



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf יז – Daf קג

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 יז-----97-----

- The father of **Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said that “old tefillin” refers to tefillin with the proper knots in the straps and “new tefillin” refer to tefillin which don't have the knots in their straps. Based on that, the reason **R' Yehuda** doesn't allow wearing “new tefillin” to a more protected place is not because it may be that it was written to be a kemaya, rather it is that one may not make the knots on Shabbos (which are necessary to wear them) because that is assur as the melacha of tying.
 - **Q:** Why can't he make a bow instead of a knot!? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, from here we see that having a bow in place of the knot required for tefillin would make the tefillin passul. **A2:** **Abaye** said, **R' Yehuda** would not allow the making of a bow on Shabbos, because he says elsewhere that making a bow is considered to be making a knot on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** seems to suggest that if not for the issue of tying a knot on Shabbos, a bow would be a kosher substitute for a knot of the tefillin. However, **R' Yehuda the son of R' Shmuel bar Shilas in the name of Rav** said that the form of the knots (they form letters of the Name of Hashem) are a halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai. How can the knot be substituted by a bow!? **A:** He makes the bow in a way that it takes on the shape of the knots.
- **R' Chisda in the name of Rav** said, if one buys a number of pairs of tefillin from one who is not known to be an expert, in order to verify that they are kosher, he must check 3 tefillins – either 2 “shel yads” and one “shel rosh” or visa-versa.
 - **Q:** If all the tefillin are from one person, he should be able to check any 3 (all “shel yad” or all “shel rosh”). If they are from a few people, he can never know whose tefillin he is checking and therefore can't establish a chazakah at all. He should therefore have to check each and every one!? **A:** All tefillin are from one person, but we must establish that this person knew the halachos that apply to shel rosh and shel yad, which is why at least one of each must be part of the 3 to be checked.
 - **Q:** **Rabbah bar Shmuel** taught, one must check 3 tefillins shel yad and shel rosh. Presumably this means either 3 of one or of the other!? **A:** It means that 3 must be checked, which must consist of at least one shel yad and one shel rosh.
 - **Q:** **R' Kahana** taught a Braisa that only 2 tefillin need be checked!? **A:** That follows **Rebbi** who says that a chazakah is established by doing something twice, not 3 times.
 - **Q:** The Braisa continues and says that 2 tefillin must be checked in the first bundle of tefillin, the second, and the third. This presumably means that one must check 3 bundles to create a chazakah for the remaining bundles. This means the Braisa does not follow **Rebbi**!? **A:** It is following **Rebbi**. The reason each bundle must be checked is because it comes from different people. The checking of one bundle cannot establish a chazakah for the other bundles. If there were 4 or 5 bundles, each one would have to be checked as well.

MITZA'AN TZIVASIM OY KRICHOS...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, both of these terms refer to bundles of tefillin. Tzivasim refers to where each pair is tied together and then piled with other such pairs. Krichos refers to where the tefillin are all just piled together, without being tied in pairs.

MACHSHICH ALEIHEN U'MIVEAN

- **Q:** Why can't they be brought in by wearing a pair at a time? **A:** **R' Yitzchak the son of R' Yehuda** said, if he has enough time to bring all the tefilin in (by wearing a pair at a time) before sundown, he does so. If not, (so he will anyway have to bring in some tefilin after Shabbos has ended) he must wait until after Shabbos is over to bring in all the tefillin.

U'VASAKANAH MICHASAN V'HOLECH

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that in times of a sakanah he may carry the tefillin less than 4 amos at a time and bring them into a protected area. Why does our Mishna not offer this method? **A:** **Rav** said, our Mishna is discussing danger of goyim who made a law threatening any wearer of tefillin with death. If they are seen carrying the tefillin, the same fate may be dealt them. Therefore, they simply cover the tefillin and move on. The Braisa is discussing danger associated with robbers. To remain there is dangerous, but to carry it less than 4 amos at a time is not, so it is allowed.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if our Mishna is discussing danger from goyim forbidding the wearing of tefillin, how is it that **R' Shimon** says the tefillin should be transported via a human assembly line? That will certainly draw the attention of the goyim!? **A:** The end of the Mishna is discussing danger due to robbers. It is regarding that case that **R' Shimon** says his halacha.

R' SHIMON OMER NOSNAN LACHAVEIRO...

- The **T"K** of the Braisa says it is preferable for one person to carry the tefillin less than 4 amos at a time, because involving additional people makes this leniency regarding Shabbos a matter of public knowledge. **R' Shimon** says it is preferable to have more people involved, because a lone person may mistakenly carry more than 4 amos.

V'CHEIN BINO

- **Q:** What is the baby doing out in the field? **A:** The Yeshiva of **Menasheh** said, the Mishna is discussing where the baby was born out in the field.
- **Q:** Why does the Mishna say “even if 100 people are needed”? **A:** Even though it is physically taxing on the baby to be passed from hand to hand, it must be done this way rather than to have one person walk less than 4 amos at a time.

R' YEHUDA OMER NOSEIN ADAM CHAVIS

- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Yehuda** limit transfer to the techum limitations of the owner of the barrel? **A:** **Reish Lakish in the name of Levi Saba** said, the Mishna is discussing where the water is being poured from barrel to barrel, so only the water is leaving the techum, and **R' Yehuda** says elsewhere (that a dough made on Yom Tov is not restricted to the techum limitations of the water used to make the dough, because the water is considered insubstantial) that water is considered to be insubstantial and therefore gets no techum restrictions.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that the **Rabanan** say that “this” (referring to the barrel) may not be moved beyond the techum!? **A:** The Mishna means “what is IN this” (i.e. the water) may not be transferred beyond the techum.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** allows transfer of the water beyond the techum when it is absorbed in the dough, but not when it is in its liquid state!? **A: Rava** says, the Mishna is discussing a barrel that had a techum restriction, but water that had no techum restriction (i.e. it was drawn on Shabbos). In that case, even the barrel may be moved beyond the techum because the barrel becomes “batul” to the water.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** allows transfer of the barrel and water beyond the techum when there is a caravan of people encamped for Shabbos who are in need of water. It seems that he would not allow it for a lone individual!? **A: R' Yosef** therefore said that our Mishna must also be discussing a case of a caravan. **A2: Abaye** said, in the case of a caravan it is allowed even if the barrel and water have techum restrictions. In other cases, it is allowed if the barrel has techum restrictions, but only if the water has no techum restrictions.
 - **R' Ashi** said that the Mishna is discussing a barrel and water of hefker. Therefore there are no techum restrictions. The “**Rabanan**” who argue on **R' Yehuda** is **R' Yochanan ben Nuri**, who says that hefker objects get their own techum restrictions (which includes 2,000 amos in every direction from where it was situated when Shabbos began).

