

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishna

They also stated another general rule: Whatever is fit to store away (*for people normally use it*), and such (*an amount*) is generally stored away (*for use at a later time*), and one carries it out on *Shabbos*, he is liable to a *chata*s offering on its account. But whatever is not fit to store away, and such (*an amount*) is not generally stored away (*for use at a later time*), and one carries it out on *Shabbos*, only he that stored it away is liable. [*If he carries it out, he is liable, since by storing it, he showed that it is significant to him. However, for others it is insignificant; therefore, if they carry it out, there is no liability.*] (75b)

Fit to Store Away

The *Mishna* had stated: Whatever is fit to store away.

The *Gemora* asks: What does this exclude?

Rav Pappa said: It excludes the blood of menstruation (*for it has no use*).

Mar Ukva said: It excludes the wood of an *asheirah* tree. [*A tree which was designated for idolatry is forbidden for benefit.*]

The *Gemora* notes: He who says the blood of menstruation, certainly excludes the wood of an *asheirah* tree. But he who says the wood of an *asheirah* tree - the

blood of menstruation, however, may be stored away for a cat (*for it is not forbidden for benefit*). But the other one (*Rav Pappa*) argues since she would become weak (*if her blood is fed to a cat*) one would not store it away for that purpose.

Rabbi Yosi ben Chanina said: This does not agree with Rabbi Shimon, for if it were in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, surely he maintained: All these standards were stated only in respect of those who (*actually*) store these items away (*however, regarding a wealthy person, who would not store away such a small quantity, he would not be liable for carrying it out*).

The *Mishna* had stated: But whatever is not fit to store away.

Rabbi Elozar said: This does not agree with Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said a general rule: Whatever is not fit for storage (*i.e. something forbidden from benefit*) or it is not a proper amount that is fit for storage (*i.e. a tiny amount of something*), and even so, it was fit for someone and he did store it away, and somebody else carried it out to a public domain on *Shabbos*, the second person is liable due to the thoughts of the first person. [*This shows that a person other than the one doing the action can cause a change in status.*] (75b – 76a)

Mishna

He who carries out (*processed*) straw (*is liable if the*



quantity is at least) as much as a cow's mouthful; *etzah* - as much as a camel's mouthful; straw (*stalks*) – as much as a lamb's mouthful; grass – as much as a kid's mouthful; garlic or onion leaves: if they are fresh – as much as a dried fig, and if they are dry – as much as a kid's mouthful. And they (*all of the above types*) do not combine with each other (*to make up the minimum measure*), because they are not alike in their standards. (76a)

Carrying Out Animal Food

The *Gemora* asks: What is *etzah*?

Rav Yehudah said: The straw of certain kinds of beans.

The *Gemora* relates: When Rav Dimi came, he stated: If one carries out a cow's mouthful of straw for a camel (*whose mouth is larger than that of a cow*), Rabbi Yochanan said that he is liable, and Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said that he is exempt. In the evening, Rabbi Yochanan ruled like this, but in the morning he retracted (*maintaining that he is exempt*).

Rav Yosef noted: He did well to retract, since it is not sufficient for a camel (*and that is what the straw was taken out for*).

Abaye said to him: On the contrary, logic supports his original view, since it is sufficient for a cow (*and the determining factor is that it is a cow's fodder*).

The *Gemora* reports differently: Rather, when Ravin came, he said: If one carries out a cow's mouthful of straw for a camel, all agree that he is liable. Where do they differ? They argue by a case where one carries out a cow's mouthful of bean straw for a cow (*which is usually food for camels, not for cows; cows, however, will eat it when nothing else is obtainable*), and the reverse was stated: Rabbi Yochanan said that he is exempt, and Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said that he is liable.

Ravin explains: Rabbi Yochanan maintained that he is exempt, for eating out of a pressing need is not designated as eating. Rish Lakish maintained that he is liable, for eating out of a pressing need is designated as eating.

The *Mishna* had stated: Straw (*stalks*) – as much as a lamb's mouthful.

The *Gemora* asks: But it was taught in a *braisa*: As much as a dried fig?

The *Gemora* answers: Both standards are identical.

The *Mishna* had stated: Garlic or onion leaves: if they are fresh – as much as a dried fig, and if they are dry – as much as a kid's mouthful. And they (*all of the above types*) do not combine with each other (*to make up the minimum measure*), because they are not alike in their standards.

Rabbi Yosi ben Chanina said: They do not combine for the more stringent, but they do combine for the more lenient standard. [*The type whose standard is greater does not combine with that whose standard is lesser to make up that lesser quantity, but that whose standard is lesser does combine with that former whose standard is greater to make up the greater quantity. That which requires a lesser quantity is considered more stringent.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Yet can anything combine when their standards are not alike? But surely we learned in a *Mishna* (*in Keilim that lists various measurements for materials regarding their susceptibility to tumah*): A garment three *tefachim* (*handbreadths*) square, a sack (*of goat's hair – a rough material*) four square, a hide five square, and a mat six square. [*They are all susceptible to tumah as midras, i.e., if a zav or a niddah rest their weight on something, it contracts tumah*]. Now a *braisa* was taught regarding that: A garment and a sack, a sack and a hide, a hide and a mat combine with each other (*to make up the requisite minimum*). And Rabbi Shimon said: What is the reason? It is because they are liable to the *tumah* of sitting (*when a*

zav would sit upon it when pieced together; that is because one may employ them for patching up a saddle, and a person is not particular about the material). Thus, the reason is that they are liable to the tumah of sitting, but whatever is not liable to the tumah of sitting is not so? [Accordingly, the different foods should not combine either!?!]

Rava said: Here too they are fit for samples. [*They can be pieced together to serve as sample of one's ware.*] (76a – 76b)

Mishna

He who carries out foodstuffs (*fit for human consumption*) to the size of a dried fig is liable, and they (*any type of food*) combine with each other, because they are equal in their standards, except their shells (*for since they are not food, they do not combine*), pits, stems, coarse bran and their fine bran. Rabbi Yehudah said: Excluding the shells of lentils, because they are cooked together with them (*and therefore combine with the lentils for the minimum requirement*). (76b)

Combining Foods

The *Gemora* asks: And coarse and fine bran do not combine (*with the flour*)? But we learned in a *Mishna*: A bit more than five quarters (*of a kav*) of flour are liable to *challah* (*a portion of dough which is separated and then given to a Kohen; has halachos like terumah*), including itself, the coarse and fine bran?

Abaye said: That is because a poor man eats his bread baked of impure dough (*even when the bran was not removed*). [*Regarding Shabbos, however, bread of better quality is required before liability is incurred.*]

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Yehudah said: Excluding the shells of lentils, because they are cooked together with

them (*and therefore combine with the lentils for the minimum requirement*).

The *Gemora* asks: Only lentils, but not beans? But it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: Excluding the shells of beans and lentils?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, for one (*the braisa*) refers to new beans (*where the shells are edible, and therefore combine*), whereas the other (*our Mishna*) refers to old beans.

The *Gemora* asks: Why not old ones?

Rabbi Avahu said: It is because they look like flies in the dish (*and therefore, they will not be eaten; accordingly, they do not combine with the beans*).

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KLAL GADOL

DAILY MASHAL

The Importance of Learning in Yeshivah

There's something interesting in Chidushei HaMaharsha here: He apologizes for not adding his chidushim to daf 76 "as I didn't learn them in the yeshivah as I was at the fair in Lublin." As is known, the members of the Va'ad 'Arba Aratzos would go to the fair, meet and institute regulations for the good of the public. As he didn't learn this daf in a Yeshivah environment, the Maharsha didn't dare to write his chidushim on it!