



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

### Pesachim Daf Chuf Zayin

- **Abaye** said, if we say that **Rebbi** is the Tanna of the first Braisa which says that the oven must be crushed (because he holds that the combination of two things, one of which is assur, causes the result to be assur), **Rebbi** shares the view of **R' Eliezer**. If we say that **Rebbi** only forbids the bread baked in the fire fueled by things that are assur b'hana'ah, but would say that the oven is fine (even if it is fired up for its first time with assur wood, because going forward the oven will be a combination of this first assur fire and future mutar fires), he would agree that earthenware utensils heated for the first time in a fire fueled by assur wood would be assur (they are used without being heated up again). **Rebbe and R' Eliezer** would only argue regarding an oven.
- **Shmuel's** version of the Braisa was that **Rebbi** said that bread baked in an oven fired up with assur wood is mutar, and the **Chachomim** said that it is assur. Either we must say that **Shmuel's** version was the reverse of the way we learned earlier, or we can say that **Shmuel** really had the same version as we did. However, he wanted everyone to pasken that the bread is assur, so he attributed that shitah to the **Chachomim** so that people would pasken that way.

BISHLA AHL GABEI GECHALIM DIVREI HAKOL HAPAS MUTERES

- **Shmuel and R' Yochanan** argue: one says that **Rebbi** only permitted the bread when the coals were no longer flaming, and the other says that **Rebbi** allowed it even if the coals were still aflame.
  - **Q:** According to the shitah that **Rebbi** permits the bread even with coals that were still aflame, in what case would **Rebbi** say that it would be assur!? **A: R' Pappa** said, when the wood is still intact and in flames. At that point he would still be benefitting from the wood.
    - **Q:** That would mean that the **Rabanan** argue and permit the bread even in that case. If so, when would they say that it is assur to benefit from the wood!? **A: R' Ami bar Chama** said, if the wood was fashioned into a bench, it would be assur to use the bench.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, according to the **Rabanan** who permit the bread that was baked in an oven fueled by assur wood, what would the halacha be if the oven was fueled by wood of hekdesch? **A:** He said it would be assur.
  - **Q:** Why is the case of hekdesch different than orlah? **A: Rava** said, orlah becomes batel in 200, whereas hekdesch never becomes batel.
    - **Q: Rava** asked, when someone lights hekdesch wood on fire he commits me'ilah, and as such the wood becomes chullin. If so, it should not make the bread assur!? **A: R' Pappa** said, we are dealing with wood of a shelamim, and we are following the shita of **R' Yehuda** that kodashim kalim are not subject to me'ilah. Therefore, even if one uses it, it does not become chullin and remains assur.
    - **Q:** How can we say that when one lights wood of hekdesch it becomes chullin? A Braisa says that even the ashes of hekdesch remain assur!? **A: Rami bar Chama** said, that Braisa is discussing where a fire began on its own, not through an act of me'ilah, and that's why it remained hekdesch. **A2: R' Shmaya** said, that Braisa is discussing a particular type of hekdesch whose ashes remain assur (but other hekdesch ashes would not be assur), like terumas hadeshen.

R' YEHUDA OMER EIN BIUR...

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** darshens a kal v'chomer: if nossar, which is not subject to bal yeiraeh and bal yimatzei, must be burned, surely chametz must be burned. The **Rabanan** said, that is not

a good kal v'chomer, because it leads to a leniency (if one doesn't have fuel for a fire he would not have to destroy the chametz at all).

- **R' Yehuda** then said we can learn it without the kal v'chomer. Nossar is assur to eat and chametz is assur to eat. Just as nossar must be burned, so too must chametz be burned. The **Rabanan** asked, neveilah is assur to eat and yet it need not be burned!?
- **R' Yehuda** then said, nossar is assur to eat and to benefit from, and chametz is assur to eat and benefit from. Therefore, just as nossar must be burned, so too must chametz be burned. The **Rabanan** asked, an ox stoned by Beis Din is assur to eat and to benefit from and yet it need not be burned!?
- **R' Yehuda** then said, nossar is assur to eat, to benefit from and carries a kares penalty, and chametz has these 3 characteristics as well. Therefore, just as nossar must be burned, so too must chametz be burned. The **Rabanan** asked, the cheilev fats of an ox stoned by Beis Din has these 3 characteristics and yet it need not be burned!?
- **R' Yehuda** then said, nossar is subject to a lav against leaving it over, and chametz is as well. Therefore, just as nossar must be burned, so too chametz must be burned. The **Rabanan** asked, according to **R' Yehuda's** own shita, an asham talui and a bird chatas brought out of doubt, which are subject to a lav against leaving them over, and yet they need not be burned!?
  - **R' Yehuda** remained quiet to this challenge. **R' Yosef** said, it is ironic when something you say is questioned based on your own words (like this was here).