-----Daf 72-----98-----

MISHNA

- If one is reading from a sefer (a scroll) on the threshold (leading to a house) and it rolled into the reshus harabim, he may roll it back to himself.
- If one is reading a sefer on a roof and it rolls off the roof, if it did not reach to within 10 tefachim of the ground, he may roll it back to himself. If it did reach there, he may only turn it over so that the words are not exposed. **R'**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Yehuda says, even if it has come to within a needle's thickness to the ground (but is not touching it) it may be rolled back to him. **R' Shimon** says, even if it is touching the ground it may be rolled back to him, because rolling it is only a gezeira of the **Rabanan** (as a concern for a case when it leaves his hand and is lying in the reshus harabim), and we don't apply gezeiros when it leads to the degradation of seforim.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the status of this threshold? If it is a reshus hayachid, and we allow rolling it back up even though it has fallen into a reshus harabim, that would be the shita of **R' Shimon** from later in the Mishna. That would mean that the beginning and end of the Mishna are **R' Shimon** and the middle is **R' Yehuda**? **A:** **R' Yehuda** (the Amora) said, that is exactly right. The beginning and end are **R' Shimon** and the middle is **R' Yehuda**. **A2: Rabbah** said, the threshold is one on which the rabbim walk. Therefore there is more potential degradation to the sefer than when it rolls from the roof. Given that, even **R' Yehuda** would agree in that case that we are not goizer and we allow him to roll the sefer back in.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that if the sefer rolled to within 4 amos of the threshold, he may roll it back up. If it rolled further, he may only turn it over so that the writing is not exposed. If we are discussing a threshold that the rabbim walk on, there is a gezeirah preventing him from rolling it whether it falls within or beyond the 4 amos. If it is allowed in one instance, it should be allowed in the other as well (i.e. even if it rolled beyond 4 amos)!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, the threshold being discussed is a karmelis. Therefore, if it falls to within 4 amos, there is no chance of an issur D'Oraisa taking place (so there is no gezeira and it may be rolled back to him). If it falls more than 4 amos into the reshus harabim, where there is a chance for an issur D'Oraisa (i.e. carrying it 4 amos in the reshus harabim) there is a gezeira, and therefore it may not be rolled back.
 - **Q:** Why are we not goizer even within 4 amos, that it may lead him to carry it from the reshus harabim to the reshus hayachid (via the karmelis threshold)!? We find that such transfer (even though it passes through a place of no transfer liability) will still be chayuv!? **A:** The case is where the threshold is very deep and therefore creates a sizeable separation between the reshus harabim and the reshus hayachid. We are not goizer, because we feel that as he is walking that considerable distance he will remind himself that he may not carry into the reshus hayachid when he is walking across the threshold. **A2:** When carrying seforim, people usually stop walking to look inside before continuing along. Therefore, he will likely pause on the threshold before putting it into the reshus hayachid, and no issur D'Oraisa will take place.
 - **Q:** We should be concerned that he will pause to read in the reshus harabim and then walk directly into the reshus hayachid without pausing!? **A:** This follows **Ben Azai**, who says that one is not chayuv for carrying something when walking, because each step is like a "hanacha" and a new "akira", therefore never going beyond 4 amos.
 - **Q: Ben Azai** agrees that one is chayuv if he throws an object, so why are we not concerned that he will throw the sefer? **A: R' Acha bar Ahava** says, we see from here that one may not throw seforim.

HAYA KOREH B'ROSH HAGAG...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that seforim must be covered with a cloth rather than be turned over onto its writing!? **A:** Our Mishna is discussing where a cloth of the required size is not available. Therefore, turning the sefer over onto its writing is allowed, to prevent its degradation.
- **Q:** Why does the Mishna say that when reading a sefer on a roof, and the sefer unrolls and falls to within 10 tefachim of the ground, it may not be rolled back up? It has not touched the ground, so why would there be a reason to be goizer? **A: Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing a slanted roof, and the sefer has come to rest on the slanted roof.
 - **Q:** If so, why does **R' Yehuda** allow it to be rolled up just because it hasn't touched the ground!? It has landed on the roof!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should say that **R' Yehuda** is arguing in a case where the roof is not a slanted one. In **T"K** says that if the sefer gets to within 3 tefachim to the ground it is considered as if it is on the ground, and therefore can't be rolled back to him. **R' Yehuda** says that a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

hanacha is only when something actually came to rest physically on something. Therefore, he says that even if it is only a needle's width off the ground, it may still be rolled back to him.

- **Q:** We find that **Rava** says that even the **Rabanan** require a hanacha to actually come to rest on something. According to what we just said it must be that there are those who argue on **Rava**!?
A: Rather, the entire Mishna is the view of **R' Yehuda** and he is explaining that when dealing with a flat roof (so that the sefer does not come to rest on the roof), as long as it does not actually come to rest on the ground, he may roll it back up.

