



Shabbos Daf Chaf Beis

The Prohibition to Benefit From the Chanukah Lights

בשבת דף ב"ב. אמר רב יהודה אמר רב אסי אסור להרצות מעות כנגד נר הנוכה. כי אמריתיה קמיה דשמואל אמר לי, וכי נר קדושה יש בה. מתקיף לה רב יוסף, וכי דם קדושה יש בו, דתניא ושפך וכסה במה ששפך וכסה שלא יבסנו ברגל שלא יהו מצות בזווית עליו, הכא נמי שלא יהו מצות בזווית עליו.

- ❧ -

Reasons for the prohibition to make use of the candlelight

To be noticeable that they were lit for Chanukah / To be like the Menorah / Disrespect for the mitzvah / The difference between a permanent and a temporary use / The difference between an ignoble use and a noble one

- דש"י, ד"ן, רא"ש, ב"י, פרמ"ג, טו"ו, בית הלוי -

[8] The prohibition to use the light of Chanukah candles is mentioned earlier in the Gemara¹, concerning the argument between the Amaroim if on Shabbos Chanukah one may use the oil and wicks that Chazal forbade us to use on Shabbos, as they do not burn well, and there is concern that one may inadvertently tilt the light to make it burn better. Rav said that one may use those oils and wicks for Chanukah lights, even on Shabbos, since he holds that one may not use the lights of the Chanukah candles. Therefore, there is no concern that he may tilt the light, as he is not using its light. [1]

The Gemara there also mentions that at a time of danger, if one places the Chanukah lights on his table, he needs to have another light next to them, so that he will use its light. The Chiddushei HaRashba writes that this is according to the one who says that it is forbidden to use the light of the Chanukah candles, and therefore he needs another source of light. [Unlike the Baal HaMaor, who says that everyone holds this way.]

The reason why it is forbidden to use their light, writes Rashi there², is so that it will be recognizable that it is a light of a mitzvah. The Rosh³ also explains this way, that it should be recognizable that he did not kindle them for his own use.

The Ran there⁴ writes since they instituted the mitzvah of lighting Chanukah candles because of the miracle that happened with the Menorah, they made it like the Menorah in that it could not be used

NOTES

The prohibition to use the lights that are added for hiddur / A light that was lit by a minor

- פרמ"ג, ג' המלך, כתב סופר, הליכות שלמה -

[1] The Pri Megadim²² writes that the prohibition to use the Chanukah lights applies also to the lights that one adds as a hiddur. The Be'er Heitev there²³ says in the name of the sefer Gan Melech²⁴, that this prohibition applies also to the lights of hiddur. The Da'as Torah there²⁵ cites the Gan Melech who compares this to what we learnt in Bikurim²⁶, that additions to bikurim also have a status of bikurim. That is to say, one may add to the fruits that ripened first, and they will also be included among the bikurim, and even have their sanctity. Here too, whatever lights one adds as a hiddur, also have a status of Chanukah lights, whose light is forbidden to use.

What they intended to say is, although logically one might have said that since one is not obligated to light lights of hiddur, so, the prohibition of using their light should not apply to them, as how can a prohibition fall on something that one was not even obligated to do. Thus, they wrote, although one was not obligated to light them, but now that one lit them, they are included in the Chanukah lights, on which there is a prohibition to use their light.

The Daas Torah there explains that even though the lights of hiddur are lit after one has fulfilled the basic obligation of the mitzvah, and one might have thought that this addition would not be included in the basic mitzvah, to have the prohibition of using its light. So, he proves from what we find with bikurim, that when one adds fruit to what ripened originally, it still has the law of bikurim.

The Teshuvos Chassam Sofer²⁷ proves this, because as a result of not being able to use even the lights of Mehadrin, therefore, we are allowed to use the oils and wicks that

may not be used on Shabbos for all the Chanukah lights. And certainly, we may use those oils and wicks for the Mehadrin lights as well. But, if we say that we may use the Mehadrin lights, we would not be allowed to use the forbidden oils and wicks for them (on Shabbos), so it must be that it must be forbidden to use the Mehadrin lights as well.

