



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

### Pesachim Daf Mem Daled

- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, in all halachos of the Torah, when prohibited items are mixed with permitted items, and one does an act that is prohibited to do with those prohibited items (e.g. he eats a mixture of kosher and non-kosher meat), the permitted item of the mixture does not combine to reach the requisite amount needed for him to be chayuv for the issur (e.g. a kezayis), *except* for the case of a nazir, who if he eats grapes and bread in the amount of a combined kezayis, will be chayuv, because regarding nazir the pasuk says "mishras". **Zeiri** says, another exception is one who burns chametz on the Mizbe'ach (all korbonos are not allowed to be chametz). Therefore, if one burns a half kezayis of chametz and a half kezayis of matzah on the Mizbe'ach, it will combine to make him chayuv.
  - **Q:** Presumably, **Zeiri** is following **R' Eliezer**, who darshens the word "kol" and said that the word "kol" in the pasuk about burning chametz on the Mizbe'ach teaches that if less than the amount needed to be chayuv is chametz, it combines with the chametz to make him chayuv. If so, regarding chametz on Pesach, which the pasuk also says "kol", one should be chayuv for eating a kezayis of a mixture that contains chametz and matzah (even though there is less than a kezayis of chametz), and that should be another exception!? **A:** Chametz on Pesach actually is another exception. The reason **Zeiri** didn't mention it is because his purpose was not to mention exceptions to **R' Yochanan's** halacha, it was to dispute **Abaye's** view. **Abaye** said that one is chayuv for burning even less than a kezayis of chametz on the Mizbe'ach. **Zeiri** argues and says that a kezayis is needed, but that kezayis can be made up of a combination of chametz and matzah.
  - **Q:** **Abaye** asked **R' Dimi**, we find that **Rabbah bar bar Channa**, when explaining a Mishna, says that a non-Kohen would be chayuv for eating a kezayis of a mixture of terumah and chullin even though he ate less than a kezayis of terumah. We see that the prohibited and permitted items do combine to reach the required amount!? **A:** He meant that the non-Kohen is chayuv if he ate enough of the mixture to have eaten a full kezayis of the terumah in the time that it takes to eat a "pras" ("k'dei achilas pras"). If he did, he will be chayuv D'Oraisa and will get malkus.
    - **Q:** If the concept of "k'dei achilas pras" is D'Oraisa, why do the **Rabanan** say that he is not chayuv if eats kutach on Pesach? There too, if he ate enough of the kutach to have eaten a kezayis of chametz "k'dei achilas pras", he should be chayuv!? **A:** Kutach is meant to be eaten as a dip. If he uses it as a dip, he will never eat a kezayis of chametz "k'dei achilas pras". If he eats it straight, that is not considered "normal" and will not be considered "eating".
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there are 2 pots – one containing terumah and one containing chullin, and in front of them are 2 spice crushers with spices – one of terumah and one of chullin, and the spices of one crusher fell into one pot, and the spices of the other into the other pot, we may assume that the terumah fell into the terumah and the chullin into the chullin. Now, if the concept of "k'dei achilas pras" is D'Oraisa, how can we be lenient and assume that? **A:** Terumah of spices is only D'Rabanan. That is why we can be lenient. However, the concept of "k'dei achilas pras" may be D'Oraisa.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there are 2 boxes of grain – one of terumah and one of chullin, and 2 smaller containers of grain in front of them – one of terumah and one of chullin, and the contents of each container fall into a box, we can assume that the terumah fell into the terumah and the chullin into the chullin. Now, if

the concept of “k’dei achilas pras” is D’Oraisa, how can we be lenient and assume that? **A:** Terumah in today’s times is only D’Rabanan.

- **Q:** How could **R’ Yochanan** say that “mishras” teaches that nazir is an exception? A Braisa says that “mishras” teaches that the flavor of the wine is just as assur as the actual wine (if grapes are soaked in water and give the water their taste, and a nazir drinks that water, he would get malkus), and from nazir we then learn this concept to all other issurin of the Torah!? **A:** This Braisa follows the **Rabanan**. **R’ Yochanan** follows **R’ Akiva** who does not learn the principle of “flavor equals substance” from “mishras”, and therefore uses “mishras” is available to teach that the prohibited and permitted items combine to reach the required amount.
  - **Q:** From where does **R’ Akiva** learn that “flavor equals substance”? **A:** He learns it from the issur of milk and meat – although there is only the taste of the milk in the meat (we don’t see any milk), it is assur.
    - **The Rabanan** don’t learn the concept from milk and meat, because the issur of milk and meat is a novelty (if the meat is left to soak in milk all day, it would not be assur, but if it is cooked in it, it becomes assur) and therefore cannot serve as the basis for teaching anything in a different context.
    - **Q:** How could **R’ Akiva** learn it from milk and meat, given that it is a novelty!? **A:** **R’ Akiva** learns the din from the issur of using keilim from a goy that they used for non-Kosher. The keilim only have absorbed taste, and yet it is assur.
      - **The Rabanan** say that this case is also a novelty (even though the absorbed flavor is somewhat spoiled it is still assur) and therefore cannot be the basis of a teaching for another context.
      - **R’ Akiva** says that the taste in the keilim is only assur within 24 hours of it being absorbed, during which time it is not a spoiled taste, and therefore not a novelty.
        - **The Rabanan** say that absorbed flavor gets somewhat spoiled immediately.
  - **Q:** **R’ Acha the son of R’ Avya** asked, just as the **Rabanan** use “mishras” to learn that “taste equals substance” throughout the entire Torah, **R’ Akiva** should use “mishras” to teach that the prohibited and permitted items in a mixture combine to reach the required amount, throughout the entire Torah!? **A:** **R’ Ashi** answered, the Torah teaches this principle regarding nazir and regarding a Korbon Chatas. If the Torah meant for this principle to be taught to all other places, there was no need to teach it twice. The fact that it was, teaches that it is only to be applied to those two places.
    - **The Rabanan** say that nazir teaches the principle of “flavor equals substance” and chatas teaches the principle of mixtures. Therefore, they are teaching different things and nazir can be the source for the rest of the Torah. However, chatas cannot be the source regarding mixtures for the rest of the Torah, because we cannot learn out chullin from kodashim.
  - **Q:** **R’ Ashi** asked, a Braisa says that the pasuk by nazir teaches that the different parts of the grape combine with each other to reach the required kezayis. If, as **R’ Akiva** says, they combine with permitted items, surely they combine with prohibited items, so why must the pasuk teach this to us!? **A:** **R’ Kahana** said, for the permitted and prohibited items to combine, they must be eaten simultaneously. Prohibited and prohibited items combine even when they are eaten one after another.