

6 Tammuz 5780  
June 28, 2020



Shabbos Daf 114

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

We learned elsewhere in a *Mishna*: A grease stain upon a saddle constitutes an interposition. [*When an article is tamei and requires immersion, nothing may interpose between it and the water; otherwise, the immersion is invalid. With respect to stains, if one generally objects to them, they are an interposition; if not, they are not an interposition. A grease stain belongs to the former category.*] Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Only if it is as much as an Italian *issar* (approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an inch). On garments - if the stain is on one side, it does not interpose; if it is on both sides, it interposes. Rabbi Yehudah said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: Even on one side it interposes.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish inquired of Rabbi Chanina: In the case of a saddlecloth (according to R' Yishmael), can the stain be on one side (to interpose), or must it be on both sides?

He said to him: I have not heard this, but have heard something similar, for we learned in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Yosi said: The garments of *bana'in* - a stain even on one side (interposes); of a boor, (only a stain) on both sides (interposes). And surely a saddle does not stand higher than the garment of an ignoramus!

What are *bana'in*? Rabbi Yochanan said: These are scholars, who are engaged all their days in the upbuilding of the world.

And Rabbi Yochanan also said: Who is the scholar to whom a lost article is returned on his visual recognition of it (even

without providing proof that he is the owner)? It is that scholar who is particular to turn his shirt around (if it was put on inside out).

And Rabbi Yochanan also said: Who is the scholar that is appointed a leader of the community? It is one whom they ask him something in any area, and he can reply to it. This applies even if he is learning the Tractate of Kallah (a relatively unknown one).

And Rabbi Yochanan also said: Who is the scholar whose work it is the duty of his townspeople to perform? It is he who abandons his own interest and engages in Heavenly matters; yet that is only to provide for his bread.

Rabbi Yochanan also said: Who is a scholar? It is one whom they ask him something in any area, and he can reply to it. In respect of what practical matter is this stated? It is to appoint him a leader of the community: if he is well versed only in one Tractate, (he can be appointed) in his own town; if it is in the entire Talmud, (he can be appointed) as the head of an academy.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said (regarding *bana'in*): This material of *olyarin* (cloaks which would be given to people by the bathhouse attendants) that are imported from beyond the sea (are the garments that the *Mishna* rules that a stain - even on one side - is deemed an interposition).

The *Gemora* asks: Shall we say that they are white (for only then would people be bothered by a slight stain)? But

didn't Rabbi Yannai request the following to his sons, "My sons, do not bury me either in black shrouds or white shrouds; 'not in black,' for I may be worthy (*of a place with the righteous in the World to Come*) and I would be like a mourner among bridegrooms, and 'not in white,' for perhaps I might not be worthy and would be like a bridegroom among mourners; rather, bury me with the cloaks of *olyarin* (*which are red*) that are imported from beyond the sea." This evidently proves, does it not, that these are colored?

The *Gemora* answers: This is not difficulty, for Rabbi Yannai was indeed referring to cloaks (*which are red*), while Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish was referring to linens on a table (*also from olyarin, which are black*). (114a)

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *The olah of each Shabbos on its Shabbos*. This teaches concerning the fats of the *Shabbos* that they may be offered (*burnt*) on *Yom Kippur*. One might think that those of *Yom Kippur* (*can*) also (*be burnt*) on *Shabbos*, therefore it is stated: *on its Shabbos*; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva said: *The olah of each Shabbos on its Shabbos*. This teaches concerning the fats of *Shabbos* that they can be offered on a Festival. One might think that they may be offered on *Yom Kippur* as well; therefore it is stated: *on its Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* notes: When you delve into the matter, according to Rabbi Yishmael's opinion, vows and donated offerings may be sacrificed on a Festival, therefore the verse is required in respect of *Yom Kippur*. But according to the view of Rabbi Akiva, vows and donated offerings

<sup>1</sup> In the evening prayer. When a Festival falls on Sunday, havdalah is recited in the evening to signify that there is a distinction between the holiness of the *Shabbos* and that of Festivals.

<sup>2</sup> Since he maintains that the fats of the *Shabbos* may not be burnt on *Yom Kippur* and vice versa, he evidently holds that they each enjoy equal sanctity. Therefore neither havdalah nor the sounding of the shofar is required, for these are necessary only to mark a difference in the degree of sanctity.

cannot be sacrificed on a Festival; therefore the verse is required to permit (the burning of the fats on) Festivals.

Rabbi Zeira said: When I was in Bavel I thought, that which was taught: If *Yom Kippur* fell on the eve of the *Shabbos* [Friday], it [the shofar] was not sounded, while [if it fell] at the termination of the *Shabbos*, havdalah was not recited,<sup>1</sup> is a unanimous opinion. But when I emigrated there [to Eretz Yisroel], I found Yehudah the son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazzi sitting and saying: This is according to Akiva [only];<sup>2</sup> for if [it agrees with] Rabbi Yishmael, — since he maintains: The fats of the *Shabbos* may be offered on *Yom Kippur*, let it [the shofar] be sounded, so that it may be known that the fats of the *Shabbos* can be offered on *Yom Kippur*,<sup>3</sup> whereupon I said to him: The Kohanim<sup>4</sup> are zealous.<sup>5</sup>

Mar Kashisha son of Rav Chisda said to Rav Ashi: Do we then say, Kohanim are zealous? Surely we learnt: Three [blasts were blown] to cause the people to cease work; three, to distinguish between the holy [day] and weekdays?<sup>6</sup> — As Abaye answered: It was for the rest of the people in Yerushalayim; so here too it was for the rest of the people in Yerushalayim.

