



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

The *Mishna* states: A door bolt that drags on the ground (*i.e., a peg that is inserted into a hole in the threshold – used to lock the door, and it is fastened to the door, but one end of the rope drags on the floor*), one may lock a door in the Bais HaMikdash, but not anywhere outside the Bais HaMikdash. A bolt that is not attached to the door and rests on the ground, one is forbidden to use the bolt to lock a door both in the Bais HaMikdash and outside of the Bais HaMikdash. [A bolt that is attached to the door is already part of the building before the onset of Shabbos. Using it is permitted Biblically, but the Sages forbade its use on Shabbos because, when it rests on the ground, it resembles building (for it does not seem to be attached to the building). In the Bais HaMikdash, however, many Rabbinic decrees did not apply, and one can use the bolt in the Bais HaMikdash even if the bolt drags on the ground. A bolt that is not attached to the building is forbidden on a Biblical level, for wedging it into the threshold would be regarded as a genuine act of building.] Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one can use the bolt that is resting on the floor (*even if it is not fastened to the building*) to lock a door in the Bais HaMikdash, and one can use a bolt that (*is attached but*) drags on the floor even outside the Bais HaMikdash. [R' Yehudah holds that once it has been designated for a bolt, it is not regarded as an act of building on a Biblical level; the Rabbis, nevertheless, forbade its use as a lock, for it resembles an act of building.] (102a)

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* to explain the *Mishna*: The bolt that drags on the ground and one may use it to lock a door in the Bais HaMikdash but not outside the Bais HaMikdash is a bolt that is attached to the door and hangs from the door, but its end touches the ground. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that such a bolt is permitted to be used even outside the Bais HaMikdash. A bolt that is not attached to the door or suspended from the door, but just remains in a corner, is prohibited to be used on Shabbos outside the Bais HaMikdash.

Rav Yehudah citing Shmuel ruled: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Yehudah<sup>1</sup> in the case of a bolt that drags along the ground.<sup>2</sup> Rava observed: This applies only where it is fastened to the door.<sup>3</sup> But could this be right, seeing that Rabbi Tavla, when he visited Machuza, saw a bolt that was suspended from the side of a doorway and yet made no remark whatsoever on the matter? — That was one that could be lifted up by the cord to which it was tied.<sup>4</sup> Rav Avya once visited Nehardea and observed that a certain man was fastening a bolt with a piece of reed grass. 'This', he remarked: 'may not be fastened'.<sup>5</sup> (102a)

Rabbi Zeira enquired: What is the ruling where the bolt was pressed into the ground?<sup>6</sup> — What question is this, retorted

<sup>1</sup> That it is permitted to shut up a door even in the country.

<sup>2</sup> But not in the case of one that is completely detached from the door which Rabbi Yehudah permitted to use in the Mikdash. The insertion of a detached bolt in the sockets is regarded as actual building which, however small in extent, is Biblically forbidden.

<sup>3</sup> Where the connection between the door and the bolt is evident; but not where it was only tied to a door-post.

<sup>4</sup> Lit., 'by its binding', sc. the cord was a strong one and the connection between the bolt and the door was unmistakable. The question of building did not, therefore, arise.

<sup>5</sup> On the Shabbos. As reed grass is too frail to sustain the weight of a bolt it is regarded as non-existent, and the bolt must be deemed to be completely detached from the door.

<sup>6</sup> Sc. it did not merely rest in a socket in the threshold but passed through it down into the ground under it. Is the insertion of the bolt in such a manner, it is asked, regarded as building?

Rav Yosef, has he not heard what was taught: 'If it was detached<sup>7</sup> it is forbidden,<sup>8</sup> but if it was pressed into the ground it is permitted; and Rabbi Yehudah ruled: If it was pressed into the ground, even though it was not detached, it is forbidden', and in connection with this 'Rav Yehudah citing Shmuel ruled: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Yehudah in the case where it was pressed into the ground?<sup>9</sup> But what is the reason? — Abaye replied: Because it<sup>10</sup> has the appearance of building. (102a)

Rav Nechumi bar Zecharyah enquired of Abaye: What is the ruling where a handle was attached to the bolt?<sup>11</sup> — You, the other replied, speak now of a club.<sup>12</sup> It was stated: Rav Nechumai bar Adda ruled: If a handle was attached to it [the handling of the bolt] is permitted. (102a)

