

22 Adar 5780
March 18, 2020



Shabbos Daf 12

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The academy of Rabbi Yishmael taught the following *braisa*: A man may go out with his *tefillin* on the eve of *Shabbos* near nightfall.

The *Gemora* asks: What’s the reason (that we are not concerned that he will not take them off in a public domain)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because Rabbah the son of Rav Huna said: A person must always touch his *tefillin* so that he realizes that he is wearing *tefillin* (*there is an argument between the Rosh and Shagas Aryeh regarding how to apply this in a practical sense*). Regarding the *tzitz* of the *Kohen Gadol*, it is said that the *tzitz* shall be on his forehead constantly, and this means that he should always be cognizant that he is wearing the *tzitz*. The *tzitz* has only one Name of Hashem on it, and the *Kohen Gadol* must be constantly aware that he is wearing the *tzitz*, so *tefillin*, which has numerous mentions of Hashem’s Name, certainly one must be aware at all times that he is wearing *tefillin*.

It was taught in a *braisa*: Chanania said: One must examine his garments on *Shabbos* eve before nightfall (to see if there is anything wrapped in them).

Rav Yosef observed: That is an important law for the *Shabbos*.

The *Mishna* had stated: One may not delouse his garments [and one may not read by the light of the lamp].

The scholars inquired: Does this mean that one may not delouse his garments (even) by day, lest he kill the louse, and this would agree with Rabbi Eliezer, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer said: If one kills a louse on the *Shabbos*, it is as though he killed a camel (and he is liable, for other Tannaim maintain that a louse is not included in the prohibition, for it is too small), while one may not read by the light of the lamp, lest he tilt it? Or perhaps, both are forbidden (only at night) lest he tilt the lamp?

The *Gemora* attempts to prove this from a *braisa*: One may not delouse his garments, nor read by the light of a lamp. [The *Gemora* assumes that they are both prohibited for the same reason.]

The *Gemora* asks: But is it stronger than our *Mishna* (which also states both prohibitions next to each other, and, nevertheless, the scholars inquired as to their respective reasons)?

The *Gemora* attempts to prove this from a *braisa*: One may not delouse his garments by the light of a lamp, nor read by the light of a lamp, and these are of the halachos stated in the upper chamber of Chananiah the son of Chizkiyah the son of Garon. This proves that both are on account lest he tilt the lamp; this indeed proves it.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: It is forbidden even to distinguish between one’s own garments and his wife’s (*by the light of a lamp*).

Rava said: That was stated only of the people who lived in Mechoza, but those of country folk are easily distinguished (*between those of a man and those of a woman*). And even in the case of the people who lived in Mechoza, this was stated only of old women; but those of young women are readily distinguishable. [*The garments of men in Mechoza were similar to those of the women; this was because the men did not perform menial labor, and they wore garments with wide sleeves. In rural areas, however, where the men worked in the field, their garments were much narrower, and were clearly distinguishable from those of the women.*]

Our Rabbis taught: One must not search [his garments] in the street out of decency. In like way Rabbi Yehudah-others state, Rabbi Nechemiah-said: One must not cause himself to vomit in the street, out of decency. Our Rabbis taught: If one searches his garments [on the Shabbos] he may press [the vermin] and throw it away, providing that he does not kill it. Abba Shaul said: He must take and throw it away, providing that he does not press it. Rav Huna said, The halachah is, he may press and throw it away, and that is seemly, even on weekdays. Rabbah killed them, and Rav Sheishes killed them. Rava threw them into a basin of water. Rav Nachman said to his daughters, 'Kill them and let me hear the sound of the hated ones.'

It was taught, Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: Vermin must not be killed on the Shabbos: this is the view of Beis Shammai; while Beis Hillel permit it. And Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said likewise on the authority of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel: One must not negotiate for the betrothal of children [girls], nor for a boy, to educate him and to teach him a trade, nor may mourners be comforted, nor may the sick be visited on the Shabbos; that is the ruling of Beis Shammai; but Beis Hillel permit it.

Our Rabbis taught: If one enters [a house] to visit a sick person [on the Shabbos], he should say, 'It is the Shabbos, when one must not cry out, and recovery will soon come.'