Yet let it [the shofar] be blown, so that they might know that the trimming of vegetables is permitted [on *Yom Kippur*] from the [time of] minchah and onwards?<sup>7</sup> Said Rav Yosef: Because a shevus<sup>8</sup> is not superseded in order to

<sup>3</sup> For the sounding of the shofar would teach that *Yom Kippur* possessed a lower degree of holiness.

<sup>4</sup> Who burn the fats.

<sup>5</sup> They take care to know the law and need no reminder.

<sup>6</sup> This was done in the Temple, and he assumed that it was in order to remind the priests

<sup>7</sup> In this it differs from the *Shabbos*, when it is forbidden.

<sup>8</sup> A Rabbinic ordinance.



give permission.<sup>9</sup>

While Rav Shisha son of Rav Idi answered: A shevus [of] immediate [importance] was permitted; a shevus [of] distant [importance] was not permitted.<sup>10</sup> But did they permit a shevus [of] immediate [importance]? Surely we learnt: If a Festival falls on Friday, we sound [the shofar] but do not recite havdalah,<sup>11</sup> [if it falls] at the termination of the Shabbos, we recite havdalah<sup>12</sup> but do not sound [the shofar]. But why so: let it be sounded so that it may be known that killing [animals for food] is permitted immediately [the Shabbos ends]?<sup>13</sup> Rather it is clear that it is as Rav Yosef [answered].

Rabbi Zeira said in Rav Huna's name — others state, Rabbi Abba said in Rav Huna's name: If Yom Kippur falls on the Shabbos, the trimming of vegetables is forbidden. Rabbi Mana said: It was taught likewise: How do we know that if Yom Kippur falls on the Shabbos, the trimming of vegetables<sup>14</sup> is forbidden? Because it is said: Shabbason; it is a shevus.<sup>15</sup> Now, in respect of what [is it stated]: shall we say. In respect of labor<sup>16</sup> — surely it is written, you shall not do any work? Hence it must surely refer to the trimming of vegetables; this proves it.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If Yom Kippur falls on the Shabbos, the trimming of vegetables is permitted. An objection is raised: How do we know that if Yom Kippur falls on the Shabbos, the trimming of vegetables is forbidden? Because Shabbason is stated:

<sup>9</sup> But only where it is necessary to emphasize prohibitions, e.g., if Friday is a Festival, so that many things permitted thereon are forbidden on the Shabbos.

<sup>10</sup> If it were of immediate importance, the shevus would have been permitted. But in any case when Yom Kippur falls on Friday, the vegetables, even if trimmed, cannot be cooked on the Shabbos. So that the sounding of the shofar would only be of importance for subsequent Yom Kippurs, and in such a case the shevus is not superseded.

<sup>11</sup> On Friday evening, because havdalah is recited only when a more stringent holiness is left behind.

it is a shevus. In respect of what: shall we say in respect of labor, — surely it is written: 'you shall not do any work'? Hence it must surely refer to the trimming of vegetables! — No: in truth it refers to actual work, but [it is stated] to [show that] one violates an affirmative and a negative injunction on account thereof.

It was taught in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan: If Yom Kippur falls on the Shabbos, the trimming of vegetables is permitted. Nuts may be cracked and pomegranates scraped from the [time of] minchah and onwards, on account of one's vexation.<sup>17</sup> The household of Rav Yehudah trimmed cabbage. Rabbah's household scraped pumpkins. Seeing that they were doing this [too] early, he said to them: A letter has come from the west in Rabbi Yochanan's name [to the elect] that this is forbidden. (114a – 115a)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, EILU KESHARIM

DAILY MASHAL

The Gemora states: Rabbi Yochanan said: Who is the scholar to whom a lost article is returned on his visual recognition of it (*even without providing proof that he is the owner*)? It is that scholar who is particular to turn his shirt around (*if it was put on inside out*). A person who pays attention to turn his shirt around when it is necessary, this is someone who we trust with his definite visual recognition of an object.

<sup>12</sup> On Saturday evening.

<sup>13</sup> For the preparation of food is permitted on Festivals.

<sup>14</sup> I.e., cutting away those parts of vegetables which are not edible. The reference is of course to unattached vegetables.

<sup>15</sup> Here it is translated as resting, and thus intimates such labor as trimming vegetables.

<sup>16</sup> I.e., the word forbids actual labor, e.g. the trimming of vegetables that are still attached to the soil. — The discussion here treats of vegetables already cut off from the ground.

<sup>17</sup> It would be very vexing if the breaking of the Fast had to be delayed while these are prepared.



The Gemora in Gittin (27b) rules: We would return a Get to a Rabbinical scholar, but not to an ordinary person. Tosfos notes that although anyone is capable of definite visual recognition of an object, we only accept a claim from a Rabbinical scholar. This is on account of his scrupulous honesty; this gives him credibility when he claims that he recognizes the Get.

Bechor Shor asks: Tosfos seems to indicate that everyone has a definite visual recognition of an object; we just do not trust someone who is not a Rabbinic scholar as we suspect that he is lying. Accordingly, why do we need to prove anything from the fact that he is particular to turn his shirt around?

He answers that a Rabbinic scholar who is occupied in his Torah studies, we would think that he is inferior than an unlearned person, for he is not particular in his clothing and belongings; it is because of this that we need to prove from his being particular to turn his shirt around, that nevertheless, he pays attention to this and we therefore know for certain that he has a definite visual recognition of an object.