



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Shabbos, Daf כב – Daf כה

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### -----Daf כב---22-----

- **Rabbah** said, Ner Chanukah should be placed within a tefach of the outside door. **R' Acha the son of Rava** says it should be on the right side of the doorway (when walking into the house). **R' Shmuel Midifti** says it should be on the left side. The Gemara paskens that it should be on the left side so that we have the mezuzah on the right and the menorah on the left.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav Assi** said, one may not count money by the light of the Menorah. **Shmuel** argued and asked, "Do the lights have kedusha"?
  - **R' Yosef** asked on **Shmuel**, an animal's blood has no kedusha, and yet we find that "kisui hadam" must be done in a respectful manner (with one's hands and not his feet)! So too the light of the Menorah must be treated respectfully and should not be used for personal use!?
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, one may not use his succah decorations during Succos (e.g. fruit that he has hanging), as we see one may not count money by the Menorah's light.
  - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, there is Braisa which prohibits using succah decorations on Succos (unless a "t'nai" is made). Why say the issur is learned from the issur of Chanuka which was never even mentioned in a Braisa? **A: Rather, R' Yosef** says, really all these issurim are learned from the halacha of "kisui hadam".
- **Rav** says one may not light one Ner Chanukah from the other; one may not transfer tzitzis from one item of clothing to another; one may not drag a chair across the ground on Shabbos if the chair is heavy enough to make a groove in the ground (even if he doesn't intend to make the groove). **Shmuel** says all these actions are permitted.
  - **Abaye** said that **Rabbah bar Nachmeini** always paskened like **Rav**, except in these three cases, where he paskened like **Shmuel**.
  - One of the **Rabanan** told **R' Ada bar Ahava**, the reason why **Rav** disallows lighting from Ner to Ner is because when one takes a piece of wood to transfer the fire from one ner to the other, it is disrespectful to the mitzvah (to place its fire onto a mundane piece of wood). **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, "Do not listen to him". Rather, **Rav's** reason is that lighting something from the ner uses a drop of its oil and in that way diminishes the mitzvah.
    - A difference between these two opinions would be if one would light one candle directly from the other. That would not be disrespectful, but it would diminish the oil and the mitzvah.
    - **Q: Rav Avya** asks, a Braisa prohibits weighing coins against coins of ma'aser (even though one is weighing to make the other coins ma'aser as well). If **Shmuel** argues on **Rav** only in a case where one lights a ner directly from another ner, but he would prohibit using a piece of wood because that would be disrespectful, this Braisa agrees with **Shmuel** and prohibits the weighing of the coins because it too is disrespectful. However, if **Shmuel** argues and even permits taking from ner to ner via a piece of wood, why would he disallow the weighing of coins? **A: Rabbah** answers, the case of the coins may be a gezeirah for a case where the coins won't weigh the right amount and they will never be made into ma'aser, in which case the ma'aser coins were disrespected for no reason. With the Menorah, there is no such fear and that's why **Shmuel** would permit it.
    - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, from a Braisa we learn that all the neiros of the Menorah in the Beis Hamikdash were lit from the "Ner Ma'aravi" which remained lit from evening to evening. The lamps of the Menorah were stationary. The only way to light the others from that lamp would be to use a piece of wood to transfer the fire. We see that this is permitted!? **A: R' Pappa** answered that they used very long wicks which could reach the lamp next to it and thus transfer fire directly without an intermediary piece of wood. This, however, does not answer the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

question on the shita that said even this would not be allowed because it diminishes the oil and the light.