At the house of Rabbi Pedas they had a beam which ten men had to lift to fix it in position at the door, but he told them no word against this. It has, he observed, the character of a vessel.<sup>13</sup> At the house of Mar Shmuel they had a mortar of the capacity of a lesech<sup>14</sup> and Mar Shmuel allowed it to be fixed behind the door. It has, he observed, the character of a vessel. (102a)

Rami bar Yechezkel sent to Rav Amram the following message: 'Will the Master tell us some of those excellent sayings that you once told us in the name of Rav Assi in respect of the arches of a boat'.<sup>15</sup> He sent word in reply: Thus said Rav Assi, 'With reference to the arches of a boat,

whenever they are a tefach<sup>16</sup> wide or, even when they are less than a tefach in width, provided there was no space of three tefachim intervening between the one and the other,<sup>17</sup> it is permissible to bring a mat on the following day and to spread it over them.<sup>18</sup> — What is the reason? One is thereby merely adding to an occasional tent which is perfectly legitimate.<sup>19</sup>

Rav Huna possessed some rams that needed the shade in the daytime and the open air at night.<sup>20</sup> When he came to Rav, the latter told him, 'Go and roll up the reed mat<sup>21</sup> but leave one tefach rolled,<sup>22</sup> and on the morrow spread it all out and you will be merely adding to all occasional tent, and that is perfectly legitimate.

Rav said in the name of Rabbi Chiya: A curtain (*used as a screen in a doorway*) may be hung up and taken down (*for it is not a 'tent,' as it has no roof*). A bridal bed (*which has one pole on each side and a rod between them; the cloth hangs over it on both sides; it is not regarded as a "tent," for there is not a tefach width on the top*) may be set up and it may be dismantled.

Rav Sheishes son of Rav Iddi said: That was said only where its roof is not a *tefach* (*tefach*) in width, but if its roof is a *tefach*, it is forbidden. And even if the roof is not a *tefach*, this was said only where there is not (*the width of*) a *tefach* within three *tefachim* from the top; but if there is a *tefach* within three from the top, it is forbidden. And even if there

<sup>7</sup> From the door, sc. if the cord whereby it was fastened to it was broken and the bolt, when not in use, now rests in a corner of the room.

<sup>8</sup> To secure the door with it.

<sup>9</sup> Anyone who heard of this could not, of course, have asked Rabbi Zeira's question which is here clearly solved.

<sup>10</sup> The insertion of a bolt through a socket in a threshold right into the ground.

<sup>11</sup> Lit., 'he made for it a house of the hand', at one of its ends; so that it assumed the shape of a mallet or club and, therefore, the character of a vessel. May such a bolt, it is asked, be moved on the Shabbos even where it was completely detached from the door?

<sup>12</sup> Which, being suitable as a pestle for crushing grain and spices, has undoubtedly the character of a vessel which may well be handled on the Shabbos.

<sup>13</sup> Since it can be used as a bench.

<sup>14</sup> Half a kor; 15 seah.

<sup>15</sup> Which serve as a framework for the canvas or other material used as a shelter against the sun or rain.

<sup>16</sup> Or more. Such a width constitutes an occasional tent.

<sup>17</sup> So that the rule of lavud may be applied.

<sup>18</sup> Though the canvas, or whatever the material, constitutes a tent the construction of which on the Shabbos is forbidden.

<sup>19</sup> Summary: Rav Assi is quoted in our Gemora as discussing planks that were laid out across the deck of a boat. These planks used to be used as a frame upon which to lay out sheets and mats on top of them which would protect the people on the boat from the elements. If these planks themselves were one *tefach* wide, or even if they were not one *tefach* wide they were within three *tefachim* of each other, one would be allowed to spread sheets on top of them on Shabbos. This is because they are already considered to constitute a temporary tent, and the law is that one may add on to a temporary tent on Shabbos.

<sup>20</sup> On a weekday this was easily arranged by spreading a mat on the top of the shed in the morning and by rolling it up in the evening; but on the Shabbos the question of tent building arose.

<sup>21</sup> Which was unrolled during the Shabbos eve as on all other weekdays.

<sup>22</sup> So that an occasional tent remains.

is not (*the width of*) a *tefach* within three *tefachim* from the top this also is not said only if its slope is less than a *tefach*, but if its slope is a *tefach*, the slopes of tents are as tents.

