



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

Rav Pappa said: Regarding a canal from which water is drawn (in pails and poured into a ditch for irrigation purposes) a person may not wash the hands [in the ditch], because [the water] here does not come [onto his hands] from the human act;¹ if, however, he is quite close to the bucket he may wash his hands [in the ditch], because there it runs directly from the human act. If the bucket was cracked so that liquid could filter in,² the waters are then considered as connected³ and he may immerse the hands [in the ditch].

Rava said: A vessel which has a hole in it so that liquid can filter into it, may not be used for washing the hands.

Rava also said: A vessel in which there is not a quarter [log of water] may not be used for washing the hands.

The Gemara asks: But this surely cannot be, for Rava has said: A vessel which cannot hold a quarter [log] may not be used

for washing the hands. Now it follows that if it can hold [a quarter log] even though there is not [that much] in it [it may be used]!

The Gemara answers: This is no difficulty, for the one passage refers to one person and the other to two peoples.⁴ And we have learned: A quarter log of water [is sufficient] for washing the hands of one person or even of two people.

Rav Sheishes asked Ameimar: Are you particular about the vessel used?⁵ He replied: Yes. About the color⁶ [of the water used]? — He replied: Yes. About the amount⁷ [of water used]? He replied: Yes. Others report that he replied thus: We are particular about the vessel and the color [of the water], but we are not particular about the amount [of water used], for we have learned: A quarter log of water [is sufficient] for washing the hands of one person or even of two people. This, however, is not correct, for it is different in

¹ The water in the ditch is supplied by buckets which a man fills from a canal and empties into the ditch, and then it runs off in its courses over fields. It is therefore forbidden to dip the hands in the ditch because the force of man has already spent itself at the beginning of the ditch and the waters run now of their own impetus.

² This implies a large hole so that the water would run out through the hole with a spurt.

³ If he filled this cracked bucket with water from the canal and emptied it out into the ditch, the water would be running out at both ends, from the crack back into the canal and from the mouth into the ditch, so that, while the bucket is being emptied out, the water in the ditch is actually connected with the water in the canal; one may therefore immerse the hands

in the ditch.

⁴ Where one person washes the hands a quarter log of water is necessary, and so also where two people wash the hands one after the other only a quarter log is necessary; obviously then in the latter case the second person washes his hands with less than a quarter log. This is allowed, however, because of the reason that the second person uses the residue of what was the proper amount for washing the hands.

⁵ That it should be whole and not damaged.

⁶ That it should have the appearance of water.

⁷ That there must be a quarter log.

that case since it is the residue of [what was the proper amount for] purification.

Rabbi Yaakov of Nehar Pekod had a standard washing vessel made that contained a quarter [log]. Rav Ashi had a standard jug made in Hutzal that contained a quarter [log].

Rava also said: If the stopper of a jar was fashioned⁸ [into a vessel], it may be used for washing the hands. It has also been taught to the same effect, viz., If the stopper of a jar was fashioned [into a vessel], it may be used for washing the hands. If a waterskin or a [leather] bottle was fashioned [into a vessel], it may be used for washing the hands. A sack or a basket, even though they were made to hold water, may not be used for washing the hands.⁹

The question was raised: May one eat with a cloth [wrapped round the hand] or not?¹⁰ Must we be concerned lest [the bare hand] touch [the food] or not? — Come and hear: But when they gave Rabbi Tzadok less than an egg's bulk of food to eat, he took it with a cloth, ate it outside the Sukkah, and did not say the Grace after it. Now presumably if it was as large as an egg's bulk it would have been necessary to wash the hands!¹¹ — No, perhaps the only inference is, if it was as large as an egg's bulk it would have been necessary to eat it in the Sukkah and to say the Grace after it.¹²

⁸ The stopper is cup-shaped, concave on the inside and convex outside. As the inside was not made to serve as a receptacle it is therefore necessary to hollow it out a little more for this purpose.

⁹ For these do not usually hold water and cannot be regarded as a vessel for washing.

¹⁰ If a person did not wash the hands but wrapped a cloth around them, may he thus eat his food or not?

