



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

### Pesachim Daf Lamed Gimmel

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** had asked, that at first the Braisa (brought down to show that **R' Pappa** retracted his view, and which discusses the possibility of learning that me'ilah should be patur when done b'meized from the fact that a korbon chatas in never brought when an aveirah is done b'meized) considers kares to be more stringent than "misa bidei shamayim" and then changes and says that the reverse is true. The Gemara brings 2 additional answers to this question.
  - **Mar the son of Ravana** said, the Braisa actually meant to say that me'ilah can't be learned from other averios, because by the other aveiros an unintentional act does not get the status of an intentional one (e.g. if on Shabbos one intends to cut a fruit detached from the ground, and by mistake cuts one that is still attached to the ground, he is patur). By me'ilah, an unintentional act does get the status of an intentional one (if one covers himself with material that he thinks does not belong to hekdesch, and in fact it does, he is chayuv). This is why a pasuk was needed to teach that an intentional act of benefitting from hekdesch will not be chayuv as me'ilah, and we can't learn it out from a regular chatas.
  - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa actually meant to say that me'ilah can't be learned from other averios, because by the other aveiros one who is preoccupied with doing a different act altogether will not be chayuv if he mistakenly does a forbidden act (e.g. if on Shabbos one intends to lift a fruit detached from the ground, and by mistake cuts one that is still attached to the ground, he is patur). By me'ilah, he would be chayuv even in such a case (e.g. if he sticks out his hand to take a keili and his hand got smeared with oil of hekdesch, he is chayuv). This is why a pasuk was needed to teach that an intentional act of benefitting from hekdesch will not be chayuv as me'ilah, and we can't learn it out from a regular chatas.
- A Braisa had said, the only way that chametz can get the status of terumah on Pesach is if produce was separated as terumah and *then* became chametz. However, if one separated terumah from chametz on Pesach, it does not get terumah status to begin with.
  - **Q:** Where do we know this from? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the pasuk says "titein *lo*" (you must give the terumah to *him* – the Kohen), which teaches us that it should not be given in a way that its only use is "l'oro" – to be burned.
    - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, a Mishna says that one may not separate terumah from tamei produce for produce that is tahor, but if it was done b'shogeg, it does get terumah status. According to what was just said it should not!? **A:** When dealing with tumah, since the produce was fit to be terumah at one point (before it became tamei) it gets terumah status. Chametz on Pesach was never fit to become terumah and therefore doesn't get terumah status.
      - **Q:** If it was never fit to become terumah, it must be that it became chametz while still attached to the ground. But, if it was detached before becoming chametz it seems that it could become terumah? The Mishna is talking only about the unusual case where it became chametz while still attached to the ground!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, "Yes, that is the case and the other **Rabanan** have agreed with me".
        - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said that the Mishna is even discussing where the produce became chametz after being detached from the ground. The reason it doesn't get terumah status is because the pasuk discussing terumah says "reishis",

which means that the produce remaining after the terumah is taken must be permitted for a Yisrael to eat. Here it is not, because it is chametz, and therefore the separated produce does not get terumah status.

- **R' Acha bar R' Avya** sat before **R' Chisda** and said that **R' Yochanan** said that grapes that became tamei should be pressed so that less than an egg-sized amount of juice comes out at a time, and this juice (wine) will not become tamei and can even be used on the Mizbe'ach.
  - It must be that **R' Yochanan** holds that the juice is considered a separate entity than the grape (it is just held in it). Therefore, it does not become tamei along with the grape. It would only become tamei when squeezed out. Since it is being squeezed less than the size of an egg, it does not become tamei then either.
    - **Q:** Why does it need to be *less* than the size of an egg? Even if exactly the size of an egg the same halacha should apply!? We find that a Mishna says that a tamei meis that squeezed juice in an amount equal to an egg, the juice is tahor!? **A:** That Mishna is talking after the squeezing already happened (di'eved) and therefore it is allowed. The Braisa is discussing l'chatchila, and that is not allowed, as a gezeirah that he may end up squeezing an amount larger than the size of an egg.
  - **R' Chisda** said that **R' Yochanan** is not correct, and the wine of the grapes retain tumah status upon being squeezed.
    - **R' Chisda** must hold that juice is absorbed in (and therefore part of) the grape. Therefore, it becomes tamei along with the grape.
    - **Q: R' Acha bar Avya** asked, we have the Mishna that says that if the tamei meis squeezes only an egg-sized amount of juice, it is tahor. That shows that it must be that the juice is a separate entity than the grape itself!? **A: R' Chisda** said, the Mishna is discussing grapes that were not muchshar l'kabel tumah until the juice was squeezed, and since the juice is less than the size of an egg, it cannot become tamei.
      - **R' Chisda** brings a proof from the Braisa brought down earlier in the Gemara, where **R' Akiva** says that juice of grapes and berries have no use when the fruits are tamei. Why can't they just be squeezed out less than the size of an egg at a time? It must be that the juice becomes tamei along with the fruit!
        - **Rava** said, it may be that the juice is truly not tamei. The reason **R' Akiva** says that there is no use is because we don't allow the Kohen to squeeze the juice, because we are concerned that it may lead him to eat the tamei fruit.
        - **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa allows the fueling of a fire with tamei bread and oil of terumah. We see that we are not concerned that he may come to eat them!? **A:** The bread is thrown among the dirty wood and therefore will not be eaten. The oil must be kept in disgusting keilim, so that it too will not come to be eaten. That is why in those cases it is mutar.
  - The Braisa just quoted allowed the fueling of a fire with tamei bread and oil of terumah. **Abaye in the name of Chizkiya** said, this allowance is limited to bread, which becomes disgusting when put among the wood. However, kernels of wheat would not be allowed, because one may come to eat them. **R' Yochanan** said, even kernels of wheat may be used. The Gemara says, this is limited to kernels of wheat that were first cooked and therefore also become disgusting when thrown among the firewood.