Rav Sheishes son of Rav Iddi said: A felt hat is permitted (*to be worn on the Shabbos*). The *Gemora* asks: But it was stated in a *braisa* that a felt hat is forbidden? The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, as in the one case it is a *tefach* in size (*and therefore it is regarded as a tent*); whereas in the other case it is not a *tefach*. The *Gemora* asks: If so, if one lets his cloak protrude a *tefach* (*in front of his head*), is he too liable? Rather, the *Gemora* answers, there is no difficulty, for here it is tightly fitted (*on his head*); there it is not tightly fitted (*and therefore the Rabbis prohibited wearing it, for one might carry it four amos in a public domain*). (102a – 102b)

MISHNAH: A lower pivot<sup>23</sup> may be re-inserted in its socket in the Mikdash<sup>24</sup> but not in the country.<sup>25</sup> The re-insertion of the upper one,<sup>26</sup> however, is everywhere forbidden.<sup>27</sup> Rabbi Yehudah ruled: The upper one may be re-inserted in the Mikdash and the lower one in the country also. (102b)

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: The [lower] pivot of the door of a carriage, crate or closet may be re-inserted into its socket in the Mikdash, while in the country it may only be adjusted; but the upper one<sup>28</sup> may not be re-inserted in either place; the former prohibition being a preventive measure against the possibility of one's driving it into its socket by force; and should one drive it in, the obligation of a *chatas* is incurred.

<sup>23</sup> Of the door of a cupboards a window or the like that open sideways.

<sup>24</sup> On the Shabbos. So long as the upper one remains in its socket it is easy for the lower one to be re-inserted and the act cannot, therefore, be regarded as 'building' which is forbidden.

<sup>25</sup> Where a preventive measure has been enacted against the possibility of driving the pivot into the socket with the aid of a hammer or axe which is, of course, forbidden on the Shabbos.

<sup>26</sup> Which requires great exertion after the lower one had come out and the door was practically dragging on the ground.

<sup>27</sup> Lit., 'here and here'. This Tanna is of the opinion that the term 'building' is also applicable to articles and, since building is an activity Biblically forbidden on the Shabbos, and since a Biblical prohibition retains its force in the Mikdash also, the re-insertion of the upper pivot on the Shabbos is forbidden in the Mikdash as well as in the country.

<sup>28</sup> Which requires great exertion after the lower one had come out and the door was practically dragging on the ground.

<sup>29</sup> Since they are within, or attached to the ground.

<sup>30</sup> Any addition to such a structure is regarded as 'building'.

The pivot of the door of a pit, cistern or an annex<sup>29</sup> may not be re-inserted in the socket,<sup>30</sup> and if one did re-insert it a *chatas* is incurred. (102b)

MISHNAH: It is permissible to replace a plaster on a wound<sup>31</sup> in the Mikdash but not in the country.<sup>32</sup> For the first time, however, this<sup>33</sup> is forbidden everywhere.<sup>34</sup>

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: A plaster that was detached from a wound may be replaced on the Shabbos.<sup>35</sup> Rabbi Yehudah ruled: Only if it slipped downwards may it be pushed back upwards or if it slipped upwards it may be pushed back downwards.<sup>36</sup> One may also uncover a part of the plaster and wipe the opening of the wound and then another part of the plaster may be uncovered and the opening of the wound be wiped, but the plaster itself may not be wiped off since such wiping is tantamount to spreading the salve; and if one did spread the salve the obligation of a *chatas* is incurred.

Rav Yehudah citing Shmuel ruled: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Yehudah. This, Rav Chisda observed, was learnt only where it slipped off on to an object, but if it slipped off on to the ground all agree that it is forbidden to replace it on the wound.

Mar son of Rav Ashi stated: I was once standing in the presence of my father when his plaster slipped off on to his pillow and he replaced it. 'Does not the Master accept', I

<sup>31</sup> If a Kohen had to remove it owing to the performance of a service which required that there be no interception between his hand and the ritual object he handled.

<sup>32</sup> This being a preventive measure against the spreading of the salve on the plaster, which is forbidden under the category of 'erasing' which is one of the main classes of work forbidden on the Shabbos.

<sup>33</sup> The application of a new plaster to a wound.

