

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ק"ז

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf with a fascinating discussion about the halachos of netilas yadayim when water is scarce. The Gemara brings down a shailah about whether a person can wash his hands in the morning and make a tney, a condition, that this washing should work for him for the entire day so he doesn't have to wash again before eating bread. We then move into the specific requirements of the vessel used for washing, discussing whether an irrigation channel, a perforated cup, or a barrel stopper can be halachically considered a proper vessel, a kli, for netilas yadayim.

Next, the Gemara delves into the shiur of the water itself, discussing the requirement of a revi'is. The Gemara analyzes whether a revi'is is required for each individual, or if two people can wash one after the other from the same revi'is. We also learn about the sensitivity of our Amoraim regarding the appearance of the water and the wholeness of the vessel, showing us the great care and hiddur they put into this mitzvah.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 107A

STATEMENT

פְּקֻתָּא דְעֶרְבוֹת:

The Gemara relates that Rabbi Avina once came to **the valley of Aravot**, where water was scarce.

STATEMENT

כְּגוֹן אֲתוֹן דְּלֹא שְׂכִיחִי לְכוּ מִיָּא, מָשׁוּ יְדֵיכֻן מְצַפְרָא וְאַתְּנוּ עֲלֵיהּ לְכוּלָּא יוֹמָא.

He said to the local residents: **For example, you, for whom water is not common** and is hard to find, **wash your hands in the morning and make a condition on them for the entire day** that this washing should remain valid for eating bread all day long.

EXPLANATION

אִיכָּא דְאָמְרִי: בְּשַׁעַת הַדָּחֶק – אֵין, שְׁלֹא בְּשַׁעַת הַדָּחֶק – לָא, וּפְלִיגָא דְרַב.

Some say that Rabbi Avina meant: **In a time of pressing need, yes**, one may rely on this condition, but **not in a time of pressing need, no**, one may not do so; **and** according to this version, Rabbi Avina **disagrees with** the view of Rav, who permitted this even when there is no pressing need.

EXPLANATION

אִיכָּא דְאָמְרִי: אִפִּילוּ שְׁלֹא בְּשַׁעַת הַדָּחֶק נְמִי, וְהֵינּוּ דְרַב.

And some say that Rabbi Avina meant: **Even not in a time of pressing need also**, one may make such a condition, **and this is** identical to the view **of Rav**.

RULING

אמר רב פפא: האי אריתא דדלא, אין נוטלין ממנו לידים, דלא אתו מכל גברא.

Rav Pappa said: Regarding this irrigation channel of buckets, which carries water poured into it from a river, one may not wash from it for the hands, because the water flowing in the channel does not come from the force of a person, but rather flows on its own after being poured.

RULING

ואי מקרב לגבי דולא, דקאתו מכל גברא – נוטלין ממנו לידים.

But if one washes close to the bucket itself, at the moment the water is poured, where the water comes from the force of a person before it flows down the channel, then one may wash from it for the hands.

RULING

ואי בזיע דולא, בכונס משקה, מילף לייפי, ומטביל בה את הידים.

And if the bucket is perforated with a hole large enough to admit liquid, then the water in the channel and the water in the river are connected through that hole, and one may immerse the hands in the channel as if immersing in the river itself.

RULING

ואמר רבא: כלי שניקב בכונס משקה – אין נוטלין ממנו לידים.

And Rava said: A vessel that is perforated with a hole large enough to admit liquid, one may not wash from it for the hands, because it is no longer considered a proper vessel.

RULING

ואמר רבא: כלי שאין בו רביעית – אין נוטלין ממנו לידים.

And Rava said: A vessel that does not have a minimum of a revi'is of water in it, one may not wash from it for the hands.

QUESTION

איני? והאמר רבא: כלי שאין מחזיק רביעית – אין נוטלין ממנו לידים, הא מחזיק – אף על גב דלית ביה.

