# <u>Chavruta</u> Shabbat – Daf Ayin Vav

Translated by: *Rabbi Avraham Rosenthal* Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus* 

[The Mishnah stated: And anything that is not fitting (i.e. important enough) to store away ... only the one who stores it away is liable.]

Said Rabbi Elazar: This Mishnah is not like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

As it was taught in a Baraita: A general rule was said by Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar: Any item that is not considered important enough to store away by most people, and they do not store away similar items, yet it was considered important by this person, and he stored it away—and someone else came and brought it out to a different domain—the Halachah is as follows: This one, the person who brought it out, becomes liable because of the thought of that one, the person who considered it important. Due to the person who granted it importance and stored it away, anyone who takes it out on Shabbat from one domain to another is liable.

Whereas our Mishnah teaches that only the one who puts it aside is liable for it, and anyone else is exempt.

### **MISHNAH**

The Mishnah begins to explain the minimum amounts of various items, for which a person will be liable for transferring them from one domain to another.

**One who transfers straw** – the minimum amount is **cow's mouthful.** Since cows eat straw, this is its minimum amount. One is only liable if he transfers the amount of straw it would take to fill the mouth of a cow.

**One who transfers** *atzah* (this will be explained in the Gemara to mean legume straw) – the amount is **a camel's mouthful**, which is larger than a cow's mouthful. However, one who transfers a cow's mouthful of legume straw is not liable, as it is not fitting as cow fodder.

One who transfers **soft straw**<sup>1</sup> – **a lamb's mouthful**, which is larger than a kid's mouthful. This is because soft straw is not fitting as kid fodder; therefore we measure with that of a lamb.

Grasses, which are softer and are fitting for both kids and lambs, one is liable for transferring the even smaller measure of a kid's mouthful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This is opposed to the straw mentioned in the first paragraph, which is a harder straw and only fitting for larger animals.

# <u>PEREK 7 – 76a</u>

**The leaves of garlic and the leaves of onion** – if they are **moist** and thus fit only for human consumption – their minimum amount is the size of **a dried date**, as this is the minimum amount for all food consumed by humans for all types of work on Shabbat.

And if they are **dry**, so they are even fit for consumption by kids – their minimum amount is **a kid's mouthful**, which is smaller than a dried fig.

And all of these do not combine with the other to make up the minimum amount that would cause one to be liable. For example, if one transferred less than a cow's mouthful of straw, and legume straw makes up the amount that is missing, he is not liable, since their minimum amounts are not equal.

In the Gemara it will be explained that only legume straw whose minimum amount is larger than straw does not combine with straw to complete the minimum amount of a cow's mouthful. But straw, whose minimum amount is smaller than legume straw, combines together with legume straw to create the minimum amount of a camel's mouthful.

### GEMARA

The Gemara explains: What is *atzah*?

Said Rav Yehudah: Straw of types of legumes.

\*\*\*

When Rav Dimi came, he said: The Amoraim disagree about a person who transfers a cow's mouthful of straw in order to feed it to a camel, as this amount is not enough to fill the mouth of a camel.

Rabbi Yochanan said: He is liable.

Reish Lakish said: He is exempt.

In the evening, said Rabbi Yochanan this, that he is liable, but in the morning, he retracted and said that he is exempt.

Said Rav Yosef: He, Rabbi Yochanan, did well that he retracted, as it is not fit – this amount of a cow's mouthful – for a camel.

Said to him Abaye: Just the opposite! Like what Rabbi Yochanan said originally, that he is liable, stands to reason. For the amount that he transferred is fitting for a cow, and this is a significant amount. Even though he transferred it for a camel, its minimum amount is not negated because of this.

Rather, when Ravin came he said: One who transfers straw, the amount of a cow's mouthful, for the use of a camel, everyone agrees that he is liable. For it has the minimum amount. It is included in the category of: "What is fitting to store away, and they store away items similar to it."

#### <u>Chavruta</u>

# <u>PEREK 7 – 76a</u>

When do Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish disagree? When he transfers a cow's mouthful of legume straw in order to feed it to a cow.

\*

And the opposite was said in a statement of Amoraim: Rabbi Yochanan said: He is exempt. Reish Lakish said he is liable.

The Gemara explains: **Rabbi Yochanan said he is exempt** because legume straw is only fit for a cow in pressed circumstances, i.e. when there is nothing else to eat. **And eating food that is not normally eaten, is not called eating.** Therefore, one cannot use the minimum amount of how much a cow eats, although he transferred it for the cow's use. Rather, he needs to use the minimum amount of how much a camel eats, as a camel normally eats legume straw, and for less than a camel's mouthful he will be exempt.

