



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

Moed Katan Daf Zayin

R' YEHUDA OMER MISDEI HA'ILAN KIDARKO UMISDEI HALAVAN SHELO KIDARKO

- A Braisa explains, the normal way of catching these animals is to dig a hole and place a trap in it. The not normal way is to knock spits into the ground and crush them.
- **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, the only time we must use the "not normal" method in the grain field is for a field near the city. However, when the field is near an orchard, we can use the normal method, because it prevents the animals from going from the field to the orchard.

UMEKARIN ES HAPIRTZAH BAMOED

- **Q:** How may one fix the hole on Chol Hamoed? **A: R' Yosef** said it may be done with branches. A Braisa says, he piles up stones, but does not plaster them.
 - **R' Chisda** said, this inferior method need only be done for a garden wall. However, if there is a hole in the courtyard wall, it may be repaired in the normal, permanent manner.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the following Braisa is a proof to this. The Braisa says that a courtyard wall that is leaning into the reshus harabim may be knocked down and rebuilt on Chol Hamoed, because of the danger it poses. We see such a wall may be fully rebuilt. **A:** It may be that case is different because of the danger it poses.
 - **Q:** Others brought this Braisa as a question to **R' Chisda**, because the Braisa suggests that it may be built only because of the danger, but otherwise could not be so built!? **A:** It is only due to the danger that it may be *destroyed* and then rebuilt, but any courtyard wall may be rebuilt on Chol Hamoed.
 - **Q:** Why don't we allow it to be destroyed on Chol Hamoed, but not rebuilt? **A:** If we do not allow it to be rebuilt, people will not take it down on Chol Hamoed, which would pose a danger.
 - **R' Ashi** said, our Mishna is a proof to **R' Chisda**. The Mishna says that this wall may be rebuilt during shmitta. If we are discussing a chatzer wall, why would we think it cannot be built during shmitta? It must be that it is discussing a garden wall, and we would think it looks like he is protecting his produce and therefore cannot be done during shmitta.

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says, a Kohen may look at tzaraas on Chol Hamoed to be meikel, but not to be machmir. The **Chachomim** say it may not be done in either case.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, a Kohen may look at tzaraas on Chol Hamoed to be meikel, but not to be machmir. **R' Yose** says it may not be done in either case, because once it is looked at, he must come out with a psak, and that psak may end up being l'chumra. **Rebbi** said, **R' Meir's** view seems to be correct in the case of a metzora who is imprisoned, and **R' Yose's** view seems to be correct in the case of a metzora who is already confirmed as a metzora.
 - **Rava** said, all agree that a Kohen does not look at a possible tzaraas of one who is currently fully tahor. When a metzora was jailed for only one week so far, all would agree that the Kohen does examine him (because the Kohen can always assign him to a

second week of imprisonment, which is no worse than if the Kohen were not to come at all). The machlokes is regarding a metzora at the end of his second week of imprisonment. In that case, **R' Meir** says the Kohen should look at the tzaraas. If it is tahor, he should pasken it as such. If it is tamei, he should just not say anything, in which case it doesn't become confirmed tzaraas. **R' Yose** learns from a pasuk that the Kohen must pasken when he sees tzaraas, so he doesn't have the option of not saying anything.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **Rebbi** says the opposite of what he said in the Braisa, above!? **A:** It is a machlokes Tanna'im as to whether **Rebbi** held that a person prefers to be back with people, even though he would become assur to his wife at that point (which is the case when a confirmed metzora begins his taharah process, and which is why we would allow a Kohen to look at the tzaraas of a confirmed metzora), or whether he would rather be mutar to his wife but be banished to outside the machaneh (which is the case of confirmed metzora, and is why we allow a Kohen to look at the tzaraas of an imprisoned metzora, because the worst possible immediate result is that he must leave the machaneh, but would still be mutar to his wife).
 - **Q:** How do we know that a confirmed metzora is mutar to his wife? **A:** A Braisa says that a confirmed metzora is assur to his wife. **R' Yehdua** says he is only assur during his 7 day tahara process, but not while he is a confirmed metzora (we darshen what the pasuk says, not anything further). **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** said, if he is assur during the taharah process days, then with a kal v'chomer we will say that he is assur during his confirmed metzora days as well. **R' Chiya** then said that **Rebbi** agreed with the view of **R' Yehuda**.
- **Q:** How do we know that the person does not become tamei until the Kohen paskens that he has tzaraas? **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, the pasuk of "U'veyom heira'os bo" teaches that not all the time should a Kohen look at a possible tzaraas (and by not looking, the person remains tahor). For example, a Kohen should not look at possible tzaraas of a chosson for the 7 days of his marriage, or for a person entering into Yom Tov. **Rebbi** says, we can learn this concept from the fact that the pasuk teaches that the house with a negah should be emptied before the Kohen renders it tamei. We can learn from here, that if the Torah tells the Kohen to delay his psak for the sake of saving some possessions, surely he should not pasken if it will prevent a mitzvah (of happiness of the chosson or for the Yom Tov) from taking place.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between these approaches? **A:** **Abaye** said, it is only a difference in opinion of how to darshen the pesukim. **Rava** said, the difference would be whether only a mitzvah can postpone the Kohen from looking at tzaraas on one's body (which would be the view of **R' Yehuda**), or even a non-mitzvah reason (which would be the view of **Rebbi**).
 - **R' Yehuda** does not say like **Rebbi**, because he would say that we don't learn the case of body tzaraas from the case of house tzaraas, because the case of house tzaraas is itself a chiddush (that mere wood and stones become tamei) and therefore, we cannot learn from that case. **Rebbi** says we do learn one from the other, and yet both pesukim are necessary: if it would only say the case of bodily tzaraas, we would think that the viewing may only be postponed for a mitzvah, and if it would only say the case of house tzaraas, we would think it is a lighter level of tzaraas, and can therefore be postponed, but the viewing of bodily tzaraas could never be postponed.