouse because it is muktzeh, how can he move it to make himself a path?! **A:** He can make himself a path by pushing the produce with his feet when he walks in and out (there is no problem with moving muktzeh items in that way).