

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Relieving one's self

R' Huna taught his son Rabbah the importance of learning about the proper way to go to the bathroom.

R' Huna rules that when given the choice between using a stone or a shard for wiping on Shabbos, the stone is preferable. R' Chisda disagrees and gives preference to the shard.

There is a similar dispute between R' Chisda and R' Hamnuna whether a stone or grass is better for wiping.

The consequences for not relieving one's self are discussed.

Advice is offered to help a person who has difficulty relieving himself.

2) MISHNAH: Tannaim dispute the minimum size of earthenware that creates liability.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara clarifies that R' Meir's minimum measurement is larger than R' Yosi's.

Although R' Yosi's refutation of R' Meir's allusion seems strong, the Gemara records R' Meir's response.

הדרן עלך המוציא יין

4) MISHNAH: R' Akiva rules that idolatry transmits tum'ah the same way a nidah transmits tum'ah.

5) Developing the disagreement concerning the tum'ah status of idolatry

A Mishnah in Avodah Zarah is quoted which records a dispute between R' Akiva and the Rabanan. The Rabanan rule that idolatry transmits tum'ah the way as a sheretz and R' Akiva rules that idolatry transmits tum'ah like a nidah.

Rabbah explains that idolatry will certainly transmit "carrying tum'ah" **משא טומאת** according to both opinions and the issue under dispute is whether idolatry will transmit the tum'ah of a "placed rock" **מסמא**. According to R' Akiva it will and according to Rabanan it will not.

R' Elazar disagrees with Rabbah's understanding of the dispute. He maintains that idolatry will not transmit the tumah of a "placed rock" according to all opinions and the point of dispute is whether idolatry transmits "carrying tumah." According to R' Akiva it does and according to Rabanan it does not.

Both Rabbah and R' Elazar, each one based upon their position, develop the full extent of the dispute between R' Akiva and Rabanan. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
The Langsner family
in memory of their grandmother
מרת רייזל בת ר' אברהם מרדכי הלוי, ע"ה

Gemara GEM

Mishnah Match Maneuver

Our Massechta, Shabbos, obviously deals with the laws of Shabbos. We must understand, therefore, the reason the first seven topics dealt with in our chapter were included in this Massechta, and why they are placed here, at this point.

Rashi addresses this issue at the very beginning of the perek, and he says that one of the topics featured within this series of Mishnayos is (86a): "How do we know that we are allowed to wash the milah on the third day after circumcision, even if it falls on Shabbos?" Therefore, Rashi says that all of these other topics which follow the same pattern ("How do we know that...?") were placed here as part of a package deal of Mishnayos with a similar style.

Tosafos (ד"ה אמר) registers an objection against this suggestion. If this was the case, Tosafos says, the only reason any of these inquiries is here is due to the question about washing a child on Shabbos. Accordingly, we would expect the topic regarding the laws of Shabbos to be the first one discussed, being that it is connected to the massechta, and the other Mishnayos would follow due to their parallel style. Yet, we find the opposite to be the case. We begin with a Mishnah discussing the ritual impurities of idolatry, and then the status of boats and their inability to contract ritual impurity (83b). Finally, after presenting rules of **פולטת ש"ז** (86a), the Mishnah finally arrives at the law of Shabbos in the middle of 86a! What is even more surprising is that the rule of caring for the milah on the third day should itself be included in the chapter of "Rabbi Eliezer" (nineteenth chapter, beginning 130a), where all other laws of milah are discussed.

Tosafos therefore suggests that because the previous perek concluded with expounding upon a verse from Yeshayahu 30:14, we now continue with another Mishnah where we find a law based upon a nearby verse (ibid. 30:22). The halachos are not associated with each other in any way other than their both being found in Yeshayahu 30. Then, our perek continues with its series of Mishnayos, all of which associate some halacha upon a verse, using the method of **אסמכתא**. ■

REVIEW and Remember

- Why did R' Huna feel that it was important that his son study with R' Chisda?
- What is the recommended way to prepare for a meal?
- Define **מסמא**.
- Why is idolatry compared to a sheretz?