Concerning Chanukah lights lit by a minor, the Halichos Shlomo²⁸ writes, if a minor, who reached the age of education in mitzvos, lit them, it is forbidden to use their light. He expresses amazement is inclined to say that according to Rashi who explains the prohibition to use the Chanukah lights, so that they it will be recognizable that they were lit for the purpose of the mitzvah, one may say that the prohibition is only for the members of one's household, as the lights are theirs, and if they use them it will not be recognizable that they are Chanukah lights, as people will say that they lit them for their own use. But, for others walking in the street, it could be that they would be allowed to use them when they pass by, as they will not come to say that they were lit for the use of passersby. However, this is only according to the reason of Rashi, but according to the reason of the Ran, who said that Chazal instituted that they should be similar to the Menorah, there is no difference between family members and others.

He writes, one cannot ask, that if passersby can use them, how could one be allowed to light the Chanukah lights on Shabbos with oils and wicks that one may not use for the Shabbos lights, because one may not use the light, if others are allowed to use the light? It should be forbidden to use these oils and wicks, since the others may come to tilt them? This is not a question, since passersby who use the lights are forbidden to tilt the light even during the week, as it is stealing to tilt one friend's light without his permission, since that way the oil will be used up much quicker. Therefore, the only concern about tilting will be about the household members, and they are anyway forbidden to use the lights.

for his own private use. The Chiddushei HaRashba⁵ concurs with this. [2]

In light of what we have said, the Rosh queries what Rav Asi says in our sugya, that it is forbidden to count money by the light of the Chanukah candles. If it already says that one may not use their light, which means that any use is forbidden, so why was it necessary for Rav Asi to say that one may not count money by them? He answers that when it says previously that one should not make use of their light, this is referring to a fixed use. The reason is because one who sees him use it for a fixed purpose, will say that he lit them for that purpose, and not for a mitzvah. But, it is not forbidden for a temporary use, as people will not come to say that he lit them for this purpose. Thus, Rav Asi adds that a temporary use that is cheapening, such as counting money, is forbidden, because he will have to get close to the lights to see the money well. Therefore, he writes that it is forbidden to count money opposite the lights, meaning, near them.

Clarifying the words of the Rosh, the Beis Yosef⁶ writes, accordingly, a temporary use will not be forbidden unless it is demeaning, such as holding it close to the light. But, a temporary use that is not demeaning, such that his hands are not close to the light, it is permitted. The Beis Yosef expresses surprise at the Tur that he does not mention this explicitly, that one may use them for a temporary use, if it is not demeaning, that he does put his hands close to the light.

The Pri Megadim⁷ explains the Beis Yosef concerning the opinion of the Rosh. He writes that for a temporary use there is no reason to forbid it because people will say that he lit it for his own use, except if it is disrespectful for the mitzvah. Being disrespectful for the mitzvah means it is a demeaning use. This could be in one of two ways, either that it is demeaning in itself, in which case it will be forbidden even at a distance from the lights. Or, it could be a use which is not demeaning per se, such

as counting money, but if one has to hold one's hands close to the lights to be able to do it, that itself is disrespectful towards the mitzvah. Therefore, if one does a temporary use at a bit of a distance from the lights, and the use itself is not demeaning, there is no reason to forbid it, neither because of the recognition that the lights are for a mitzvah, nor that it is disrespectful for the mitzvah.