MISHNA

- A ledge that is 4 tefachim wide and 10 tefachim off the ground, protruding in front of a window, one who is in the building may put things on it and take things from it on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** If this ledge is situated over the reshus harabim, we should be goizer against its use because of the concern that items will fall to the reshus harabim below and be carried back in!? If it is situated over a reshus hayachid, it is obvious that it may be used!? **A: Abaye** says, we are discussing a ledge situated over the reshus harabim and it may be used for keilim that will break if they fall. In that case there is no concern of picking them up after they have fallen.
 - A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says, "if there is a ledge in front of a window over the reshus harabim, one may place breakable items on it. The ledge may be used along the length of the entire wall, provided it is 10 tefachim off the ground. If there are 2 ledges, one above the other, one may use the lower ledge, but the upper ledge may only be used opposite the window".
 - **Q:** If this upper ledge is smaller than 4 tefachim, it may not be used at all. If it is 4 tefachim, it should be allowed even not opposite the window!? **A: Abaye** said, the lower ledge is 4 tefachim, but the upper ledge is only 4 tefachim when combined with the window sill. Therefore, it may only be used opposite that window.

MISHNA

- A person may stand in the reshus hayachid and move things in the reshus harabim, and visa-versa, as long as he doesn't move them more than 4 amos in the reshus harabim.
- A person may not stand in the reshus hayachid and urinate into the reshus harabim, or visa-versa. Similarly, one may not spit from one reshus to another.
- **R' Yehuda** says, if someone has saliva gathered in his mouth, he may not walk 4 amos in reshus harabim until he first spits it out.

GEMARA

- **R' Chininah bar Shlemya** taught a version of the Mishna to **Chiya bar Rav** in front of **Rav**, that says that a person may not stand in reshus hayachid and move items in the reshus harabim. **Rav** said to him, you have chosen to follow **R' Meir** instead of the **Rabanan**!? **R' Chinina** felt that since the end of the Mishna (i.e. the next Mishna) follows **R' Meir**, this Mishna must do so as well. However, this is not the case. This part of the Mishna follows the **Rabanan** and the next follows **R' Meir**.

-----Daf 99-----

U'VILVAD SHELO YOTZI CHUTZ

- The Mishna seems to say that if he would move it 4 amos he would be chayuv. This is so even though our Mishna may be discussing a case where the person is standing on a roof, lifts the item from the reshus harabim to above 10 tefachim, moves it 4 amos, and puts it down in the reshus harabim. This would support **Rava**, who says that one would be chayuv in this case.
 - It could be that the Mishna means it would be assur, but not that he would be chayuv.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Another version** says, the Mishna seems to say that if one does carry in this way it will be assur, but he will not be chayuv. This is problematic according to **Rava**!? The Gemara answers, the Mishna may mean that if one carried in this way he would be chayuv.

LO YA'AMOD ADAM BIRSHUS HAYACHID...

- **R' Yosef** said, one who does urinate or spit from reshus to reshus would be chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** The akira is from a place that is less than 4x4 tefachim, so he should not be chayuv!? **A:** His intent to move the urine or saliva from its current location is enough to make it be considered an akira from a significant place (even though the place is less than 4x4).
 - We find that **Rava** says this same concept when he says that one is chayuv for throwing something into the reshus harabim that lands in a dog's mouth or in an oven in the reshus harabim, even though it is less than 4x4 (because of his intent).
- **Q: Rava** asked, if his body is in the reshus hayachid, but his eiver is in the reshus harabim, and he urinates into the reshus harabim, would he be chayuv (do we follow the place of the bladder or of the eiver)? **A: TEIKU.**

V'CHEIN LO YAROK. R' YEHUDA OMER...

- **Q: R' Yehuda** seems to say that saliva is considered detached in his mouth even before he swirls it around his mouth. A Mishna says that **R' Yehuda** requires the saliva to be swirled around before being considered as detached from his body!? **A: R' Yochanan** said that **R' Yehuda** originally held one way and then later changed his view. **A2: Reish Lakish** said, our Mishna is talking about phlegm, which is considered detached without swirling, and the other Mishna is discussing saliva, which is only considered to be detached after swirling.
 - **Q:** A Braisa seems to say that **R' Yehuda** says neither needs to be swirled!? **A:** That refers only to phlegm.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that he treats them both as detached without swirling!? **A:** We must use **R' Yochanan's** answer.
- **Reish Lakish** said, we learn from a pasuk that one who spits out phlegm in front of his rebbi is chayuv misah from Heaven.

MISHNA

- A person may not stand in the reshus hayachid and drink from a cup in the reshus harabim, or visa-versa, unless his head and most of his body are in the reshus together with the cup. The same halacha applies when drinking from a winepress.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The beginning of this Mishna (i.e. the last Mishna, which was not goizer) follows the **Rabanan** and this part of the Mishna follows **R' Meir**!? **A: R' Yosef** said, in this case, because we are dealing with an item that the person really needs, even the **Rabanan** would be goizer.
- **Q:** What would the halacha be if one of the 2 reshus in this case would be a karmelis? **A: Abaye** says it would be treated the same way.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, that would be making a gezeirah on top of another gezeirah!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna gives an additional example of a winepress, which is a karmelis, and says the halacha is the same. **Rava**, however, says that the case of the winepress is not about Shabbos, it is about ma'aser, which must be given only if one drinks the wine in a more "kavua" (settled) way.

MISHNA

- A person in the reshus harabim may hold a keili in the air to catch water coming from a gutter pipe (which is often within 3 tefachim to the house) that is within 10 tefachim to the ground of the reshus harabim. From a drain pipe (which always protrudes more than 3 tefachim from the wall of the house), he may even drink directly from the pipe.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Mishna allows catching water from the gutter in a keili, but not drinking from it directly. **R' Nachman** explains, this is so because the Mishna discusses a gutter that is within 3 tefachim to the roof, and therefore has the status of a reshus hayachid as well. There are Braisos that agree with this as well.
- One may drink directly from the drainpipe only if the pipe is itself less than 4 tefachim. If it is 4 tefachim, it is considered to be its own reshus and one who is standing in the reshus harabim may therefore not drink directly from it.