The Gemara asks: Is that so? But didn't Rava say: A vessel that cannot contain a revi'is, one may not wash from it for the hands? We can infer from this: But if the vessel can contain a revi'is, it is valid even though there is not a full revi'is of water left in it when washing!

ANSWER

לא קשיא: הא לחד, הא לתרי,

The Gemara answers: This is not difficult: This first statement of Rava, requiring a full revi'is of water, refers to one person washing, whereas that second statement, which allows a vessel containing less than a revi'is, refers to two people washing, where the second person washes with the leftovers of a revi'is.

PROOF

דתנא: מי רביעית נוטלין לידים לאחד, ואפילו לשנים.

As it was taught in a braisa: With a revi'is of water, one may wash the hands for one person, and even for two people, if they wash one after the other.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב ששית לאמימר: קפדיתו אמנא?

Rav Sheshet said to Ameimar: Are you particular about the vessel being completely whole and undamaged?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין.

Ameimar said to him: Yes, we are particular.

QUESTION

אחזותא?

Rav Sheshet asked further: Are you particular **about the appearance** of the water, that it not be discolored?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין.

Ameimar said to him: Yes.

QUESTION

אשיעורא?

Rav Sheshet asked: Are you particular **about the measure** of the water, that there must be a full revi'is?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין.

Ameimar said to him: Yes.

EXPLANATION

איכא דאמרי, הכי אמר ליה: אמנא ואחזותא – קפדינן, אשיעורא – לא קפדינן,

Some say that this is what Ameimar said to him: About the vessel and about the appearance of the water we are particular, but about the measure we are not particular to require a full revi'is for each person,

PROOF

דתנא: מי רביעית נוטלין לידיים לאחד, ואפילו לשנים.

as it was taught in a braisa: With a revi'is of water, one may wash the hands for one person, and even for two.

REFUTATION

ולא היא, שאני התם, משום דקאתו משירי טהרה.

The Gemara notes: But it is not so; it is different there, because the second person's washing comes from the remnants of a measure of water that was initially fit for purity, but to begin with, there must be a full revi'is.

STATEMENT

אתקין רב יעקב מנהר פקוד נטלא בת רביעתא,

The Gemara relates: **Rav Yaakov of Nehar Pekod prepared a glass vessel that held a revi'is** for washing his hands.

STATEMENT

אַתְּקִין רַב אָשִׁי בְּהוּצָל כּוּזָא בֵּת רְבִיעֵתָא.

Similarly, **Rav Ashi in Huzal prepared an earthenware jug that held a revi'is** for washing.

RULING

וְאָמְרָה רָבָא: מְגוּפַת חֲבִית שֶׁתִּקְנָהּ – נוֹטֵלִין מִמֶּנָּה לְיָדַיִם.

And Rava said: The stopper of a barrel that one prepared by hollowing it out to hold water, **one may wash from it for the hands.**

PROOF

תִּנְיָא נָמִי הָכִי: מְגוּפַת חֲבִית שֶׁתִּקְנָהּ – נוֹטֵלִין מִמֶּנָּה לְיָדַיִם.

It was also taught likewise in a braisa: **The stopper of a barrel that one prepared, one may wash from it for the hands.**

RULING

חֶמֶת וּכְפִישָׁה שֶׁתִּקְנָן – נוֹטֵלִין מֵהֶם לְיָדַיִם.

Similarly, with **a leather flask or a leather bag that one prepared** to hold water, **one may wash from them for the hands.**

RULING

שֶׁק וְקוּפָּה, אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁמִּקְבְּלִים – אֵין נוֹטֵלִין מֵהֶם לְיָדַיִם.

But with **a sack or a basket, even though they can hold** water temporarily, **one may not wash from them for the hands,** because they are not made to hold liquids.

QUESTION

אֵיבָעִיא לְהוֹ: מַהוּ לְאַכּוֹל בְּמַפָּה?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the halacha regarding eating with a cloth wrapped around one's hands instead of washing them?

