

7 Nissan 5780
April 1, 2020



Shabbos Daf 26

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

One may not use untithed (*tevel*) oil for Shabbos lights, because untithed produce may not be benefited from. This is true even if the oil is impure. Although the *terumah* that one separates from such oil may be used since it is impure, one may nevertheless not burn the oil in an untithed state.

One may not use white naphtha for Shabbos lights because it is extremely flammable and presents a safety hazard.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar does not allow one to use the sap of the balsam tree for Shabbos lights, as explained above.

Another reason is that Rabbi Shimon agrees to Rabbi Yishmael, who says that one may not use any derivatives of a tree for oil, which is why he tells us here that “*tzri* is no more than sap from the balsam tree” (Rashi).

Alternately, that statement is not meant to explain his previous ruling, but merely to define the meaning of *tzri*.

Rabbi Yishmael, as explained, does not allow one to use any product that derives from a tree, such as the bark or sap.

R' Yishmael ben Berokah is even more stringent. Anything that does not come from some type of produce, such as fruit or vegetables, may not be used. Thus, pitch and fish oil are also excluded (Rashi).

Rabbi Tarfon does not allow one to light with anything other than olive oil.

Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri, however, held that anything may be used that was not excluded in the first *Mishna* by the *Tanna Kamma* (such as *cheilev* and *terumah* oil that became

tamei).

Rabbi Shimon Shezuri held that one may use oil of colocynth and naphtha.

Sumchos prohibited any type of fuel that came from an animal except for fish oil.

The *Gemora* concludes that the difference between Sumchos and the *Tanna Kamma*, who also prohibited *cheilev* and permitted fish oil, is the opinion of Rav Berona, who states that oil made from crushed fish innards or *cheilev* may be used if a little bit of oil is added to them. It is not clear which of these two agree with Rav Berona (or to what extent they agree – see *lyunim*).

Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar says that the halachah that a cloth of 3x3 fingers-breadth is susceptible to *tum'ah* does not apply to any plant matter except for linen.

The *Gemora* explains that in truth, Rabbi Shimon meant that this halachah does not apply to any cloth at all except for wool and linen.

Rabbi Shimon only said his ruling as regards plant matter since he was discussing the laws of what may be used as a roof for a Succah. Since one may only use plant matter that is not susceptible to *tum'ah*, Rabbi Shimon phrased his ruling as regards plant matter.

The source for Rabbi Shimon's ruling is a statement made by Rabbi Yishmael regarding the definition of clothing in the Torah. The Torah mentions “clothing” many times, but it only explains itself regarding the laws of *tzara'as*, where it

specifically refers to “a garment of wool or a garment of linen.” Since the Torah introduces these laws by stating the general term “garment,” and later qualifies it by the phrase “a garment of wool or a garment of linen,” we learn that the laws of *tzara'as* of clothing apply only to clothing of these two materials (*klal u'prat ain licha ela mah shebiprat*). We then extend this law (*binyan av*) and say that everywhere that the Torah refers to clothing without qualification, it means specifically clothing of wool or linen. Thus, the laws of clothing that are susceptible to *tum'ah* apply only to clothing of wool or linen.

Abaye considers Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar's ruling to be synonymous with that the Tanna of the School of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar, as stated. The Tanna of the School of Rabbi Yishmael: what is that? For the School of Rabbi Yishmael taught there: Since in the Torah the word ‘garments’ is used without specifying the material, but in one particular case (*by tzaraas*), the Torah specified ‘wool and linen,’ the implication is that all garments mentioned in the Torah are to be understood as being of wool or of linen.

Rava said: They differ in respect to three [handbreadths] by three in other clothes [not wool or linen]: Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar accepts [their liability to tumah],¹ while the Tanna of the School of Rabbi Yishmael rejects it.²

Now all at least agree that an area of three [fingerbreadths] of wool or linen is subject to the tumah of *tzaraas*. How do we know it? Because it was taught, A garment: I know it only of a [complete] garment; from where do I learn it of [cloth] three [fingerbreadths] square? From the verse, and the garment. Yet say that it is to include three [handbreadths] square? - Does that not follow with a *kal vachomer*: if a warp and a woof become tamei, is there a question of three [handbreadths] square? If so, if it is three [fingerbreadths]

¹ In his statement he employs the word *shalosh*, feminine, which must refer to fingerbreadths (*etzba'os*, fem.). Hence they are not subject to the stricter law that even when only three fingerbreadths square they shall be liable to tumah. From here it follows that they are subject to the next standard of liability, viz., three handbreadths (*sheloshah*, masc. agreeing with *tefachim*, handbreadths).

square, let it also be deduced with a *kal vachomer*?³ — Rather, [this is the reply]: three [handbreadths] square, which is of use both to the wealthy and to the poor, can be deduced with a *kal vachomer*⁴ three [fingerbreadths] square, which is of use to the poor only, but not to the rich,⁵ cannot be learned with a *kal vachomer*: hence it is only because Scripture wrote it; but had Scripture not written it, we could not deduce it with a *kal vachomer*. Yet say [that its purpose is] to include three [handbreadths] square of other materials? — Scripture said, a woollen garment, or a linen garment: only a woollen or a linen garment, but not anything else. Yet say, when it is excluded it is from [the tumah of] three [fingerbreadths] square, but three [handbreadths] square can become tamei?— Two limitations are written: ‘a woollen garment or a linen garment’, [hence] one is to exclude [them] from [the tumah of] three [fingerbreadths] square, and the other to exclude them from [the tumah of] three [handbreadths] square.

