

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

20 Elul 5769

Bava Basra Daf 19

Sept. 9, 2009

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
HaRav Refoel Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel o"n.

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.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Soaking and Scrubbing Pool

The *Mishna* had stated: He should not make a place to launder clothes there, unless he distanced it three *tefachim* from the wall of his neighbor's pit.

Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: The three *tefachim* mentioned here apply only to the soaking pool, but the scrubbing pool must be kept four *amos* from the wall (*on account of the splashing*).

The *Gemora* cites a supporting *braisa*: The launderer's pool must be kept four *amos* away. But did we not learn that three *tefachim* is sufficient? This shows that the *Mishna* must be understood as Rav Nachman has explained.

Some put this in the form of a contradiction as follows: We learned in our *Mishna*: He should not make a place to launder clothes there, unless he distanced it three *tefachim* from the wall of his neighbor's pit. But does not a *braisa* say that four *amos* are necessary?

Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: There is no contradiction. The *Mishna* is speaking about the soaking pool and the *braisa* is dealing with the scrubbing pool.

Rav Chiya the son of Rav Avya taught a *braisa* that explicitly stated like Rav Nachman: unless he distanced his soaking pool three *tefachim* from the wall of his neighbor's pit. (19a)

Distancing and Plastering

The *Mishna* had stated: A person should not dig a circular pit next to that of his friend, unless he distanced his pit three *tefachim* from the wall of his neighbor's pit and he puts plaster on the inside of his pit.

The *Gemora* inquires: Are both steps (*distancing his pit, plus applying plaster*) required, or is either one of them sufficient?

The *Gemora* initially thinks that it is obvious that both are necessary, for otherwise, the *Mishna* should have combined this case together with the next cases of the *Mishna* (olive refuse etc.), where there it explicitly states that one may either distance the hazard, or he may apply plaster to the wall. However, the *Gemora* rejects this, for perhaps they are separated because one case involves a damage due to moisture and the other is dealing with damage because of heat.

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah says: If they both have fields that have ground so soft that it comes away in their

hands, they can each dig their pits on each side and distance three *tefachim* and plaster their pits. Seemingly, only this type of soil requires both; however, in an ordinary case, either option would be sufficient.

The *Gemora* rejects this proof, for perhaps the *halachah* would apply even with ordinary soil. It had to say this case, as one might think they should have to distance themselves even further with this type of soil. This is why it said that even with this type of soil, only three *tefachim* is necessary. (19a)

Flint Stones and Sand

The *Mishna* had stated: One must distance his olive refuse, manure, salt, plaster, and flint stones (*all things which generate heat*) from a wall belonging to his friend a distance of three *tefachim*, or he should put plaster inside.

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* in *Shabbos* (47b): One may not insulate food before *Shabbos* with materials that generate heat, such as olive refuse, manure, salt, plaster, and wet or dry sand.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it that here flint stones are included in the list and not sand, and there sand is included and not flint stones?

Rav Yosef answered: It is because it is not usual to insulate food in flint stones.

Abaye asked him: And is it usual to insulate food in woolen shearings and strips of purple wool? And yet these are mentioned in a *braisa*, which says: Food may be insulated in woolen shearings, combed wool, strips of purple wool and fluff, but these things must not be moved on *Shabbos* (*on account of muktzah*)!?

Rather, said Abaye in explanation of the *Mishna*: *Its friend sheds light on the other*. That which our *Mishna* taught in connection with flint stones is also to be applied to sand, and that which was taught in connection with sand in the other *Mishna* is also to be applied to flint stones.

Rava asked him: If *its friend sheds light on the other*, let the *Mishna* mention the whole list in one place and only one item in the other, allowing us to understand that the same rule applies to the rest?

Rather, said Rava, the reason why flint stones are not mentioned in connection with *Shabbos* is because they are liable to break the pot if used for insulation, and the reason why sand is not mentioned here is because while it makes hot things hotter, cold things (*like the wall*) remain cold.

