

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Beitza Daf 21
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
Tosfos.ecwid.com
Subscribe free or Contact: tosfosproject@gmail.com

Daf 21a

It says that it's only "if you sprinkled it," but you can't L'chatchila sprinkle it. This fits well to Rava's opinion (since you're not eating the meat on Shabbos anyhow, so there is no Heter to sprinkle the blood). However, this is difficult according to Rabbah b R' Huna. The Gemara concludes; we can either say that it's a difficulty to him. Alternatively, we can say we're stricter by rabbinical prohibitions on Shabbos than on Yom Tov. (So, even though we have proof that it would be prohibited on Shabbos, it's not a proof that it's also prohibited on Yom Tov.)

New Sugya

R' Aviya the old asked R' Huna if you can Shecht on Yom Tov an animal that a Jew and a non-Jew own together? (After all, you're partially Shechting for a non-Jew.) R' Huna permitted it. R' Aviya asked: why is this different than what we forbid bringing a volunteer Shlomim on Yom Tov, although it's half brought for Jews to eat? R' Huna pushed him off by saying; "isn't that a bird flying by?" After R' Aviya left, R' Huna's son, Rabbah, asked him, didn't you always praise R' Aviya that he's a great person? (So, why push him off disgracefully?) R' Huna answered (I didn't push him off because he felt it was below my dignity to answer him, but I had just finished giving the Shiur at the Yarchei Kala and I need to eat to get my mind clear) so I need, like the Pasuk describes, "sustain me with flasks of wine and surround my bed with apples," and he asked me something that I need to reason (so, I couldn't think straight at the moment to answer him). The Gemara asks: what is the reason? The Gemara answers: you can Shecht the animal that's owned jointly by the Jew and non-Jew, since, even if you only need a Kazayis of meat, you'll need to do Schita on the animal. (So, you did the whole Schita for the Jew.) However, by a volunteer Shlomim, (you really Shechted to make the Korbon for Hashem), and when the Kohanim receive their share, they only receive a present from Hashem's table (after-the-fact that it was Shechted for the Korbon).

Tosfos quotes Rashi: the Kohanim receive the breast and leg and the Yisrael receives the rest of the meat from Hashem's table, like a slave receiving his portion from his master.

Tosfos adds: even according to R' Yossi Haglili who says that Kodshim Kalim are considered their owner's property even after it's Shechted [except for the parts that we give to the Kohain], (so, you may think that he's Shechting for himself, still it's forbidden to Shecht on Yom Tov), since we consider that ownership after Schita comes from Hashem's table (i.e., that the Korbon is completely Hashem's, and he lets you have your portion). Therefore, the main Korbon is only for Hashem. Granted that what you receive is enough yours that you may give it to a woman for Kiddushin, still, all the Avodos done to it (including Schita) was done exclusively for Hashem.

New Sugya

R' Chisda says that you can Shecht on Yom Tov an animal that a Jew and non-Jew own jointly since it's impossible for the Jew to have a Kazayis of this meat without Shchita. However, if they own jointly a dough, you can't bake the whole dough since you can split up the dough before baking.

Tosfos asks: we said before the R' Shimon b. Elazar allows filling an oven with loaves bread and bake them even if he only needs one loaf, since bread bakes better when the oven is full. So, we

permit L'chatchila to bake all the bread, even those you don't need, in the same oven. (So, why can't you put all this dough, even the non-Jew's share, in the oven?) You can't say because R' Chisda says this Halacha according to the Rabanan who disagree with R' Shimon b. Elazar, because we Paskin like R' Shimon b. Elazar.

Tosfos answers: R' Shimon b. Elazar's case is different since it's completely owned by the Jew. Therefore, he can pick any of the loaves to eat (therefore, we can consider each one baked for Yom Tov). Also, we can say he may possibly use all of them on Yom Tov, since, perhaps, guest might barge in. However, these ideas are not applicable in our case where a non-Jew owns half of it.