MISHNA

- If there is a “bor” (watering hole) in the reshus harabim with a mound around it which is 10 tefachim high, if one has a window that opens to the area on top of it, he may fill water and bring it in the window on Shabbos.
- If there is a garbage dump which is 10 tefachim high and situated in the reshus harabim, if there is a window that opens to the area on top of it, one may spill water from that window onto the garbage dump.

GEMARA

- **Q:** If the house is within 4 tefachim to the bor, why do we need a mound of 10 tefachim to make it permissible (the area in between would be a makom petur)!? **A: R' Huna** said, the house is more than 4 tefachim away. If there was no mound, he would be drawing water from a reshus hayachid (the bor) and carrying it through the reshus harabim to his house. That is why we need the mound. **A: R' Yochanan** said, the house may be within 4 tefachim to the bor. The reason the Mishna says there is a mound is to teach the concept that the depth of the bor and the height of the mound may combine to reach the necessary size of 10 tefachim.

ASHPA BIRSHUS HARABIM...

- **Q:** We find that **Rebbi** does not allow using a garbage dump as a reshus hayachid based on its height of 10 tefachim, because he is concerned that a garbage dump may be removed!? **A: Rebbi** was concerned by a garbage dump owned by an individual, which gets removed from time to time. The Mishna is discussing one owned by the community, which doesn't get removed.

MISHNA

- If the branches of a tree bend over and come close to the ground (leaving empty space between them and the trunk), if the branches reach to within 3 tefachim of the ground, one may carry within the enclosure that the branches create.
- If roots of a tree rise 3 tefachim above the ground, one may not sit on them because they are considered to be a tree.

GEMARA

- **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, to be allowed to carry there, the area under the branches may not be larger than a beis sasayim. This is because the purpose of the area is to provide shade for workers or watchmen who tend to the fields outside. The halacha is, to carry in an enclosure whose principle purpose is to serve the outside, the enclosure may not be larger than a beis sasayim.

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

SHARASHAV GIVOHIN MIN HA'ARETZ...

- If roots of a tree first rise from the ground 3 tefachim, and then bend and go to within 3 tefachim of the ground, **Rabbah** says one may use (e.g. sit on) the part of the root that is within 3 tefachim to the ground (because anything within 3 tefachim to the ground has the status of the ground itself). **R' Sheishes** says it may not be used (because this part of the root comes from a root that itself is assur, since it is 3 tefachim off the ground).
 - In a case where the root rises to above 3 tefachim on an incline, and along the incline there are offshoots that angle down to within 3 tefachim: the part of the main root within 3 tefachim is mutar to use; the part of the root above 3 tefachim is assur to use; the offshoots which come back to within 3 tefachim would be the same machlokes between **Rabbah and R' Sheishes**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Also, where a tree grows in a groove in the ground. **Rabbah** says we begin measuring the 3 tefachim from ground level (not the bottom of the groove). **R' Sheishes** says we measure from the bottom of the groove.
- Also, when a tree grows at the corner of a wall, and is thus covered on 3 sides, **Rabbah** says we begin measuring 3 tefachim from above the wall. **R' Sheishes** says we measure from the ground.
 - **Abaye** had a tree in his house that stuck out of a skylight and onto the roof. **R' Yosef** allowed him to use the tree on the roof. **R' Acha bar Tachlifa** said, **R' Yosef** permitted this only according to **Rabbah**, who would say to measure from the roof level. **R' Sheishes** would not allow this use, even though regarding other halachos we say that we view a house as if it is filled with items, we would not say that here, so he would say to measure the tree from the ground level.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says that one may not sit on roots which are 3 tefachim off the ground. That is obvious!? It must be that the Mishna is teaching that it may not be sat on even if it bends down to within 3 tefachim, and this would be a proof to **R' Sheishes**!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where it is higher than 3 tefachim on one side of the tree, but even with the ground on the other. The Mishna teaches that it is still assur to sit on.
- **Q:** One Braisa says that if one is on a tree on Shabbos, he may climb down. Another Braisa says that he may not climb down!? **A:** The Braisa that allows him to climb down is discussing where he climbed up before Shabbos. The other Braisa is where he climbed up on Shabbos. **A2:** Both Braisos discuss where he climbed up on Shabbos, but one is where he went up b'shogeg, the other was where it was done b'meizid. **A3:** Both were b'shogeg, but the Braisos argue regarding whether we are goizer in the case of a shogeg.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the machlokes between the Braisos is the same as that found in another Braisa. The Braisa says, if the blood of korbanos became mixed, where one of the korbanos needed to be sprinkled one time (e.g. a bechor), and one of the korbanos needed to be sprinkled 4 times (e.g. a chatas or an olah), **R' Eliezer** says the mixture should be sprinkled 4 times (even though he is oiver "bal tosef" for the korbon needing only one sprinkle he should do so, because if he doesn't, he will be oiver "bal tigma" for the one that needs 4 sprinkles). **R' Yehoshua** says he should only sprinkle the mixture once (so that he shouldn't be oiver bal tosef).
 - **R' Eliezer** said, bal tosef does not apply when there is a mixture like this, because one of the components needs 4 sprinkles. **R' Yehoshua** said, bal tigma does not apply for the same reason, and also, if he sprinkles 4 times, he is being oiver bal tosef through his direct action. If he sprinkles only once, even if he is oiver bal tigma, it is only through his *inaction*.
 - According to this, **R' Eliezer** would seemingly hold that one should climb down the tree on Shabbos, and **R' Yehoshua** would say it is better not to do an action, and therefore would say that he should not climb down the tree.
 - It could be that **R' Eliezer** says to do the action that causes the aveirah only when the action also accomplishes a mitzvah, but would not allow climbing down the tree, where there is no mitzvah. It could also be that **R' Yehoshua** says not to do an action when inaction does not cause an aveirah. Here, inaction makes him stay in the tree and thereby use it (which is not allowed).
 - **Q:** One Braisa says the prohibition to use trees applies to live and dead trees. Another Braisa says it applies only to live trees!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, the Braisa that prohibits the use of the dead tree is where the it is possible that it will regenerate. The Braisa that allows it discusses the case where it is not possible.
 - **Q:** If it is possible to regenerate, the Braisa wouldn't call it a dead tree!? **A:** In the winter all trees are assur because they all look the same. In the summer the dead trees are not assur, because it is clearly discernible from the live trees.
 - **Q:** Using the dead tree in the summer months can cause any fruit it has to fall off!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a case where there is no fruit on the tree.
 - **Q:** Using the dead tree may cause twigs to fall off!? **A:** The case is where there is only a trunk, with no branches.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** We find that **Rav** prohibited use of a bare trunk in Aspastiya!? **A:** He did so because the people there were unlearned and would have taken the heter to use that trunk to mean that all trees were mutar.
- **Rami bar Chama in the name of R' Assi** said, a person may not walk on grass on Shabbos (because blades of grass may be pulled out).
 - **Q:** One Braisa says that one may walk on grass and another says that one may not!? **A:** The first Braisa refers to dead grass and the second refers to live grass. **A2:** Both discuss live grass. The first Braisa discusses the wintertime, where walking on grass does not cause seeds to be detached. The second Braisa refers to the summertime, where walking on grass causes the seeds to be detached. **A3:** Both discuss the summertime. The first Braisa refers to walking on grass with shoes (it is not likely that grass will be pulled out). **A4:** Both discuss walking on the grass with shoes. The first Braisa discusses shoes that don't have spikes on the bottom (so grass will not be pulled out). **A5:** Both discuss shoes with spikes. The first Braisa discusses where the grass is not long (so it will not be pulled out).
 - The Gemara says, today that we pasken like **R' Shimon** (that unintentional acts are permitted), one may walk on grass in any of the above cases if he does not intend to pull out blades of grass.
- **Rami bar Chama in the name of R' Assi** said, a person may not force his wife to have tashmish.
 - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, a person who does force his wife, will have children that are not proper.
 - A Braisa says this as well and then adds that one who has tashmish and then has tashmish again right away is considered improper.
 - **Q: Rava** said that tashmish twice in a row creates boys (and should be done by one wanting to have a boy)!? **A: Rava** is discussing where the wife is okay with repeated tashmish.
 - **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason** said, if a woman causes her husband to want tashmish, that will result in exemplary children, better than could be found in the times of Moshe Rabbeinu.
 - **Q: R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** says that Chava was cursed with 10 curses when she ate from the Eitz Hada'as. One of them was that a woman does not ask for tashmish, but rather must wait for her husband to do so, and this is considered the proper thing for a woman to do!? **A: R' Yonason** was referring to where the wife creates the desire of the husband, without actually asking for it.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, even if the Torah had not been given to us, we would learn modesty from a cat (it does not relieve itself in front of people, and covers its waste), the issue of stealing from an ant (each ant stores food for the year during the summer and no ant takes from the next), the issue of arayos from a dove (it only mates with its partner) and the proper method of tashmish from a rooster (it first appeases the female and then has tashmish).