- **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the way to decide this machlokes is to decide whether the mitzvah of Chanuka is the actual lighting ("hadlakah oseh mitzvah"), or the placing of the lights to visibly burn ("hanacha oseh mitzvah"). If the mitzvah is the actual lighting, once it is lit, you would be able to take from the fire for another light. If the mitzvah is the placing of the lights to visibly burn, one would not be allowed to take from the fire. We find that this itself is a question – whether it is "hadlakah oseh mitzvah" or it is "hanacha oseh mitzvah".
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer based on a ruling of **Rava**, who said that if a person holds the lit wick in his hand, he is not yotze the mitzvah like that. From here we see that hanacha oseh mitzvah! **A:** The Gemara says, that is not a valid proof because in that case it looks like the person needs the light for his own, personal use, and that may be why he is not yotzeh.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from another ruling of **Rava** that says that if one lights the menorah inside the house and then transfers it outside (to the proper place) once lit, he is not yotzeh. This must be because the lighting was done improperly, which would mean that hadlaka oseh mitzvah! **A:** The Gemara again says that this is not a valid proof because in that case it looks like the person needs the light for his own, personal use, and that may be why he is not yotzeh.
  - We can answer from a ruling of **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** in which he says, if someone had a lantern lit all Shabbos and on Motzei Shabbos wants to use that as his Ner Chanuka, he should extinguish the flame and relight it for Chanukah. That is a proof that hadlaka oseh mitzvah, because if hanacha oseh mitzvah, he should have to extinguish it, lift it up, place it down, and then relight it. **Also**, we make the bracha "asher kidishanu...*I'hadlik ner shel Chanuka*", so we see hadlaka oseh mitzvah. **SHEMA MINA**.
    - Since we now say that hadlaka oseh mitzvah, if a cheirish, shoteh or katan light, we can't be yotzeh with them. If a woman lights, we can be yotzeh, because **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says that women are chayuv in Ner Chanuka, since they were included in the miracle (part of the bad decree was specifically on the women and the miracle came about through a woman).

### Daf נט---23---

- **R' Sheishes** said, a guest is chayuv in Ner Chanuka. **R' Zeira** would therefore "chip in" with his host to have a share of the Ner Chanuka to be yotzeh. When he was married, even if he was away from home for Chanuka and was a guest, he would not "chip in" because he said he is yotzeh with his wife's lighting.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, all oils are ok to use for Ner Chanukah, but olive oil is best.
  - **Abaye** said, **Rabbah bar Nachmeini** would look to light on sesame seed oil because it burns longest. After hearing that olive oil is best, he began to use olive oil, saying that this produces the clearest light.
  - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, all oils are good for making ink, but olive oil is best. A Braisa explains, this is true for the smoking and mixing stages. Another Braisa says it is true for the smoking stage. **R' Huna** says, all saps are good for producing ink, but sap of the ketaf tree is best.
- **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, the one who lights makes a bracha. **R' Yirmiya** says, even one who sees a lit menorah (and who won't be lighting his own) makes a bracha (not "*I'hadlik*", but he makes the other brachos).
  - On the first night, one who lights makes 3 brachos. The other nights he does not say shehechiyanu.
  - The bracha made is "V'tzivanu lihadlik..." Where are we "commanded"? Chanuka is only D'Rabanan?! **A:** Either from "Lo sasur" or from "Zikeinecha v'yomru lach" (which teach that we must listen to our Rabanan).
  - **Q: R' Amram** asked, Demai is a D'Rabanan and we don't make a bracha?! **A:** Demai is a safek, Chanuka is a vadai. (Yom Tov sheni we make a bracha even though it is a safek, to prevent people from treating the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Yom Tov with disrespect). **A2:** **Rava** answered that Demai is not even a safek, because most amei ha'aretz give ma'aser, and that is why a bracha is not made.

- **R' Huna** said, if one has 2 doors leading from his house to the chatzer, and **Rava** adds that the doors are not on the same side of the house, he has to light ner chanuka by each door. We are afraid of “ch’shad”, that someone will walk by one side and assume that this home does not light ner Chanukah, not realizing that it is lit by the other door.
  - We find that we are concerned with ch’shad, as we find one of the reasons one must give pe’ah at the end of the cutting of his produce is so that people shouldn’t think that he never gave pe’ah.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Redifa in the name of R' Huna** said, if a lamp has 2 wicks (each sticking out of its own hole), it can be used by 2 people for ner chanuka. **Rava** said, if a bowl of oil has many wicks sticking out they can be used by many people for ner chanuka, IF there is a cover on top. If there isn’t, all the wicks look joined into one fire and therefore not even one person can use that for ner Chanukah.
- **Rava** said, if one can only afford either ner Chanukah or ner Shabbos, he should buy ner Shabbos because that is for shalom bayis. Same result would be if he must choose between ner Shabbos and Kiddush. If faced with the choice of ner Chanukah or Kiddush, one should choose ner Chanukah because of parsumei nisah.
- **R' Huna** said, one who is consistent with ner Shabbos and ner Chanukah will merit children who will be talmidei chachomim. One who is careful with mezuzah will merit having a nice house. One who is careful with tzitzis will merit having nice clothing. One who is careful with Kiddush will merit having a lot of wine.
  - **R' Huna** saw that **R' Avin** was consistent with ner Shabbos and Chanukah and it was through these two mitzvos that he merited having his two sons – **R' Iди bar Avin** and **R' Chiya bar Avin**.
  - **R' Chisda** saw the parents of **R' Shizbi** being very consistent with ner Shabbos and Chanuka, and they merited to have a great son – **R' Shizbi**.
- **R' Yosef's** wife would wait until immediately before Shabbos to light the Neros. He told her, it is improper to wait until so late. We find, that in the Midbar, Hashem would bring the pillar of fire to provide light while it was still day. She then wanted to light very early. A certain elder told her, you can't light too early because it must be noticeable that you are lighting for Shabbos.
- **Rava** said,, one who loves talmidei chachomim will merit sons who are talmidei chachomim. One who honors talmidei chachomim will have sons-in-law who are talmidei chachomim. One who fears talmidei chachomim will himself become a talmid chachom, or, if he doesn’t learn, his words will be listened to like those of the talmidei chachomim.