Rabbi Meir said, [One should say] 'It [the Shabbos] may have compassion.' Rabbi Yehudah said, 'May the Omnipresent have compassion upon you and upon the sick of Israel.' Rabbi Yosi said, 'May the Omnipresent have compassion upon you in the midst of the sick of Israel.'

Shevna, a citizen of Yerushalayim, on entering would say 'Peace'; and on leaving, 'It is the Shabbos, when one must not cry out and healing will soon come, His compassion is abundant and enjoy the Shabbos rest in peace.'

With whom does this dictum of Rabbi Chanina agree: One who has an invalid in his house should combine him with other Jewish sick? With whom? — With Rabbi Yosi.

Abbi Chanina also said: It was [only] with difficulty that comforting mourners and visiting the sick was permitted on the Shabbos.

Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said: When we followed Rabbi Elozar to inquire after a sick person, sometimes he would say to him, [in Hebrew], 'The Omnipresent visit you in peace'; at others, he said, [in Aramaic], 'The Omnipresent remember you in peace'. But how might he do thus: didn't Rav Yehudah say, One should never petition for his needs in Aramaic; and Rabbi Yochanan said: When one petitions for his needs in Aramaic, the Ministering Angels do not heed him, for they do not understand Aramaic? — An invalid is different, because the Divine Presence is with him. For Rabbi Anan said in Rav's name, How do you know that the Divine Presence supports an invalid? Because it is written, Hashem supports him upon the couch of languishing. It was taught likewise: One who enters [a house] to visit the sick may sit neither upon the bed nor on a seat, but must wrap himself about and sit in front of him, for the Divine Presence is above an invalid's pillow, as it is said, Hashem supports him upon the couch of languishing. And Rava said in Ravin's name: How do we know that the Holy One, Blessed be He, sustains the sick? Because it is said, Hashem supports him on the couch of languishing.



The Mishnah had stated: Nor must he read by the light of a lamp. Rava said: Even if it is as high as twice a man's stature, or as two ox-goats [height], or even as ten houses on top of each other.

One alone may not read, but for two [together] it is well? But it was taught: Neither one nor two! — Said Rabbi Elozar, There is no difficulty: the former refers to one subject; the latter to two.

Rav Huna said: But by [the light] of an open fire even ten people are forbidden. Said Rava: If he is an important man, it is permitted. An objection is raised: One must not read by the light of a lamp, lest he tilt [it]. Said Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha, 'I will read and will not tilt.' Yet once he read and wished to tilt. 'How great are the words of the Sages!' he exclaimed, 'who said, One must not read by the light of a lamp.' Rabbi Nassan said, He read and did tilt [it], and wrote in his note book, 'I, Yishmael ben Elisha, did read and tilt the lamp on the Shabbos. When the Temple is rebuilt I will bring a fat chatas-offering.' — Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha was different, since he treated himself as an ordinary person in respect to religious matters.

One [Baraisa] taught: An attendant may examine glasses and plates by the light of a lamp; and another taught: He must not examine [them]! There is no difficulty: one refers to a permanent attendant, the other to a temporary one. Alternatively, both refer to a permanent attendant yet there is no difficulty: one refers to [a lamp fed with] oil, the other to naphtha.

The scholars propounded: What of a temporary attendant and a [lamp fed with] oil?—Rav said: There is the halachah, but we do not teach thus. Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba said: There is the halachah and we teach it so. Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba chanced to visit Rav Assi. Now, his attendant arose and examined [the glasses] by candlelight. Thereupon his [Rav Assi's] wife said to him [Rav Assi], 'But you do not act thus!' 'Let him be,' he answered her, 'he holds with his master.'

The Mishnah had stated: In truth it was said, the chazzan etc., But you say in the first clause, [he] may see; Surely that means to read? -No: to arrange the beginnings of the sections. And Rabbah bar Shmuel said likewise: But he may arrange the beginnings of the sections; But not the whole section? An objection is raised: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: School children used to prepare their [Biblical] portions and read by lamplight? — There is no difficulty: I can answer either [that it means] the beginnings of the sections; or that children are different: since they are in awe of their teacher, they will not come to tilt it.