



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bava Basra Daf Yud Tes

V'LO NIVRECHES HAKOV SIN...

- [Lauderers would use two ditches of water – one for soaking the clothes and one for scrubbing them]. **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, when the Mishna says that 3 tefachim is sufficient distance, that is only in regard to the soaking ditch, but for the scrubbing ditch, 4 amos are needed. We can prove this from a Braisa as well. The Braisa says that one must distance a laundering ditch 4 amos from the neighbor's wall. Now, how can that be, when our Mishna said 3 tefachim!? We must say like **R' Nachman**, and the Mishna and the Braisa are discussing the different ditches.
 - **Others** asked the Braisa as a contradiction to our Mishna, and answer using the statement of **R' Nachman**.
 - **R' Chiya the son of R' Avya** taught a Braisa that explicitly says that 3 tefachim is sufficient for the soaking ditch.

V'SAD B'SID

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean that he must distance *and* line it with lime, or does it mean he must distance it *or* line it with lime? **A:** It must be "and", because if it means "or", this set of cases should be combined with the next set of cases in the Mishna (the olives after the press, the animal waste, etc.) where it is clearly "or".
 - This is no proof. It may be that the sets of cases were separated because they damage in different ways. The first set damage with moisture and the second set damage with heat.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer based on a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, if the land has soil that is soft enough to be dug by hand, each neighbor may dig near the property line, but must distance 3 tefachim from the property line *and* apply lime to the bor walls. It seems that both measures are necessary only because we are dealing with soft soil. If not for that, he would not need to do both!? **A:** It may be that for harder soil he would still have to do both. The reason the Braisa gives the case of the soft soil is to teach that even in that case, distancing 3 tefachim is sufficient, and he need not distance more than that.

MARCHIKIN ES HAGEFES V'ES HAZEVEL...

- **Q:** These items all produce heat and therefore can damage the wall. However, a Mishna says, one may not insulate on Shabbos with the following, whether moist or dry: "gefes" (leftover pulp in the oil press after the oil has been pressed out), manure, salt, lime or sand. Why is it that our Mishna lists fire stones and the other Mishna lists sand? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, it is because people don't insulate with stones.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, we find a Braisa that discusses insulating with wool shearings and purple wool, even though people don't typically insulate with those items either!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, our Mishna says stones, but means to include sand as well, and the Mishna there says sand, but means to include stones as well.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, if that is true, one Mishna should have provided an all-inclusive list, and the other could have then just mentioned one item and we would know to add the rest!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the reason our Mishna doesn't mention sand is because sand keeps a hot thing hot and a cold thing cold. Therefore, it would not produce heat that would damage a wall. The reason the other Mishna doesn't mention stones, is because using stones would damage the pot that is being insulated, and that is why it would not be used.

- **Q:** We have learned that **R' Oshaya** taught a Braisa that includes sand in the items that must be distanced from a wall!? **A:** He was referring to wet sand, which produces moisture.
- **Q:** Why doesn't our Tanna also list sand in the items that damage through moisture? **A:** The Tanna listed an irrigation canal, and wet sand can easily be learned from that.
 - **Q:** If so, why did he also list a launderer's water ditch? **A:** These are needed. An irrigation canal is more permanent, so we may think that only that must be distanced. The water in a launderer's ditch is stagnant, so we would think that only that must be distanced.

MARCHIKIN ES HAZRA'IM V'ES HAMACHAREISHA...

- **Q:** Seeds are placed in the plowed rows, so once we say the plow must be distanced, it becomes unnecessary to say that the seeds must be distanced!? **A:** The Mishna mentions it to cover the case of where one plants seeds in smaller, hand-dug holes.
- **Q:** Once we know that seeds must be distanced, we would know that plows must be distanced, because plowing is done for the seeds!? **A:** The Mishna mentions it to cover the cases of plowing done for trees.
- **Q:** Once we say that water must be distanced, why is there a need to mention seeds (which must be watered with irrigation)!? **A:** The Tanna is referring to EY, where the seeds can subsist on rainwater.
 - **Q:** If the reason for distancing seeds is not because of the water, will you say it is because their roots will grow sideways, into the neighbor's field? A Braisa says that one may plant seeds to the side of a buried vine branch, because it will not get nourishment from the branch, since it is off to the side!? **A: R' Chaga in the name of R' Yose** said, seeds must be distanced because their roots break up the ground, and cause loose earth to come up.

V'ES MEI RAGLAYIM MIN HAKOSEL...

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** darshens a pasuk to teach that it is mutar for a man to urinate at the side of someone's wall.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that urine must be distanced 3 tefachim!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to pouring collected urine.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, a person may only urinate near a brick wall if he distances himself 3 tefachim. If the wall is made of stones, he need only distance himself one tefach, if the wall is built on rocky ground, it is mutar to urinate right next to it. This seems to clearly refute **Rabbah bar bar Chana**!? **TEYUFTA.**
 - **Q: Rabbah bar bar Chana's** statement was based on a pasuk!? **A:** The pasuk was referring to a dog urinating, not a man.
- [The halacha is that a wall separates for purposes of tumas ohel. If there is an opening of 1x1 tefach in the wall, tumah passes through. However, if something is left in that opening, and will be left there permanently, it is considered to reduce the size of the opening]. **R' Tuvi bar Kisna in the name of Shmuel** said, a thin cookie left in the opening does not reduce the size of the opening (because someone will eventually take it away).
 - **Q:** Why does he specify a thin cookie? The same would apply if it was a thick cookie as well!? **A:** The chiddush is, even a thin cookie, which becomes disgusting when left there, is not considered to be permanently left there, and does not reduce the size of the opening.
 - **Q:** A cookie is mekabel tumah, and the halacha is that anything that is mekabel tumah cannot act as a barrier to prevent tumah!? **A:** He was referring to a cookie made with fruit juice (instead of water), and therefore it is not mekabel tumah.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that straw in a box left in the opening in a way that the straw will stay there even if the box is removed, or dried figs in a barrel left in the opening in a way that the figs will stay there even if the barrel is removed, can reduce the size for purposes of tumah, and yet the straw will likely be taken for his animals!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to rotted straw, that can't be given to his animals.
 - **Q:** Even rotted straw is useful for the making of clay for bricks, and it will therefore not be left there!? **A:** The case is that the straw has thorns in it, and it therefore cannot be used for bricks.

- **Q:** Even such straw can be used to fuel a fire, and it will therefore not be left there!? **A:** The case is that the straw is wet.
 - **Q:** It can still be used in a large fire!? **A:** A large fire is not common, and it is therefore considered to be unlikely that the straw will be removed.
- **Q:** The figs can be eaten and will therefore be removed!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, the case is where the figs are wormy, and therefore won't be eaten. **Rabbah bar Avuha** taught this as well.
- **Q:** What is the case of the barrel? If the opening of the barrel is facing the side where there is no tumah, the earthenware barrel itself should act to decrease the size of the opening!? **A:** It must be that the opening is facing the tumah, because in that way the earthenware barrel becomes tamei and therefore cannot act as a barrier to tumah. **A2:** It may be that the opening is facing the side where there is no tumah, but the barrel is made of metal, which becomes tamei even if the opening is not facing the tumah.