

9 Tammuz 5780
July 1, 2020



Shabbos Daf 117

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

One can save a scroll and Tefillin with their containers from a fire on *Shabbos*

The Mishna states that one can save the container of the scroll along with the scroll from a fire on *Shabbos*, and he can save the container of Tefillin along with the Tefillin. This can be done even if there is money inside the scroll or the Tefillin, despite the fact that money is muktzeh. He can save them to an unopened mavo. Ben Beseira posits that one can even save the scroll and Tefillin to an open mavo (116b)

A dispute regarding flaying the Pesach offering when the fourteenth of Nissan occurs on *Shabbos*

There is a dispute regarding flaying the Pesach offering when the fourteenth of Nissan occurs on *Shabbos*. Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah maintains that one can only flay the Pesach offering as far as the breast, whereas the Rabbis maintain that that one can flay the entire animal.

Rabbi Yishmael’s reasoning is that what is necessary for the Divine service has been achieved, i.e. flaying the animal for the sacrificial parts, whereas flaying the rest of the animal is deemed to be for personal use and is forbidden on *Shabbos*. The Rabbis, however, maintain that it is said (Mishlei 16:4) HaShem has done all for His sake.

Rav Yosef posits that it is not considered respectful to HaShem that the meat should spoil, and if one does not flay the entire animal, the heat of the hide will cause it to spoil, and it is despicable to have sacrificial meat that is spoiled.

Rava maintains that “for His sake” refers to the idea that sacrificial meat should not be left lying around like a dead

carcass.

The difference between these two opinions is when the meat is lying on a golden table and is no longer lying in a degraded manner. According to Rava, the Rabbis would accord with Rabbi Yishmael and they would forbid flaying the entire hide until nightfall. However, Rav Yosef would say that the Rabbis would still require that one flay the entire hide, because there is still the concern that the meat will spoil.

An alternative difference between the two opinions would be if the fourteenth of Nissan would be on a day when the northern wind is blowing. Rav Yosef would say that in such a situation the Rabbis would agree with Rabbi Yishmael and one would not to flay the entire animal, whereas Rava would say that there is still the concern that the sacrificial meat will be lying around like a dead carcass and the Rabbis would require that he flay the entire animal that day. (116b)

One is required to first flay the animal and then remove the sacrificial parts

Rabbi Yishmael maintains that the verse that states “HaShem has done all for His sake” teaches us that one cannot remove the sacrificial parts of the Pesach offering before flaying the hide up to the breast. The reason he must first flay the animal before removing the sacrificial parts is because some hairs of the animal will become stuck on the sacrificial parts when he removes the parts from the body, and it is not appropriate to offer these parts as a sacrifice. (116b)

According to the Rabbis flaying the animal for the sacrificial parts is only a Rabbinic prohibition



The *Gemora* elaborates on the dispute between Rabbi Yishmael and the Rabbis regarding flaying the Pesach offering when the fourteenth of Nissan occurs on *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* concludes that the Rabbis proved from that it permissible to flay the entire animal, because we learned in our *Mishna* that one can save the money together with the scroll, despite the fact that saving the scroll is a Divine need and saving the money is only for the owner's benefit. Similarly, one should be permitted to flay the entire Pesach offering even though the flaying beyond the breast is only a benefit for the owner. Although regarding the scroll and the money the concern is a Rabbinic nature because of *muktzeh*, whereas regarding the Peach offering the concern is a Biblical prohibition, we are discussing a case where he does not need the hide. When he flays the animal his intention is for the sacrificial parts and not for the hide, so the act an unintentional act and is only Rabbinically prohibited. Although it is inevitable here that he will have flayed the hide, the case we are discussing is when he removes the hide in thin pieces, thus performing the flaying in an unusual manner which is only Rabbinically prohibited. (116b-117a)

The explanation of an unopen *mavoi* and an open *mavoi*

The *Mishna* states the Rabbis allowed one to save a scroll to an unopen *mavoi* and Ben Beseirah maintains that once can save the scroll even to an open *mavoi*.

Rav Chisda explains the dispute to mean that that a *mavoi* with three walls and two *lechis* (*side post*) on each side of the entrance is deemed to be an unopen *mavoi* whereas three walls and one *lechi* on one side of the entrance is deemed to be an open *mavoi*. Both the Rabbis and Ben Beseirah accord with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer as the *Mishna* states that to allow carrying in a *mavoi*, Beis Shammai requires a *lechi* and a *korah* (*cross beam*). Beis Hillel requires a *lechi* or a *korah*, and Rabbi Eliezer maintains that the *mavoi* requires two *lechis*. Thus, the Rabbis will require two *lechis* even to save a scroll, whereas Ben Beseirah is lenient and posits that to save a scroll only one *lechi* is required.

Rabbah disagrees with Rav Chisda and he maintains that two walls and two *lechis* are deemed to be an unopen *mavoi* and

two walls and a one *lechi* is deemed to be an open *mavoi*. The Rabbis and Ben Beseirah will both accord with Rabbi Yehudah, as a *braisa* states that if one has two houses on opposite sides of a *reshus harabim* (*public domain*), he makes either a *lechi* at the end of each house or a *korah* at each end and that allows him to carry in the area in between the houses. The Sages disagreed with Rabbi Yehudah, as they maintain that one cannot suffice with *lechis* and *korahs* to adjust a *reshus harabim*. Thus, Rabbah explains that both the Rabbis and Ben Beseira agree with Rabbi Yehudah that when the *mavoi* has two walls one only needs a *lechi* at either end. The Rabbis require two *lechis* and Ben Beseirah only requires one *lechi* to save a scroll.

