

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ק"ו

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf with a powerful and sobering look at the immense spiritual and physical dangers of neglecting netilas yadayim. The Gemara brings down the famous, frightening accounts of how being meizel in mayim rishonim or mayim acharonim can lead to terrible tragedies, including eating treif or worse, chas v'shalom. This teaches us just how careful a Yid must be with the takanos of Chazal, which protect us both physically and spiritually.

From there, the sugya moves into the practical halachos of what kind of water may be used for netilas yadayim. We find a major machlokes regarding using water heated by fire, as well as the status of the hot springs of Tiberias. The Gemara goes deep into the shakla v'tarya of whether we can use these waters for pouring from a vessel or for immersion, and whether Chazal made a gezeirah on water drawn through a ditch due to a concern that one might come to use unfit water in a vessel.

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

עמוד א' DAF 106A

GEMARA

חֲזַנְהוּ דְקָא שְׂדוּ מִיָּא מְפּוּמָּא דְחֻצְבָּא,

The demon **saw them**, the members of Rav Pappa's household, **pouring water from the mouth of the pitcher** before drinking, to wash away any harmful substance,

GEMARA

אָמַר: אִי הָוָה יִדְעָנָא דְרַגְלִיתוֹ לְמִיעָבֵד הָכִי, לָא אִיעָבְבִי.

and the demon **said** to them: **If I had known that you are accustomed to do this**, I would not have delayed trying to harm you; rather, I would have brought the water straight from the river, knowing you would pour out the dangerous water anyway.

STATEMENT

כִּי אָתָּא רַב דִּימִי אָמַר: מִיָּם הָרִאשׁוֹנִים הָאֵכִילוּ בֶּשֶׂר חֲזִיר, אַחֲרֵיכֵן הוֹצִיאוּ אֶת הָאִשָּׁה מִבֵּעָלָהּ.

When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael, he said: Neglecting the **first waters** of hand-washing before a meal caused a Jew to be fed pig meat, and neglecting the **final waters** after a meal caused a woman to be divorced from her husband.

STATEMENT

כִּי אָתָּא רַבִּין אָמַר: רִאשׁוֹנִים הָאֵכִילוּ בֶּשֶׂר נֶבֶלָה, אַחֲרֵיכֵן הָרְגוּ אֶת הַנֶּפֶשׁ.

When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael, he said a slightly different version: Neglecting **first waters** caused a Jew to be fed meat of a carcass, and neglecting **final waters** killed a person.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: וְסִימְנִיהּ – אֶתָּא רַב דִּימִי אֶפְקָה, אֶתָּא רַבִּין קִטָּלָה.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: And your mnemonic to remember which Sage said which version is: Rav Dimi came and divorced her, meaning in his version she was sent out from her husband, and Ravin came and killed her, since in his version the husband killed his wife.

STATEMENT

רבי אבא מתני חדא מהני, וחדא מהני, לחומרא.

Rabbi Abba would teach one of these versions regarding the first waters, and one of these versions regarding the final waters, choosing the more stringent and severe outcome in both cases: that the first waters led to eating pig meat, and the final waters led to the husband killing his wife.

STATEMENT

איתמר, חמי האור: חזקיה אמר אין נוטלים מהן לידים, ורבי יוחנן אמר נוטלין מהם לידים.

It was stated that there is a machlokes regarding water heated by fire: Chizkiyah says we do not wash with them for the hands, and Rabbi Yochanan says we do wash with them for the hands.

PROOF

אמר רבי יוחנן: שאלתי את רבן גמליאל בנו של רבי, ואוכל טהרות, ואמר לי כל גדולי גליל עושין כן.

Rabbi Yochanan said: I asked Rabban Gamliel, the son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who would always eat his chullin in a state of ritual purity, and he said to me: All the great men of the Galil do so, washing their hands in heated water.

STATEMENT

חמי טבריא, חזקיה אמר: אין נוטלין מהם לידים, אבל מטבילין בהם הידים.

Regarding the hot springs of Tiberias, Chizkiyah says: We do not wash with them for the hands by pouring from a vessel, but we may immerse the hands in them directly.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: כל גופו טובל בהן, אבל לא פניו ידיו ורגליו.