¹¹ Even though his hands were wrapped in a cloth.

¹² But not to wash the hands since they were covered with a cloth.

¹³ He assumed that he had not washed his hands.

Come and hear [from the following incident]. Shmuel once found Rav eating with a cloth and said to him: Is it right to do so?¹³ And Rav replied: I am very sensitive.¹⁴

When Rabbi Zeira went up [to Eretz Yisroel] he found Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi eating food with leather rags around their hands;¹⁵ he exclaimed: Two great men like you to be in error about the incident of Rav and Shmuel! Didn't Rav reply that he was very sensitive? — In truth he [Rabbi Zeira] had forgotten the statement of Rav Tachlifa bar Avimi in the name of Shmuel, viz., They permitted those that eat terumah¹⁶ the use of a cloth, but they did not permit those that eat [common food] in conditions of cleanness the use of a cloth. And Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi were Kohanim.

The question was raised: Must he that is being fed by another wash his hands or not? — Come and hear. Rav Huna bar Sechora once was standing before Rav Hamnuna and put some meat¹⁷ into Rav Hamnuna's mouth which he ate. Said [Rav Huna]: If you were not Rav Hamnuna I would not have fed you. Now what was the reason [for the exception in Rav Hamnuna's case]? Was it not because he was very careful not to touch [the food]?¹⁸ — No, it was because he was most scrupulous and had certainly washed his hands previously.

Come and hear: Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rav: One should not put a piece [of bread] into the mouth of the waiter unless one knows that he has washed his hands. The waiter must say a Blessing for each cup [of wine that he receives],

¹⁴ He had in fact washed his hands yet he would not touch his food with his fingers but always wrapped a cloth around them. It is however apparent that both Rav and Shmuel are of the opinion that the use of a cloth does not dispense with the need for washing the hands.

¹⁵ Without having washed their hands.

¹⁶ For they are most scrupulous and would avoid touching the food with their hands.

¹⁷ Together with bread.

¹⁸ Hence where one is careful not to touch the food there is no need to wash the hands.

but does not say a Blessing for each piece [of bread].¹⁹ Rabbi Yochanan said: He must also say a Blessing for each piece [of bread]. And Rav Pappa said: In fact there is no contradiction [between Rav and Rabbi Yochanan], for one refers to the case where a notable person [is sitting at the table]²⁰ and the other to a case where there was no notable person [at the table]. Nevertheless it expressly says: Unless one knows that he has washed his hands! — In the case of a waiter it is different because he is kept busy.²¹

Our Rabbis taught: A man should not give any bread to the waiter while the cup [of wine] is in the hand [of the waiter] or in his host's hand, lest there occur a mishap at the table.²² If the waiter has not washed his hands, one may not put bread into his mouth.

The question was raised: Must he that feeds another wash his hands or not? — Come and hear: It was taught in the school of Menasheh: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says. A woman may wash one hand in water²³ and give some bread to her small child. It was said of Shammai the Elder that he would not feed a child even with one hand, and the Sages ordered him that he feed it with both hands!²⁴ — Abaye answered: There it was on account of evil spirits.²⁵

¹⁹ The waiter can expect to receive from the diners a morsel of bread from time to time, therefore the blessing for the first piece would serve also for the subsequent pieces. He cannot however be certain that he will receive wine from time to time, therefore each time he must make a blessing.

²⁰ Only in this case, Rav holds that the waiter should not make several blessings, for he can reasonably expect to receive bread from time to time.

²¹ In such circumstances there is a danger that he will actually touch the food that he is eating; but with an ordinary person there is no such apprehension. It must be noted that the serving of food by the waiter with his hands does not impose upon him the obligation of washing the hands.

Come and hear [from the following incident]: The father of Shmuel once found Shmuel crying and asked him: Why are you crying? Because my teacher beat me. But why? Because he said to me: You were feeding my son and you did not wash your hands before doing so. And why did you not wash? [He replied:] It was he that was eating, so why should I wash? Said [the father of Shmuel:] It is not enough that he [your teacher] is ignorant [of the law], but he must also beat you! The law is: He that is fed by another must wash his hands; he that feeds another need not wash his hands.

