



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

The *Gemora* asks why one may not light on *Yom Tov* with impure *terumah* oil, and answers that one may not burn holy items on *Yom Tov*.

The *Gemora* offers the following sources for this rule:

1. Chizkiya taught a *braisa* which learns from the verse about burning *nossar* – leftover sacrifice meat that one burns it after *Yom Tov*. The verse says that you shouldn’t leave over from the Pesach sacrifice until the morning (*i.e., of Yom Tov*), and the leftover from the sacrifice *ad boker* – until the morning, you should burn in fire. The repeated phrase “until the morning” teaches that one must wait the next morning, after *Yom Tov*, to burn it.
2. Abaye says that the verse refers to the *olah* sacrifice of each *Shabbos* [brought on] its *Shabbos*, implying that one may not burn the sacrifice on a weekday on *Shabbos* or *Yom Tov*.
3. Rava says that the verse about *Yom Tov* permitting work for food preparation says *hu levado* – only it shall be done. The word *hu* – it excludes work for items that enable food preparation (*e.g. fixing a knife*), while the word *levado* – only excludes a circumcision that isn’t on the eighth day, which we logically would have thought would override *Yom Tov*. We learn from the case of circumcision that a *mitzvah* which must not be done on this day, including burning something holy to dispose of it, may not be done on *Yom Tov*.
4. Rav Ashi says that since *Yom Tov* is both a positive and negative commandment, it is not overridden

by the active mitzvah to dispose of holy items. (24b – 25a)

The *Gemora* infers from here that the burning of *terumah* which is *tamei* is forbidden only on Festivals, but on weekdays it is permissible (*to derive benefit from the burning, e.g., by using it as fuel*).


The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason for this?

Rav said: Just as it is obligatory to burn sacred food which is *tamei*, so it is obligatory to burn *terumah* which is *tamei*, and the Torah said: When it is being destroyed, you may derive benefit from it.

The *Gemora* asks: Where did the Torah say that?

The *Gemora* answers: It is learned from Rav Nachman’s verse, for Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: It is written: *Hashem says: “I gave you the guarding of terumosai – my terumos,”* referring to two types of *terumah* – one of *terumah* which is *tahor* and one of *terumah* which is *tamei*; and the Torah said: [*I have given*] to you – (*meaning*), let it be yours for burning it under your pot.

Alternatively, it is learned from Rabbi Avahu’s verse, for Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: [*It is written regarding the confession of the tithes -- viduy ma’asros (before Pesach on the fourth and seventh years of the shemita cycle, he must make sure that all tithes from the previous years were given to their proper*



destination; on the final day of Pesach, he must declare that he has removed all the holy things from his house):] Neither have I consumed it in a state of tumah. 'It' (ma'aser sheini) was not consumed (in a state of tumah), but oil of terumah that became tamei may be consumed.

The Gemora asks:

The Gemora asks: Yet (perhaps) the inference should be as follows: 'It' (ma'aser sheini) was not consumed (in a state of tumah), but consecrated oil that became tamei may be consumed?

The Gemora answers: Doesn't the following kal vachomer teach us otherwise: if ma'aser (sheini), which is light (i.e., its sanctity is less than that of sacred food), yet the Torah stated: it was not consumed in a state of tumah; then how much more so regarding sacred food, which is more stringent (that it should not be consumed in a state of tumah)!?

The Gemora asks: If so, in the case of terumah as well, let us say this kal vachomer (for terumah is also more stringent than ma'aser sheini)!?

The Gemora answers: Surely 'mimenu' – 'it' is written (and it must exclude the case of terumah).

The Gemora asks: And why do you prefer it that way (to exclude terumah from the inference, and include sacred food from the kal vachomer)?

The Gemora answers: It is logical that I do not exclude sacred food (from the prohibition), since it is stringent in respect of the following: [Mnemonic: PaNaK IKaS] (2) Piggul¹, (2)

¹ a korban whose avodah was done with the intention that it would be eaten after its designated time

² sacrificial meat that has been leftover beyond the time that the Torah designated for its consumption

³ one who has unintentionally benefited from hekdesch or removed it from the ownership of the Beis Hamikdash has committed the

Nossar², (3) Korban, (4) Me'ilah³, (5) Kares, and (6) it is forbidden to an onein⁴. [Since Kodosh is so strict in all these matters, it is logical that the limitation does not apply to it.]

The Gemora asks: On the contrary, terumah is not to be excluded, since it is stringent in respect of the following: [Mnemonic MaCHPaz] (1) Death (if eaten by a non-Kohen), (2) a fifth (when a non-Kohen inadvertently eats terumah), (3) it cannot be redeemed, and (4) it is forbidden to strangers (non-Kohanim)!?

The Gemora answers: The former are more numerous.

Alternatively, sacred food is more stringent, since it involves the penalty of kares.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: It is written: [The first of your grain, of your wine, and of your oil] shall you give to him. The inference is: (terumah can be given) to him; to him, but not for his fire (teaching us that one may not separate tamei produce for produce which is tavor). It may be inferred from here that terumah which is tamei may be used for fire.

Rabbi Yishmael said etc. [One cannot light with itran because of the honor of Shabbos.

The Gemora asks: What is the reason?

Rava answered: Since it is malodorous, it is feared that he will leave the light and go out.

