

25 Teves 5773  
Jan. 7, 2013



Shabbos Daf 96

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rav Assi said: They taught a *braisa*: As for an earthenware vessel, its standard is a hole large enough for liquid to enter (*and if such a hole does exist, it will remove it completely from being regarded as a utensil*), while one merely sufficient to let out liquid was mentioned only in connection with a shard (*which is awarded a status as a utensil, for people place a shard under a vessel to catch a leak; however, if it develops a hole of this size, that deprives it of its character as a utensil*).

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Nachman explained the reason for this: It is because people do not say, “Let us bring a shard for another shard.” [*If a vessel is a regular sound one, such a small hole does not deprive it of its character as a utensil and it is still susceptible to tumah, for people place a shard under it to catch the leak; however, if it is only a utensil based on it being used as a shard, then a small hole causes it to lose its status as a utensil.*]

Ulla said: Two *Amoraim* in *Eretz Yisroel* differ on this matter, and they are: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Avin and Rabbi Yosi the son of Zavda: One maintains: The standard is a hole large enough to allow a pomegranate to pass through; while the other rules: As large as a small root. [*Rashi explain the dispute is regarding how large the hole of a perforated pot must be in order to render its seeds susceptible to*

*tumah.*] And your mnemonic is: whether one gives a lot or whether one gives a little. [*The two extremes (of the three largest of Rava’s enumeration of the five measures) are taken, and neither of these Amoraim takes one of the intermediate standards. The largest is the size of a pomegranate and the smallest is that of a small root. The middle standard – that of an olive, is discarded. There is no doubt that the two smallest (of the five) standards – that of liquid seeping in or out, are too small for they are too small (seeing that they are smaller than the size of a root) to render the seeds susceptible to tumah.*]

Rav Chinena bar Kahana said in Rabbi Eliezer’s name: As for an earthenware vessel, its standard is a hole large enough to allow olives to pass through, and Mar Kashisha son of Rabbah completes this statement in Rabbi Eliezer’s name: And then they are regarded as vessels of dung, stone, or clay, which do not contract *tumah* either by Biblical or by Rabbinical law; and in respect to the law of a sealed cover, it is regarded as a vessel unless the greater portion of it is broken through.

#### **WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HAMATZNIA**

If one throws (*an object*) from a private domain into a public domain, or from a public domain into a

private domain, he is liable (*to a chatas, if done inadvertently*).

If one throws (*an object*) from one private domain to another private domain, and a public domain lies between them, Rabbi Akiva holds that he is liable, but the Sages exempt him.

How so? [*The Mishna, according to Rashi, proceeds to explain the opinion of the Sages:*] If there are two balconies (*beams protrude from the wall, and planks are placed on them for the purpose of walking on them*) one opposite the other in a public domain (*while the balconies themselves are private domains, for they are ten tefachim higher than the street and they are four tefachim square*), he who hands something over (*from one balcony to the other, across the public domain*), or throws (*an object*) from one to the other is not liable. If both (*balconies*) are on the same upper story (*i.e., on the same side of the street*), he who hands something over (*from one balcony to the other, across the empty space above the public domain between them*) is liable, while he who throws is not. [*The Mishna explains why he is liable in this case.*] For this was the service of the *Levi'im* (*when they loaded the boards of the Tabernacle onto the wagons*): two wagons (*stood*) behind each other in the public domain, and they handed over the boards from one to another, but they did not throw them. [*When it was time to transport the Mishkan, four wagons would line up in front of the Mishkan in two pairs, one behind the other. The Levi'im would hand over a beam from the ground to the Levi'im standing on the wagon in the rear, and those Levi'im would hand it over to the Levi'im in the front wagon, passing over a public domain. They had no reason to hand them over from one wagon to the adjacent wagon. It emerges that*

*we find in the Mishkan an instance of handing objects over from one private domain to another, crossing over the length of a public domain (the space between the rear wagon and the one in front of it), but we do not find an instance where they handed objects over from one private domain to another, crossing over the width of a public domain. They would not throw the beams from one wagon to the other out of fear that they would ruin. All melachos are derived from what was done in the Mishkan.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Let us consider: Throwing is a derivative of (*the melachah of*) “taking out.” Where is taking out itself written?

Rabbi Yochanan said: It is written in Scripture: *And Moshe gave the commandment, and they sounded a proclamation in the camp.* [*Moshe was informed that there were more than enough materials donated for the construction of the Tabernacle. Moshe therefore instructed all the people not to donate any more.*] Now, where was Moshe stationed? In the camp of the Levites, which was a public domain (*for everyone would come there to gain access to Moshe*), and he said to the Jewish people: Do not carry out materials from your private domain into the public domain.