However, the Turei Zahav there⁸ argues with the Beis Yosef's interpretation of the Rosh. He writes that there is a printer's error in our version of the Rosh that is missing a word. It needs to read: Even a use that is not demeaning, such as counting money, is forbidden because of disrespect to the mitzvah. That is to say, if only because of a lack of recognition that it is a Chanukah light, one would be able to use it for a temporary use. Thus, Rav Asi comes to tell us that there is an additional reason to forbid using the light, and that is, due to it being disrespectful for the mitzvah. Therefore, any use is forbidden, even temporary ones, even ones that are not demeaning, and even if one does not hold them close to the light - since they are all disrespectful towards the mitzvah. Therefore, the Tur did not differentiate between different types of use, as the correct version of the Rosh says that any use constitutes disrespect to the mitzvah, even a temporary use, and even one that is not demeaning. [3]

Concerning the words of the Rosh, who wrote that the prohibition to use its light is because of recognizing that it was lit for the sake of Chanukah, this applies only to fixed uses, but not to temporary ones. The Beis HaLevi⁹ writes that this is only according to Rashi, who says the reason is because of recognition, and with a temporary use they will not say that that he lit it for that use. But according to the Ran, who said that they made the Chanukah lights like the Menorah in the Mikdash, there is no distinction made, and one may not use it, either for a permanent use, or a temporary one.

NOTES

Was there a prohibition to benefit from the light of the Menorah in the Beis HaMikdash? / Explanation of the Amoraim's argument about using the Chanukah lights

- הכנסת שלמה -

[2] The Ran says that it was forbidden to use the light of the Menorah in the Mikdash, because of the prohibition to benefit from hekdesch. Therefore, they forbade using the Chanukah lights, so that they should be like the Menorah in the Mikdash.

However, the Chochmas Shlomo²⁹ points out that seemingly it is not completely agreed upon that it was forbidden to use the light of the Menorah in the Mikdash. In Sukkah³⁰ the Mishnah says, there was no courtyard in Yerushalayim that what not lit up by the light of the Beis Hasho'evah. And there³¹ it quotes a braysa that women used to check wheat by the light of the Beis Hasho'evah, which implies that there was no prohibition to use the light of hekdesch. The reason for this is explained in Pesachim³², where it says, sound, sight and smell do not have me'ilah. Rashi writes there³³, because they are intangible. Tosfos in Shabbos³⁴ wrote in the name of the Yerushalmi in Sukkah³⁵, therefore women would check wheat by the light of the Beis Hasho'evah, because sight does not have me'ilah, and it is therefore permitted to benefit from hekdesch, by using its light.

However, there in Pesachim the Gemara says that even though these do not have me'ilah mide'oraysa, it is nevertheless forbidden miderabanan. Tosfos there³⁶ ask from this on the Yerushalmi which wrote that women would check wheat by the light of the Beis Hasho'evah. How could they do this if it is forbidden miderabanan to do so? Tosfos in Sukkah³⁷ wrote that according to what was explained in Pesachim, that it is forbidden miderabanan, we will have to say that when the braysa says that women would check wheat by its light that meant that the light was strong enough to do so, but not that they actually did that. However, the Yerushalmi does say that one is allowed to use the light of hekdesch, even according to the Rabanan, as there is no me'ilah for sight.

The Chochmas Shlomo writes, that which the Ran wrote that they instituted the Chanukah lights to be similar to the Menorah in the Mikdash, whose light was forbidden to use, fits in well with our Gemara, which holds that benefitting from sight has a prohibition miderabanan. If so, they instituted the Chanukah lights to be similar to the Menorah. But, according to the Yerushalmi, which holds that even according to the Rabanan it is permitted, it does not fit in with the Ran.

He adds that according to the Ran, one can explain that the previous³⁸ argument of the Amoraim, whether or not one is allowed to benefit from the Chanukah lights, depends on the argument of the Bavli and the Yerushalmi, regarding if there is a prohibition miderabanan to benefit from the light of hekdesch. The one who forbids having benefit from it, holds that hekdesch is forbidden miderabanan, and Chazal instituted the Chanukah lights to be like the Menorah. And the one who holds that it is permitted to have benefit from its light, holds like the Yerushalmi, which allows one to benefit from the light of hekdesch even miderabanan, and they did not have to institute it to be like the Menorah.