<sup>34</sup> Even in the Mikdash. While replacing a plaster that had been removed for the purpose of performing a Mikdash service has been allowed in order to prevent a Kohen from abstaining from his Mikdash duties on account of a plaster on his hand, the application of a plaster for the first time, which cannot affect the Mikdash service, could not be allowed since such an application would infringe a Rabbinical enactment.

<sup>35</sup> As such accidents do not frequently happen the Rabbis enacted no preventive measure against them.

<sup>36</sup> But if it was completely detached it may not be replaced.

asked him, 'the statement of Rav Chisda that they differed only where it slipped off on to an object but that if it slipped off on to the ground all agree that replacement is forbidden; in connection with which Shmuel stated: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Yehudah?'<sup>37</sup> — 'I', he replied, 'did not hear of this, by which I mean: I do not accept it'. (102b)

MISHNAH: A string<sup>38</sup> may<sup>39</sup> be tied up in the Mikdash but not in the country. For the first time, however,<sup>40</sup> this is forbidden everywhere.<sup>41</sup> (102b)

GEMARA: Isn't our Mishnah in disagreement with the following: If the string of a harp was broken one would not tie it up but secure it with a loop? — This is no difficulty, since the latter represents the view of the Rabbis whereas the former represents that of Rabbi Eliezer. According to Rabbi Eliezer who holds that the preliminary requirements of a mitzvah supersede the Shabbos<sup>42</sup> one may tie the string,<sup>43</sup> while according to the Rabbis who ruled that they did not supersede it one may only secure it with a loop. But if this represents the view of Rabbi Eliezer shouldn't tying be permitted also for the first time? — Rather say: This is no difficulty since the former is the view of Rabbi Yehudah<sup>44</sup> whereas the latter is that of the Rabbis.<sup>45</sup> According to whose

view, however, did Rabbi Yehudah give his ruling?<sup>46</sup> If he made it according to the view of Rabbi Eliezer,<sup>47</sup> shouldn't this be permitted also for the first time? — Rather say: There is no difficulty since the latter represents the view of Rabbi Shimon while the former represents that of the Rabbis. For it was taught: if a Levite had a break in the string of his harp he may tie it up; Rabbi Shimon ruled: He may only make a loop; Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: Neither the one nor the other would produce a tone; one<sup>48</sup> should rather unwind the string from the lower pin and<sup>49</sup> wind it<sup>50</sup> round the upper one or unwind it from the upper pin and wind it round the lower one.<sup>51</sup> And if you prefer I might reply: The former as well as the latter represents the view of the Rabbis,<sup>52</sup> and yet there is no difficulty, since the former refers to a break in the middle<sup>53</sup> while the latter refers to one at the end.<sup>54</sup> And if you prefer I might reply: Both refer to a break in the middle part, but the Master holds that a preventive measure is enacted,<sup>55</sup> while the Masters hold that no preventive measure is to be enacted.<sup>56</sup> (102b – 103a)

<sup>37</sup> Viz., that even where a plaster had only slipped off upon an object it is forbidden to replace it on a wound. Now, since this is the halachah, why did he disregard it?

<sup>38</sup> Of the musical instruments used by Levites in the Mikdash service.

<sup>39</sup> If it was broken on the Shabbos.

<sup>40</sup> I.e., to insert a new string on the Shabbos.

<sup>41</sup> Lit., 'here and here', in the Mikdash as well as in the country; since such work could have been performed before Shabbos.

<sup>42</sup> Such as the chopping of wood and the burning of charcoal for the purpose of preparing a knife for the performance of the mitzvah of circumcision.

<sup>43</sup> Since the repair of the string of a musical instrument in the Mikdash is a preliminary requisite of the precept of the sacrifices which could not be offered in the absence of the instrumental music of the Levites.

<sup>44</sup> Who in respect of work on the Shabbos draws no distinction between a knot and a loop and, since the preliminary requisites of a mitzvah supersede the Shabbos, a knot is permitted as well as a loop.

<sup>45</sup> Who do not include the making of a loop among the main classes of work forbidden on the Shabbos, while a knot is included. As the string can be secured by a loop (which is a permitted act) the making of a knot (a forbidden act) was justly forbidden even in the case of the preliminary requisites of a mitzvah.

<sup>46</sup> According to which the making of a knot (which is one of the main classes of work forbidden on the Shabbos) is forbidden for the first time

(even though it is a preliminary requisite of a mitzvah) but permitted after the string had been broken.

