



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

MISHNAH: person can tear a wart off an animal (*with his hand*) on Shabbos in the Beis Hamikdash. If he wants to use an instrument, it is forbidden in both places (*in the Mikdash and in the provinces*). (103a)

The *Gemora* asks that the ruling of our *Mishna* contradicts the ruling of a *Mishna* in Pesachim: Carrying it,¹ bringing it from outside the permitted Shabbos limit, and cutting off its wart do not supersede the Shabbos, and Rabbi Eliezer ruled: They do supersede it?² — Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina gave different explanations. One Master explains that both rulings refer to a moist wart and yet there is no difficulty, since the former deals with removal by the hand while the latter deals with removal by means of an instrument.³ And the other Master explains that both rulings refer to removal with the hand, and yet there is no difficulty, since the latter refers to a moist wart⁴ while the former refers to a dry one.⁵ But according to the one who explained that the former dealt with removal by the hand while the latter dealt with removal by means of an instrument, what was his reason for not explaining that the latter dealt with a moist wart and the former with a dry one? — He can answer you: A

dry one may be removed even by means of an instrument. What is the reason? Because It merely crumbles away. And according to the one who explained that the latter referred to a moist wart while the former referred to a dry one, what was his reason for not explaining that the former referred to removal by hand and the latter to an operation by means of an instrument? — He can answer you: Concerning an instrument we have explicitly learnt: If [the operation, however, must be performed] with an instrument it is forbidden everywhere.⁶ And the other? — The reason why the ruling was taught there is because it was desired to indicate the divergence of opinion between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis. And the other? — The ruling must be similar to that of ‘carrying it’ or ‘bringing it from without the permitted Shabbos limit’ which is only a Rabbinical restriction.⁷ And the other? — As regards ‘carrying it’ he is not in agreement with Rabbi Nassan who⁸ holds that a living being carries its own self; and as regards ‘bringing it from without the permitted Shabbos limit’, he is in agreement with Rabbi Akiva who holds that the laws relating to Shabbos limits are Biblical.⁹

¹ Lit., ‘causing it to ride’, sc. carrying the korban pesach on one’s shoulder beyond four amos in a public domain on the Shabbos when Pesach falls on that day.

² How then is the anonymous ruling here, which forbids the cutting off its wart on the Shabbos to be reconciled with the anonymous ruling in our Mishnah which permits it?

³ While the latter is forbidden as work the former is permitted.

⁴ The removal of which is deemed to be work forbidden on the Shabbos.

⁵ Which crumbles away and its removal cannot, therefore, be regarded as forbidden work.

⁶ And there is, therefore, no need to repeat the same anonymous ruling in the Mishnah.

⁷ It could not, therefore, refer to an operation by means of an instrument which is Biblically forbidden on the Shabbos.

⁸ In maintaining that the carrying on the Shabbos of a living creature is only Rabbinically forbidden.

⁹ As the two rulings of ‘carrying’ and ‘bringing’ embody Biblical prohibitions the third one, that relating to the wart, must also be Biblical.

Rav Yosef raised an objection: Rabbi Eliezer argued: May not this¹⁰ be inferred through a kal vachomer? If slaughtering which is forbidden under the category of work supersedes the Shabbos, how much more so should these, which come only under the category of shevus, supersede the Shabbos?¹¹ — Rather, said Rav Yosef, both deal with removal by hand¹² but a shevus¹³ relating to the Mikdash within the Mikdash¹⁴ has been permitted whereas a shevus relating to the Mikdash in the country¹⁵ has not been permitted.

Abaye once sat at his studies and discoursed on this statement when Rav Safra pointed out to him the following objection: If one is reading a scroll (*of Scripture*) on a threshold (*which has a status of a karmelis, for it is four tefachim wide, between three and ten tefachim high, and a public domain passing before it*), and it rolls out of his hand, he may roll it to himself. [*There is no Biblical prohibition to transport a partial object from one domain to another. If one side of the scroll remains in his hands there cannot be a Biblical prohibition. Now, in this case, even if it entirely fell out of his hand, it is still only Rabbinically prohibited to carry it back, for we are dealing with a karmelis; therefore, here, where he retains one end, there is no Rabbinic decree on account of a case where the entire scroll fell from his hand.*] Now is it not the case here

one of a shevus relating to the Mikdash in the country and yet no preventive measure has been enacted against the possibility that the scroll might fall down completely and the man might then carry it?¹⁶ — Have we not explained this case as dealing with ‘a threshold that was a karmelis in front of which passed a public domain’, so that, since its rolled up section was still in his hand, even the prohibition of shevus does not exist.¹⁷