[3] According to the Beis Yosef and the Pri Megadim who explain the Rosh as saying that as far as the reason of disrespect for a mitzvah, we will only forbid a use which is demeaning. But one which is not demeaning will not be considered disrespectful. It seems that the Rosh felt forced to say this, because just as one asked why it was necessary for Rav Asi to forbid counting money in front of the Chanukah lights, if we have already said that one may not use the light of the Chanukah lights. Similarly, one may ask oppositely, since there is a reason to forbid due to disrespect to a mitzvah, how could the Amora'im argue earlier concerning if one may use the Chanukah lights, it is certainly forbidden because of disrespect for a mitzvah? Moreover, according to the view that one may not use its light, why was it necessary to have a special institution that it be recognizable that they are Chanukah lights, derive it from the prohibition of showing disrespect to a mitzvah?

We are therefore forced to say that even according to the reason of disrespect to a mitzvah, there is still a use that would not have been forbidden due to disrespect for a mitzvah. Concerning this the Amoraim argued if they forbade using the light because of a special institution, and this is because disrespect to a mitzvah can only be forbidden if it is a demeaning use. And as we said, this is either if the action is demeaning, or if one brings his hand close to the lights to look closely, but a use which is neither demeaning nor close to the lights, one cannot forbid for reasons of disrespect to a mitzvah. Concerning this there was an argument between the Amoraim, if using the lights was prohibited, so as to make it recognizable that he had lit Chanukah lights. Therefore, since this reason is only applicable to a fixed use, it turns out that a temporary use, which is not demeaning, will be permitted according to all.

According to the Turei Zahav who changes the wording of the Rosh, and forbids any use, because of disrespect to a mitzvah, whether it is a fixed use or only a temporary one,

Putting a Shamash near the lights

Does placing an additional candle permit one to use all the Chanukah lights or just the additional light? / Is the prohibition to use the Chanukah lights because it is forbidden to benefit from them, or is it just a prohibition to use them?

- טור, דרכי משה, ב"ה, טו"ו, לבושי שרד, פרי חדש -

[ג] The Gemara writes earlier¹⁰, in a time of danger one places them on one's table and that is sufficient. Rava said, he must place another candle, to be able to use its light. If there is a fire there, that is ample. However, if he is an important person, even if there is a fire, he must have an additional candle.

The Tur¹¹ writes that since one is forbidden to use its light, one must add another candle, so that if he uses its light, he will be using the candle that he added. The Shulchan Aruch there writes that we are accustomed to add a candle, so that if he uses its light, he will be using the additional candle. The Beis Yosef writes in the name of Rabeinu Yerucham that when he places another candle to use its light, he should put it by itself, because if not, they will say that he lit all of them for his use. The Shulchan Aruch also writes there that he should place it a bit apart from the other candles.

The Rema writes there in the name of the Mordechai, that we are accustomed to place the shamash, with which we lit the candles, next to them, so that if one comes to use the light, it will be the light of that candle. He writes that one should make it a bit taller than the other candles, so that if he comes to use light, he will be using its light. [4]

Concerning the law of using the light by adding an additional light, the Darchei Moshe there¹² derives that just as one may use the Chanukah lights when there is an extra candle there, so, if they were mixed up with other candles, he may light the mixture in a way that there will certainly be a permitted candle burning there, as well as a forbidden candle. Then, he may use the light, as there is also a permitted candle. The Rema also writes this there.

However, the Bach argues with the Rema, and writes that which we allow using it by adding a candle, is specifically because that candle is standing separately, and he is using its light, but to use the light of the Chanukah candles is forbidden, even if there is a permitted candle with them. He is supported from the words of the Ran on the previous Gemara, where he implies that at a time of danger, when one places the Chanukah lights on the table, without a choice he will be using its light, even if he placed an extra candle to use its light.