The *Gemora* asks: But Rabbi Oshaya included sand in his *braisa* in the list of things that have to be kept away from the boundary?

The *Gemora* answers: He was speaking of things which produce moisture. (19a)

Explaining the Restrictions

The *Mishna* had stated: One must distance seeds, his plow, and urine three *tefachim* from the wall of his friend.

The *Gemora* asks: Cannot seeds be inferred from the restriction against a plow (*for they are planted in plow furrows*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* is referring to seeds that are dropped into the ground by hand.

The *Gemora* asks: Cannot the restriction against a plow be inferred from seeds (for one plows in order to plant seeds)?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* can be referring to the plowing done for trees.

The *Gemora* asks: Cannot both be inferred from the restriction against water?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Tanna* is speaking of *Eretz Yisroel*, of which it is written: *It drinks the water of the rain of heaven (and it does not need to be irrigated)*.

The *Gemora* notes: Our *Mishna* would imply that seeds spread their roots sideways (*and that is how the wall can be damaged*). How is it then that we have learned in a *Mishna*: If a man bends over a vine and plants it in the earth, if there are not three *tefachim* of earth over it (*the part of the vine that is under the ground*), he must not plant a seed on top of it (*for that would be kilayim*). And to this a *braisa* was taught: But he may plant all around it! [*Evidently, the seeds do not spread their roots sideways!?*]

Rabbi Chaga answered in the name of Rabbi Yosi: The reason one is forbidden from planting seeds near a wall is because the seeds break up the soil underneath it and brings up loose earth (*which consequently causes the wall to weaken*). (19a – 19b)

Distancing Urine from a Wall

The *Mishna* had stated: One must distance his urine three *tefachim* from the wall of his friend.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah said: It is permissible for a man to urinate on the side of another man's wall, as it is written: *And I will cut off from Achav's house every one that urinates against the wall (every man) and the wealth that is stored in houses, and the animals that are left in the fields of Israel.* [*Evidently, urinating by a wall was common practice!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: our *Mishna* is discussing urine which is poured from a pot (*and then it requires distancing from a wall*).

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: A man should not urinate on the side of another man's wall unless he keep three *tefachim* away. This is the rule for a wall of brick, but if it is a wall of stone, he should keep away only so far as not to do any damage. How much is this? A *tefach*. If the wall is of hard stone, it is permitted. This surely refutes the ruling of Rabbah bar bar Chanah!

The *Gemora* asks: But Rabbah bar bar Chanah based himself upon a scriptural verse?

The *Gemora* answers: The meaning of the verse is this: Even something whose way is to urinate against a wall, I will not leave him (*Achav*). And what is this? A dog. (19b)

Lessening the Size of a Window

Rav Tuvi bar Kisna said in the name of Shmuel: A thin wafer does not lessen the size of an opening (*food will not diminish the size of an opening since there is a good possibility that it will be removed to be eaten; the tumah in one room will be transmitted to the other room through the window which is larger than one tefach by one tefach*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why a thin one? The same can be said even of a thick one!?

The *Gemora* answers: He had no need to state the obvious ruling. It goes without saying in the case of a thick cake that since it is fit for food, the owner does not abandon it in the window (*and therefore it does not lessen the window space*), but with a thin one, since it soon becomes repulsive (*due the moisture in the wall*), I might think that he abandons it there. Therefore Shmuel teaches us that even a thin wafer does not lessen the window space.

The *Gemora* asks: Shouldn't Shmuel's *halachah* be derived from the fact that a wafer is a thing which is susceptible to *tumah*, and the rule is that anything which is susceptible to *tumah* cannot form a partition to prevent the transmission of *tumah*?

The *Gemora* answers: He was referring to a wafer which was kneaded with fruit juice (*and not water; fruit juices is not one of the seven liquids that can make a food item susceptible to tumah*). (19b)