He raised a further objection against him: We allow the korban pesach to be placed in the oven immediately prior to Shabbos.¹⁸ Now isn’t the case here one of a shevus relating to the Mikdash in the country¹⁹ and yet no preventive measure was enacted against the possibility that the man might stir up the coals? Thereupon he remained silent. When he came to Rav Yosef and told him, ‘Thus said Rav Safra to me, the latter asked him: Why did you not answer him, ‘The members of a [korban pesach] party are careful?’ — And Abaye? — We only presume that Kohanim are careful, but we do not presume that the members of a [korban pesach] party are also careful.

Rava²⁰ explained: This²¹ represents the view of Rabbi Eliezer who ruled that the preliminary requisites of a mitzvah supersede the Shabbos,²² Rabbi Eliezer however, agreeing that a change should be made as far as this is

¹⁰ His statement that the acts enumerated in the anonymous ruling do supersede the Shabbos.

¹¹ Which shows that the prohibitions in the anonymous ruling, including that against the removal of the wart, are merely Rabbinical. How then could anyone maintain that the removal of a wart is a Biblical prohibition?

¹² Our Mishnah, therefore, cannot refer to a dry wart since such may be removed even by means of an instrument.

¹³ Such as the removal of a soft wart with one's hand.

¹⁴ If a wart, for instance, was found on a regular daily offering which is examined within the Mikdash.

¹⁵ The removal of a wart from the korban pesach which, though the animal is ultimately brought into the Mikdash, is first examined at its owner's home.

¹⁶ How then could Rav Yosef maintain that a ‘shevus of the Mikdash’ was not permitted in the country?

¹⁷ Lit., ‘even a shevus also is not’, since no Biblical law would be transgressed even if the entire scroll were to fall down and the man were to carry it back into the private domain by way of the karmelis.

¹⁸ Because the people who are involved in the roasting of the Korban are conscientious, and they will remind each other that it is forbidden to stir the coals.

¹⁹ Since the roasting is done at one's own home.

²⁰ Maintaining that both Mishnayos deal with the case of removal by hand of a soft wart. The Mishnah of Pesachim cannot refer to removal by means of an instrument, on account of the objection raised supra that such a removal would be an act Biblically forbidden; and our Mishnah cannot refer to a dry wart which may be removed even by means of an instrument since, in its final clause the use of an instrument is forbidden.

²¹ The ruling in our Mishnah which permits the removal of a wart by hand, which is shevus that could have been performed prior to the Shabbos.

²² Even where one of the main classes of work that are Biblically forbidden has to be performed, and much more so, as is the case in our Mishnah and in that of Pesachim, where only a shevus is involved.

possible.²³ What is the proof? — Since it was taught: If a wart appeared²⁴ on [he body of] a Kohen, his fellow may bite it off for him with his teeth. Thus only ‘with his teeth’ but not with an instrument; only ‘his fellow’ but not he himself. Now whose view could this be? If it be suggested: That of the Rabbis,²⁵ and [the permissibility is because it is in connection] with the Mikdash, the objection would arise: Since the Rabbis have elsewhere forbidden [such acts] only as a shevus, what would it matter here whether he or his fellow does the biting? Consequently it must represent, must it not, the view of Rabbi Eliezer who ruled elsewhere that [for such acts] a chatas is incurred but here, though the preliminary requirements of a mitzvah supersede the Shabbos, a change must be made as far as this is possible?²⁶ — No, it may in fact represent the view of the Rabbis, and if the wart had grown on his belly the law would indeed have been so, but here we are dealing with one, for instance, that grew on his back or his elbows where he himself cannot remove it. And, if this, however represents the view of the Rabbis, why should he not be allowed to remove it with his hand, and this you might easily verify the statement made by Rabbi Elozar, for Rabbi Elozar stated: They only differ in the case of removal with the hand but if it is done with an instrument all agree that guilt is incurred? — And according to your line of reasoning why should he not be permitted even in accordance with the view of Rabbi Eliezer to remove it with his hand? — What an argument is this! If you grant that it represents the view of Rabbi Eliezer one can easily see why removal with the hand was forbidden as a preventive measure against the use of an instrument, but if you maintain that it represents the view of the Rabbis, why should he not be allowed to remove it with his hand? And nothing more need be said about the matter. (103a – 103b)

²³ As it is possible to remove a wart by hand he ruled in the final clause of our Mishnah that the use of an instrument is forbidden. Where, however, no change is possible, even one of the main classes of forbidden work supersedes the Shabbos.