-----Daf 101-----

MISHNA

- A door leading to a backyard (which is not a proper door, but is simply forced into place, requiring a full removal to be opened), or thorns that are placed to block an opening in place of a door, or reed mats that are used in place of a door, all may not be put into place (even though they are attached to the doorway) unless they are hanging in a way that they do not touch the ground.

GEMARA

- **Q:** A Braisa says that doors or the like that drag on the ground may be put into place on Shabbos and Yom Tov as long as they are attached and hanging from the wall (even though they are dragging)!? **A: Abaye** says the Braisa discusses where the door has a pivot, which makes it more noticeably a door (and it therefore doesn't look like construction is being done on Shabbos). **Rava** says, even if they don't currently have a pivot, as long as it did have a pivot, that is good enough.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that a door which is attached and hanging must be raised off the ground to be used on Shabbos!? **A: Abaye** will say that the Braisa's requirement is only where the door doesn't have a pivot. **Rava** will say it is only where the door never had a pivot.
- A Braisa says, thorn branches and bundles of wood that were prepared to be used to close an opening in a chatzer may be put into place on Shabbos only if they are attached to the wall and hanging off the ground.
- **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that said, a "widowed door" that drags on the ground may not be put into place on Shabbos.
 - A "widowed door" is one made of a single piece of wood. Others say the boards are not held together by a crossbeam.
- **R' Yehuda** said, if one wants to build a bonfire on Yom Tov, to avoid the act of "building", he must first hold the upper pieces (the "roof") in place and then have the lower pieces (the "walls") put into place under it (not the other way around). The same would apply to placing eggs on a grill. The same applies when placing a pot onto barrels. The same applies when putting together a bed. The same applies when piling barrels.
- A tzeduki said to **R' Yehoshua ben Chananya**, the tzadikim of Klal Yisrael are referred to in the pasuk as thorns (a seemingly derogatory term)! **R' Yehoshua** told him, the end of the pasuk ends off on a positive and thereby clearly shows that it is meant in a positive way. It is meant to say that just like thorns protect an area with a hole in the wall, so too the tzadikim protect the Yidden. Another explanation is that it refers to the tzadikim crushing the resha'im in Gehinom.