And **Reish Lakish said** that **he is liable,** for he takes the view that **eating food that is not normally eaten, is called eating.** And he transferred it specifically for the cow. Thus it is sufficient to transfer the amount of a cow's mouthful since a cow can eat it when there is nothing else to eat.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: Soft straw – a lamb's mouthful.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And note that it was taught** in a Baraita: The amount of soft straw is **a dried fig.** 

The Gemara answers: **This and that are the same amount.** A lamb's mouthful is the size of a dried fig.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **The leaves of garlic and the leaves of onion** – if they are **moist**– their minimum amount is the size of **a dried date.** 

And if they are **dry**, their minimum amount is **a kid's mouthful**, which is smaller than a dried fig.

And all of these do not combine with the other to make up the minimum amount that would cause one to be liable, since their minimum amounts are not equal.

Said Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina: They do not combine with the more stringent of them. An item that requires a relatively large minimum amount is considered lenient, since it will more often be exempt. It does not combine to complete the minimum amount of the more stringent, i.e. an item that requires a relatively small minimum amount. For the lenient item is not as important; one needs to have more of it to make it significant.

For example, legume straw does not combine with straw to complete the minimum amount of a cow's mouthful.

#### <u>Chavruta</u>

# <u>Perek 7 – 76a</u>

But they combine with the more lenient of them. The more stringent item, which is more important and thus has significance in smaller amounts, combines to complete the minimum amount of the more lenient item, which is less important.

For example: straw, which is more stringent, combines with legume straw to complete a camel's mouthful.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And all** the items **that are not equal in their minimum measures** – **do they combine** at all? Even something stringent should not combine with something lenient where the minimum measures are not equal.

And the proof is: It was taught in a Mishnah in Tractate Keilim:

**A cloth** becomes impure with *midras*<sup>2</sup> impurity when it is three *tefachim*<sup>3</sup> by three *tefachim*, as then it is fitting for lying on. (If it is smaller than this size, as long as it is larger than three by three fingerbreadths, it can only receive  $maga^4$  impurity.)

**And a sack** that is made from goat hair – its minimum measure for impurity, whether *midras* impurity and whether any other impurity (this applies to the other items listed here as well), is **four by four** *tefachim*.

And leather – is five by five.

A woven reed mat is six by six.

And it was taught in a Baraita with reference to the Mishnah: A cloth whose minimum amount is three *tefachim*, and a sack, whose minimum amount is four, combine. Meaning, a cloth will complete the minimum amount of the sack, that if both of them together add up to four *tefachim*, it will receive impurity. (This does not work in reverse. The sack will not combine with a cloth to complete the minimum amount of a cloth of three *tefachim*, as only the stringent combines with the lenient and not vice versa.)

And similarly, a sack and leather and similarly, leather and a mat combine with each other.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A person who becomes spiritually impure through a seminal-like emission is called a *zav*. When he sits or lies on an object designated for such, this object becomes impure with *midras* impurity, even if the *zav* does not touch it, and is considered an *av hatumah*, a primary source of impurity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 1 tefach: 3.1 in., 8 cm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This impurity is created when a *zav* touches an object.

# <u>PEREK 7 – 76B</u>

This is only true in the stated order, since they are similar to each other and they are fitting to combine with each other. But, a cloth and leather or a sack and a mat do not combine with each other since they are not fitting to combine. If anyone does combine them, this action is not considered significant.

And said Rabbi Shimon: What is the reason that they combine? Because they are fitting to become impure as a seat (*moshav*). For if one cut from two items (in the order mentioned) and attached them to each other to make a patch for a donkey's saddle, this piece receives *midras* impurity, if it is one *tefach* by one *tefach*. It is considered as if there was only one *tefach* by one *tefach* of each type (and this is the minimum amount if it was designated for patches).

The reason is since people do not care if the patch is made from two materials and since we find that the two materials are being used together for the same purpose, therefore they combine for *midras* impurity.

The Gemara infers: The **reason** they combine is because **they are fitting to become impure** together as a **seat** (*moshav*). They are used together in the donkey's saddle that can receive *moshav* impurity.

But if they are not fitting to become impure together with *moshav* impurity, they do not combine—even the stringent with the lenient.

Therefore, how did Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina say regarding Shabbat that they combine?

#### AMMUD BET

The Gemara answers: **Said Rava: Here also, it is fitting** to combine **for a sample.** Sometimes a person wants that the straw and legume straw (and all the species mentioned in the Mishnah) should be connected together. For example, if he sells these items and places them in a display window. Since each item by itself is small and tends to scatter, he prefers them connected so they should not be blown by the wind. Therefore they combine for transferring on Shabbat.

#### **MISHNAH**

One who transfers foods the size of a dried fig is liable for a sin offering.

**And they combine with each other** – one type of food with another – to make the size of a dried fig. **For they are equal in their minimum amount.** The minimum amount for all food for human consumption is the size of a dried fig.

#### <u>Chavruta</u>

# <u>Perek 7 – 76B</u>

Aside from their shells, which are not food, therefore the shells do not combine with the food to complete the amount of a dried fig.