Abaye said to him: Then let him leave it!?

transgression of me'ilah, and as a penalty, he would be required to pay the value of the object plus an additional fifth of the value; he also brings a korban asham

⁴ one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet



He replied: I maintain that the kindling of the lights on Shabbos is an obligation (that the lights must be lit where the evening meal is consumed; if the person leaves it and dines elsewhere he does not fulfill his obligation), for Rav Nachman bar Rav Zavda, and others state Rav Nachman bar Rava, said in the name of Rav: The kindling of the lights for Shabbos (in the place where the evening meal is eaten) is an obligation; the washing of the hands and the feet in warm water on the eve of Shabbos is voluntary, While I (Rav Nachman) maintain that it is a mitzvah.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the mitzvah?

The *Gemora* answers: For Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: This was the practice of Rabbi Yehudah ben Il'ai: On the eve of Shabbos a basin filled with hot water was brought to him, and he washed his face, hands, and feet, and he wrapped himself and sat in fringed linen cloak, and he was like an angel of the Lord of Hosts. But his disciples hid the corners of their garments from him. He said to them, "My sons! Have I not taught you: A linen cloak, in respect to *tzitzis*: Beis Shammai exempts it (*for the fringes, which are wool, would be shatnez with the linen garment*), while Beis Hillel hold that it is liable (*for they interpret juxtaposes verses, which teach that tzitzis may have shatnez*), and the *halachah* is as Beis Hillel? But they held that it is forbidden on account of a night garment. [A garment worn only at night is not subject to *tzitzis*; consequently, *shatnez* is then forbidden, since there is no mitzvah of *tzitzis* to supersede it. The disciples held that Beis Hillel's ruling was Scriptural only; nevertheless, it is forbidden by Rabbinical law, to avoid confusing night garments with day garments.]

It is written: *And you have removed my soul far off from peace; I forgot goodness.*

The *Gemora* asks: What is the meaning of, '*and you have removed my soul far off from peace*'?

Rabbi Avahu said: This refers to the kindling of the lights on *Shabbos*.

I forgot goodness. Rabbi Yirmiyah said: This refers to the bathhouse. Rabbi Yochanan said: This means the washing of hands and feet in hot water. Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha said: This refers to a beautiful bed and beautiful bedclothes upon it. Rabbi Abba said: This refers to a made bed and an adorned wife for scholars.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Who is wealthy? He who has pleasure in his wealth; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

[Mnemonic: Mat Kas] Rabbi Tarfon said: He who possesses a hundred vineyards, a hundred fields and a hundred servants working in them. Rabbi Akiva said: He who has a beautiful wife in deeds. Rabbi Yosi said: He who has a latrine near his table.

It was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: One may not kindle (*the Shabbos lights*) with balsam.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason?

Rabbah said: Since its smell is pungent, there is the need of a preventive measure, lest one partake from it (*and he will be liable for extinguishing*).

Abaye said to him: let him say that it should not be used, for it is volatile (*and can cause a fire*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbah said 'one reason and another.' Firstly, it should not be used, for it is volatile, and secondly, there is a decree that perhaps one might partake from it. (24b – 26a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Washing

The *Gemora* notes a dispute over whether washing one's

hands, face, and feet in hot water in preparation for Shabbos is a *reshus* (“permission”) or a mitzvah. That is, Rav holds that there is no particular mitzvah in washing, but Rava (Rabbah) says that it is a mitzvah to do so.

Tosafos (s.v. *Chovah*) seems to have the text as reading not that it is a mitzvah to do so, but rather a *chovah*, a requirement. They explain that this case is called a *chovah* because “it is not so much of a mitzvah.” (Presumably, this means that such a washing is appropriate, but not a commandment.) On the other hand, the mitzvah to wash one’s hands before *bircas hamazon* is called a *chovah* because it is required as a safety precaution (in case one’s hands are dirty with the salt from Sodom that can injure a person), and is therefore *more* strict than the mitzvah to wash before eating.

The *Gemora* says, “The first water (i.e. before eating) is a mitzvah and requires a *brachah*. The latter water (i.e. before *bircas hamazon*) is a *chovah* and does not require a *brachah*.” Although the *Gemora* seems to indicate that one does not make a *brachah* on a “*chovah*,” Tosafos point out that Shabbos lights, which are also called a *chovah*, should nevertheless have a *brachah* recited on them, as we see many cases of things called *chovah* that require a *brachah*.

Interestingly, though Tosafos’ whole discussion centers around the fact that washing one’s face, hands, and feet in warm water is called a *chovah*, neither the text of the Rosh, who quotes the entire Tosafos under discussion, nor the text of the Rif refer to it as anything but a mitzvah.

DAILY MASHAL

Like an Angel

The *Gemora* cites a story of R’ Yehudah bar Ilai: Every *erev Shabbos*, they would bring him a bucket filled with hot water, and he would wash his face, hands, and feet. He would then wrap himself in a linen garment with woolen tzitzis. One string of each of the four tzitzis was dyed blue,

according to halachah of *techeiles* (Rashi). The *Gemora* finishes: “he was like an angel of the Hashem, Master of Legions.” His students would cover the corners of their linen garments in his presence, since they held that by rabbinic injunction, one should not tie tzitzis on such a garment.

Maharsha gives an interesting explanation of why R’ Yehudah was “like an angel of Hashem.” In Meseches Menachos (41a), the *Gemora* recounts that Rav Ketina was approached by an angel who rebuked him for wearing a linen garment without tzitzis. According to Maharsha, the angel held that such a garment must have tzitzis on it (see the *Gemora* there). Rav Ketina held, as the *Gemora* there explained earlier, that the halachah is that a linen garment should not have tzitzis put on it due to a rabbinic injunction (as R’ Yehudah’s students held in our *Gemora*). R’ Yehudah bar Ilai, wearing his linen garment adorned with tzitzis, was thus like an angel, in that he held, as did the angels, that such a garment requires tzitzis.