R' Chana b. Chanilai asks: we have a Mishna; if you have a dough made for dogs, if the shepherds eat from them (they get the status of regular bread) and you're obligate to separate Challah, you can use it for your Eiruv Chatzeiros, and your Shitufei Mevayos (an Eiruv for alleyways), you make Hamoitzie on it, and you can make a Ziman with people who ate it, and you may bake it on Yom Tov, and if it's unleavened, you can be Yoitza your obligation to eat Matzah on Pesach. Anyhow, we see you can bake it on Yom Tov. If you can split the part you'll eat with the part that the dogs will eat, how can you bake the whole dough?

The Gemara answers: the dog dough is different (than a non-Jew's dough) since (you can eat it all yourself) if you would give the dogs Neveila (an animal that died).

The Gemara asks: does R' Chisda hold of the logic 'since' (i.e., since there might be a way that it will be permitted, so we permit it)? After all, if you cook from Yom Tov to weekday, R' Chisda says you get lashes and Rabbah holds you don't get lashes. R' Chisda says you get lashes, since we don't say that, 'since' if guest comes, it's fit for them (and it's considered that it's cooked for Yom Tov), so right now, even if guest don't show up, we consider it fit for guest too. Rabbah says you don't get lashes, since he holds of this logic of 'since' (it's fit for guest, it's considered as if it's cooked for Yom Tov).

Rather, the Gemara answers: don't say since you can eat it yourself if you had Neveila to give them, but rather, we refer to the case that you have Neveila to give them, so you can definitely eat all of the dough yourself.

(The bottom) Tosfos asks on Rabbah's opinion of 'since': the Gemara in Shabbos says that, if someone removes a honeycomb (from where the bees made it) on Yom Tov, he gets lashes. Why, according to Rabbah, would he receive lashes? After all, (even if he doesn't need it for Yom Tov), perhaps guests will come and he'll serve it to them.

Tosfos says: you can't answer that, since they could have done it before Yom Tov, then you can't do it on Yom Tov. After all, we already explained in the beginning of the Mesechta (when explaining the enactment of not eating fruit that fell from a tree on Yom Tov) that, regarding the actual food preparation, it's always permitted and it doesn't make a difference whether you could have done it before Yom Tov or not.

Rather, Tosfos answers: we refer to a case where the honey spoiled (and it's not edible) and it could only be used to sooth a camel's wound. Alternatively, we refer to a case where he detached the honeycombs so close to nightfall, you don't have a chance to feed it to guests even if they would barge in immediately.

New Sugya

They asked R' Huna: in a case where the government places upon Jewish villagers to bake for the army,

are they allowed to do so on Yom Tov? He answered: see if you can give some bread to a child and they wouldn't care, then you may bake all the bread on Yom Tov, since each bread is fit to give to the child. If they would care, then you can't bake for them.

Tosfos quotes Rashi: R' Huna argues against the above Gemara that disallows baking the whole dough that a Jew has a partnership with a non-Jew since he could split the dough before the baking. (So, although the child may take a bread, but that doesn't permit baking all of it even the amount that they'll give to the soldiers.)

Ri says that he doesn't argue. Only in the case of the partnership, where he can divide the dough before baking, must he only bake the bread that's for him. However, here we refer to a case where the flour belongs to the army. The villagers were only forced to do the labor of baking. Thus, a villager can't take any flour to bake for the child without baking for the army. It's only after all the baking was done for the army, they wouldn't care if you take one bread for a child. Therefore, they try to bring a proof in the upcoming Gemara from a case where they prepared a calf for an army. (R' Yehuda b. Bava prohibited, supposedly, even though the villagers could have taken some.) It was a similar case where the army gave the calf, therefore, they would care that no one should eat any of it unless they labored in the cooking, like the way that cooks sample from their cooked items. Therefore (it's a parallel case) and they asked from it to R' Huna.

