



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**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### **What’s a Garment?**

The *Mishna* stated that if *chatas* blood sprinkled on hides that had not yet been removed from an animal, they need not be washed. If it sprinkled on it after it was removed from the animal, Rabbi Yehudah says that it must be washed, while Rabbi Elozar says it need not be.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which provides the textual source for these parameters. The verse says that if the *chatas* blood sprinkles on the *beged* – clothing, *asher yizeh aleha* – that which it sprinkled on must be washed. Rabbi Yehudah says that the first word, *beged*, includes a proper article of clothing, while the second phrase includes even hides that have been removed. Hides which have not been removed are not washed, since the word *beged* excludes anything which is not fit to become impure. Rabbi Elozar says *beged* includes clothing from linen or wool, while the second phrase includes clothing made of other material. Rabbi Elozar says that hide, even removed, is not included, since the verse stipulates says *beged*, limiting the washing to something that can become impure, like a *beged*.

The *Gemora* offers a number of possible cases where Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yehudah differ:

Abaye says that they dispute whether one needs to wash material less than three square finger widths. Rabbi Yehudah, who only requires something to be *fit* to be impure, would require washing this small material, since it can become impure if someone planned to use it, while Rabbi Elozar, who requires it to actually be able to become impure, wouldn't require washing, since it currently cannot become impure.

Rava says they dispute the case of clothing that one planned to embroider. Since they plan to continue processing this clothing,

it is not currently considered complete, and cannot become impure. However, it is *fit* to become impure, since it can become impure if one decided to not embroider it.

Some say Rava says they dispute the case of a rug which one planned to embellish by cutting off the edges. Since he still plans more processing, it cannot currently become impure, but it is *fit* to become impure, since it can become impure if he decides not to cut off the edges.

The *Gemora* supports this classification of such a rug from a *braisa* in which Rabbi Shimon ben Menasia says that a rug that one planned to finish by cutting off the edges cannot yet become impure. (93b – 94a)

### **How Much?**

The *Mishna* stated that if part of a garment was sprinkled by *chatas* blood, only that part must be washed.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says the source for this is the verse which requires washing for *asher yizeh* – that which is sprinkled, limiting it to the area that was sprinkled. (94a)

### **What is Washable?**

The *Mishna* said that only a garment which is fit to become impure must be washed, and the *Gemora* notes that this follows Rabbi Yehudah's position above.

The *Mishna* says that only a garment which is fit to be washed must be washed, and the *Gemora* explains that this excludes a utensil, which is cleaned by simply scraping off their surface. (94a)

### Leather

The *Mishna* said that washing applies to a garment of cloth, goat hair, or leather, implying that all of these materials are washable.

The *Gemora* challenges the statement that leather is washable from a *braisa* about *Shabbos*. The *braisa* says that if a dirty liquid fell on a pillow, one may only scrape it off with a cloth, but if it fell on a leather pillow, one may rinse it off with water, implying that washing leather is not considered washing.

Abaye answers that the status of leather is a dispute between the Sages and *Acheirim* – others in a *braisa*. The Sages say that if blood of a *chatas* sprinkled on cloth or goat hair, one must wash it, but if it sprinkled on leather or a utensil, it only needs to be scraped off, but the others say that leather also must be washed. Abaye explains that Rav Chiya bar Ashi, who testified that he would often rinse off Rav's leather shoe with water on *Shabbos*, is following the position of the Sages.

Rava challenges the suggestion that leather may not be considered washable, as the verse about plagues on clothing discusses plagues on leather, and mandates that it be washed.

Rather, Rava says that all agree that soft leather is considered washable, and the dispute is limited to hard leather.

Rav Chiya bar Ashi was washing hard leather, and following the Sages' position.

Rava rejects his answer, since we cannot artificially limit the verse to only soft leather.

Rather, a plague is different, since it makes even hard leather soft when it gets embedded in it.

Rava says that we also cannot limit the dispute of the Sages and the others to hard leather, since they are discussing a pillow, which is soft.