MISHNAH: A person may wrap up meat and cheese in one cloth, provided they do not touch one another. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Two people at an inn²⁶ may eat at the same table, the one meat and the other cheese, without hesitation.

GEMARA: And what does it matter if they do touch one another? It is only cold [food] with cold [food]? — Abaye answered: I grant you that it is not necessary to scrape away the surface,²⁷ but surely each must be washed.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Two people at an inn may eat at the same table etc. Rav Chanan bar Ammi said in the name of Shmuel: This is permitted only if they do not know each other, but if they know each other it is forbidden. It has

²² The host may be annoyed at it and may choke while drinking, or he may look with anger at the waiter who might get frightened and spill the wine and thus cause an unfortunate incident.

²³ On Yom Kippur when it is forbidden to wash.

²⁴ It is evident from these cases that even when feeding another it is necessary to wash the hands!

²⁵ The washing of the hands referred to on Yom Kippur is that which has to be performed in the morning on account of the evil spirit that clings to unwashed hands. But once the hands have been washed in the morning there is no further need to wash them when about to feed others.

²⁶ I.e., two strangers.

²⁷ Of the meat and cheese where they came into contact.



DAILY MASHAL

Self-sacrifice for Washing the Hands

also been taught to the same effect: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If two guests stay at the same inn, one having come from the north and the other from the south, the one with his piece of meat and the other with his cheese, they may eat at the same table, the one meat and the other cheese, without hesitation. They only forbade it where the two eat from one parcel.

The Gemara asks: From one parcel! You surely cannot mean that!²⁸

The Gemara answers: It means, if it appears as [though they are eating from] one parcel.²⁹

Rav Yeimar bar Shelemya asked Abaye: What is the law in the case of two brothers who are particular with each other!³⁰ — He replied: Then people will say: All cakes are forbidden but the cakes of Baitos are permitted.³¹

The Gemara asks: Then according to your argument, what of the statement of Rav Assi in the name of Rabbi Yochanan viz.: One who possesses only one shirt may wash it on Chol HaMoed! There, too, Baitos are permitted!

The Gemara answers: Surely Mar son of Rav Ashi has explained that his belt proves his special case.

The Aderes (Rabbi Eliyahu David Rabinowitz Teomim) gathered words of Torah which he discussed with visitors who were scholars and leaders of the generation in a special work called *'Over Orach*. Among others, we found the following story told by a visitor from what he read in a manuscript in Ostra: In a certain town the local Rabbi proclaimed a *cheirem* because of a certain breach in matters of Pesach. A certain resident didn't obey him and was subject to the *cheirem*. After a while he was on a journey and murderers chased him but couldn't catch him. However, because of dire hunger he went to a nearby stream to wash his hands and then they caught up with him and killed him. One day the Rabbi was learning in his room and the murdered person suddenly appeared and told him that because of his self-sacrifice for washing his hands he entered Gan Eden without delay but because of the *cheirem* he returned to the Rabbi to absolve him from it! "About this *Chazal* said," concludes the Aderes, "that some acquire their world in one moment – a plain reminder of how much we should be careful also about a mitzvah which is a Rabbinical decree."

²⁸ But this is forbidden even when one is not sitting at the table.

²⁹ I.e., they are intimate with each other and it appears that what one has is shared by the other.

³⁰ Not to share each other's food. May they both eat at the same table, the one meat and the other cheese, as strangers, or not?

³¹ It is forbidden to make cakes of fancy shapes on Pesach, for, in the time spent in shaping, the dough might become leavened. A certain baker Baitous had molds of various shapes, and the

question was asked: May one eat the cakes of Baitos on Pesach or not? It was resolved that no distinction can be made; all cakes in fancy shapes are forbidden whether made in molds or not, and the law does not admit of any exceptions. Here, too, the law is clear, that strangers may eat at the same table but friends or brothers may not. It will not alter the law the fact that the brothers are unfriendly or particular with each other.