QUESTION

מִי חִיִּישִׁינוּ דְּלָמָא נִנְע, אוּ לָא?

Do we fear that perhaps he will touch the food with his unwashed hands, **or not?**

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, וּכְשֶׁנָּתְנוּ לוֹ לְרַבִּי צָדוֹק אוֹכֵל פָּחוֹת מִכִּבִּיצָה, נוֹטֵלוּ בְּמַפָּה וְאוֹכְלוּ חוּץ לְסוּכָּה, וְאֵין מְבָרַךְ אַחֲרָיו.

Come and hear a proof from a Mishnah: And when they gave to Rabbi Tzadok food less than the size of an egg, he took it with a cloth and ate it outside the Sukkah, and did not recite a blessing after it.

INFERENCE

מֵאִי לָאוּ – הָא פְּבִיצָה בְּעֵי נְטִילַת יָדַיִם?

What, is it not to be inferred from here that **consequently**, if the food was the size of an egg, it would require washing of the hands even if he used a cloth?

REFUTATION

דלמא הא כביצה – פעי סופה, ובעי ברכה.

The Gemara rejects this: **Perhaps** the inference is only that **consequently**, if it was the size of an egg, it would require a **Sukkah and would require a blessing**, but a cloth might still be permitted instead of washing.

PROOF

תא שמע: דשמואל אשכחיה לרב דקאכיל במפה, אמר ליה:

Come and hear another proof: For Shmuel found Rav eating with a cloth wrapped around his hands, and Shmuel said to him:

עמוד ב' DAF 107B

QUESTION

עבדין כדיו?

Do we **act in this manner**, eating with a cloth instead of washing?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: דעתך קצרה עלי.

Rav **said to him: I am delicate** and do not want to touch food with my bare hands, so I used a cloth; but I did wash my hands beforehand.

STATEMENT

כי סליק רבי זירא, אשכחניהו לרבי אמי ורבי אסי דקאכילי בבליאי חמתות.

When Rabbi Zeira went up to Eretz Yisrael, he found Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi eating bread with worn pieces of wineskins wrapped around their hands, without washing.

OBJECTION

אמר: תרי גברי רבירבי פוותיכו, ליטעו בדרב ושמואל?

He **said** to them: Could two great men like yourselves err in the incident of Rav and Shmuel?

EXPLANATION

הא "דעתך קצרה" קאמר!

Behold, "I am delicate" Rav **said**, meaning he only used a cloth because of his delicateness, but he actually washed first!

EXPLANATION

אשתמיטתיה הא דאמר רב תחליפא בר אבימי אמר שמואל:

The Gemara notes: **It escaped** Rabbi Zeira's mind **that which** Rav Tachlifa bar Avimi said that Shmuel said:

STATEMENT

הִתִּירוּ מִפֶּה לְאוֹכְלֵי תְּרוּמָה,

The Sages **permitted** wrapping the hands in a cloth to those who eat terumah,

STATEMENT

וְלֹא הִתִּירוּ מִפֶּה לְאוֹכְלֵי טְהָרוֹת,

but they **did not permit** wrapping in a cloth to those who eat chullin in purity,

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי אָמִי וְרַבִּי אָסִי כֹהֲנִים הָיוּ.

and Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi were Kohanim, so they were eating terumah and were permitted to use a cloth.

QUESTION

אִיבָעִיָּא לְהוֹ: אוֹכֵל מִחֻמַּת מֶאֱכִיל, צָרִיךְ נְטִילַת יָדַיִם אוּ לֹא?

A dilemma was raised before them: Does one who eats by means of another feeding him, without touching the food himself, need washing of hands, or not?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּרַב הוּנָא בַּר סְחוּרָה הָוָה קָאִי קַמִּיָּה דְּרַב הַמְנוּנָא, בָּלֵם לֵיהּ אוּמָצָא וְאָכִיל.