The *Gemora* asks: But how do you know that this was on *Shabbos*; perhaps this happened during the week, and the reason (*for the proclamation*) being that the material was complete (*for the donations were adequate*), as it is written: *And the work was sufficient, etc.?*

The *Gemora* answers: This is derived through a *gezeirah shavah* employing the words “*ha’avarah*,



*ha'avarah* – “sounding, sounding” (in connection) by *Yom Kippur*: Here it is written: *and they sounded a proclamation in the camp*, and there it is written: *You shall sound a broken blast on the shofar*. Just as there the reference is to a day of prohibition (*Yom Kippur*), so here too the day of prohibition is meant (*Shabbos*).

The *Gemora* asks: We have found the Scriptural source for “taking out”; from where do we know that “bringing in” is forbidden as well?

The *Gemora* answers: That is quite logical, for let us see: it is the transferring (*of an object*) from one domain to another (*that is forbidden*); what does it matter whether one takes out or brings in? Nevertheless, “taking out” is the primary labor (*av melachah*), whereas “bringing in” is a derivative (*a toladah*). [This is because one is written explicitly in the Torah, whereas the other one is merely derived through logic.]

The *Gemora* asks: [Whether one transgresses a main category or sub-category unwittingly, he must bring a *korban chatas*. Whether one transgresses a main category or sub-category willfully, he is liable to be stoned.] What difference, then, does it make that one is called a main category (*an av melachah*) and one is called a sub-category (*a toladah*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The difference is that if one performs two main category prohibitions or two sub-category prohibitions, he is liable twice. However, if he performs a main category prohibition and its sub-category prohibition at the same time, he is only liable for transgressing *Shabbos* once (*and would only bring one korban chatas*).

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Eliezer who says that one would be liable twice if he performs a main category and sub-category prohibition of *Shabbos* at the same time, why is one called a main category and one called a sub-category?

The *Gemora* answers: Any work done in the building of the *Mishkan* that was significant is called a main category, and any work done in the building of the *Mishkan* that was not significant is called a sub-category. Alternatively (*regarding transferring*), that which is written explicitly is designated as a main category, whereas that which is not written explicitly is designated as a sub-category.

The *Gemora* asks: As to what we learned in a *Mishna*: If one throws (*an object*) four *amos* on to a (*side of a*) wall above ten *tefachim*, it is as though he throws it into the air (*and he is not liable; this is because an area higher than ten tefachim from the ground in a public domain is not considered a public domain, but rather, it is a place of exemption*); if it is below ten, it is as though he throws it on to the ground (*and he is liable*), and he who throws (*an object*) four *amos* along the ground (*that it lands four amos away*) is liable. How do we know that he who throws (*an object*) four cubits in the public domain is liable?

Rabbi Yoshiyah said: It is because the curtain weavers (*of the Mishkan*) threw their needles to each other.

The *Gemora* asks: Of what use are needles to weavers (*for they would use a loom*)? —

Rather, the *Gemora* says, it is because the sewers (*of the curtains*) threw their needles to each other.



The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps they sat close to each other?

The *Gemora* answers: Then they would reach each other (*and prick the other*) with their needles.

The *Gemora* asks: Yet perhaps they sat within four *amos* of each other (*but far away that they wouldn't prick each other*)?

Rather, said Rav Chisda: It is because the curtain weavers threw the shuttle (*which held the spool of weft thread, needed for the weaving process*) across (*the width of*) the curtain.

The *Gemora* asks: But he is still holding it (*the weft thread*) in his hand (*and as long as it is somewhat attached to the person who threw it, he is not Biblically liable for throwing four amos in a public domain*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The reference is to the last piece of thread (*i.e., the last throw of the shuttle when there is no more weft thread*).

The *Gemora* asks: But it passed through a place of non-liability? [*Since it is thrown between the panel of warp threads, he should be exempt, for that is regarded as a place of exemption, for any surface, which is at least three tefachim high, and is not four tefachim wide at every point, is regarded as such.*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, it is because the curtain weavers threw the (*extra*) shuttle to those who would borrow it from them.

The *Gemora* asks: Yet perhaps they sat near each other?

The *Gemora* answers: Then they would touch each other at the edge (*as they were pulling the weft thread out from between the panels of the loom*).

The *Gemora* asks: Yet perhaps they sat in irregular lines (*i.e., one weaver sat before or behind the weaver next to him; and therefore they would not interfere with each other*)?

And furthermore, did they borrow from each other? Surely Luda taught in a *braisa*: It is written: *every man from his work which they were doing*. This teaches us that he did of his own work (*tools*), but not of his fellow's!?

And furthermore (*even if we derive the prohibition of "throwing" four amos in a public domain*), how do we know that if one carries (*an object*) four *amos* in the public domain that he is liable?

Rather, the *Gemora* concludes, the entire (*law of transporting*) four *amos* in the public domain is known by tradition (*transmitted from Sinai*). (96a – 96b)