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says, a person may not stand in the reshus hayachid and unlock a door in the reshus harabim, or visa-versa, unless he has a wall 10 tefachim tall enclosing the area of the lock. The **Rabanan** said to him, in the butchers' market in Yerushalayim they would lock their stores while standing in the street and they would put the key on the window sill on top of the door (which was a reshus hayachid)! **R' Yose** said it was the wool merchants' market.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Meir** prohibited doing so from a reshus harabim to a reshus hayachid. Why did the **Rabanan** try to disprove him from a story that took place in Yerushalayim, which **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** says has the status of a karmelis, not a reshus harabim!? **A: R' Pappa** said, **R' Yochanan** said his halacha when the walls around Yerushalayim were complete. The **Rabanan's** story was from a time when there were sizeable gaps in the walls (and it therefore had the status of a reshus harabim). **A2: Rava** says that **R' Meir** also meant to discuss and prohibit doing so from a karmelis to a reshus hayachid. On that point the **Rabanan** ask from the story in Yerushalayim.
- A Braisa says, "regarding a gateway with a locked door between a garden (a karmelis) and a reshus harabim, if there is a gatehouse on the garden side of the door, one may unlock and lock from the garden side. If there is a gatehouse on the reshus harabim side, one may unlock and lock from the reshus harabim side. If there is a gatehouse on each side, it may be unlocked and locked from both sides. If there is no gatehouse, unlocking or locking from either side is assur (because the key area is a reshus hayachid). Similarly, a store that opens to the reshus harabim, if the lock is lower than 10 tefachim (and therefore a karmelis), one may place the key on the threshold of the door (also a karmelis) before Shabbos, use it to open and lock the door on Shabbos, and then return the key to the threshold. If the lock is above 10 tefachim (it is a reshus hayachid), one may place the key on the area of the lock (also a reshus hayachid) before Shabbos, use it to open and lock the door on Shabbos, and then return it to that area. These are the words of **R' Meir**. The **Chachomim** say, even if the lock is above 10 tefachim, one may place the key on the threshold of the door, use it, and return it to the threshold, or he can place it on a window sill above the door that is less than 4 tefachim (and therefore a makom petur), but if the window sill is 4 tefachim, it is considered a reshus hayachid and would be assur".
 - **Q:** The Braisa compares the case of the garden to the case of the store. This must mean that the threshold discussed is one with the status of a karmelis. If the lock is less than 4 tefachim (and therefore a makom petur), **R' Meir** would not say that it is assur to take the key from the karmelis to the lock. If

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the lock is 4 tefachim, the **Chachomim** would not allow taking the key from the threshold to the lock!? **A: Abaye** said, the area of the lock is less than 4, but the door is wide enough that it can be hollowed to make the area of the lock into an area that is 4x4 tefachim. **R' Meir** says we view it as if it is already hollowed out and therefore it is considered to be a reshus hayachid. The **Chachomim** say that we don't view it as such and it is therefore a makom petur.

- **R' Bibi bar Abaye** said, we learn 3 things from this Braisa: 1) That **R' Meir** says we view an area as already hollowed out; 2) That since **R' Meir** allows one to stand on the threshold and use the key to open the lock, he must have retracted his view that it is assur to stand in a karmelis and open a lock in a reshus hayachid; 3) From the fact that the **Rabanan** do not allow the transfer of the key from the karmelis to the window sill if it is 4 tefachim, even though the transfer is happening via the lock (which is a makom petur), we see that the **Chachomim** agree with **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** that a makom petur may not be used to transfer items from one reshus to another.

MISHNA

- A bolt that is thicker on one end, which is used to lock a door by being stuck into the threshold, **R' Eliezer** says it may not be used on Shabbos. **R' Yose** says it may be used.
 - **R' Eliezer** said, in the shul in Teverya they originally allowed it, but **R' Gamliel and the Elders** came and prohibited it! **R' Yose** said, the story actually was that they originally prohibited it, but **R' Gamliel and the Elders** came and permitted it!

GEMARA

- If the string tied to the bolt is strong enough to lift the bolt, all agree that the bolt may be used. The machlokes is where the string is not strong enough to do so. **R' Yose** says, since the bolt is thicker on one end (which can be used to crush spices) it has the status of a keili and may therefore be used on Shabbos (because a keili is not used in "building"). **R' Eliezer** says, even so, since it is attached in such a weak manner, it is considered to be totally unattached, in which case it is assur to use.

-----Daf כק--102-----

MISHNA

- A bolt that is attached to the door, but drags on the ground, may be used in the Beis Hamikdash (because we don't apply gezeiros in the Beis Hamikdash), but not elsewhere. A bolt that is not attached at all may not be used even in the Beis Hamikdash. **R' Yehuda** says, an unattached bolt may be used in the Beis Hamikdash, and a dragging bolt may be used anywhere.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the "dragging bolt" that may be used in the Beis Hamikdash, but not elsewhere, is one which is tied to the door with a string that is long enough to allow it to drag on the ground. **R' Yehuda** says the bolt that may be used in the Beis Hamikdash but not elsewhere is one that is totally not attached to the door, but is rather placed in a corner.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, we pasken like **R' Yehuda** (that a bolt which is attached but dragging on the floor may be used everywhere). **Rava** says, that is only when it is attached to the actual door (not just the doorpost).
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Tavla** allowed use of a bolt that was attached to the doorpost, even though it was not attached to the door?! **A:** That bolt could have been lifted by the string tied to it, so it is different.
 - **R' Avya** saw a person tying a bolt to a door with reeds. **R' Avya** said, that bolt could not be used, because reeds rip easily and it is not even considered to be tied.
 - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, what is the halacha if a bolt goes through the threshold and into the ground? **R' Yosef** said, **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskens like **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa, that a bolt stuck into the ground is assur, because it looks like the act of "building".