Come and hear a proof, as Rav Huna bar Sechora was standing before Rav Hamnuna, and he cut a piece of meat for him and Rav Hamnuna ate it.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לֵיהּ: אִי לָאוּ דְּרַב הַמְנוּנָא אַתָּה, לָא סְפִינָא לָךְ.

Rav Huna bar Sechora said to him: If you were not Rav Hamnuna, I would not feed you in this way.

INFERENCE

מֵאִי טַעְמָא, לָאוּ מְשׁוּם דְּזָהִיר וְלֹא נִגַּע?

What is the reason? Is it not because you are careful and will not touch the food? This implies that generally, one who is fed by another does not need to wash, provided he is careful not to touch.

REFUTATION

לֹא, דְּזָרִיז קָדִים וּמָשִׁי יְדִיָּה מַעֲיָקְרָא.

The Gemara rejects this: No, perhaps he was fed because he was diligent and went ahead and washed his hands at the outset.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּאָמַר רַבִּי זִירָא אָמַר רַב: לֹא יִתֵּן אָדָם פְּרוּסָה לְתוֹךְ פִּיּוּ שֶׁל שְׁמֶשׁ, אֶלָּא אִם כֵּן יוֹדֵעַ כּוֹ שֶׁנֶּטְל יָדָיו.

Come and hear another proof, as Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said: A person may not place a slice of bread into the mouth of an attendant unless he knows about him that he washed his hands.

STATEMENT

וְהַשְׁמֵשׁ מִבֶּרֶךְ עַל כָּל כּוֹס וְכוּס, וְאֵינוֹ מְבָרֵךְ עַל כָּל פֶּרוֹסָה וּפְרוֹסָה.

And the attendant recites a blessing over each and every cup of wine given to him, but he does not recite a blessing over each and every slice of bread.

STATEMENT

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: מִבֶּרֶךְ עַל כָּל פֶּרוֹסָה וּפְרוֹסָה.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: He must recite a blessing over each and every slice.

RESOLUTION

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: בְּשָׁלְמָא דְרַב וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לָא קָשְׁיָא, הָא דְאִיכָא אָדָם חָשׁוּב, הָא דְלִיכָא אָדָם חָשׁוּב.

Rav Pappa said: Granted, the contradiction between Rav and Rabbi Yochanan is not difficult; this ruling of Rav is where there is an important person at the meal, so the attendant knows he will be fed, and this ruling of Rabbi Yochanan is where there is no important person.

INFERENCE

מִכָּל מָקוֹם, הָא קָאָמַר: אֵלֶּיָּא אִם כּוֹן יוֹדַע שְׁנִטַּל יָדָיו!

In any case, Rav says: "Unless he knows that he washed his hands"! This proves that one who is fed by another must wash.

REFUTATION

שְׂאֵנִי שְׂמֵשׁ, דְּטָרִיד.

The Gemara answers: An attendant is different, because he is busy serving and might touch the food.

BRAISA

תְּנוּ רַבָּנִי: לֹא יִתֵּן אָדָם פְּרוֹסָה לְשַׁמֵּשׁ, בֵּין שֶׁהַכּוֹס בְּיָדוֹ בֵּין שֶׁהַכּוֹס בְּיָדוֹ שֶׁל בַּעַל הַבֵּית, שְׂמֵא יֵאָרַע דְּבַר קְלָקְלָה בְּסַעֲוֵדָה.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: A person should not give a slice to the attendant, whether the cup is in his hand or the cup is in the hand of the host, lest a mishap occur at the meal.

BRAISA

וְהַשְׁמֵשׁ שֶׁלֹּא נִטַּל יָדָיו – אָסוּר לִיתֵּן פְּרוֹסָה לְתוֹךְ פִּיו.

And as for an attendant who did not wash his hands, it is forbidden to place a slice into his mouth.

QUESTION

אִיבַעֲיָא לְהוֹ: מֵאֲכִיל, צָרִיךְ נְטִילַת יָדַיִם, אוֹ אֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ?