Rather, Rava says that washing, even with water, without scrubbing, is not considered washing, and therefore is permitted on *Shabbos*.

Rav Chiya bar Ashi, who would rinse off Rav's shoes, but not scrub them, considered leather washable. If the shoes were soft leather, he was in accordance with both the Sages and the others, or if they were hard, he was following the others.

Rava explains that the *braisa* does not allow one to even rinse off a cloth pillow, since simply soaking cloth is considered washing.

The *Gemora* explains that Rava is consistent with his other statement, that one who threw a cloth or flax into water on *Shabbos* is liable.

The *Gemora* says that throwing cloth into water is a form of washing, but asks what one is liable for when throwing flax into water. If it is a form of planting, since it sprouts, one should be liable for placing wheat or barley in water.

The *Gemora* answers that flax that falls in water spreads out and becomes a contiguous unit, similar to kneading dough, but wheat and barley do not. Although hides in water also spread out, they do not become a contiguous unit, and therefore are not considered a form of kneading.

Rava taught that one may wash a shoe on *Shabbos*.

Rav Pappa said to Rava that Rav Chiya bar Ashi would only rinse Rav's shoe, but not wash it. Rava then reversed his statement, saying that his original statement was incorrect. Rather, on *Shabbos*, one may rinse off leather but not wash it. (94a – 94b)

### Where?

The *Mishna* said that the garment must be washed in the Temple Courtyard.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*, which says the source for this is the verse which says the garment should be washed in "a holy

place”, i.e., the courtyard. This requirement also applies to the other rules related to *chatas*, i.e., breaking a clay vessel which cooked a *chatas*, and washing a metal vessel which cooked a *chatas*. (94b)

### **Chatas Stringencies**

The *Mishna* said that the requirement to wash clothing sprinkled with *chatas* blood is a stringency of *chatas* compared to other *kodshei kodashim* - severe sacrifices, implying that there are no other stringencies specific to *chatas*.

The *Gemora* challenges this from the following stringencies: The inner *chatas* sacrifices’ blood must be applied inside the sanctuary.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying the *Mishna* is referring to an outer *chatas*.

If the blood of an outer *chatas* entered the sanctuary, it is invalid.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying the *Mishna* follows Rabbi Akiva, who says that this applies to the blood of any sacrifice.

A *chatas* atones for severe sins, punishable by *kares* – cutting off a life.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that the *Mishna* is referring to the sliding scale *chatas*, which atones for non-*kares* sins.

A *chatas* requires four applications of blood.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying the *Mishna* is Rabbi Yishmael, who says that all sacrifices are applied on four sides of the altar.

A *chatas* is applied on the four top corners of the altar.

The *Gemora* notes that this last stringency is not the only one, as a *chatas* must be applied on a corner (or at the tip of it), and with the *Kohen’s* finger. Rather, the *Mishna* was only listing one

of a *chatas’* unique stringencies, and not providing an exhaustive list. (94b)

### **Back to the Courtyard**

The *Mishna* says that if a garment that was sprinkled by *chatas* left the Courtyard, it must be returned and washed in the Courtyard. If it became impure, it may not be brought into the Courtyard while still impure. Instead, it must first be torn, to remove its impurity, and then brought to the courtyard and washed. If a clay vessel which cooked a *chatas* left the Courtyard, it must be returned and broken in the Courtyard. If it became impure, it must first be pierced, to remove its impurity, and then brought to the Courtyard and broken. If a metal vessel which cooked a *chatas* left the Courtyard, it must be returned and washed in the Courtyard. If it became impure, it must be made unusable with a large hole, and then brought to the Courtyard and washed. (94b)

### **Still a Beged**

Ravina objects to the tearing of the garment before washing it, as the verse requires washing a *beved* – garment, and a torn garment is not a garment.

The *Gemora* answers that a bare minimum, enough to wrap something in, is left, allowing it to retain the title of *beved*.