V'LO B'SHEMEN SREIFAH...

- **Rabbah** explains, “shemen sreifah” is oil which is tamei terumah and must therefore be burned. It cannot be burned on Shabbos, because since it is a mitzvah to burn it, one might tilt the lamp to make sure every last bit gets burned.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, based on this we should be allowed to use it on Yom Tov when there is no issue of “shema yateh”. Why does a Mishna prohibit it on Yom Tov as well? **A:** It is assur on Yom Tov as a gezeirah for Shabbos.
  - **R' Chisda** said, the reason our Mishna says shemen sreifah is assur has nothing to do with shema yateh. The reason is because our Mishna is discussing a case where Yom Tov is Friday, and the shemen sreifah cannot be used because it is prohibited to burn kodashim on Yom Tov.

### -----Daf 70---24-----

- **Q:** Do we mention Chanuka in bentsching on Chanuka? Chanuka is only D'Rabanan, so maybe we shouldn’t, but maybe we should because of parsumei nisa? **A:** **Rava in the name of R' Sechora in the name of R' Huna** said, it need not be mentioned, but if one chooses to mention it, it should be done in “Hoda’ah” (birchas ha'aretz).
- **Q:** Do we mention Rosh Chodesh in bentsching on Rosh Chodesh? Rosh Chodesh is D'Oraisa, so maybe we should, but there is no issur melacha, so maybe we shouldn’t? **A:** **Rav** says we do mention it, and **R' Chanina** says one need not mention it.
  - **R' Zrika** paskens like **Rav** because **R' Oshiya** says like **Rav**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Do we mention Chanuka in Mussaf (on Shabbos Chanuka or Rosh Chodesh Teves)? Mussaf is not said because of Chanuka, so maybe there is no need to mention it, or maybe Mussaf is like all the other tefillos of the day and therefore needs the mention of Chanuka? **A:** **R' Huna and R' Yehuda** say we don't mention Chanuka in Mussaf. **R' Yochanan and R' Nachman** say that we do mention it.
  - **Abaye** paskens like **R' Huna and R' Yehuda** because **Rav** seems to say like them as well. **Rav** said, on Yom Tov that falls out on Shabbos, when they lein haftorah by Mincha (something that they used to do ONLY on Shabbos) we don't mention Yom Tov in the birchas haftorah (since that haftorah is being read only because it is Shabbos). Similarly, **Rav** would seemingly hold that because Mussaf is said not due to it being Chanuka, there is no need to mention Chanuka.
  - **The Gemara** itself paskens that Chanuka needs to be mentioned in Mussaf as well, just like we find that **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that Shabbos is mentioned in Ne'ilah when Yom Kippur falls out on Shabbos.
    - Although we pasken that when Yom Tov falls on Shabbos, when the chazzan repeats a short form shmoneh esrei on Friday night he does not mention Yom Tov, that is different because the chazzan's repetition of maariv shmoneh esrei was instituted as a safeguard to a sakana, and is truly not necessary. Therefore, mentioning Yom Tov is not required.

### V'LO B'ALYA

- **Q:** The **T"K** said we may not use fats and the **Chachomim** say that as well? **A:** They argue in the din of **R' Bruna in the name of Rav**, whether adding some permissible oil will make the mixture permissible. One says it would be ok, and one says it would still be prohibited.