²⁴ On the shabbos so that there was no possibility of removing it on the previous day.

MISHNAH: If a *Kohen* was wounded in his finger, he can wrap reed-grass on it on *Shabbos* when he is in the Mikdash (*as it is unseemly for his wound to be exposed during the service*), but not when he is in the city (*for the Rabbis forbade healing in order that people won't grind herbs*). If he intends to squeeze blood out of this wound when doing so, it is forbidden in the Mikdash as well (*for this act constitutes making a wound, which is Biblically forbidden*). (103b)

GEMARA: Rav Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya says: This is only regarding reed-grass. However, he cannot put a small belt on it because this is as he is wearing an additional garment while he is doing the Mikdash service (*when the Kohen is only supposed to wear the four priestly vestments*).

Rabbi Yochanan argues: Additional garments are only a concern when the extra garment is being worn on a place where the priestly garments are usually worn. Being that this is on the finger, it is not regarded as an additional garment.

The *Gemora* asks: Why isn't this considered a *chatzitzah* (*interposition*) between his hand and whatever service he is performing? [*He is required to perform the service without having anything between his hand and the items upon which the service is being performed.*]

The *Gemora* answers: The case is where the wound is on his left hand. Alternatively, it is when it is on a place on his right hand that does not touch anything upon which he is performing service.

Rabbi Yochanan argues on Rava, for Rava said in the name of Rav Chisda: If the *chatzitzah* is where the priestly

²⁵ Who hold that the preliminary requirements of a mitzvah may only override a shevus but not one of the main classes of forbidden work.

²⁶ Hence the ruling that the Kohen himself must not remove his wart and that his friend should do it with his teeth only, which proves does it not, that a change must be made wherever possible?



vestments are worn, even one thread is a *chatzitzah*. If it is not where they are worn, only material of three by three fingerbreadths interposes, less than that does not (*implying that if it is less than that, like a small belt, it is not regarded as an additional garment*).

The *Gemora* observes: This certainly argues on Rabbi Yochanan (*who holds that it is not regarded as an additional garment on a place where the priestly vestments are not usually worn*). Is he arguing on Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya (*who said that even a small belt will be considered an interposition*)?

The *Gemora* concludes: [*They agree.*] A small belt is a significant article (*as it is made to look nice, and therefore even Rava will agree that it interposes even if it is less than three fingerbreadths*).

There is another version of our *Gemora*. Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya says: This is only regarding reed-grass. However, he cannot put a small belt on it because this is as he is wearing an additional garment while he is doing the Mikdash service. Rabbi Yochanan says: If the material is less than three by three fingerbreadths, it is only a *chatzitzah* if it is in a place where the vestments usually are. If it is not in such a place, only a material of three by three fingerbreadths interposes, not less. This is the same opinion as that of Rava in the name of Rav Chisda.

The *Gemora* asks: Let us say that he is arguing on Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chiya!

The *Gemora* answers: A small belt is significant, and therefore interposes even according to Rabbi Yochanan.

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Yochanan, why did the *Mishna* there mention that reed-grass is permitted? It should have taught us that even a belt is permitted!?

The *Gemora* answers: It was teaching us another lesson, namely that reed-grass has healing properties (*for these types of wounds*). (103b – 104a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The *Mishna* discusses a case where an animal sacrifice is to be brought, but it has a blemish that can be cut off the animal. It is forbidden to do this on Shabbos, as it is under the category of “gozez” -- “shearing,” a Torah prohibition on Shabbos.

This prohibition does not only apply to an animal, but also to a person. This is apparent from Rashi in our *Gemora*, which continues to discuss a kohen who cannot do avodah on Shabbos because he has a blemish. Rashi cites the prohibition of cutting off the blemish as being gozez.

The Taz (end of Orach Chaim 336), however, says that the prohibition against cutting off pieces of skin from a person is because a person is considered like the ground, and it is prohibited to cut something from the ground on Shabbos. This seems more likely to be referring to tolesh, not gozez.

The Biur Halachah (ibid. 340) asks that the Taz seems difficult, as Rashi and the Rishonim in our *Gemora* only mention gozez, not tolesh or any melachah of that nature. He therefore has difficulty with the Taz’s statement that this is prohibited due to tolesh.