HALACHAH Highlight

Is grass Muktzeh while it is still attached?

היו לפניו צרור ועשבים: רב חסדא ורב המנונא ... וחד אמר מקנה בעשבים ואין מקנה בצרור.

If a person had before himself a stone and grass, Rav Chisda and Rav Hamnuna disagree as to which is preferable to be used. ... One says that he should utilize the grass for hygienic issues, and should not utilize the stone for that purpose.

In his second explanation, Rashi¹ understands that the grass being referred to here is still attached to the ground. According to this view, the stone should not be used because the stone is Muktzeh, but he can use the grass while it is still attached, as long as he doesn't "move them" (שלא יזיזם). This view is codified in the Shulchan Aruch². However, the Poskim disagree regarding the practical application of this view. The Magen Avraham³ maintains a more literal interpretation of Rashi's statement that the grass may be used but "not moved." The Magen Avraham thus opines that grass is also Muktzeh, and as such can not be moved directly⁴; however, it can be moved by the person's body⁵ and not by his hands. Therefore, the person would need to move the posterior region of their body over the grass in order to affect the desired hygienic result.

However, numerous Poskim challenge the Magen Avraham's position. The Eliyahu Rabbah⁶ disagrees with the Magen Avraham's view that attached grass is Muktzeh; rather, the concern is that perhaps the person will sever the grass from its place of attachment. Thus, Rashi's intent when he writes as long as he doesn't "move them" (שלא יזיזם) is as long as he doesn't sever them. This opinion is upheld by many Poskim⁷, amongst them the Mishnah Berura⁸. It must be noted that support for this position can be found in the writings of several Rishonim⁹.

The Rema rules¹⁰ that the prohibition of using that which is attached to the ground applies only to trees and the like which have stiff trunks¹¹. However, it is not forbidden to use supple reeds such as grass and the like, even though they are attached to the ground. The Taz¹² takes issue with the Rema on this point. He opines that it

is prohibited to use supple vegetation as well as hard stemmed vegetation. He as well considers attached vegetation to be Muktzeh. [Still, one is permitted¹³ even according to this opinion to walk on grass because that is done with one's feet.] The Eliyahu Rabbah¹⁴ rises to challenge the viewpoint that prohibits the use of grass and similarly supple vegetation. He is joined in this objection by numerous Poskim¹⁵, amongst them the Mishnah Berura¹⁶.

Thus, there would be no dispute about walking and/or sitting¹⁷ on grass. Additionally, according to the Eliyahu Rabbah, the Mishnah Berura and others, supple vegetation such as grass is not Muktzeh and is not included in the prohibition of making use of that which is attached to the ground, and as such, one would be permitted¹⁸ to gently move with ones hands grass or other similarly non-stiff stemmed vegetation, as long as he was careful not to uproot or sever the grass. However, one should note that it appears that Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach¹⁹ rules that in the present day when attached grass serves no purpose, grass is Muktzeh and can not be moved directly. A similar view is quoted in the name of Rav Yosef Shalom Elyashiv²⁰. ■