### MISHNA

- One may not light with "Shemen Sreifa" (teruma oil that became tamei) on Yom Tov.
- **R' Yishmael** prohibits lighting with "itran" on Shabbos because it has a bad smell.
- The **Rabanan** permit all oils: sesame seed oil, nut oil, radish oil, fish oil, "desert gourd" oil, "itran" and "neift".
- **R' Tarfon** says one may only light with olive oil.

### GEMARA

- We can't use "shemen sreifa" because it is like burning kodashim on Yom Tov, which is not permitted.
  - **Q:** From where do we learn that burning kodashim on Yom Tov is not permitted? **A:** **Chizkiya** – "V'lo sosiru mimenu ahd boker, v'hinosar mimenu ahd boker ba'eish tisrofu" – the pasuk mentions the work "boker" a second time to tell us that the left over kodashim of Pesach night cannot be burned on the morning of the first day of Pesach, rather it must wait until a second boker, the morning of chol hamoed, to be burned. **Abaye** – "Olas Shabbos b'shabato" – only a korbon of Shabbos may be burned on Shabbos and only a korbon of Yom Tov may be burned on Yom Tov. Certainly then, a passul korbon may not be burned on Yom Tov. **Rava** – "Hu livado yei'aseh lachem" – "livado" teaches that a milah done after the 8<sup>th</sup> day does not override Shabbos or Yom Tov. Since it can be done afterwards, it doesn't supersede Shabbos and Yom Tov. Similarly, burning kodashim, which can be done afterwards, will not override Shabbos or Yom Tov. **R' Ashi** – "Shabasson" – this word teaches that one who does melacha on Yom Tov is oifer an asei as well as the standard lo sa'asei of doing melacha on Yom Tov. If so, the asei of burning the kodashim on Yom Tov cannot override an asei AND a lo sa'asei and therefore must be done after Yom Tov.

### -----Daf נז-----25-----

- **Q:** How do we know it is permitted to have hana'ah from tamei terumah as it is being burned? **A1:** **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** says, the pasuk says "Va'ani hinei *nasati lecha* es mishmeres *terumoiso*". The pasuk says there are 2 terumahs (terumah tehorah and terumah temaya) and they are both given to the Kohen to benefit from ("lechah"). Even the terumah temaya is to be benefitted from as it is being burned. **A2:** **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** says, the pasuk says about ma'aser "V'lo vi'arti *mimenu* (from it) b'tamei" (I did not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

consume it when it was tamei) – the word “mimenu” teaches that one may not consume tamei ma’aser, but one may benefit from terumah temaya that must be burned.

- **Q:** Maybe the pasuk means to say that one may benefit from kodashim as they are being burned? **A:** We have a kal v’chomer – if ma’aser, which is less kadosh than kodashim, may not be benefitted from when tamei, surely kodashim which are tamei may not have benefit derived from it.
  - **Q:** Maybe we should say the same kal v’chomer to prohibit benefit from terumah temaya? **A:** The word “mimenu” comes to allow benefit of something, so we say it is terumah. It makes more sense to prohibit the benefit of kodashim because kodashim have the 6 chumros of piggul, nossar, korban, me’ilah, kares, and it is assur to an onein. Although terumah has the 4 stringencies of misah bidei shamayim, chomesh, there is no pidyon, and it is assur to non-Kohanim, there are more chumros for Kodashim. Also, kares makes it more stringent and therefore benefitting from its burning will be assur.
- **A3: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, the pasuk says one may not separate tamei items as terumah for tahor grains – “Titen lo” – “lo, v’lo l’oro” – it must be given the Kohen to eat and not just to benefit from its burning. We see from here, that a Kohen may benefit from the burning of tamei terumah.

R' YISHMAEL OMER...

