

13 Tammuz 5780
July 5, 2020



Shabbos Daf 121

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

Now, does then Rabbi Yosi hold, tevillah in its [due] time is a mitzvah? Surely it was taught: A zav and a zavah, a male metzora and a female metzoraas, he who cohabits with a niddah, and he who is defiled through a corpse, [perform] their tevillah by day.¹ A niddah and woman in confinement [perform] their tevillah at night.² A ba'al keris must proceed with tevillah at any time of the day.³ Rabbi Yosi said: [If the mishap happened] from minchah and beyond he need not perform tevillah.⁴ — [The author of] that is Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah who maintained: [One] tevillah at the end suffices for her.⁵ (121a)

MISHNAH: If a gentile comes to extinguish, we do not say to him, ‘extinguish it’ or ‘do not extinguish,’ because his resting is not our obligation.⁶ But if a minor comes to extinguish, we must not permit him, because his resting is our obligation. (121a)

¹ The seventh day from their tumah. They can perform tevillah any time after dawn, even if it is not yet seven full days of twenty-four hours each from the time of their tumah, and even if this falls on Yom Kippur.

² The evening following the day which completes their period of tumah, the full period being required in their case. This holds good even if the evening belongs to Yom Kippur.

³ Lit., ‘the whole day’. Even if he discharged semen in the late afternoon of Yom Kippur, he may perform tevillah on the same day and need not wait for the evening, because tevillah in its right time is obligatory.

⁴ Because tevillah at its right time is not obligatory, which is the point of the objection. The circumstances here are that he has already recited all the prayers of the day, or at least minchah, while the ne'ilah (concluding) service may be recited at night.

⁵ The reference is to a woman who gave birth without knowing exactly when, what, and whether it was with or without a zivah

GEMARA: Rabbi Ammi said: In the case of a fire, they [the Rabbis] permitted one to announce, ‘Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby].’ Shall we say that this supports him: If a gentile comes to extinguish, we do not say to him, ‘extinguish it’ or ‘do not extinguish,’ because his resting is not our obligation: thus we [merely] may not say to him, Extinguish [it],’ but we may say, ‘Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby].’ Then consider the second clause: We do not say to him.... do not extinguish but neither may we say to him, ‘Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby]?’⁷ Rather no deduction can be made from this.⁸ (121a)

Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a fire broke out in the courtyard of Yosef ben Simai in Shichin, and the men of the garrison at Tzipori came to extinguish it, because

discharge. The first view is that all possibilities must be taken into account and she must perform tevillah at the due times posited by these. Rabbi Yosi ben Rabbi Yehudah, however, rules that a single tevillah, performed at the end of the whole period that is in doubt, is sufficient, though actually the right time may have been earlier, for in any case tevillah at the time when it becomes due is not obligatory.

⁶ It is not the duty of Jews to see that he rests on the Shabbos, hence we need not forbid him. On the other hand by Rabbinical law one must not instruct a Gentile to work — hence we may not tell him to extinguish the fire.

⁷ For the second clause merely states that it is unnecessary to stop him, which implies, however, that one must not give him a hint to extinguish.

⁸ For one clause of the Mishnah must be exact, even in respect of its implication, whereas the other clause is not to be stressed so far, and it is not known which is exact.

he was a steward of the king. But he did not permit them, in honor of the Shabbos, and a miracle happened on his behalf, rain descended and extinguished [it]. In the evening he sent two sela to each of them, and fifty to their captain. But when the Sages heard of it they said: He did not need this, for we learnt: If a gentile comes to extinguish, we do not say to him, 'extinguish it' or 'do not extinguish.' But if a minor comes to extinguish, we must not permit him, because his resting is our obligation. You may infer from this [that] if a minor eats nevelos,⁹ it is the duty of Beis Din to restrain him? — Said Rabbi Yochanan: This refers to a minor acting at his father's desire.¹⁰ Then by analogy, in respect to the Gentile, he [too] acts at the Jew's desire: is this permitted? — A Gentile acts at his own desire.¹¹ (121a)

MISHNAH: A dish may be inverted over a lamp, that the beams should not catch [fire], and over an infant's excrement, and over a scorpion that it should not bite. Rabbi Yehudah said: an incident came before Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai in Arab, and he said, I fear on his account [that he may be liable to] a chatas-offering.¹² (121a)

GEMARA: Rav Yehudah and Rav Yirmiyah bar Abba and Rav Chanan bar Rava visited the home of Avin of Nashikiya. For Rav Yehudah and Rav Yirmiyah bar Abba couches were brought; for Rav Chanan bar Rava none was brought.¹³

⁹ Or any forbidden food.

¹⁰ But where he acts entirely of his own accord it may not be so.

¹¹ Though he knows that the Jew too desires it, he may nevertheless act on his own accord. But a minor is more likely to be directly influenced by what he understands to be his father's wish.

¹² Since the snake was not pursuing him, his action may constitute trapping, which involves a chatas-offering.

¹³ And as such, he needed to sit on the ground.

¹⁴ To prevent him from dabbling with it.

¹⁵ This remark was made in anger at his host's discourtesy.

¹⁶ Sc. Friday; thus it is newly-created, as it were, on the Shabbos (technically called nolad), and as such may not be handled.

