



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

Rabbah further stated: When we were at Rav Huna's we raised the question whether the benediction on the season (she'hechyanu) is to be recited on Rosh Hashanah and on Yom Kippur. Must it be recited [we argued] since [these solemn days] occur only periodically or is it possible that it is not to be said since they are not described in Scripture as 'festivals'? He was unable to give an answer. When I later arrived at Rav Yehudah's he stated: 'I recite the benediction on the season even over a new pumpkin. 'I do not ask', I told him, 'whether it is permitted [to recite this benediction]. What I ask is whether its recital is obligatory' 'Both Rav and Shmuel', he replied: 'ruled: The benediction on the season is recited only on the occasion of the three major festivals.'

An objection was raised: *Give a portion unto seven, and also to the eight*. Rabbi Eliezer explained: 'Seven' alludes to the seven days of the creation and 'eight' alludes to the eight days of circumcision. Rabbi Yehoshua explained: 'Seven' alludes to the seven days of the Passover and 'eight' alludes to the eight days of the festival of Tabernacles: and since Scripture says: and also', Sukkos, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur are also included. Now does not this inclusion refer to the benediction on the season? — No; [the reference is] to the benediction [on the sanctity of the day]. This may also be logically supported. For if it were to be assumed [that the reference is] to the benediction on the season [the objection could be advanced:] Is [the benediction on] the season recited all the seven [days of the festival]? — This is really no objection, since a person who did not recite the benediction on the proper day must do so on the following

or any subsequent day [of the festival]. At any event, however, [it may be objected] is not a cup of wine required? May it [thus] be suggested that this provides support for Rav Nachman who laid down: One may recite the benediction on the season even in the market-place? — This is no difficulty [at all, since the benediction on the season could be said] when one happens to have a cup of wine. This explanation is quite satisfactory as regards Sukkos and Rosh Hashanah; but how could one proceed on Yom Kippur? If [it be suggested that] one is to recite the benediction over the wine and drink it [the objection might be advanced:] Since the man recited the benediction on the season he has thereby accepted the obligation of the day and caused the wine to be forbidden to him; for did not Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba once say to Rav, 'Have you ceased from work?' And the latter replied: 'Yes, I have ceased'. [And if it be suggested that] one might recite the benediction over the wine and put it aside [it might be objected:] He who recites the benediction [over any food or drink] must taste it. [Should it be suggested that] one might give it to a child, [it could be retorted:] The law is not in agreement with Rav Acha bar Yaakov, since [the child] possibly might get used to it. Now what is [the decision] on this question? — The Rabbis sent av Yeimar the Elder to Rav Chisda on the eve of Rosh Hashanah. 'Go,' they said to him, 'observe how he acts in practice and come and tell us'. When [Rav Chisda] saw him he remarked: 'He who picks up a moist log desires to have a press on the spot'. Thereupon a cup of wine was brought to him [over which] he recited the kiddush and also the benediction on the season. And the law is that the benediction on the season is to be recited both on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.



And the law, furthermore, is that the benediction on the season may be said even in the street.

Rabbah further stated: When we were at Huna's we raised the question whether a student who kept a fast on the eve of the Shabbos must also complete it? He had no ruling on the subject. I appeared before Rav Yehudah and he also had no ruling on the subject. 'Let us', said Rabbah, 'consider the matter ourselves. It was in fact taught: If the Ninth of Av fell on a Shabbos¹ and, similarly, if the eve of the Ninth of Av fell on a Shabbos a man may eat and drink as much as he requires and lay on his table a meal as big as that of Solomon in his time. If the Ninth of Av fell on the Shabbos eve [food] of the size of an egg must be brought and eaten [before the conclusion of the day] so that one does not approach the Shabbos in a state of affliction'.

It was taught: Rabbi Yehudah stated: We were once sitting in the presence of Rabbi Akiva, and the day was a Ninth of Av that occurred on a Shabbos eve, when a lightly roasted egg was brought to him and he sipped it without any salt. And [this he did] not because he had any appetite for it but in order to show the students what the halachah was. Rabbi Yosi, however, ruled: The fast must be fully concluded. 'Do you not agree with the', said Rabbi Yosi to them, 'that when the Ninth of Av falls on a Sunday one must break off while it is yet day?' — 'Indeed [it is so]', they replied. 'What', he said to them, 'is the difference between beginning the Shabbos when one is in a state of affliction and between letting it out when one is in such a state?' 'If you allowed a person', they replied: 'to let it out [when in such a state] because he has eaten and drunk throughout the day, would you also allow a person to begin it when in a state of affliction, though he has not eaten or drunk all day?' And in connection with this Ulla said that the halachah is like Rabbi Yosi (who maintains that fasts must continue until nightfall, even on a Friday).