And similarly regarding their seeds and stems, and their bran i.e. the shell of the wheat that falls off during pounding, and the coarse bran that remains in the sifter. All of these items are not food and do not combine to make up the minimum amount.

**Rabbi Yehudah says:** No shells combine, **aside from the shells of lentils that cook with them.** Meaning, only the internal shell that cooks together with the lentils combines with them, but not the external shell that falls off in storage.

### **GEMARA**

The Gemara raises a difficulty: And bran and coarse bran - they do not combine?

And note that it was taught in a Mishnah: Five quarters of a  $kav^5$  of flour and a little more – are obligated in *challah*<sup>6</sup> if one made it into dough.

**They** (the five quarters of flour) **and their bran and their coarse bran.** If everything all together equals five quarters, it is obligated in *challah*.

Thus bran and coarse bran do combine!

The Gemara answers: **Said Abaye:** *Challah* is different **since a pauper eats his bread** made **of dough mixed** with bran and coarse bran. Therefore it is all included in  $(Bamidbar^7 15:19)$ , "the bread of the land," and it is obligated in *challah*. But regarding transferring on Shabbat, the item needs to be something important. Since bran and coarse bran generally are not eaten, they do not combine.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: Rabbi Yehudah says: Aside from the shells of lentils that cook with them.

<sup>5</sup> 1 kav: 1.4 liter, 1.5 US quarts

<sup>6</sup> A small portion separated from dough made of either wheat, barley, spelt, oat or rye flour, and given to a cohen. <sup>7</sup> Numbers



# <u>PEREK 7 – 76B</u>

The Gemara infers: And only shells of **lentils do** combine, while shells of **beans do not** combine?

And note that it was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Yehudah says: Aside from shells of beans and lentils that do combine.

The Gemara answers: It is **not difficult. This** where they combine is **with new** beans. **That** where they do not combine is **with old** beans.

The Gemara explains: **Old – what is the reason they do not** combine?

**Said Rabbi Abahu: Since** the shells **appear as flies in the plate**, as they are black. Therefore it is not usual to cook them together with the shells.

### HADRAN ALACH KLAL GADOL

### WE WILL RETURN TO YOU, PEREK KLAL GADOL

### <u>PEREK 8 – 76B</u>

# PEREK HAMOTZI YAYIN

#### MISHNAH

**One who transfers** undiluted **wine** – its minimum amount is **enough for mixing a cup** used for a blessing, which is a *revi'it*<sup>8</sup> of a *log*.<sup>9</sup> Since their wines were very strong they would dilute them by adding three parts water to one part wine. Therefore, the amount of wine in a cup the size of a *revi'it* is a quarter of a *revi'it*. If one transfers this amount from a public domain to a private domain, he is liable for a sin offering.

**Milk** – **enough** to **swallow** – the amount a person would swallow at one time. (This is less than a cheekful.)

**Honey** – **enough to put on a wound** that is on the back of horses or camels, which came about because of the weight of the load. (Another explanation: The wound on the back of the hand or foot of a person.)

Oil – enough to anoint a small limb of a one-day-old child.

Water – enough to dissolve the eye medicine.

And all other liquids – their minimum amounts are a *revi'it* of a *log*.

And all waste water, which is used to make clay, even its minimum amount is a revi'it.

<sup>8</sup> revi'it: 86.4 gm or 2.9 fl. oz. <sup>9</sup> 1 log: 0.35 liters, 0.36 US quarts

**CHAVRUTA** 

### <u>PEREK 8 – 76B</u>

**Rabbi Shimon says: All of them,** all the liquids mentioned in the Mishnah – their minimum amounts are a *revi'it*. **And all these minimum measures** less than a *revi'it* which were mentioned in the Mishnah were only for those who stored them away. Only the person who put these items aside in the prescribed amounts and subsequently transferred them will be liable for less than a *revi'it*. But anyone who did not put them aside, they are not liable unless they transferred a *revi'it*. (Rabbi Shimon disagrees with the Mishnah in the previous chapter that said that the one who put it aside is obligated for transferring even the smallest amount. Rabbi Shimon says that even the one who put it aside is not liable unless there is a certain minimum amount, even if it is smaller than the minimum amount anyone else will be liable for.

# GEMARA

It was taught in the Tosefta: One who transfers wine – enough for mixing a beautiful cup.

The Gemara explains: And what is a beautiful cup? A cup used for blessing of *Birkat Hamazon*,<sup>10</sup> that the Sages required beautifying it (as it requires *itur*, *ituf*, *hadachah*, *shetifah*, *chai* and *malei*, as it says in Berachot 51).

Said Rav Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: A cup used for a blessing needs to have in it a quarter of a *revi'it* of a *log* of undiluted wine in order to dilute it with water three times the amount of wine and it will be a *revi'it*.

Said Rava: We also...

<sup>10</sup> Grace after meals

**CHAVRUTA**