The Gemara asked from a Braisa: Shimon Hateimani didn't show up to the Beis Medrish one Yom Tov evening. The next day, R' Yehuda b. Bava asked him why. He answered: there was an army that came to his town and they threatened to loot the whole town. We Shechted (and prepared) one calf, they ate and left us in peace. R' Yehuda b. Bava said back: I wonder if you didn't lose more than you gained (since you did a prohibited act by doing work for the army). After all, the Torah says that you may only do Melacha "for you" and not for non-Jews. (If R' Huna is correct), why isn't this permitted since they could have eaten some of the calf?

R' Yosef answers: we refer to a Treif calf (that Jews can't eat). The Gemara asks: (even if it's not fit for you) it's fit for the dogs. (So, since you can give a piece to your dog, why don't we consider it doing Melacha for the dog, [which we assume now to be permitted]?)

The Gemara answers: It's a Tannaic argument (whether you can do Melacha for animals on Yom Tov). As the Braisa states; R' Yossi Haglili says; the Pasuk says that you may do Melacha for anything needed to eat for all souls." Since it says 'souls' I would say it infers even souls of animals, (as the Pasuk uses the term 'souls' by animals), "if someone smites the soul of an animal, he shall pay." Therefore, the Pasuk says "for you" to exclude dogs.

Daf 21b

R' Akiva says: I say that we include animals in what we allow doing Melachos for 'souls.' If so, why does the Pasuk say "for you?" To exclude non-Jews. The Gemara asks: why do we assume that it includes animals and excludes dogs? The Gemara answers: because it's not upon you to feed non-Jews, but you need to feed your animals, (so, it's logical that the Torah permits us to prepare for what we're obligated to do).

Tosfos quotes R' Shmuel from Ibrah who quotes his brother, R' Moshe, that the Halacha is like R' Yossi Haglili (who holds you can't do Melacha for dog). Although, we usually Paskin like R' Akiva when he argues with colleagues, however, we find an unnamed Mishna like R' Yossi Haglili in Challah. The Gemara already brought it down, that dough made for a dog, if the shepherds also eat from it, may be baked on Yom Tov. This infers that if the shepherd doesn't eat from it (and it's

exclusively for the dogs), you can't bake it on Yom Tov. After all, at the end of the Mishna (not quoted in the above Gemara) says explicitly, if the shepherd doesn't eat from the dough, you can't bake it on Yom Tov.

New Sugya

Abaya asked R' Yosef: according to R' Yossi Haglili who says (you can only do Melacha) "for you," and not for dogs, how can you move date-pits on Yom Tov to give to wild animals?

Tosfos asks: what's wrong that we should forbid them? After all, if we're worried about the bother (to prepare them for animals), then the Gemara's answer "since you can use it for fuel in a fire," doesn't answer the question. After all, just because it's fit for fuel for a fire doesn't take away the bother of preparing it for the animals.

If the question is because of Muktzta, that he must hold that fodder is Muktzta, then the Gemara should have asked; how can you feed straw to animals? Also, we have a Mishna that allows carrying the hair-like items that grow on lentils "because they're fodder." (So, fodder isn't Muktzta.) We also say that you can move spoiled meat, since dogs eat them.

Tosfos answers: we must say these pits are not fit for animals unless you fix them up greatly, by mincing them, which softens them, which is rabbinically considered to be a Melacha. However, if in need, the animal can eat it as is. However, since it's not mainly considered fodder unless you do the fixing, how can we give it to the animals according to those who hold you can't do Melacha for an animal? After all, in order to make them really fit, you need a Melacha to fix it, which is forbidden. (Therefore, we should consider it Muktzta.) On that we answer: since it's fit for fuel for a fire, (it's not Muktzta on Yom Tov).

The Gemara answers: since it's fit to fuel a fire. The Gemara asks: this fits well for dried pits, but fresh pits, what's it fit for? The Gemara answers: it's fit for a bonfire. The Gemara asks: this fits well for Yom Tov, but why can you move it on Shabbos (where it's forbidden to fuel fires)? The Gemara answers: on Shabbos, you must carry it with bread (to look like it's part of the carrying of a permitted item). Like Shmuel says that you may use bread for anything, (like here you're using it to carry the pits, and we don't say you're degrading the bread).

