



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

### Moed Katan Daf Hey

UMISAKNIN ES KILKULEI HAMAYIM SHEBIRSHUS HARABIM...

- This suggests that clearing out an existing well is allowed, but digging a new one would not be.
  - **R' Yaakov in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that is only if the tzibbur is not in need of that well. If they are, even a new one may be dug.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that existing wells of an individual or of the tzibbur may be cleaned out, but a new one may not be dug in either case!? **A:** That is discussing where the well was not needed by the tzibbur.
      - **Q:** That would mean that the case in the Braisa of the individual is also discussing where the individual does not need the well. If so, why would it be allowed to clear out the well for him? A Braisa says that clearing a well for an individual is not allowed. Now, if we say that it is not allowed when he does not need it, we can say that that would be the case of this Braisa, but according to the way we explained the first Braisa, that would not be correct!? **Q2:** To say that the original Braisa is discussing where the well was needed, also cannot be correct, because in that case it would not be assur to dig a well for the tzibbur, as another Braisa clearly says!? **A:** We must understand the first Braisa to be saying as follows: We may clear the well of an individual when he needs it, and certainly a well of the tzibbur if they are in need of it, because a well may even be dug for a tzibbur if they are in need of it. We may not dig a well for the tzibbur when they don't need it, and certainly not for an individual, because even clearing an existing well may not be done for an individual when he does not need it.
    - **R' Ashi** said, our Mishna suggests this as well, because the Mishna says that all communal needs may be done on Chol Hamoed. Presumably, that comes to include the digging of a new well for the tzibbur.
      - **Q:** It may be that the Mishna comes to include the fixing of roads, streets, and mikvehs!? **A:** The Mishna clearly says that roads and streets may be repaired. Therefore, the Mishna must be coming to include the digging of a new well for the tzibbur.

MITZAYNIN ES HAKVAROS

- **R' Shimon ben Pazi** said, we learn this concept of marking graves from a pasuk in Yechezkel that says "V'ra'ah etzem adam u'vanah etzlo tziyun".
  - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, before Yechezkel came about was there no such concept!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, we find this in other places as well. We must say that there was a tradition for this concept, and Yechezkel came and memorialized the concept into a pasuk.
  - **R' Avahu** said, we learn this concept from the pasuk by metzora which says "v'tamei tamei yikrah", which teaches that it is as if the tumah calls out and tells people to keep away. We learn that we should do things to prevent the spread of tumah – such as by marking graves.
    - **Q:** We have learned that this pasuk is used to teach that the metzora should let other people know of his predicament, so that they daven for him!? **A:** The fact that the pasuk repeats the word "tamei" twice, allows for both drashos to be learned.

- **Abaye, R' Pappa, R' Chinina, R' Yehoshua the son of R' Idi, Mar Zutra, R' Ashi, and Ravina** each learn this concept from different pesukim.
  - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** darshens the pasuk used by **Ravina** to teach that one who assesses his ways (considers how much reward a mitzvah will bring, and the opposite for an aveirah) will merit to see the salvation of Hashem.
    - **R' Yanai** had a student who would always ask him questions as he spoke, except when he spoke before Yom Tov to the heavily attended crowd (so as not to embarrass him). **R' Yannai** felt that this student was the type of person described by **R' Yehoshua ben Levi's** drasha.
- A Braisa says, we do not mark for an olive sized piece of a meis, or for a bone the size of a barley, or for something that does not give off tumah with tumas ohel. However, we do mark for a spinal column, for a skull, for a majority of the skeletal frame, and for a majority of the number of bones. We do not mark areas of definite tumah, only areas of questionable tumah, such as areas under a canopy, under a protrusion, and a beis hapras (a grave that was plowed over). We also do not place the marking directly on the tumah, so as not to cause the loss of tahor items (the person will not see the marking until he is already over the tumah and thus make his tahor things become tamei), and we do not place the marking too far away from the tumah, so as not to cause land of Eretz Yisrael to be lost.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that a kezayis of a meis does give off tumah via tumas ohel!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa is discussing a piece exactly the size of a kezayis, which will give off tumah via ohel as is, but will soon shrink and no longer give off tumah via ohel. The Braisa teaches that a marking should not be made for it, because it is better that something become tamei for this short time, rather than make the marking and forever have the place treated as being tamei.
  - The Gemara explains, the canopy referred to in the Braisa is a tree that overhangs the ground. The protrusion referred to is a stone that protrudes from a fence and overhangs the ground. A Beis Hapras is a plowed over grave, which becomes questionably tamei for an area of 100 amos from the grave.
    - **Q:** We find that a Beis Hapras does not give off tumah via ohel, so why must it be marked? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa refers to an area where a grave was lost in a field (we don't know where it is), and therefore it still gives off tumah via ohel. The other teaching was referring to a field with a plowed over grave, which will not give off tumah via ohel.
      - **Q:** Is a field with a lost grave referred to as a Beis Hapras? **A:** We find it is called so in a Mishna.
      - **Q:** How can we say that a plowed field does not need to be marked? We find a Braisa that discusses how we determine whether a marked field was marked for a lost grave or for a plowed grave, which means that such a field does get marked as well!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa is discussing where a field was marked because a grave was lost in it, and we now want to know whether it was subsequently plowed over (and therefore no longer gives off tumah via ohel). However, a field with a grave that is known to have been plowed over is not required to be marked.