Rav Ashi posits that three walls and one *lechi* is deemed to be an unopen *mavoi*, whereas three walls and no *lechi* is called an open *mavoi*. Even according to Rabbi Eliezer who requires two *lechis*, that was only said regarding saving food and liquids, but when saving a scroll, one is only required to have one *lechi* according to the rabbis. According to Ben Beseirah, Rabbi Eliezer would not require any *lechi*. (117a-117b)

How much food can one save from a fire on *Shabbos*

Once can save from a fire enough food for three meals on *Shabbos*. He can save what is for people for people and what is for animals he can save for animals. If the fire occurred on Friday night before he ate, he can save enough for three meals. If the fire occurred *Shabbos* morning before mealtime, he can save enough food for two meals. If the fire broke out in the afternoon before he ate the final meal, he can save enough food for one meal. Rabbi Yosi, however, disagrees, and maintains that one can always save enough food for three meals. The reason for this is because Rabbi Yosi holds that food is not *muktzeh* and can only be saved into a courtyard that has an *eruv*. In fact, one would ideally be permitted to save more than three meals if not for a decree instituted by the Sages. For this reason, one can save three meals no matter when the fire broke out. (117b)

Decrees that prohibit one from saving more than three meals and saving spilled wine with more than one utensil



Rava said that the reason that one can only save three meals from a fire is because he is in a tumult over his potential loss of property and if we allow him to save more than three meals, he may come to extinguish the fire.

Abaye questioned this, because a *braisa* states that if a barrel of wine broke on one's rooftop, he is allowed to bring another barrel and place it underneath the broken barrel to catch the wine. He cannot, however, bring another utensil to catch the wine that is dripping out of the broken barrel, and he cannot take another utensil to catch the wine that is running off the edge of the roof. What was the reason for the decree there?

The *Gemora* answers that the reason he cannot bring more than one utensil is because the Sages were concerned that he may forget that it is *Shabbos* and he will carry a utensil in the *reshus harabim*. (117b)

Employing a subterfuge to catch wine of a barrel that broke

When a barrel of wine broke on one's rooftop, he can bring a utensil and place it under the barrel to catch the wine that is flowing from the broken barrel. He cannot, however, bring another utensil to catch the wine that is dripping out of the broken barrel, and he cannot take another utensil to catch the wine that is running off the edge of the roof. If guests arrive and he needs to serve them wine, he can bring another barrel to catch the wine dripping from the barrel and he can bring another utensil to catch the wine running off the roof. However, he cannot catch the wine and then invite guests. Rather, he must first invite the guests and then catch the wine. One is also not allowed to invite guests who have already eaten so that they will leave over the wine that he serves them. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that one is allowed to engage in such a trick.

The *Gemora* assumed that this dispute is similar to another dispute. A *braisa* states that if an animal and its offspring fall into a pit on Yom Tov, Rabbi Eliezer maintains that one can take one animal out of the pit with the intention of slaughtering it and then he is required to slaughter it, while he provides sustenance for the second animal inside the pit so it should not die. Rabbi Yehoshua, however, posits that he

can lift the first animal out of the pit with the intention of slaughtering it but he is not required to slaughter it, and he can then engage in a trick to take out the second animal (*he can say that the first animal was too thin and for that reason he prefers the second animal that is still in the pit.*) He can then choose which animal he wishes to slaughter. We can now assume that similar to this dispute regarding engaging in a trick with the animals, Rabbi Yehoshua would allow one to invite guests who do not plan on drinking the wine so that he can use more utensils to save the wine, whereas Rabbi Eliezer would prohibit him from engaging in trickery.

The *Gemora* answers that perhaps Rabbi Eliezer prohibited taking both animals out of the pit because he can provide sustenance for the animal in the pit, but regarding saving the wine he would allow the person to engage in a trick of inviting guests who have already eaten. And we can suggest that Rabbi Yehoshua allows one to take both animals out of the pit to alleviate distress to an animal, but concerning saving the wine there is no distress to an animal, so he would not allow one to engage in a trick. (117b)

More halachos regarding saving from a fire

If one saved from a fire bread made of fine flour for three meals, he cannot then save bread made from coarse flour (*this is because no one would say that he prefers coarse flour over fine flour*). If he saved coarse flour, however, he can then save bread made of fine flour. If a fire breaks out on Yom Kippur that occurs on Friday, he can save food for *Shabbos*, but if a fire breaks out on *Shabbos* and Yom Kippur occurs on Sunday, he cannot save food in order to break his fast. (*The reason for this is because after the fast he can obtain other food.*) It goes without saying that if Yom Tov occurs immediately following *Shabbos*, he cannot save food on *Shabbos* for the Yom Tov meals, because he is permitted to prepare new food on Yom Tov. He is also prohibited from saving food on one *Shabbos* for the following *Shabbos*, because he can prepare food during the week. (117b)