And Rabbi Yochanan says: An impure person may immerse his entire body in them to become pure, but one may not immerse only his face, his hands, and his feet to fulfill the obligation of washing.

QUESTION

השתא כל גופו טובל בהם, פניו ידיו ורגליו לא כל שפן?

The Gemara asks: Now, if his entire body may be immersed in them, is it not all the more so permitted to immerse just his face, his hands, and his feet?

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: במקומן – דכולי עלמא לא פליגי דשרי,

Rav Pappa said: When the waters are in their natural place, everyone agrees that it is permitted to immerse the hands in them.

ANSWER

משקל מינייהו במנא – דכולי עלמא לא פליגי דאסיר.

And if one were to **take from them in a vessel** to pour on the hands, **everyone agrees that it is forbidden** because they are not fit for washing.

ANSWER

כי פליגי – דפסקינהו בבית בירתא:

Where they disagree is in a case where one drew them through a ditch away from their source:

ANSWER

מר סבר גזרינן בת בירתא אטו מנא, ומר סבר לא גזרינן.

One **Master**, Rabbi Yochanan, **holds we decree** against using water in a ditch because of the concern that one might come to use water in a **vessel**, and one **Master**, Chizkiyah, **holds we do not decree** this.

INFERENCE

כתנאי: מים שנפסלו משתיית בהמה, בכלים – פסולים, בקרקע – כשרין.

The Gemara comments: This is like a dispute between **Tanna'im**, as it was taught in a braisa: **Water that became unfit for drinking** even by an animal, if it is in **vessels**, it is **unfit** for washing hands, but if it is in the **ground**, it is **fit** for immersion like a mikveh.

INFERENCE

רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר: אף בקרקע, טובל בהן כל גופו, אבל לא פניו ידיו ורגליו.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: Even when the water is in the **ground**, one may immerse his entire body in them, but not his face, his hands, and his feet.

QUESTION

השתא, כל גופו טובל בהן, ידיו ורגליו לא כל שפון?

The Gemara asks: Now, if his entire body may be immersed in them, is it not all the more so permitted for his hands and his feet?

ANSWER

אלא לאו דפסקינהו בבית בירתא, ובקא פליגי:

Rather, is it not referring to a case where one drew them through a ditch, and they disagree about this:

ANSWER

דמר סבר גזרינן בת בירתא אטו מנא, ומר סבר לא גזרינן.

that one **Master**, Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, **holds we decree** against using water in a ditch because of the concern that one might come to use water in a **vessel**, and one **Master**, the first Tanna, **holds we do not decree** this. This is indeed the same dispute.

STATEMENT

אמר רב אידי בר אבין, אמר רב יצחק בר אשיאן: נטילת ידים לחולין, מפני סרך תרומה.

Rav Idi bar Avin said that Rav Yitzchak bar Ashiyan said: The washing of hands for chullin is not a Torah law, but was instituted because of the association with terumah, so that people would be accustomed to washing before eating terumah.

STATEMENT

ועוד משום מצוה.

And furthermore, washing hands is required because of a mitzvah.

QUESTION

מאי מצוה?

The Gemara asks: **What mitzvah** is there in this?

ANSWER

אמר אביי: מצוה לשמוע דברי חכמים.

Abaye said: It is a mitzvah to listen to the words of the Sages who enacted this decree.

ANSWER

רבא אמר: מצוה לשמוע דברי רבי אלעזר בן עזרה, דכתיב: "וכל אשר יגע בו הזב ויגדיו לא שטף במים".

Rava said: It is a mitzvah to listen to the words of Rabbi Elazar ben Arach, as it is written: "And whomever the zav touches, and his hands he did not rinse in water."

ANSWER

אמר רבי אלעזר בן עזרה: מכאן סמכו חכמים לנטילת ידים מן התורה.

Rabbi Elazar ben Arach said: From here the Sages found an allusion for washing hands from the Torah.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רבא לרב נחמן: מאי משמע?

Rava said to Rav Nachman: From where is this implied in the verse?