A dilemma was raised before them: Does one who feeds another need washing of hands, or does he not need it?

PROOF

תא שמע, דתני דבי מנשה: רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: אשה מדיחה את ידה אחת במים, ונותנת פת לבנה קטן.

Come and hear a proof, as the school of Menashe taught that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: A woman may rinse her one hand in water on Yom Kippur and give bread to her young son.

PROOF

אמרו עליו על שמאי הזקן שלא רצה להאכיל בידו אחת, וגזרו עליו שיאכיל בשתי ידיו.

They said about Shammai the Elder that he did not want to feed his children even with his one hand, and they decreed upon him that he must feed with his two hands, forcing him to wash both. This implies that one who feeds another must wash.

REFUTATION

אמר אביי: ה'ם משום שיבתא.

Abaye said: There the washing is because of Shivta, the evil spirit of the morning, not because of feeding.

PROOF

תא שמע, דאבוה דשמואל אשכחיה לשמואל דקא בכי.

Come and hear another proof, as Shmuel's father found Shmuel crying.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: אמאי קא בכית? דמחיין רבאי.

He said to him: Why are you crying? Shmuel replied: Because my teacher hit me.

STATEMENT

אמאי? דאמר לי: קא ספית לבראי ולא משית ידיה.

His father asked: Why? Shmuel said: Because he said to me: You are feeding my son and you did not wash your hands.

STATEMENT

ואמאי לא משית? אמר ליה: הוא אכיל ואנא משיןא?!

His father asked: And why did you not wash? Shmuel said to him: He is eating, and I should wash?!

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: לא מיסת'יה דלא גמיר, מימחא נמי מחי!

His father said to him: Is it not enough that the teacher did not learn the halacha, he even hits you based on his mistake?!

RULING

והלכתא: אוכל מחמת מאכיל – צריך נטילת ידים, מאכיל – אינו צריך נטילת ידים.

And the halacha is: One who eats by means of another feeding him needs washing of hands; one who feeds another does not need washing of hands.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי צוֹרֵר אָדָם בְּשָׂר וּגְבִינָה בְּמִטְפַּחַת אַחַת, וּבִלְבָּד שֶׁלֹּא יִהְיוּ נֹגְעִין זֶה בָּזֶה.

MISHNAH: A person may bind meat and cheese in one cloth, provided that they do not touch each other.

MISHNAH

רַבִּין שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר: שְׁנֵי אֲכִסְנָאִין אוֹכְלִין עַל שְׁלֹחַן אֶחָד, זֶה בְּשָׂר וְזֶה גְבִינָה, וְאֵין חוֹשִׁין.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Two guests may eat on one table, this one meat and this one cheese, and they do not fear that they will come to eat from each other.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גָּמ' וְכִי נֹגַע זֶה בָּזֶה, מֵאִי הָיִי? צוֹנֵן בְּצוֹנֵן הוּא!

GEMARA: And if they touch each other, what of it? It is cold food touching cold food, which does not transfer taste!

ANSWER

אָמַר אַבָּיִי: נִהִי דִקְלִיפָה לָא בְּעִי, הִדְחָה מִי לָא בְּעִי?

Abaye said: Although peeling is not required, is rinsing not required? Therefore, they must not touch, to avoid needing to rinse the food.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רַבִּין שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר: שְׁנֵי אֲכִסְנָאִין אוֹכְלִין עַל שׁוֹלְחָן וְכוּ'.

We learned in the Mishnah: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Two guests may eat on one table etc.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב חֲנַן בְּרַם אָמִי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שֶׁאֵין מְכִירִין זֶה אֶת זֶה, אֲבָל מְכִירִין זֶה אֶת זֶה – אָסוּר.

Rav Chanan bar Ami said that Shmuel said: They only taught this where they do not know each other, but if they know each other, it is forbidden.