- **Rava** explains the reason that lighting with itran is assur out of respect for the Shabbos. He says, itran smells very bad. If one lights with it, we are afraid that he may end up leaving the room and eating in the dark. One is supposed to eat in a lighted room to honor Shabbos.
  - Like **Rav** says, lighting candles for Shabbos is a “chova” (so that one eats in the light). Washing one’s body for Shabbos is a “reshus”. **Rava** says washing for Shabbos is a “mitzvah”. Like we see that **R' Yehuda bar Ilai** would wash up and put on nice clothing for Shabbos.
- Yirmiya said “Vatiznach mi’shalom nafshi” – **R' Avahu** said this refers to Ner Shabbos. “Nashisi tova” – **R' Yirmiya** says this refers to having a bathhouse. **R' Yochanan** says this refers to washing up with warm water. **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** says, this refers to a nice bed and linens. **R' Abba** says, this refers to a made bed and a bejeweled wife, meaning a wife fit for a talmid chachom.
- A Braisa asks: Who is truly wealthy?
  - **R' Meir** – one who is satisfied with what he has, whether little or abundant.
  - **R' Tarfon** – one who has 100 vineyards and 100 fields and 100 servants to work them (Maharsha – this is a “guzma” to say that one will never be happy and will always want more).
  - **R' Akiva** – one who has a wife beautiful in her deeds.
  - **R' Yose** – one who has a bathroom in close proximity to his table.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, one may not light Ner Shabbos with “tzari”. **Rabbah** explains, this is because: 1) it is very flammable, it evaporates and can cause the house to blow up, 2) it smells nice and there is therefore a gezeira that one may remove some and thereby be oifer “mechabeh”.
  - A mother in law who hated her daughter in law told her to put on tzari oil to make her smell nice. She then told her to light a candle. The lighting of the candle caused the daughter in law to catch on fire because of the highly flammable tzari, and she was totally burned.

### -----Daf 15---26-----

- The pasuk says, after the Churban Habayis, Nevuzradan left some Yidden in Eretz Yisrael and the Gemara explains that he did so to collect the “afarsimon” fragrance and to catch the chilazon fish (to use its dye for the royal garments).
- A Braisa says: 1) one may not have hana’ah from burning tevel which is tamei even on weekdays, because just like a Kohen may not eat terumah tehorah until it has been separated from the tevel, so too a Kohen may not have hana’ah from burning terumah temaya until it has been separated from the tevel; 2) one may not light candles with white “neift” even during the week, because it is highly flammable and evaporates into the air where it creates a risk of fire.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa said, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, one may not light with tzari (it is highly flammable and has a nice fragrance which may cause someone to remove some from the lamp on Shabbos). **R' Shimon ben Elazar** also says, tzari is the sap of a ketuf tree. **R' Yishmael** says, one may not light for Shabbos with any fuel that comes from a tree (according to this, fish oil and the like should be ok). **R' Yishmael ben Broka** says, one may only light with things that comes from a fruit (according to this, fish oil and the like would NOT be ok). **R' Tarfon** says one may only light with olive oil. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** exclaimed to **R' Tarfon**, what should all the communities that don't have olive oil do? Rather, only the oils listed as assur in the Mishna are a problem. Everything else is ok, and we even light with fish oil and itran. **R' Shimon Shezuri** says we may light with desert gourd oil and neift. **Sumchos** says, any oil derived from flesh may not be used except for fish oil.
  - **Q:** **Sumchos** is saying the same thing as **R' Yochanan ben Nuri**?! **A:** They would argue whether another oil needs to be mixed in to make it mutar (or whether other flesh derived oils are mutar if another oil is mixed in – see Rashi).
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, any cloth that comes from a tree cannot be mekabel tumah even if it is 3x3 etzba'os (fingerbreadths), and it can therefore be used as s'chach for a succah, except for flax, which is mekabel tumah.
  - **Abaye** says that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** and the **Tana D'vei R' Yishmael** say the exact same thing, because the **Tana D'vei R' Yishmael** says, the Torah uses the general term "Begadim" whenever it discusses tumah except by tumas nega'im. There, the Torah specifies begadim as "a begged of wool or a begged of linen". We learn from there to all other forms of tumah, that only cloths of wool and linen can become tamei.
  - **Rava** says, that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** and the **Tana D'vei R' Yishmael** argue about a case where you have a cloth of other materials (other than wool and linen) that are at least 3x3 *tefachim* in size. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says that they can be mekabel tumah, and the **Tana D'vei R' Yishmael** says that they cannot be mekabel tumah.
  - **Q:** All agree that a cloth of wool or linen which is 3x3 etzba'os is mekabel tumah from negaim. How do we know that? **A:** We learn that from a Braisa which says, that the pasuk could have said "Beged", and instead it says "**VIHA**beged". The extra letters teach us that a wool or linen cloth measuring 3x3 fingers is also mekabel tumah.
    - **Q:** Maybe the extra letters teach that a cloth 3x3 *tefachim* is mekabel tumah? **A:** We don't need extra letters for that, because that is taught through a kal v'chomer. The pasuk says that negaim are metameh the "shesi" and "eirev" strings of the weaving machine, which are not even a piece of cloth, so for sure a cloth that is 3x3 *tefachim* could become tamei as well.
    - **Q:** We should learn out that a cloth 3x3 fingers could become tamei from this kal v'chomer as well?! **A:** 3x3 *tefachim* can be learned from the kal v'chomer because it is of a size that both, paupers and wealthy people, do not disregard. However, 3x3 fingers, which wealthy people dispose of, cannot be learned from the kal v'chomer. Since people dispose of it, one would say that it should not be mekabel tumah. For that, we need the extra letters in the pasuk.
    - **Q:** Maybe the extra letters come to teach that cloths made from materials other than wool and linen measuring 3x3 *tefachim* are mekabel tumah? **A:** The pasuk says "wool or linen", which excludes any other materials.
    - **Q:** Maybe other materials are excluded when they are only 3x3 fingers, but once they are 3x3 *tefachim* they can become tamei as well? **A:** The Torah says "wool or linen" twice. Once to exclude other materials that are only 3x3 fingers and once to exclude other materials that are 3x3 *tefachim*.
  - **Q:** According to **Rava** who says that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says that other materials that are 3x3 *tefachim* are mekabel tumah, where does he learn this out from? **A:** The pasuk by sheretz tumah says "**oy** begged". The extra word "oy" teaches that cloths of other materials measuring 3x3 *tefachim* are mekabel tumah.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** will use the extra word to teach that a cloth of wool and linen measuring 3x3 fingers is mekabel tumah from sheratzim. **Rava** would say that I don't need a special pasuk for sheratzim, because we can learn sheratzim from negaim.
  - **Abaye** says sheratzim can't be learned from negaim because negaim are metameh even the shesi and eirev strings, so we see it is more stringent and maybe that's why it is also metameh a cloth of 3x3 fingers. **Rava** would say, if negaim are more stringent, the Torah should have just said the din of a cloth of wool and linen measuring 3x3 fingers by sheratzim, and we could have learned negaim from there. From the fact that the Torah wrote it by negaim, shows that negaim are not more stringent and we therefore CAN learn sheratzim from negaim.
    - **Abaye** would say that negaim could not be learned from sheratzim, because a sheretz is metameh even if it is only the size of a lentil.