QUESTION

דכתיב "ויגדיו לא שטף במים", הא שטף – טהור? הא טבילה בעי!

Is it because it is written: "and his hands he did not rinse in water," implying that if he did rinse his hands, he becomes pure? But a zav requires immersion of his entire body in a mikveh, not just rinsing his hands!

ANSWER

אלא הכי קאמר: ואחר שלא שטף – טמא.

Rather, this is what the verse is saying: And another person, who is not a zav, who did not rinse his hands, is considered impure and renders other things impure. This refers to hands that did not wash.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי אושעיא: לא אמרו נטילת ידים לפירות אלא משום נקיות.

Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said: They only spoke of washing hands for fruit because of cleanliness, not because of ritual impurity.

INFERENCE

סבור מינה: חובה הוא דליכא, הא מצוה איכא.

The disciples **understood from this** statement: It is only an absolute **obligation** that there is not, but there is still a mitzvah to do so.

REFUTATION

אמר להו רבא: לא חובה ולא מצוה, אלא רשות.

Rava said to them: It is neither an obligation nor a mitzvah, but rather it is optional.

STATEMENT

ופליגא דרב נחמן, דאמר רב נחמן: הנוטל ידיו לפירות אינו אלא מגסי הרוח.

And this **disputes** the view of Rav Nachman, as Rav Nachman said: One who washes his hands for fruit is nothing other than of the **haughty-spirited**, as he shows off a level of piety that is not required.

STATEMENT

אמר רבה בר בר חנה: הוה קאימנא קמיה דרבא אמי ורבא אסי, אייתו לקמיהו כלכלה דפירי, ואכלו ולא משו ידיהו, ולא יהבו לי מידי, ובריה חד חד לחודיה.

Rabba bar bar Chana said: I was standing before Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi, and they brought before them a basket of fruit, and they ate and did not wash their hands, and they did not give me anything to eat, and each one blessed the after-blessing **individually**.

INFERENCE

שמע מינה תלת: שמע מינה אין נטילת ידים לפירות, ושמע מינה אין מזמנין על הפירות, ושמע מינה שנים שאכלו – מצוה ליחלק.

He said: **Learn from this three** halachos: **Learn from this** that there is no washing of hands for fruit; and **learn from this** that we do not make a zimun over fruit; and **learn from this** that when two people ate together, it is a mitzvah to **separate** and bless individually rather than having one bless for both.

PROOF

תנא נמי הכי: שנים שאכלו – מצוה ליחלק.

It is also **taught** in a braisa like this: Two who ate, it is a mitzvah to **separate** and bless individually.

EXPLANATION

במה דברים אמורים? שהיו שניהם סופרים, אבל אחד סופר ואחד בור – סופר מברך ובור יוצא.

In what case are these words said? When both of them were scholars, but if one is a scholar and one is an ignoramus, the scholar blesses and the ignoramus fulfills his obligation by listening.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: נטילת ידים לחולין – עד הפֶּרֶק, לתְרוּמָה –

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: Washing hands for chullin must be until the joint of the fingers, but for terumah it must be until the wrist.

עמוד ב' DAF 106B

BRAISA

עד הפֶּרֶק.

The water must reach until the joint of the fingers.

BRAISA

קידוש ידים ורגלים במקדש – עד הפֶּרֶק,

And regarding the sanctification of the hands and feet in the Beis HaMikdash before the Avodah, the water must reach until the joint where the hand meets the arm.

BRAISA

וְכָל דָּבָר שֶׁחֹצֵץ בְּטִבְיָלָה בְּגוֹף – חֹצֵץ בְּנִטְיַלַּת יָדַיִם לְחוּלִין, וּבְקִידוּשׁ יָדַיִם וְרַגְלַיִם בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ.

And any item that interposes in a tevilah of the body in a mikveh, thereby invalidating it, likewise interposes in the washing of the hands for chullin, and in the sanctification of the hands and feet in the Beis HaMikdash.

STATEMENT

אמר רב: עד כאן לחולין, עד כאן לתְרוּמָה.

Rav said, while pointing to his fingers: One must wash until here for chullin, meaning the second joint of the fingers, and until here for terumah, meaning the third joint where the fingers meet the palm.