PROOF

תנאי נמי הכי: רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: שני אכסנאים שנתארחו לפונדק אחד, זה בא מן הצפון וזה בא מן הדרום, זה בא בחתיכתו וזה בא בגבינתו, אוכלין על שלחן אחד, זה בשר וזה גבינה, ואין חוששין.

It is also taught in a Braisa like this: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Two guests who stayed at one inn, this one coming from the north and this one coming from the south, this one coming with his piece of meat and this one coming with his cheese, may eat on one table, this one meat and this one cheese, and they do not fear.

BRAISA

ולא אסרו אלא בתפיסה אחת.

And they only forbade it with one grasp.

QUESTION

תפיסה אחת סלקא דעתך?

Does "one grasp" enter your mind? How can two people eat from the same physical grasp?

ANSWER

אלא כעין תפיסה אחת.

Rather, it means something like one grasp, meaning they are eating as one group and are familiar with each other.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב יימר בר שלמנא לאבאי: שני אחין, ומקפידין זה על זה, מהו?

Rav Yeimar bar Shelemya said to Abaye: Two brothers who are particular with each other and do not share food, what is the law? May they eat meat and cheese on one table?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: יאמרו כל הסריקין אסורין, וסריקי ביתוס מותרין!?

He said to him: Shall people say, "All figured loaves are forbidden, but the figured loaves of Boethus are permitted"?! We do not make distinctions in Rabbinic decrees.

OBJECTION

ולטעמיה, הא דאמר רבי אסי אמר רבי יוחנן: מי שאין לו אלא חלוק אחד מותר לכבסו בחולו של מועד. יאמרו:

And according to your reasoning, that which Rabbi Assi said that Rabbi Yochanan said: One who has only one shirt is permitted to wash it on Chol HaMoed. Do we not worry that people will say:

SUMMARY

The Gemara concludes with a practical shakla v'tarya regarding whether a person is allowed to eat bread by wrapping his hands in a cloth instead of washing them. The Gemara brings a raaya from the hanhaga of Rabbi Tzadok and a famous encounter where Shmuel found Rav eating with a cloth. Although Rav had actually washed his hands beforehand because he was simply delicate, the Gemara ultimately clarifies that there is a distinction between chullin and terumah: the Sages were mekil to allow eating with a cloth without washing only for those eating terumah, but for ordinary chullin, a cloth is not a substitute for netilas yadayim.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by a basic question: what is the halacha if a person wants to eat bread but doesn't want to wash his hands, so he wraps them in a cloth instead? We see a fascinating shakla v'tarya about whether this is muttar. Shmuel once found Rav eating with a cloth wrapped around his hands and asked him, "Do we do such a thing?" Rav answered him, "Da'ati ketzara alai", my mind is narrow, meaning I am in deep distress and cannot find water, so I must rely on this leniency.

Lichoira, look at the lengths these great Amora'im went to. Rav was in such a state of distress, yet he did not just grab the bread and eat. He made sure to wrap his hands in a cloth, finding a halachic way to protect his food from impurity even in his pain. On the other hand, Shmuel saw this and immediately questioned it, because a Yid must always strive for the highest level of hiddur mitzvah, avoiding even the appearance of bypassing the standard takanas chachamim of netilas yadayim.

This teaches us a massive yesod in our own avodas Hashem. Sometimes we find ourselves in a state of "da'ati ketzara", we are overwhelmed, exhausted, or facing a difficult nisayon where we cannot perform a mitzvah with all its usual hiddurim. The yetzer hara tries to tell us, "If you can't do it perfectly, don't do it at all." But the Torah way is the opposite. Even when we are squeezed, we do whatever we can, using every halachic tool available to keep ourselves connected to the ratzon Hashem.

Today, if you find yourself in a difficult situation where you cannot perform a mitzvah or learn your regular shiur perfectly, do not give up. Do whatever small part you can, even if it is only a "wrapping," because every single effort a Yid makes in a time of distress is precious to Hashem.