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Nechumei bar Zecharya** asked **Abaye**, if a bolt has a handle (and therefore looks like a crusher), may it be used even if not attached to the door? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Nechumei bar Ada** said it would be mutar (since it is like a keili).
- **R' Pedas** had a very heavy beam in his house that had to be lifted by 10 people. He allowed it to be used to lock the door because it had the status of a keili. **Mar Shmuel** had a huge mortar that he allowed to be used for the same purpose for the same reason.
- **Rami bar Yechezkel** asked **R' Amram** to repeat the halacha taught by **R' Assi** regarding the arches which used to be placed on boats. **R' Amram** said, **R' Assi** said, if the arches are a tefach wide, or even if they are less but are within 3 tefachim, then on Shabbos he may spread a mat over them, because it is considered to be adding on to a temporary structure, not creating one.
 - **R' Huna** had rams that needed shade by day and fresh air by night. **Rav** told him to roll up the mat (before Shabbos) that was being used for the shade, but to leave it unrolled at least a tefach. Then, it can be opened all the way, because it is adding to the temporary structure, not creating it.
- **Rav in the name of R' Chiya** said, one may hang and take down a curtain (in between rooms) on Shabbos. A sloping canopy is mutar to make and take down on Shabbos.
 - **R' Sheishes the son of R' Idi** said, this is only if there is not a tefach of horizontal roof before it begins sloping to either side. *Even then*, it is only mutar if the canopy does not reach a tefach wide within 3 tefachim to the point in the roof. *Even then*, it is only mutar if the width of the area underneath each sloping side is less than a tefach.
- **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, wearing a wide brimmed hat is mutar on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that it is assur?! **A:** The Braisa is referring to where the brim is a tefach, and thus creates an ohel when one puts it on. **R' Shisha** is discussing where the brim is not a tefach wide.
 - **Q:** If so, if one pulls his talis in front of his head so that it sticks out a tefach, he should be chayuv as well, and we know this is not the case, so that can't be the answer!?! **A:** The difference has nothing to do with the halachos of ohel. Rather, **R' Shisha** is discussing a hat that fits snugly on the head and won't fall off. The Braisa is discussing a more loose fitting hat, which is assur, because a wind may blow it off and one may end up carrying it on Shabbos.

MISHNA

- If the bottom pivot of a door fell out of place, it may be put back into place in the Beis Hamikdash, but not elsewhere. If the upper pivot falls out of place it may not be put back in place even in the Beis Hamikdash. **R' Yehuda** says, even the upper pivot may be put back in the Beis Hamikdash, and the lower pivot may even be put back everywhere else as well.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if the lower pivot of a door slips out of place, it may be put back in place in the Beis Hamikdash. Elsewhere, it may be pushed back into place if it hasn't fully fallen out yet, but may not be put back fully. The upper pivot may not be put back in place even in the Beis Hamikdash. The lower pivot may not be put back other than in the Beis Hamikdash as a gezeirah that the person may fix it permanently, for which he would be chayuv a chatas. The door of a pit or other openings in the ground may not even be pushed back into place, and one who does so is chayuv a chatas (they are attached to the ground and are therefore considered to be "building").

MISHNA

- One may replace a wound dressing that was taken off in the Beis Hamikdash on Shabbos, but not elsewhere. However, dressing a wound for the first time is assur in the Beis Hamikdash as well.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if a dressing falls off a wound on Shabbos, it may be replaced. **R' Yehuda** says, if it started slipping off the wound it may be slid back into place, but may not be totally replaced.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskens like **R' Yehuda**.
- **R' Chisda** says, even the **T"K** only allows replacing the dressing when it fell onto a keili. However, if it fell onto the floor, he would agree that it may not be replaced.
 - **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, his father (**R' Ashi**) once replaced a dressing that had fallen onto a pillow. **Mar** said to him, **R' Chisda** said that **R' Yehuda** said it is assur to replace it in that case, and **Shmuel** said we pasken like **R' Yehuda**! **R' Ashi** said that he did not agree with **R' Chisda**, and held that **R' Yehuda** would permit replacing a dressing that fell onto a keili (e.g. pillow).

MISHNA

- One may tie the broken string of a musical instrument with a knot in the Beis Hamikdash on Shabbos, but not elsewhere. To string an instrument initially is assur to do in the Beis Hamikdash as well.

GEMARA

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the string of a “kinor” that broke on Shabbos in the Beis Hamikdash may be tied with a bow, not a knot!? **A:** The Braisa follows the **Rabanan** who say that a preparatory act for a mitzvah does not supersede Shabbos, and therefore a knot on the instrument may not be made, but a bow may be made in its place. The Mishna follows **R' Eliezer** who says that such an act does supersede Shabbos, and therefore a knot may be tied for the instrument.
 - **Q:** If the Mishna follows **R' Eliezer**, one should be allowed to string an instrument initially on Shabbos as well?! **A:** We must say that the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, who says that a knot and a bow are the same thing. Therefore, he allows a knot. The Braisa follows the **Rabanan** who say that a bow is not an issur D'Oraisa. That is why one must make a bow rather than a knot.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** must be following the shita of **R' Eliezer** that the preparatory act supersedes Shabbos. If so, why can't the instrument be initially strung for the mitzvah as well?! **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Shimon** and the Mishna follows the **Rabanan** of a Braisa in which **R' Shimon** says the instrument may only be repaired with a bow and the **Rabanan** say that it may be repaired with a knot. **A2:** The Mishna and the Braisa both follow the **Rabanan**. The Braisa is discussing where the string ripped at the end, so repairing with a bow will allow the musical notes to be played. The Mishna is discussing where the string ripped in the middle, and the only way to repair the string in a way that will allow the music to be played is with a knot. **A3:** The Mishna and the Braisa discuss a string that broke in the middle. The Braisa follows **R' Shimon** who says that even in this case only a bow may be made, as a gezeirah for when the string breaks at the end. The Mishna follows the **Rabanan**, who are not so goizer and therefore allow a knot to be made when the string breaks in the middle.

-----Daf ל"ג--103-----

MISHNA

- One may remove a wart from an animal with his hands on Shabbos in the Beis Hamikdash, but not elsewhere. To remove a wart with an instrument would be assur even in the Beis Hamikdash.