### -----Daf 10-----27-----

- **Abaye** says, the **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** from last Daf argues with another **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** which says that the word “**oy** begged” written by tumas sheretz comes to include cloths made of materials besides wool and linen (e.g., camel hair, rabbit fur, goat hair, silk) and to teach that they are subject to tumas sheretz.
  - **Rava** says, the first **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** actually agrees that although cloths which are only 3x3 fingers, made from materials other than wool and linen are not mekabel tumah, if the cloths are 3x3 *tefachim*, they will be mekabel tumah. So the machlokes between the first and second **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** is limited to cloths of other materials which are 3x3 fingers.
    - **Q:** **Rava** said on the last Daf that the **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** says that no other materials are mekabel tumah?! **A1:** **Rava** retracted from that earlier statement. **A2:** **R' Pappa** is the one who gave this explanation of the first **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael**, not **Rava**. We see that **R' Pappa** says, when the **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** said, “just like when the Torah says “begged” by negaim it is limited to wool and linen, so too other places where it says “begged” it is limited to wool and linen”, the “other places” referred to is kelayim, which teaches that there is only a prohibition of kelayim for clothing made of wool and linen.
      - **Q:** The pasuk clearly says that klayim only applies to clothing of wool and linen!?! **A:** One would think the issur of wool and linen is for clothing that is worn, but for a covering (e.g. blanket) maybe combinations of any 2 materials would be assur, that's why we need the teaching of the **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael**.
        - **Q:** If wearing is only assur with wool and linen, covering should surely not be assur with other materials?!? **A:** **R' Pappa's** explanation is not correct.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, when the **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** said, “just like when the Torah says “begged” by negaim it is limited to wool and linen, so too other places where it says “begged” it is limited to wool and linen”, the “other places” referred to is tzitzis, which teaches that there is only a mitzvah of tzitzis for a beged made of wool or linen. But, for purposes of tumas sheretz, cloths of any material are included.
  - **Q:** We learn this requirement of tzitzis from the fact that tzitzis is written right next to klayim?!? **A:** We would have thought that this “s'muchin” of tzitzis to sha'atnez teaches us like **Rava** says, that all types of begadim need tzitzis and they need tzitzis made of either the same material as the beged or wool and linen.
    - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, just like the **Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael** include all materials for tumah because of the word “Oy”, they should also include all materials in the chiyuv of tzitzis from the extra words “asher tichaseh bah” written in the parsha of tzitzis?! **A:** We need those words to teach that the beged of a blind person is chayuv in tzitzis. Although the pasuk says “Ur'isem oso”, since other people can see the blind man's beged, it is chayuv in tzitzis.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- It makes sense, that “Asher tichaseh bah”, which is written near the parsha of sha’atnez, must be written to include a beged of wool and linen (a blind man’s beged) rather than begadim of other materials.
- **Abaye** said, **R’ Shimon ben Elazar** (who says that anything grown from a tree other than flax can be used as s’chach) and Sumchos (who says that flax may not be used as s’chach) say the same thing. They both agree, that since flax is subject to tumas negaim, it cannot be used for s’chach.