<sup>47</sup> He could not do so according to the Rabbis who do not permit a knot in either case.

<sup>48</sup> Discarding the shorter section of the broken string.

<sup>49</sup> Having obtained sufficient length.

<sup>50</sup> At the other end.

<sup>51</sup> Thus obtaining a sound length of string free from knots or loops. As the lowering of the string is no more forbidden than tying it, the former, which enables the tone to be produced, is to be preferred. Our Mishnah thus represents the view of the Rabbis of the Baraisa who, agreeing with Rabbi Eliezer on one point, that preliminary requisites of a mitzvah supersede the Shabbos, permit the tying up of the string on the shabbos; but disagreeing with him that such an act is permitted for the first time, permit it only where the break occurred on the Shabbos.

<sup>52</sup> That preliminary requisites which could not be prepared before the Shabbos may be prepared on the Shabbos.

<sup>53</sup> Of the string, when a knot is essential. A loop would not be strong enough. Hence the ruling that a string may be tied up.

<sup>54</sup> Lit., 'at the side', near the pin, where a loop suffices to hold the string in position.

<sup>55</sup> Sc. were a knot to be permitted in the middle someone might make one at the ends also.

<sup>56</sup> Hence the ruling that only a loop may be made but not a knot.



## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***Wearing a Fedora***

The Gemora quotes Rav Shisha as saying that one way wear a hat with a wide brim on Shabbos. The Gemora asks, there is a braisa that says this is forbidden! The Gemora answers, when it has a brim of a *tefach* it is forbidden, as putting it on is akin to making a tent.

The Gemora then asks that this should not be forbidden, as it is akin to one stretching out his cloak one *tefach*, which surely does not mean he made a tent! The Gemora answers, rather, one case is where it is tight and one is where it is not.

Rashi understands that this last answer is retracting the entire previous discussion. The Gemora is explaining that the problem here is not making a tent, but rather the possibility that a person's garment will fly off and he will end up carrying it. This is why the Gemora says that if the clothing is secure, he can wear it and there is no such suspicion. If it is loose, like a loose hat, he cannot wear it as we suspect he will end up carrying it.

Tosfos quotes Rabeinu Chananel who understands the Gemora is not retracting that we are discussing a problem of making a tent. Rather, the Gemora is saying that if the brim is a *tefach* wide and solid (does not bend), it appears like a tent and is forbidden to be worn according to Rabbinic law. Otherwise, it is permitted. According to Rabeinu Chananel, Tosfos explains, it would be indeed forbidden to wear a hat with a solid *tefach* brim on Shabbos.

The Rosh (in Perek Tolin) and others (see Toras Chaim here) comment that according to this explanation, the Gemora's text does not have the word "Ela" -- "rather" as this word means that we are going away from the reasoning of the previous discussion.

The Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 301:40) indeed rules that it is forbidden to put on a hat with a *tefach* wide brim even in the house, because of making a tent. However, the Mishna Berura there explains that this is only when the brim is very

hard and does not bend at all. However, even for this kind of hat there are Acharonim who are lenient (see Mishna Berura there at length).

## DAILY MASHAL

### **Miracles of Eiruv**

Once the Chazon Ish was asked why miracles are not openly performed in our own generation, as they were in previous eras? The Chazon Ish answered that even today, Hashem constantly performs miracles to protect His nation. He related the following miracle that he himself had experienced during his youth.

In Russia, during the time of the First World War, anyone who was caught without the proper identification papers was suspected of being a spy, and was subject to interrogation, imprisonment, or worse. On the day that the Chazon Ish completed his commentary to Eiruv, he was sitting in the shul in Minsk when suddenly someone entered and announced that a group of soldiers had gathered on the outskirts of the city, and were preparing to make a search for all those who did not have their papers in order. Since the Chazon Ish did not have the necessary papers, he fled to the forests outside the city to hide until the soldiers had completed their search and left. When he reached the edge of the forest, he realized that he had walked right into the soldiers' camp where they were preparing to enter the city. Since he was already in clear view of the soldiers, he could not turn around and run. He had no choice but to walk straight through their camp, trying to appear as innocent as possible. Amazingly, the soldiers took no notice of him at all and he walked safely through into the forest.

The Chazon Ish concluded that Hashem had performed for him this great miracle in the merit of his studies in Maseches Eiruv (Toldos Yaakov).