1. רש"י (ד"ה ואינו מקנה)
2. שו"ע (סי' שיש סי' ו)
3. מג"א (שם סי' ו)
4. וכן ראה בשו"ע הגר"ז (סי' שלו סי' ד) שאם משתמש בירק המחובר לא יזיזו בידו משום מוקצה. ע"ש.
5. כן הסביר הפרמ"ג (שם). אמנם עיין בלבושי שרד על המג"א שם.
6. א"ר (סי' שיש סי' יג)
7. תוספת שבת (שם סי' יא) ובבגדי ישע שם וכן במאמר"ר שם (סי' ט) וכ"כ הערוך השלחן שם (סי' ט) ועוד.
8. משנ"ב שם (סי' יט) וע"ש בשער הציון (סי' כב) ועוד בשער הציון (סי' שלו סי' מב).
9. וכן ראה שם במשנ"ב (סי' יז) שיקנה בעשבים דלא הוי מוקצה.
10. ע"י במאמר כאן וכן באחרות חיים (הלכות שבת אות שסג) ובחידושי הר"ן כאן. וכן בפסקי הרי"א הנדמ"ח (סוף פ"ח דשבת, דף קפג ע"ב בדפדפ"ס) וכן בפסקי הרי"ד שם (עמי שנו) והובאו דבריהם בשו"ת יביע אומר ח"ה (חאו"ח סי' כו אות ב). ע"ש.
11. רמ"א בהגה (סי' שלו סי' א)
12. משנ"ב שם (סי' יג)
13. ט"ז (שם סי' ב). וכן ראה דברי הטי"ז שם (סי' י)
14. ע"י פרמ"ג (סי' שלו במשנ"ב סוס"ק ד וסי"ק ו). וכן בשביתת השבת (מלאכת קוצר סי' כ)
15. א"ר (סי' שלו סי' ג)
16. ע"י בתוספת שבת שם (סי' ד) ובבגדי ישע שם וכן בנהר שלום שם (סי' ג). וכן ראה בברכ"י (שו"ב סי' שלו אות א) באריכות. וע"י מש"כ עליו בפתח הדביר שם (אות א).
17. וכן פסק להקל בערוה"ש (סי' שלו סי"ז). וכן ראה לרבי יהודה עייאש בשו"ת בית יהודה ח"א (חאו"ח סי' יא).
18. שם (סי' טו). ע"ש.
19. ע"י ערוה"ש (סי' שח סו"ס מו)
20. שש"כ (פרק כו אות כ, עמי שלא) ובס' מנוחת אהבה (פרק יג אות ו, וע"ש בהערה 17 אריכות דברים בענין זה).
21. בס' שלמי יהודה (פ"י הערה ד, עמי ר) [= שלחן שלמה (סי' שיש סי' ב' אות ד)]. וכן ראה בס' קובץ מאמרים בעניני חשמל בשבת (מאמר מקרר חשמלי בשבת הערה 2, עמי 11) [= שו"ת מנחת שלמה ח"א (סי' י, עמי עח) ושלחן שלמה (סי' שיש סי' ב' אות א)].
22. בס' שלמי יהודה (פ"י הערה ד, עמי ר) ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Remedy for the soul, Remedy for the body

Rav Huna noticed that his son, Rabba, did not often go and study with Rav Chisda, although Rav Chisda was known to be a sharp teacher. When Rav Huna asked his son why he did not take advantage of the opportunity to study with such a great scholar as Rav Chisda, Rabba told his father that Rav Chisda had provided valuable "medical advice" to him, and he felt that it was not worth his while to go and hear mundane matters. Rav Huna quickly corrected his son,

and told him that the matters which Rav Chisda had discussed were the very essence of what affects people's lives, and that information was even more valuable than Torah teachings.

The intent of Rav Huna's advice to his son was that because Rav Chisda was teaching critical medical advice about preserving one's health, the words of Rav Chisda were not mere idle worldly comments, but they were Torah itself. "For it (the Torah) is your very life" (Devarim 30:20), and we can therefore consider every effort to maintain proper health as the fulfillment of Torah.

The Gemara (Bava Kamma 100a) expounds upon the verse in Parashas Yisro

where Yisro addressed Moshe and advised him to set up systems to promote the community of the Jews and their various needs (Shemos 18:20): "והודעת להם – and you shall make it known to them". We are taught that this refers to "בית חייהם – the livelihood" of the Jews. Rashi explains that this refers specifically to the professions and trades by which the Jews would earn their living. We see, therefore, that caring for the physical welfare of a Jew is Torah. Moshe was told by Yisro that it was his responsibility, as leader of the Jews, to see to it that the Jews provided training for people to be able to support themselves. ■