¹ Although one would normally must refrain from eating much during the last meal before Tisha b'Av known as the "seudah ha'mafsek" -- "meal that divides (between Erev Tisha b'Av and

The *Gemora* asks from a *Mishna*: Rabban Gamliel said that the Chachamim would never decree that the first day of the series of fasts should be on Rosh Chodesh, Chanukah, or Purim. If the fasts began already and one of the days of the fasts fell out on Rosh Chodesh, we would not interrupt the fasts. Rabbi Meir maintains that even though Rabban Gamliel said that they do not interrupt, he would admit that the fast should not be completed. This halachah is identical to a case where Tisha B'av fell on Erev Shabbos. And it was taught in a *braisa*: After the death of Rabban Gamliel, Rabbi Yehoshua entered to invalidate his ruling (to rule that the fast should be completed – even on Friday), when Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri stood up and exclaimed: I submit that "the body must follow the head" (referring to Rabban Gamliel). Throughout the lifetime of Rabban Gamliel we established the halachah in agreement with his view and now you wish to invalidate it? Yehoshua, we shall not listen to you, since the halachah has once been established in agreement with Rabban Gamliel! And there was not a single person who raised any objection whatever to this statement.

The *Gemora* answers: In the time of Rabban Gamliel, the people acted in agreement with the views of Rabban Gamliel, but in the time of Rabbi Yosi, they acted in agreement with the views of Rabbi Yosi.

The *Gemora* asks: And in the time of Rabban Gamliel, did the people act in agreement with the views of Rabban Gamliel? But it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Elazar ben Rabbi Tzadok said: I was of the sons of Sna'av from the tribe of Binyamin. One time Tisha B'av occurred on Shabbos and it was pushed off to Sunday. We fasted but did not complete the fast because it was our Yom Tov. [Rashi explains that the lottery for bringing the wood offering for that family was on the Tenth of Av during the days of Ezra, and it was a Yom Tov for them forever. It is

Tisha b'Av),” and one certainly does not eat on Tisha b'Av, when these days fall on Shabbos one can eat whatever they want. This is because we do not show signs of mourning on Shabbos.

evident that it is considered a valid fast even though it was not completed.] The reason [then was] that [the day had been their] festival, but on the eve of [their] festival they did complete the fast, did they not? Ravina replied: A festival of Rabbinic origin is different [from a Shabbos]. Since it is permitted to fast for a number of hours on the former it is also permitted to complete a fast on its eves; [but as regards] the Shabbos, since it is forbidden to fast on it even for a few hours, it is also forbidden to complete a fast on its eves.

'I have never heard', said Rav Yosef, 'that tradition'. Said Abaye to him, 'You yourself have told it to us and you said it in connection with the following: "No fast may be imposed upon the public on Rosh Chodesh etc." and it was in connection with this that you told us, "Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: This is the view of Rabbi Meir who laid it down in the name of Rabban Gamliel; but the Sages ruled: One must complete the fast". Now doesn't this refer to all the days mentioned? — No; only to Chanukah and Purim. This may also be supported by a process of reasoning for if it could have been presumed that the reference is to all the days mentioned [the objection would arise:] Didn't Rabbah ask [a question on the subject] from Rav Yehudah and the latter did not answer him? — But according to your view [wouldn't the following objection arise:] In view of Mar Zutra's exposition in the name of Rav Huna that the halachah is that one fasting [on a Shabbos eve] must complete the fast, why, when Rabbah asked [a question on the subject] from Rav Huna didn't the latter answer him? But [you would no doubt reply:] That question was asked before [Rav Huna] heard the ruling while his statement was made after he had heard it; so also here [one might explain] that the question was asked before [Rav Yehudah] heard it while his statement was made after he heard it', Mar Zutra made the following exposition in the name of Rav Huna: The halachah is [that those] fasting [on a Shabbos eve] must complete the fast.