Now, according to Rava, who said, They differ in respect of three [handbreadths] by three in other cloths, Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar accepting [their liability to tumah], while the Tanna of the School of Rabbi Yishmael rejects it, - how does he [Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar] know [the tumah of] three [handbreadths] square of other materials? — He deduces it from, or a garment. For it was taught: ‘garment’: I only know [it] of garment, how do I know [it of] three [handbreadths] square of other materials? Therefore it is stated, ‘or a garment.’ And Abaye? How does he employ this or a garment! - He utilizes it to include three [fingerbreadths] square of wool or linen, that it becomes tamei through creeping things. And Rava? -The Merciful One revealed this in reference to *tzaraas*, and the same holds good of reptiles. And Abaye? — It [the analogy] may be refuted: as for *tzaraas*, [the reason is] because the warp and the woof [of wool or linen] become tamei in their case And the other? -Should you think that *tzaraas* is stricter, let the Divine Law write [it] with

² For he simply rules that wherever ‘garments’ is stated it means wool or linen.

³ Since cloth containing a warp and a woof can be less.

⁴ For it is then nearer to an actual garment.

⁵ A rich man would not trouble to save it for some possible service-hence it is further removed from ‘garment’.

reference to reptiles, and tzaraas would be learned from them. And the other? - Tzaraas could not be derived from reptiles, because it may be refuted: as for reptiles, [the reason is] because they transmit tumah by the size of a lentil.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Fish Oil and Fat

The *Gemora* notes that the author of the first *Mishna* in the perek, whose opinion is endorsed by Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri, seems to be the same as that of Sumchos, mentioned after Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri. Both seem to hold that one may use fish oil for Shabbos lights, but not *cheilev* (forbidden fats). The *Gemora* answers that they disagree regarding the opinion of Rav Berona.

Rav Berona's opinion is discussed on Daf 21a, where he says that melted *cheilev* and crushed fish innards may be used for Shabbos lights if one adds a slight amount of oil.

Rashi offers two explanations of our *Gemora*. The first explanation is that either Sumchos or the *Tanna Kamma* hold that both fish innards and *cheilev* may be used if one adds oil. The second explanation is that one opinion permits *cheilev* if one adds oil, and allows one to use fish innards without adding oil, while the other opinion allows one to use fish innards only with the addition of oil, but *cheilev* may never be used. Thus, according to this answer, neither opinion actually agrees entirely with Rav Berona.

The *Ba'alei Tosafos* find it difficult to accept that when the *Gemora* said that the dispute between the *tanna kamma* and Sumchos revolves around Rav Berona, it meant that each party accepts only part of Rav Berona's opinion.

Rabbeinu Tam therefore suggests that the "fish oil" under discussion in the *Mishna* and *baraisa* refers not to the crushed fish innards that Rav Berona discussed, but rather oil that comes from the eye of a fish. Since Rav Berona never discussed this type of oil, it is plausible to suggest that he would not require one to add regular oil to it before lighting. Thus, either the *Tanna Kamma* or Sumchos, both of whom

allowed one to use fish oil but not *cheilev*, and did not mention oil of fish innards at all, could hold that *cheilev* would be permitted with the addition of oil.

Tosafos does not address Rashi's first answer, that either the *Tanna Kamma* or Sumchos requires the addition of oil to both fish innards and *cheilev*.

It would seem that they found this answer untenable since both the *Tanna Kamma* and Sumchos clearly allow "fish oil" and prohibit *cheilev*. If either of them would hold that the addition of oil makes both types of fuel permissible, then he would write not that fish oil is permitted and *cheilev* prohibited, but that either they are both permitted (with the addition of oil) or both prohibited (by themselves). To call one case permitted and the other prohibited when both have the same law is untenable in Tosafos' view. It is for this reason that Rabbeinu Tam changed the definition of "fish oil." According to Rabbeinu Tam's view, whichever opinion agrees to Rav Berona's ruling can legitimately write that fish oil is permitted, since the fish oil under discussion is not the fish oil Rav Berona discussed. This type of oil is *always* permitted, even without the addition of regular oil. In contrast, *cheilev* (or oil made of fish innards) may not be used unless oil is added in.

DAILY MASHAL

At the *siyum* of the second cycle of the Daf HaYomi, Rabbi Menachem Zamba announced with pathos: The highest knot is from the Torah. Someone who wants to tie himself to the Highest and cleave to Him must do so only through the Torah, by its learning!" Historians describe that the stirring words excited the audience till all those sitting stood up and those standing swayed in exhilaration.