However, the Magen Avraham there¹³ writes that essentially we follow the Rema, that if there is an additional permitted candle, he may then also use the Chanukah candles. He is supported by what is written in Shulchan Aruch¹⁴ regarding a candle that was lit by a non-Jew on Shabbos, from which one may not benefit. Nevertheless, if there is also a candle that was lit before Shabbos, one may benefit from both together. The Pri Chodosh there writes that even though from the Ran it is implied like the Bach, nevertheless, the straightforward understanding of the Gemara and Poskim does not sound like that.

To understand this leniency, the Turei Zahav there¹⁵ writes that seemingly there is question, what does the extra candle help, if he is deriving benefit for the Chanukah lights, as certainly there is more light when there are a lot of candles? He writes that this is not a question, as there is no prohibition to benefit from using the Chanukah lights, as the reason why one may not use them, is so that it should be recognizable that they were lit for the mitzvah of Chanukah. Alternatively, so that there will not be any disrespect shown to them. Therefore, if there is a permitted candle with them, since these reasons do not apply to it, one may use it even though he is getting benefit from the Chanukah candles as well. [It is implied that he holds like the Rema, that whenever there is another candle with him, he may even use a Chanukah light.]

And to understand the opinion of the Bach, who holds that an additional candle does not help to allow one to use its light, unless it is standing separately, as then he will only be using the light of the additional candle. It is implied by Rabi Akiva Eger on Shulchan Aruch¹⁶ that he holds that the prohibition to use its light is because it is forbidden to benefit from the light of the Chanukah candle. Therefore it will be forbidden even if there is an additional candle there, as he is still benefitting from the additional light coming from the Chanukah candle.

The Magen Avraham¹⁷ cites Rabeinu Yerucham who writes that when one lights in a place where one will normally not be placing a candle, there is no need to place an extra candle to be able to use its light. He writes, that nevertheless, he should place the shamash next to it, in case he does use it.

The Levushei Srad explains there, that if he does not use the light, he does not need to place another candle there even though he is benefitting from the light, as a Chanukah light is not forbidden to have benefit from it. It is only forbidden to use their light, as the Turei Zahav explained. The reason why the Magen Avraham wrote that he should put the shamash there, was in case he comes to use it.

NOTES

a demeaning use or not a demeaning one. Seemingly, one could ask, if so, how could the Amoraim argue about whether one may use the lights or not, is there anyone who argues with what we learnt in the braysa, which forbids one to cause disrespect to a mitzvah?

However, the Chiddushei Rashba³⁹ explains the Amoraim's argument if one may use the light [in another way]. The reason of the one who forbids it, is really because of disrespect to a mitzvah, and the one who allows it, is because he holds since he is not using the actual oil, but just its light, there is no disrespect for the mitzvah. Accordingly, the argument is if it is permissible to use the light, is not a special institution to do with the Chanukah lights, but rather with disrespect of all mitzvos, which a general rule. Moreover, what Rav Asi said, to forbid counting money in front of the Chanukah lights, is specifically according to the opinion that one may not use their light, as according to the one who allows it, there is no disrespect in doing this. Accordingly, we can explain easily that the view that forbids using its light, forbids any type of use, whether fixed or temporary, whether demeaning or not.

However, one cannot answer the Turei Zahav this way, as he wrote his version of the Rosh, who wrote that the reason of the one who forbids using its light is so that it should be recognizable that he lit Chanukah lights, and not because of disrespect to mitzvos.

Does one need to have an extra candle for each candle of hiddur?

- הלכות קטנות -

[4] The Teshuvos Halachos Ketanos⁴⁰ he writes that it makes sense to say that when it says in the Gemara that one needs an extra candle to use its light, that is talking when there is one Chanukah candle, and then one candle will suffice to use its light, but if he is lighting like Mehadrin then he must add candles, an extra one for each candle. However, he concludes that perhaps he does not need one extra one for each candle.