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HAKOL ME'ARVIN

MISHNAH. He whom gentiles, or an evil spirit, have taken out [beyond the permitted Shabbos limit] has no more than four cubits [in which to move]. If he was brought back [he is regarded] as if he had never gone out. If he was taken to another town, or if he was put in a cattle-pen or in a cattle-fold, he may, ruled Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elozar ben Azayrah, move through the whole of its area; but Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva ruled: he has only four cubits [in which to move].

It once happened that they were coming from Plandrasin and while their ship was sailing on the sea, Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elozar ben Azayrah walked about throughout its area, but Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva did not move beyond four cubits because they desired to impose a restriction upon themselves.

Once [on a Shabbos eve] they did not enter the harbor until dusk. 'May we disembark?' they asked Rabban Gamliel. You may', he told them, 'for I have carefully observed [the distance from the shore and have ascertained] that before dusk we were already within the Shabbos limit'.

The Gemora cites three lists of three types of people who suffer calamities.

The first is a list of three situations that cause people to go crazy and go against Hashem. They are people who are oppressed by gentiles, evil spirits, and poverty. What difference does this make? — People should pray for mercy concerning these. Three do not see the face of Gehinnom (because they suffered so much in this world). They are people who are poor, people who have stomach (intestinal) illnesses, and people who owe people money. Some say this also applies to one who has a bad wife. The other opinion maintains that it is appropriate to divorce a bad wife. And the other? — It may sometimes happen that her kesuvah amounts to a large sum, or else, that he has children from her and is, therefore, unable to divorce her. In what practical respect does this matter? — In respect of

receiving [these afflictions] lovingly. Three types of people die suddenly, even while they are talking. They are: people who have a stomach illness, killed by an animal, or a type of mouth disease. In what respect can this information matter? — In that of making arrangements for their shrouds to be ready.

Rav Nachman stated in the name of Shmuel: If a man went out deliberately [beyond his Shabbos limit] he has only four cubits [in which to move]. Isn't this obvious? If one whom gentiles have taken out has only four cubits [in which to move], is there any necessity [to mention that one who] went out deliberately [is subject to the same restriction]? — Rather read: If he returned deliberately he has only four cubits [in which to move]. Have we not, however, learnt this also: 'If he was brought back by gentiles ['he is regarded] as if he had never gone out'; [from which it follows] that only if he was brought back he [is regarded] as if he had never gone out, but that if gentiles took him out and he returned of his own accord he has only four cubits? — Rather, read: If he went out of his own free will and was brought back by gentiles he has only four cubits [in which to move]. But have we not learnt this also: whom . . . have taken out and he was brought back [he is regarded] as if he had never gone out, [from which it is evident] that only he whom gentiles have taken out and also brought back [is regarded] as if he had never gone out, but that a man who went out of his own free will is not [so regarded]? — It might have been assumed that our Mishnah deals with two disconnected instances: [i] He whom the gentiles . . . have taken out and he has returned on his own has no more than four cubits; but [ii] if he went out on his own and was brought back by gentiles [he is regarded] as if he had never gone out. Hence we were informed [that the second clause is the conclusion of the first].

An enquiry was addressed to Rabbah: What is the ruling where a man had to attend to his needs? — Human dignity, he replied, is so important that it supersedes a negative precept of the Torah. The Nehardeans remarked:

If he is intelligent he enters into his original Shabbos limit and, once he has entered it, he may remain there.

DAILY MASHAL

There seems to be a contradiction in the Gemora. In the three lists, one of the types of people who go crazy and go against Hashem are people who are poor. On the other hand, people who are poor are also cited as one of the three who do not see the face of Gehinnom. How can it be that a person goes against Hashem, but will not see the face of Gehinnom?

The Maharsha answers that the people who are poor and who fight hard not to let it get to them and interfere with their service of Hashem are people who will not see the face of Gehinnom.

Alternatively, the Maharsha answers that this can be answered by the Gemora's question and answer. The Gemora asked, why is it important to note that these types of people go crazy and go against Hashem? The Gemora answers, this is to teach that one should daven for Heavenly mercy for such people. The Maharsha explains that if the prayer induces Heavenly mercy these people will not end up going against Hashem, and end up not even seeing the face of Gehinnom.