STATEMENT

ושמואל אמר: עד כאן בין לחולין בין לתְרוּמָה, לקולא.

And Shmuel said: Until here, whether for chullin or whether for terumah, pointing to the stringent location, which is the third joint.

STATEMENT

ורב ששֶׁת אמר: עד כאן בין לחולין בין לתְרוּמָה, לקולא.

And Rav Sheshet said: Until here, whether for chullin or whether for terumah, pointing to the lenient location, which is the second joint.

STATEMENT

אמר בר הדיא: הוה קאימנא קמיה דרבא אמר: עד כאן בין לחולין בין לתְרוּמָה לקולא,

Bar Hedya said: I was standing before Rabbi Ami, and he said: Until here, whether for chullin or whether for terumah, pointing to the stringent location of the third joint.

EXPLANATION

ולא תימא רבי אמי משום דכהן הוא,

And do not say that Rabbi Ami ruled this way only because he is a Kohen, and therefore he was extra stringent with chullin so that he would not come to make a mistake with terumah.

PROOF

דְּהָא רַבִּי מֵיִשָּׁא בֶר בְּרִיהַ דְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי הוּא לֵוִי, וְאָמַר: עַד כָּאן בֵּין לְחוּלִין בֵּין לְתִרְמָה לְחוּמְרָא.

For behold, Rabbi Meyasha, the grandson of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, is a Levi, who does not eat terumah, and yet he also said: Until here, whether for chullin or whether for terumah, pointing to the stringent location.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב: נוֹטֵל אָדָם אֶת שְׁתֵּי יָדָיו שְׁחֲרִית, וּמִתְנָה עֲלֵיהֶן כָּל הַיּוֹם כּוּלּוֹ.

Rav said: A person may wash both of his hands in the morning, and make a condition on them that this washing should work for him for the entire day, provided he keeps his hands clean and guarded from tumah.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לְהוֹ רַבִּי אַבִּינָא לְכַנִּי

So too, Rabbi Avina said to the people of his town:

SUMMARY

On this daf, the Gemara establishes that while netilas yadayim for chullin is mid'Rabbanan—enacted so that people would remain accustomed to the purity required for eating terumah—it is nevertheless a complete mitzvah to listen to the Sages. We learn that this obligation of washing hands applies specifically to bread, whereas washing for fruit is not required at all. In fact, the Gemara points out that one who washes for fruit is considered haughty for putting on airs of extra piety. We conclude with a practical maaseh showing that the Sages did not wash for fruit, did not make a zimun over fruit, and made their berachos achronos individually.

The Gemara brings down the famous and terrifying words of Rav Dimi and Ravin regarding the severe consequences of neglecting netilas yadayim. We see that neglecting mayim rishonim led to a Yid eating treif, and neglecting mayim acharonim led to a tragic loss of life. Lichoira, we must ask: how does a simple, rabbinic act of washing hands before a piece of bread prevent such spiritual and physical catastrophes?

The yeshivish sevara here is deep. Netilas yadayim is not just a physical cleaning; the Gemara tells us it was instituted "mifnei serech terumah", to keep us connected to the high standards of kedushah and taharah of the Beis HaMikdash. When a person treats this small, rabbinic fence with respect, they are declaring that even their mundane, physical act of eating is holy. But when someone treats it lightly, saying "it's just a chumra" or "it's only a rabbinic decree," they break the protective boundary. Once that boundary is breached, the yetzer hara has an opening to drag a person down to the worst spiritual and physical dangers.

This is our avodah. We often think that only the big, explicit Torah prohibitions require our utmost vigilance. But Chazal are teaching us that the small, rabbinic fences we keep around our daily lives are what actually preserve our neshama's purity. When you wash your hands carefully up to the joint, with proper kavanah, you are building a wall of kedushah around yourself that keeps the forces of tumah far away.

Today, when you wash your hands for bread, do not do it as a mindless habit. Pause for three seconds before pouring the water, and think: "I am doing this mitzvah to guard my kedushah and to listen to the words of Chazal." Wash with care, up to the wrist, and feel how this simple act elevates your entire meal into an avodas Hashem.