### MISHNA

- Anything that comes from a tree may not be used as a wick for Ner Shabbos, except for flax.
- Anything that comes from a tree will not become tamei as a roof over a meis, except for flax.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna excludes flax from being included with other things that come from a tree. Where do we find that flax is considered to be from a tree? **A:** **Mar Zutra** said, the pasuk says that Rachav hid the spies that Yehoshua had sent “b’pishtei ha’eitz” – in the trees of flax.

### V’HAYOTZEH MIN HA’ETZ EINO METAMEH TUMAS OHALIM ELAH PISHTAN

- **Q:** How do we know that a roof of flax is mekabel tumah? **A:** **R’ Elazar** says we learn it from a gezeirah shava from the Mishkan. Just like by the word “Ohel” by the Mishkan refers to a covering made of flax, so too the word “Ohel” by a meis refers to a covering made of flax.
  - **Q:** The flax by the Mishkan was twisted threads and 6 threads put together into one, so flax should only be tamei as an ohel if it is made in the same way?! **A:** The Torah says the word “Ohel” multiple times regarding a meis to teach that any flax, even not threaded like the Mishkan, will become tamei as an ohel.
  - **Q:** Maybe the multiple mentions of “Ohel” teach that other materials can act as an ohel as well? **A:** The gezeirah shavah keeps the teaching limited to an ohel of flax.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says to make “Krashim LaMishkan”, so maybe wood (kerashim) should have a din of an ohel as well? **A:** Krashim were made for the Mishkan (the covering) but they themselves are not a covering and are thus not an ohel.
  - **Q:** The pasuk refers to the covering of the Mishkan made of animal skins as a “Michseh L’ohel”. Does that mean that skins themselves are likewise not an ohel (the same way that we said that “krashim l’Mishkan meant that the krashim were not an ohel)? We find that **R’ Elazar** holds they are an ohel (at least from a kosher animal like those of the Mishkan)?! **A:** The pasuk makes a hekesh from one covering of the Mishkan to another, which teaches us that just as the covering of flax is called an ohel, so too the covering of animal skins is also called an ohel.