The Shaarei Teshuvah⁴¹ quotes him, and explains his conclusion. Since one extra candle is sufficient to assume that his use will be from it, we are lenient to say that the

This concept that the prohibition to use its light is not a prohibition to have benefit from it, but merely to use it, is also explained by from the Pri Chodosh¹⁸, who writes in the name of the Maharikash, that even though it is forbidden to use its light, nevertheless, he may walk in its light

unintentionally, and does not need to close his eyes, as that is not regarded as a use. It turns out that they did not forbid one to have benefit from Chanukah lights, but it is forbidden to use them for anything that may be referred to as a use.

- 3 -

Using it for a mitzvah

If one may use it for a mitzvah or some matter of kedushah / The deciding factor between a temporary use and permanent one.

- טוד בשם העיטור, ט"ו, ביאור הגר"א -

[3] The Tur¹⁹ writes in the name of the Baal Ha'itur, who holds that the prohibition to use its light is only if he uses for a mundane purpose, but if he uses it for a matter of kedushah, it is permitted. However, the Tur writes that this was not clear to my father, the Rosh.

The Shulchan Aruch there writes that even for a matter of kedushah, such as learning in its light, is forbidden. He writes, that some allow to use it for a matter of kedushah.

The Turei Zahav there²⁰ questions the opinion of the Baal Ha'itur, as the reason why it is forbidden to use its light, explains Rashi, is because it should be recognizable that it is a light of a mitzvah. And so, if we allow him to learn by it, one who sees him will say that he did not light it as Chanukah lights, but to learn by it.

Furthermore, the reason they allowed one to light Chanukah lights on Shabbos, with oils and wicks that one may not use for Shabbos lights, is because he may not use their light. Therefore, there is no concern that he may tilt the candle, but if he is allowed to learn by them, we still must be concerned that he may tilt it.

Therefore, the Turei Zahav concludes that the Baal Ha'itur did not allow using the light for a mitzvah, except in a temporary fashion, as by using it temporarily he will not detract from the recognition that they are Chanukah lights, as everyone knows that it was not lit for a temporary use. And there is no problem of disrespect to a mitzvah, as the Itur holds that a use of a mitzvah is not disrespectful. This also answers how they allowed to light with oils and wicks that are invalid

for Shabbos candles, as it is forbidden to use its light, but they did not forbid because of the use of a mitzvah, as even the use of a mitzvah they only allowed in a temporary fashion, and as such, there is no concern that he may tilt it. The Turei Zahav queries what the Mechaber wrote, that there is an opinion who allows using the light for a use of kedushah, he should have written that it is only if it is temporary, but not in a permanent fashion.

The Biur HaGr"a there proves the opinion of the Rosh, from what the Gemara asks about one who only had one candle, either for Chanukah or Shabbos, which one gets preference? He writes that if we say that it is permissible to use it for the purpose of a mitzvah, he could light the one candle as a Chanukah and a Shabbos candle, since the Shabbos meal is a mitzvah. And according to the Itur he would be allowed to eat the Shabbos meal by the light of the Chanukah candle. It is clear from this that one is prohibited to use Chanukah lights to give light even for a mitzvah use.

However, according to the Turei Zahav even this question on the Baal Ha'itur can be answered, as a Shabbos meal is a fixed use, and even the Itur would agree that it is forbidden.

However, the Biur Halachah²¹ cites in the name of the Achronim, who argue with the Turei Zahav, and hold that according to the Itur who allows using the light for a mitzvah, it is even for a permanent use. And they answer the question of the Turei Zahav, that when Chazal forbade using oils and wicks that do not burn well, that is specifically because one will use the light for all his needs. But if he only uses it for the use of a mitzvah, they did not forbid him to use wicks that have a concern that he might tilt the light, as the main use of a mitzvah is to learn from a sefer, and learning from a sefer is only permitted if someone else is sitting with him, and then there is no concern that he may tilt. [5]

NOTES

extra candle is not cancelled among the many Chanukah candles, as we say that he is using the extra one. Moreover, since he needs to make his use closer to the extra candle, we do not care if there is much light coming from the numerous Chanukah candles.

