



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Pesachim Daf Tes Vuv

- **Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara** said, that the basis for **R' Meir's** halacha in the Mishna was the halacha of **R' Yehoshua**.
 - **Q:** Which halacha of **R' Yehoshua**? It can't be his halacha from a Mishna in which he says that if terumah becomes safek tamei, we may take that terumah and leave it in a compromising position which may cause it to become tamei with certainty (there is no need to guard it against become certainly tamei), because there he is not *directly* causing the terumah to become tamei. However, **R' Meir** allows him to *directly* make it tamei!? **A:** It is his halacha from another Mishna. **R' Yehoshua** argues with **R' Eliezer** and says, if tahor terumah wine is spilling into tamei chullin wine, and there is no way to save even a revi'is of the terumah wine from becoming tamei (he has no tahor keilim), one may try and catch the terumah in tamei keilim to prevent it from mixing with the chullin and making the chullin unusable as well. We see that he holds that if the terumah is unusable (it is headed to the tamei chullin) one may make it tamei even *directly*. Based on that, **R' Meir** said that the chametz terumah (which is assur to eat and therefore unusable) may be made tamei even *directly* by burning it together with the tamei items.
 - **Q:** If this is the basis of **R' Meir's** opinion, why does the Mishna say that it is based on "their" words, it should say that it is based on "his" words!? **A:** It is based on **R' Yehoshua's** words as part of his machlokes with **R' Eliezer**. That is what is meant by "their" words.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** also said that **R' Meir** based his opinion on the halacha of **R' Yehoshua**.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked from a Braisa that explains **R' Yose's** response to **R' Meir**. The Braisa explains that **R' Yose** said to **R' Meir**, you can't learn your halacha from **R' Chanina**, because in that case both pieces of meat were already tamei, and you can't learn your halacha from **R' Akiva**, because over there the oil was "passul" (tamei) as well. Obviously, **R' Meir** is basing his opinion on them, which is why **R' Yose** was saying that it is not correct to do so!? **A:** **R' Yose** thought that **R' Meir** was basing his opinion on them. When he was told that the opinion was based on **R' Yehoshua**, he then asked, that **R' Yehoshua** agrees with **R' Eliezer** that tahor and tamei terumah must be burned separately.
 - **Q:** **R' Yehoshua's** halacha with the terumah wine falling into the chullin wine seems to be a perfect comparison to **R' Meir's** case of chametz. Why does **R' Yose** think it is not!? **A:** It could be that it is allowed in the case of the wine to prevent the loss of the chullin wine. In the case of the chametz, there is no loss that we are trying to prevent. The loss of having to use more wood for a second fire is considered insignificant.
- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the machlokes is in the 6th hour (when the chametz is only assur D'Rabanan). In that case **R' Meir** says one may burn the tahor terumah with the tamei terumah, and **R' Yose** says they must be burned separately. However, once the 7th hour begins (when the chametz is assur D'Oraisa), even **R' Yose** would agree that they may be burned together (the issur on the terumah puts it on even standing with the tamei and they can therefore be burned together).
 - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, from the fact that **R' Yochanan** says that **R' Meir** only permits burning the tahor with the tamei during the 6th hour, it shows that **R' Chanina** must be

the basis of **R' Meir's** halacha. He will say that **R' Chanina** is discussing a case where the sheini meat was only tamei D'Rabanan. We see that a D'Rabanan is enough to allow the tahor to be burned with the tamei. (If his basis was **R' Yehoshua's** case with the wine, it would not need an issur D'Rabanan to be burned, and could therefore be burned together with the tamei terumah even before the 6th hour)? **A: R' Assi** said, this is correct!

- We can bring a proof that **R' Yose** would agree that tahor terumah may be burned with tamei terumah beginning at the 7th hour of the day. In the Braisa quoted earlier, **R' Yose** brought down the shita of **B"H** that piggul, nosar, and tamei may all be burned together. Presumably his point is that something that is assur D'Oraisa (like piggul and nosar) may be burned with tamei, but something only assur D'Rabanan (like chametz during the 6th hour) may not.
 - It could be that piggul and nosar may be burned with tamei, because a Braisa says that they themselves are tamei D'Rabanan. However, chametz in the 6th hour, although assur D'Rabanan, is not tamei at all, and therefore could not be burned along with tamei items.
- A Braisa, which must follow **R' Yose**, says that inedible (moldy bread), tahor terumah may be burned with tamei terumah. Based on this, in the 7th hour, when it is assur D'Oraisa, it will be considered inedible and therefore allowed to be burned with tamei items. This is a proof that **R' Yose** would agree with **R' Meir** in the 7th hour.
 - It could be that he says that only in regard to moldy bread, because it is truly inedible and the equivalent of dirt. However, when something is inedible due to an issur, he would not allow it to be burned with tamei items.
- **Q:** If the basis to **R' Meir's** halacha is **R' Chanina**, why does **R' Yose** bring down the machlokes between **R' Yehoshua** and **R' Eliezer**!? **A: R' Yose** was telling **R' Meir**, that even according to **R' Yehoshua** who is lenient and allows *safek* tamei to be burned along with definite tamei, it would be assur to burn *tahor* terumah and tamei terumah together.
- **Q:** If **R' Yose** agrees that an issur would allow the tahor to be burned with the tamei (although according to him it would have to be an issur D'Oraisa), **R' Chanina's** case (which we said is talking about tumah D'Rabanan on the piece that is a sheini) is a perfect comparison to the case of chametz, so why did **R' Yose** say that it is not!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, **R' Chanina's** case is talking about where the sheini meat became tamei from a liquid that itself became tamei from a sheretz. **R' Meir** says that liquids can only make other things tamei D'Rabanan, and therefore this case is one of a D'Rabanan. **R' Yose** says that liquids can make other things tamei D'Oraisa, and therefore this case is one of a D'Oraisa. Therefore, according to **R' Meir** the case is a perfect comparison to the chametz which is only assur D'Rabanan. According to **R' Yose**, it is not.