The *Gemora* objects, since Rav Huna says that if a garment is torn, but enough is still attached to wrap something in it, it is still impure, and would therefore not be permitted into the Courtyard.

The *Gemora* answers that its impurity is only Rabbinic, so it can be brought in fulfill the Torah commandment of washing it in the Courtyard. (94b – 95a)

### **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

#### **Cleaning Contact Lenses on Shabbos**

What do soft and shiny contact lenses have to do with the blood of sacrifices? The world of *halachah* includes every topic in the

world and even contact lenses and sacrifices have a common denominator.

Our *sugya* serves as a source for *halachic* foundations concerning cleaning items on *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* discusses the cleaning of skins spattered with the blood of *kodoshim* and subsequently, expands on cleaning skins in general, on whether there is a difference between soft and hard hides and on the *halachos* of cleaning them on *Shabbos* in particular.

As we know, one of the 39 *av-melachos* performed in constructing the Sanctuary and forbidden to be done on *Shabbos* is *melaben* – “whitening”. The essence of this *melachah* is whitening and cleaning raw wool. The *tolados* (“offspring”) of the *melachah* include all types of laundering, such as soaking a garment in water, as explained in our *sugya*, and this act is forbidden *midoraysa* even without rubbing the garment.

Our *Gemora* asserts that all the above only applies to fabrics but the *halachah* is different for leather garments (soft or hard), which may be soaked in water on *Shabbos*. The *Gemora* even recounts that people would splash Rav’s shoes with water to clean them on *Shabbos* but that it is forbidden to **rub** leather garments (soft or hard; see *Beirur Halachah*, 302:9, s.v. *Aval*).

In this article we shall examine the reasons for distinguishing between leather and fabrics and the practical implications for the care of lenses on *Shabbos*.

**Leather does not absorb dirt and water:** The reasons for distinguishing between leather and fabrics focus on the fact that fabrics are absorbent materials that soak up dirt and the water that cleans them and therefore their soaking is considered laundering. On the other hand, leather does not absorb dirt and water in the same way.

Some suggest that as leather absorbs very little, its soaking is not regarded as laundering since the leather is not really being

laundered (just as one may rinse soiled eating utensils on *Shabbos* as the dirt is not absorbed in them). Possibly, though leather absorbs a little dirt and water, soaking it in water is not considered laundering because people are not accustomed to launder leather or because laundering it thus takes much time and is not regarded as a regular method of cleaning. (But at any rate, one mustn’t rub the leather because the prohibition of laundering does apply to leather. Only the *halachah* of “its soaking is its laundering” does not apply).

We shall now focus on our topic: the care of soft lenses on *Shabbos*. If it is allowed to soak leather on *Shabbos*, may we conclude that it is also permitted to soak lenses in cleaning fluid? We must precede the discussion by saying that soft lenses do not resemble ordinary plastic at all. Though plastic does not absorb liquids, lenses can (though when exposed to air, one cannot squeeze out the liquids absorbed therein). Therefore, it is forbidden to rub them with liquid as they are thereby cleaned, just as it is forbidden to rub leather. Furthermore, there is basis to forbid soaking lenses in cleaning fluid even if we assume that they resemble leather, which may be soaked, as our *sugya*, which allows soaking leather, only concerns soaking it in **water**. It could be that leather is also forbidden to be soaked in a cleaning fluid as in this way it becomes cleaned and “whitened” and the cleaning fluid of the lenses also removes the dirt that adheres to them.

**The solution for people with contact lenses:** The solution for people with contact lenses is to soak them in saline – a fluid designed only to preserve the lenses without cleaning them. In this way, soaking the lenses resembles soaking leather in water, which is allowed on *Shabbos*. We emphasize that HaGaon Rav Y.S. Elyashiv rules that someone who wants to soak lenses in saline on *Shabbos* should clean them well before *Shabbos*. Readers who want to expand their knowledge of the topic should refer to *Orchos Shabbos* (Ch. 13, 37-40 and the remarks there, and *Beirurei Halachah*, 5).