[5] This law, if it is permitted to use the light for the purpose of a mitzvah, is already discussed by the Rishonim, the commentaries on the Rif. The Baal HaMa'or writes there⁴² that the earlier opinion⁴³ that it is forbidden to use its light even for a mitzvah or a matter of sanctity. The reason is because it is forbidden to use its light as they instituted that it should be a remembrance of the lights in the Sanctuary, which were forbidden to have benefit from. If so, there is no difference between mundane and a mitzvah, and even to read a sefer or to eat a Shabbos meal is forbidden.

However, he writes, according to Rav Asi in our sugya who says that it is forbidden to count money before the lights because it is disrespectful to the mitzvah, it is implied that the prohibition is only counting money and the like, as it is a mundane use. However, for a mitzvah or kedushah one would be allowed to use its light.

In practice, the Baal HaMaor concludes like Rav Asi that the prohibition to use the light is only because of disrespect for a mitzvah. And therefore, one is not allowed to use it for something mundane, like counting money. However, using it for a matter of kedushah, since there is no disrespect to the mitzvah, one may do so. And that is because he holds like the opinion that one may use its light.

However, the Ran writes there that what they said earlier, that it is forbidden to use its light, this is even for a mitzvah. Since because of the miracle, they instituted to make it like the Menorah, which may not be used at all. He proves this, because if it was permitted to use it for a mitzvah, how could they light the lights of Chanukah and Shabbos from any oils, they would have to be concerned in case he would tilt it when he uses it for his Shabbos meal. He also writes, that which they said in our sugya, that one may not count money by the Chanukah lights, that is not to say that only a mundane use is forbidden, but rather, even counting money which is an easy job, is forbidden, but also regarding a mitzvah, there is a disrespect for the mitzvah of Chanukah lights, which is unlike the Rezah.

מראי מקומות

1) דף כ"א: 2) ד"ה ואסור. 3) ס' ל'. 4) ד"ה הלכות. 5) דף כ"א: (ד"ה אמר). 6) ס' תרע"ג. 7) במ"ז ס' תרע"ג סק"ג. 8) סק"ג. 9) על התורה בחיל' לחנוכה (ד"ה בגמרא). 10) דף כ"א: 11) ס' תרע"ג. 12) סק"ה. 13) סק"א. 14) בס' רע"ו סעיף ד'. 15) סק"ה. 16) ס' רס"ד (במג"א סק"ד). 17) סק"ד. 18) בס' תרע"ג (ד"ה ומ"ט). 19) ס' תרע"ג. 20) סק"ד. 21) שם (ד"ה ויש). 22) ס' תרע"א מ"ז סק"א. 23) סק"ב. 24) ס' מ"ב. 25) שם סעיף א' (ד"ה לפי). 26) בפ"ג דבכורים משנה י"א. 27) א"ח ס' קל"ג (ד"ה עד). 28) מועדים פרק ט"ו סעיף י"א. 29) ס' תרע"ג סעיף א'. 30) דף נ"א: 31) דף נ"ג. 32) דף כ"ו. 33) ד"ה אין. 34) דף כ"א: (ד"ה שמחת). 35) פ"ה דסוכה הלכה ג'. 36) ד"ה מעילה. 37) דף נ"ג. (ד"ה אשה). 38) דף כ"א. 39) לעיל דף כ"א: (ד"ה אמר). 40) ס' ק"ח. 41) ס' תרע"ג סק"ה. 42) דף ט'. מדיף הרי"ף. 43) לעיל דף כ"א.