GEMARA

- **Q:** A Mishna in Pesachim says that carrying an animal in the reshus harabim, or bringing it from beyond the techum, or removing a wart from it, are all assur to do on Shabbos, but **R' Eliezer** says they may be done. The **Rabanan (T"K)** of this Mishna contradict the **Rabanan** of our Mishna!? **A: R' Elazar and R' Yose b'R' Chanina:** One says the Mishnayos are discussing moist warts, our Mishna is discussing removing it by hand and it is therefore permitted, and the other Mishna is discussing removing it by utensil, which is assur. The other says that both Mishnayos are discussing removing it by hand, our Mishna is discussing a dry wart, which is mutar to be removed by hand and the other Mishna is discussing a moist wart, which is assur to be removed even by hand.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The one who gives the answer that one Mishna discusses removal by hand and the other by instrument does not want to say that one Mishna is discussing a moist wart and the other a dry wart, because he holds that a dry wart may even be removed with an instrument, since a dry wart crumbles and is therefore only an issur D'Rabanan.
- The one who gives the answer that one Mishna discusses a moist wart and the other a dry one does not want to give the answer of by hand vs. by instrument, because our Mishna already said that removal is assur if done by an instrument, so there would be no need to repeat it again.
 - The other answerer does not consider this to be an issue, because it could be that it was repeated to differentiate between the **Rabanan** and **R' Eliezer** who says that removal is even mutar with an instrument.
 - The answerer that says the Mishna in Pesachim discusses removal by hand says that must be so, because the other examples listed in the Mishna are only assur D'Rabanan (carrying a live animal and traveling beyond the techum), so the case of removal must be so as well.
 - The other answerer will say that the other examples are actually issurim D'Oraisa (the Mishna holds that carrying a live animal is assur D'Oraisa and that the issur of techum is D'Oraisa).
- **Q: R' Yosef** asked, in the Mishna in Pesachim **R' Eliezer** says there is a kal v'chomer: if shechita, which is a true melacha, supersedes Shabbos, surely the other cases, which are only D'Rabanan, should certainly supersede Shabbos. We see from here that the case of removal is referring to a D'Rabanan!? **A: R' Yosef** said, both Mishnayos are discussing removal by hand. Our Mishna is discussing removal in the Beis Hamikdash, where there are no gezeiros applied. The Mishna in Pesachim is discussing removal outside of the Beis Hamikdash, and therefore even though it is being done for sake of the Mikdash (i.e. of a korbon), gezeiros do apply.
 - **Q: R' Safra** asked **Abaye**, we learned earlier that if a sefer rolls off a threshold into the reshus harabim, but is still being held onto by a person on the threshold, he may roll it back up. This is like a case of something done for the Mikdash (i.e. protecting the sefer) not in the Beis Hamikdash, and we are not goizer that he may be led to transfer from a reshus harabim to a reshus hayachid!? **A:** We said earlier that the case refers to a threshold with karmelis status, and since he is holding onto one side, a gezeira does not apply.
 - **Q: R' Safra** asked, a Mishna says that when Erev Pesach is Friday, one may place the Korbon Pesach into the oven right before Shabbos even though it will not get roasted until it is already Shabbos. This is something done for the Mikdash, not in the Beis Hamikdash, and we are still not goizer that he may be led to stir the coals!? **A: Abaye** did not know what to answer. **Abaye** asked **R' Yosef** this question that was posed to him. **R' Yosef** said, we are not goizer there because the people in the "chaburah" of the Korbon Pesach are careful and would not stir the coals.
 - **Abaye** felt that we don't say that about a chaburah.
- **Rava** said, the Tanna of our Mishna is **R' Eliezer**, who says that although the preparatory acts of a mitzvah (that itself supersedes Shabbos) supersede Shabbos, if the goal can be accomplished in a way that does not violate the Shabbos as much (e.g. by changing the way the wart is removed), then it must be done in that way. The Mishna in Pesachim follows a different Tanna who argues on that.
 - We see that **R' Eliezer** holds this way, because a Braisa says that a Kohen who has a wart (which makes him passul to do the avodah) can have his friend remove it for him on Shabbos by biting it off of him. This Braisa must follow **R' Eliezer**, because according to the **Rabanan** who hold that preparatory acts do not supersede Shabbos, and therefore the case must be referring to a D'Rabanan, since the **Rabanan** hold that biting off a wart is only assur D'Rabanan, there would be no reason to have his friend bite it off for him! It must be following **R' Eliezer**, who says that biting off a wart would be assur D'Oraisa, and the reason his friend must bite it off is because he holds that the act must be done in a way that minimizes the Shabbos violation.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** It could be that the Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, and the reason his friend has to bite it off for him is because the wart is in a place that the person cannot reach to bite off by himself (on his back or his elbows)!? **A:** If it was following the **Rabanan**, there would be no need for the person to bite it off. He could have simply removed it by hand, which according to the **Rabanan** is only assur D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** If it follows **R' Eliezer**, the Braisa should also give the simpler case of removing the wart by hand!? **A:** It makes sense if it follows **R' Eliezer**, because he says to use the most unusual method possible (to lessen even the D'Rabanan Shabbos violation). But, according to the **Rabanan**, there would be no reason to give this case.

MISHNA

- If a Kohen has a wound on his finger on Shabbos, he may wrap it in reed-grass in the Beis Hamikdash, but not elsewhere (it has healing properties and healing on Shabbos is assur D'Rabanan). To wrap the wound tightly with the grass to push out blood, is assur in the Beis Hamikdash as well.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda the son of R' Chiya** said, it is mutar to wrap a finger in grass, but not in a small belt, because that would be considered as if the Kohen is wearing additional clothing, which is not permitted. **R' Yochanan** said, extra clothing is only a problem when worn in a place that the clothing of a Kohen is worn, not when something is worn on the finger.
 - **Q:** Why is it not a problem of "chatzitza"? **A:** The wound is on his left hand and the avodah is done with the right hand. Or, the wound is on the right hand, but not on a part of the hand that is used in the avodah (e.g. the back of his hand).
 - **R' Yochanan** argues with **Rava**, because **Rava in the name of R' Chisda** said, in the place of the Kohen's clothing, even one hair is a chatzitza. Elsewhere, if the additional item is 3x3 fingers wide, it is considered an additional garment and is a problem. Less is not an issue.
 - It could be that **Rava** would agree with **R' Yehuda the son of R' Chiya**, because he may say that a small belt is significant and is therefore problematic even though it is less than 3x3.