### -----Daf נז---28-----

- **R’ Elazar** asked whether the skin of a non-kosher animal can be metameh as an ohel on a meis. **R’ Ada bar Ahava** explains, we learn ohel hameis from the ohel haMishkan. **R’ Elazar’s** question was whether the “tachash”, whose skins were used as a covering for the Mishkan, is a kosher animal or not. If it is not, that would mean, even a non-kosher animal skin can be an ohel.
  - **R’ Yosef** says we can answer from a Braisa that says that only kosher animals may be used for “Mileches Shamayim”, which presumably means the Mishkan, which would mean that non-kosher animal skins cannot be mekabel tumah as an ohel of a meis.
    - **Q:** **R’ Abba** asks, a Braisa says that the Tachash skins were like a “tela ilan”, which is a non-kosher animal? **A:** The Braisa means that it is *like* a tela ilan in that it was very colorful, but it was not an actual tela ilan, because a tachash is a kosher animal.
  - **Rava** says, skins of non-kosher animals **do** become tamei as an ohel hameis. Just like we find that the skins are mekabel negaim tumah, they are mekabel ohel hameis tumah as well.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Negaim are more stringent in that the shesi and eirev strings are mekabel tumah?! **A:** Rather, we learn it out from sheretz tumah. Non-kosher animal skins are mekabel tumah from a sheretz, so they are also metameh as an ohel hameis.
- **Q:** Sheratzim are more stringent in that they are metameh even if only the size of a lentil!?! **A:** We learn it out from a tzad hashava of negaim and sheratzim. Both are metameh skins, and there is no difference made between skins of a kosher and non-kosher animal, so too ohel hameis, there is no difference between skins of kosher and non-kosher animals.
  - **Q:** Rava M'Barnish asks, negaim and sheratzim are metameh with less than a kezayis, so we can't learn from them to meis which is only metameh with a kezayis!?! **A:** He answered, we have a kal v'chomer from goat hair, which is not metameh from negaim and is metameh as an ohel hameis, so skin of a non-kosher animal, which is metameh from negaim is surely metameh as an ohel hameis.
- **Q:** If non-kosher animal skins are metameh as an ohel hameis, that means they must have been used in the Mishkan (only things used as an ohel in the Mishkan are considered an ohel hameis). If so, when **R' Yosef** said that non-kosher animals were not used in "mileches shamayim", what does that refer to? **A:** The parshiyos of tefillin.
  - **Q:** We know that tefillin must be made from a kosher animal because the pasuk says "Toras Hashem b'ficha" – from something you can eat?! **A:** **R' Yosef** was referring to the batim of the tefillin.
  - **Q:** The batim are a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, and thus learned out from the same pasuk as the parshiyos?! **A:** **R' Yosef** was referring to the hairs used to wrap the parshiyos and the veins used to sew the tefillin. They must be from a kosher animal.
  - **Q:** These are also a Halacha L'Mshe MiSinai?! **A:** **R' Yosef** was referring to the retzu'os of the tefillin, that they must be from a kosher animal.
- **Q:** Returning to the question posed earlier - was the tachash used in the Mishkan a kosher animal? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, **R' Meir** would say, the tachash was a unique animal with a single horn in middle of its forehead. The korbon of Adam Harishon was similar in that way. The korbon was certainly a kosher animal, which means that the single horn must be a characteristic of a kosher animal and the tachash must be a kosher animal.
  - However, although the animal offered by Adam was certainly a beheimah, it is unclear if the tachash is a beheimah or a chaya, because we find a chaya, the "keresh", which only had this single horn as well. Therefore, it may that it is a chaya.

### MISHNA

- A wick that is made out of a beged, which was folded into the shape of a wick, but was not "pre-lit" to facilitate easier lighting: **R' Eliezer** says it is mekabel tumah and may not be used for Ner Shabbos. **R' Akiva** says it is not mekabel tumah and may be used for Ner Shabbos.

### GEMARA

- With regard to tumah, the machlokes is: **R' Eliezer** says that folding the beged into a wick does not make it lose its status as a beged, and it therefore is mekabel tumah. **R' Akiva** says that folding it does not make it lose its status as a beged.
- With regard to using it as Ner Shabbos, the machlokes is:
  - **R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya and R' Ada bar Ahava** say, we are discussing a cloth that is exactly 3x3 fingers, and we assur using it only when Friday is Yom Tov. **R' Eliezer and R' Akiva** both hold of muktze and both also hold that one must light most of the wick which is out of the oil before leaving it. **R' Eliezer** says that the cloth is a beged even though it is folded, but as soon as it is burned, it becomes less than 3x3 and is no longer a beged, which makes it nolad (a form of muktze). For this reason it can't be used on Friday which is Yom Tov. **R' Akiva** says, when folded into a wick (which was done before Yom Tov) it already lost its beged status. Therefore, when it begins burning there is no nolad and no muktzeh.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yosef** says, this must be what was referred to when I once heard a halacha that applies to something exactly the size of 3x3.
- **R' Ada bar Ahava** who says that all hold of muktze, is saying that to explain the Mishna, but he himself does not hold of muktze, as we find in another ruling of his.
- **Rava** says, the Mishna is talking about a regular Friday, and the reason **R' Eliezer** does not allow the use of these wicks is because he says one may not use wicks which have not been pre-lit (they don't light properly and may cause the person to handle them on Shabbos in an attempt to make the flame better).
  - According to this, the halacha **R' Yosef** heard regarding a cloth that is exactly 3x3 fingers was regarding tumah, where there is a machlokes whether a cloth must be a little more than 3x3 to be mekabel tumah, or whether exactly 3x3 is enough. The **Chachomim** say exactly 3x3 is enough. **R' Yosef** heard that the halacha that follows these **Chachomim**.