Tosfos asks: we say in Mesechtas Shabbos that we don't allow this Heter of carrying Muktzta with bread (or with a child) by any other Muktzta item but by a corpse (so you can carry the corpse to a place where it would be safe and wouldn't decompose over Shabbos). [So, why do we permit it here to bring the pits to the animals?]

Tosfos answers: we only brought that rule regarding items that could have been moved on Friday, that we don't permit moving it with bread except if it's a corpse. However, these pits couldn't be brought Friday (since they were still part of the date then), so we allow moving it with bread.

The Gemara says that this (i.e., R' Huna who says that you may bake all the bread if you can give one to a child) argues on the following R' Yehoshua b. Levi. As we see, R' Yehoshua b. Levi says you can invite a non-Jew for Shabbos, but not for Yom Tov, since you might add to cook for them, (and, we don't say, since you give some to a Jew, it's not a problem cooking all of it and give some to a non-Jew).

[See Maharsha who writes: this doesn't fit well to Tosfos who said the reason R' Huna allowed there is because you can't give anything to the child unless you bake for the whole army. This doesn't

argue with R' Yehoshua b. Levi, since you can cook for the Jews here without cooking for the non-Jewish guest. Therefore, he says Tosfos wouldn't have the text that "R' Yehoshua b. Levi argues."]

R' Ada b. Ahavah forbade inviting the non-Jew for Shabbos too, since you'll have problem of clearing off their cups that they drank wine in (because of the leftovers in the cup). The Gemara asks; why aren't we worried about our own used cups (which is useless, and thus should be Muktzah)? The Gemara answers: because our leftovers in the cups (aren't Muktzah) since you can feed them to your chickens. The Gemara asks: why can't you also feed the non-Jew's leftovers to chickens? (So, why are they Muktzah?) The Gemara answers: they're forbidden to give to the chickens, since it's forbidden to partake pleasure in their wine.

The Gemara asks: why not move it because of the cup (that's not Muktzah)? After all, why is it different than the case of a utensil called Kenusa, (which incense was burned inside it) that you may move it, despite having pieces of wood in them that are Muktzah, because of the ash that's in there (that's used to cover unpleasant items). The Gemara answers: we only allow there, since the Muktzah is not something forbidden to partake pleasure from, not like the wine which is forbidden to have pleasure from.

Tosfos asks: how can we originally compare the cups of wine to the Kenusa, since you have a non-Muktzah item in it, like the ash, which is fit to cover spit and dung. However, if there were no ash, we would forbid moving it since it's a base to Muktzah (the wood). Therefore, by the cups that only contain something that's Muktzah (the wine), you shouldn't be able to move them.

Tosfos answers: here, each case has a separate reason to permit and to forbid, (so we compare them). After all, the cup is a non-Muktzah utensil (which is a reason to permit), but has wine inside it which is Muktzah (a reason to forbid). The same by the Kenusa, which has something inside it that's not Muktzah (the ash, and that's a reason to permit) but the Kenusa by itself is forbidden to move, (which is a reason to forbid), since it's a utensil that's main function is forbidden on Shabbos. Therefore, our comparison; just as we permit moving the Kenusa because of the ash, we should permit moving the leftover wine through the cup.

However, Tosfos concludes, this is not the implications of the Gemara. It doesn't seem that you need the ash to move the actual Kenusa, since you're moving it to use it for some function, or because you need its place. After all, it's permitted to move a utensil that's main function is forbidden to use or for its place. Therefore, it's not similar to the case of a cup (where you need the cup to move the wine).

Rather, Tosfos answers: the Gemara held that the leftover wine is such a degraded item, it's considered to be completely negated to the cup (to say that the cup is the main object you're moving, since the wine is of negligible worth). This is compared to how the wood is considered negligible to the ash.