¹⁷ On the Shabbos or Festival an article may be carried, where carrying is permitted through an eruv, only where its owner may go, i.e., it is 'as the feet of its owner'. But this does not apply to

Now, he found him reciting to his son: 'and over an infant's excrement', on account of the infant.¹⁴ [Rav Chanan bar Rava] said to him, 'Avin! A fool recites nonsense to his son:¹⁵ surely that itself is fit for dogs! And should you say that it was not fit for him from yesterday,¹⁶ surely it was taught: Flowing rivers and gushing springs are as the feet of all men?¹⁷ Then how shall I recite it? — Say: Over the excrement of fowls, on account of an infant.¹⁸ But deduce it¹⁹ because it is [as] a vessel for excrements.²⁰ And should you answer that the vessel of excrements is only [permitted] in virtue of the utensil, yet that itself may not [be carried out], — but a mouse was found in Rav Ashi's spices, and he said to them [his servants], 'Take it by the tail and throw it out?' — This refers to a dung heap. But what business has an infant with a dung heap? — It is in the courtyard. But in a courtyard too it is a vessel of excrements? — It refers to a dung heap in the courtyard. (121a – 121b)

The Mishnah had stated: And over a scorpion that it should not bite. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: All [animals, etc.] that cause injury²¹ may be killed on the Shabbos. Rav Yosef objected: Five may be killed on the Shabbos, and these are they: the Egyptian fly, the wasp of Nineveh, the scorpion of Chadyav, the snake in Israel, and a mad dog anywhere. Now, who [is the authority?] Shall we say it is Rabbi Yehudah? Surely he maintains: One is guilty on account of a labor not required for itself? Hence it must be Rabbi

the water of a flowing river, and every man may carry it wherever he himself may go, though not all may go to the same place. Now, that which comes on the Shabbos from outside the techum may not be taken anywhere within the techum. But although the water of a flowing river does come from outside, it may be carried within. This shows that though that particular water was not there on the Friday, it is regarded as fit on the Shabbos, because it was naturally expected. Hence the same applies to the excrement: though it did not exist before the Shabbos, it was expected, and therefore may be handled, seeing that it can be put to a legitimate use.

¹⁸ But this may not be handled itself, because it is not fit for dogs.

¹⁹ That one may carry it.

²⁰ Which may be cleared away on account of its repulsiveness.

²¹ I.e., that are lethal.

Shimon, and only these are permitted, but not others? — Said Rabbi Yirmiyah: And who tells us that this is correct: perhaps it is corrupt? Said Rav Yosef: I recited it and I raised the objection, and I can answer it: This is where they are pursuing him, and is unanimous.²² (121b)

A teacher of Baraisos recited before Rabbah son of Rav Huna: If one kills snakes or scorpions on the Shabbos, the spirit of the pious is displeased with him. He retorted: And as to those pious men, the spirit of the Sages is displeased with them. Now, he disagrees with Rav Huna, for Rav Huna saw a man kill a wasp. Said he to him, 'Have you wiped them all out?'²³ (121b)

Our Rabbis taught: If one chances upon snakes and scorpions, and he kills them, it is manifest that he had chanced upon them in order to kill them; if he does not kill them, it is manifest that he had chanced upon them that they should kill him, but that a miracle was performed by Heaven on his behalf. Ulla said: — others state, Rabbah bar Chanah said in Rabbi Yochanan's name — That is when they hiss at him.²⁴ (121b)

Rabbi Abba bar Kahana said: One [of them] once fell in the Beis Hamidrash, and a Nabatean arose and killed it. Said Rebbe: A similar one must have attacked him. The scholars asked: 'A similar one must have attacked him' [means] that he had done well, or not?²⁵ — Come and hear: For Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Chiya bar Abba, and Rabbi Zeira were sitting in the anteroom of Rabbi Yannai's academy, [when] The matter arose between them. [So] they asked Rabbi Yannai: May one kill snakes and scorpions on the Shabbos? Said he to them: I kill a wasp, how much more so snakes and scorpions! But perhaps that is (only) incidentally,²⁶ for Rav Yehudah said: One can tread down spittle

incidentally,²⁷ and Rav Sheishes said: One can tread down a snake incidentally, and Rav Katina said: One may tread down a scorpion incidentally. (121b)

Abba bar Martha, who is Abba bar Manyumi, owed money to the house of the Exilarch. [So] they brought him [before the Exilarch]; he distressed him [and] there was spittle lying on the ground, [whereupon] the Exilarch ordered, 'Bring a vessel and cover it'. Said he to them, 'You do not need this, [for] thus did Rav Yehudah say: One can tread down spittle incidentally.' 'He is a scholar,' remarked he [the Exilarch]; 'let him go'. (121b)

Rabbi Abba bar Kahana also said in Rabbi Chanina's name: The candelabras of Rebbe's household may be handled on the Shabbos. Rabbi Zeira asked him: [Does that mean] where they can be taken up with one hand, or [even] with two hands? Such as those of your father's house, he replied.

Rabbi Abba bar Kahana also said in Rabbi Chanina's name: The wagons of Rebbe's household may be handled on the Shabbos. Rabbi Zeira asked him: [Does that mean] those that can be moved with one hand, or [even] with two hands? Such as those of your father's house, replied he.

Rabbi Abba bar Kahana also said: Rabbi Chanina permitted Rebbe's household to drink wine [carried] in the wagons of non-Jews [sealed] with one seal, and I do not know whether it is because he agrees with Rabbi Eliezer²⁸ or because of the [non-Jew's] fear of the Nasi's household. (121b – 122a)

²² I.e., Rabbi Yehoshua's statement refers to this case. But in the Baraisa they are not pursuing him, and it is taught on Rabbi Shimon's view.

²³ Sarcastically. I.e., you have achieved nothing, and should not have done it on the Shabbos.

²⁴ Otherwise it is not to be assumed that they were meant to kill him.

²⁵ Did Rebbe speak seriously or sarcastically?

²⁶ Lit., 'in one's simplicity' — i.e., not intentionally, but in the course of his walking.

²⁷ Despite the possibility of levelling thereby some grooves in the soil.

²⁸ Who maintains that one seal is sufficient.