R' Tam answers: the comparison is; we don't say utensils becomes a base to a negligible amount of Muktzah. Therefore, the cup shouldn't be a base for the wine the same way the Kenusa is not a base for the wood. The only reason the Gemara says that you need the ash to move the Kenusa, that's only a reason why you can move it with the wood inside it, and you don't need to shake out the wood beforehand. Therefore, it says that it has ash in it, so you just can't spill its contents out over the floor. The same with the cup with wine, the reason you can move it with the wine in it since you can't spill out the wine on the floor.

R' Acha b. Diftsi asked Raveina: (why can't you move the cups on Shabbos?) After all, it should have the status as a "chamber pot." (I.e. the rabbis give a Heter to move anything that's disgusting, even if it's

Muktza, so too, it's disgusting leaving these wine cups on the table.)

Raveina answered: we don't make a situation that will create a "chamber pot" to allow carrying it. (It's only permitted after the fact that it happened.)

New Sugya

On what we said that you can't invite a non-Jew for Yom Tov for, perhaps, you'll cook extra for him; when Mareimar and Mar Zutra had non-Jews visit them on Yom Tov, they would tell them flatly; "if there is enough for you to eat from the extras of what we prepared for ourselves, then it's good. However, if it's not (and you need more), we won't prepare anymore just for you."

New Sugya

Beis Shammai held that you can't cook up water to wash your feet unless it's fit to drink. Beis Hillel permits in all cases.

Tosfos asks: why does Beis Shammai permit if it's fit to drink? After all, he doesn't hold of the logic "once the Torah permits Melachos for eating, it permits it for all needs, even what's not needed for eating." (Therefore, you can't do any Melacha unless you'll use it for eating.)

Tosfos answers: we refer to a case where he cooked water to drink, but added extra in the pot to wash his feet. This is explicitly brought in the Yerushalmi that Beis Shammai requires him to drink some, and Beis Hillel permits it (without drinking).

Tosfos concludes: this is only cooking water for washing your feet, but not for your whole body. That's forbidden since the Torah only permit a Melacha that's enjoyed by all. however, washing the whole body is only enjoyed by pampered people. However, washing hands and feet are enjoyed by all.

The Mishna concludes: you're allowed to make a bonfire to warm yourself. The Gemara asks: who is of the opinion that it's permitted to make this fire? Is it permitted by everyone, since Beis Shammai might only forbid cooking for washing your feet, but a fire, which the whole body benefits (just like food), perhaps they admit that it's permitted. Or do we say that it's only Beis Hillel who permits it, but Beis Shammai (forbids) since he doesn't differentiate in the above way. The Gemara answers: the Braisa says explicitly; Beis Shammai forbids making a bonfire to warm yourself, and Beis Hillel permits it.

New Sugya

There were three things R' Gamliel was stringent like Beis Shammai. He didn't insulate hot water on Yom Tov (for Shabbos). He didn't reset a candelabra (that fell apart) on Yom Tov. He didn't bake thick loaves on Yom Tov, only wafers. R' Gamliel said that his ancestors never baked thick bread on Yom Tov, only wafers. The rabbis responded: what should we do about your ancestors who were stringent on themselves but were lenient on everyone else and allowed them to bake thick loaves and cakes.

The Gemara asked: why didn't they insulate water from Yom Tov to Shabbos? After all, if they made an Eiruv Tavshilin, what's the reason for Beis Shammai to forbid? If he didn't make an Eiruv Tavshilin, what's the reason for Beis Hillel to permit?

R' Huna answers: we refer to when he didn't make an Eiruv Tavshilin, and Beis Hillel allows him to prepare a barebones Shabbos.

Daf 22a

This is R' Huna being consistent to his opinion, as he says; if someone didn't make an Eiruv Tavshilin, he's allowed to bake one loaf of bread, and cook one pot, he can light a candle. R' Yitzchok allows him to roast one fish. We have a Braisa that says the same idea.

Tosfos says that this Gemara implies that you must mention lighting candles when you place the Eiruv Tavshilin. If you didn't mention lighting the candles, we'll only allow you lighting one candle. Since the Gemara here lists it as one of the barebones things that we allow if you don't make an Eiruv Tavshilin, implies we only allow the barebones minimum, i.e., one candle.