



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf טז – Daf קה

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf טז---104-----

MISHNA

- One may place salt on the ramp of the Mizbe'ach on Shabbos so that it should not be slippery.
- One may draw water from the "Gola Well" and from the "Great Well" with a windlass (pail attached to a turning mechanism which makes for easy drawing of water) on Shabbos. One may do so from the Hakir Well on Yom Tov.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna says that salt may be placed on the ramp in the Beis Hamikdash, which is mashma that this method cannot be done elsewhere (because it is like adding to the ground and "building"). However, a Braisa says that one may place straw on the ground even not in the Mikdash in the rainy season to make the ground easier to walk on!? **A:** Straw is not left on the ground (it is eventually picked up and used) and therefore is not considered to be adding to the ground. Salt will be left there and is therefore problematic outside of the Mikdash.
- **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if the salt will be abandoned there, it is adding to the dimensions of the Mizbe'ach, which may not be done!? If it will not be abandoned there, the salt acts as a chatzitza between the Kohen and the ramp, which is also problematic!? **A:** The salting is being done when the Kohanim are walking the limbs up the Mizbe'ach, which is not considered to be an avodah, and therefore a chatzitza is not a problem.
 - **Q:** We learn from a pasuk that walking the limbs up the ramp is considered to be an avodah!? **A:** The salting is done when they are walking up the ramp with wood for the Mizbe'ach.
- **Rava** said that one may place straw on the ground in the rainy season.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, a Braisa says that the straw used must be from a broken box!? **A: Rava** said, I was mistaken and it may only be done with straw from a broken box.

MIMALIN MIBOR HAGOLAH

- **Ulla** was by **R' Menashe** and someone came and was knocking on the door. **Ulla** said, making sounds like that is assur to do on Shabbos! **Rabbah** said, making noise is only assur when one is making musical sounds.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that one may make water drip from an "arak" to make a noise for a sick person on Shabbos. It is mashma this may only be done for a sick person even though this is not a musical sound!? **A:** The sound it makes is actually somewhat musical and helps put a person to sleep. That is why it is only mutar to do for a sick person.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, one who is guarding produce from birds may not clap his hands to scare the birds on Shabbos (even though clapping does not create a musical sound)!? **A: R' Acha bar Yakov** said, it is assur because of a gezeirah that it may lead to him throwing rocks at the birds and having the rocks thrown into the reshus harabim.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that women may not play a game that involves knocking nuts into each other (presumably because it creates a noise)!? **A:** It is not allowed because we are afraid that they will smooth out the ground to allow the nuts to roll easier. In fact, we even find that he also does not allow this game using apples, even though apples do not create any noise.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that we can draw water with a windlass in the Mikdash, but not elsewhere. Presumably this is because it creates a noise, which is something that we will only allow in the Mikdash!? **A:** We don't allow it elsewhere, because we are afraid that drawing water with it is too easy and one will draw water for his gardens or ruins.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Ameimar** allowed drawing water in this way in Mechuza, because they didn't have gardens or ruins there. When he saw that people drew water and were soaking flax in it, he said drawing the water like this is no longer allowed.

U'MIBE' AIR HAKIR

- **Shmuel** said this refers to a well about which there were arguments regarding its permissibility (after the galus Bavel) and an eventual heter to use it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that there are a number of wells by this name, so it can't be referring to one specific incident!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says it refers to a fresh water well.

MISHNA

- If a sheretz is found in the Beis Hamikdash, **R' Yochanan ben Broka** says, a Kohen removes it by using his belt (so that he doesn't touch it directly and doesn't become tamei), and does not look for another method of removal so as not to prolong the presence of the tumah in the Beis Hamikdash. **R' Yehuda** says, a Kohen removes it with wooden tongs so as to prevent the spread of tumah.
- A sheretz (which is muktzeh) is removed on Shabbos when found in the following areas of the Beis Hamikdash: **R' Shimon ben Nanas** says, the Heichal, the Ulam, and the area between the Ulam and the Mizbe'ach. **R' Akiva** says, from any area which would be assur for a tamei person to enter in the Beis Hamikdash under the penalty of kares or chatas.
 - In any other area, we cover it over with a pot until after Shabbos.
- **R' Shimon** says, when the **Chachomim** are allowing something to be done, it is something that would anyway have been allowed if not for them having made it assur in the first place.

GEMARA

- **R' Tavi bar Kisna in the name of Shmuel** said, if one brings a keili that is tamei from a sheretz into the Beis Hamikdash he is chayuv. But one who brings the actual sheretz itself is not chayuv. The reason is, because the Torah uses the terms "whether man or woman" when stating this issur, to teach that one is only chayuv for bringing in items that can become tahor in a mikvah.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring proof to this concept from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk uses the terms "whether man or woman" to teach that one who brings a tamei earthenware keili into the Beis Hamikdash will not be chayuv. Presumably this is because it cannot become tahor in the mikvah! **A:** It could be that the reason he is not chayuv in that case is because to be chayuv, the item brought in must have the ability to become an "av hatumah", which an earthenware keili cannot become.
 - **Q:** Maybe this is the source of the machlokes in our Mishna. **R' Yochanan ben Brokah** may hold that one is chayuv if he brings a sheretz into the Mikdash, that is why the first priority is removing it, even at the cost of the belt becoming tamei. **R' Yehuda** says one would not be chayuv, and that is why it's removal is not priority!? **A:** It could be that all would agree that he would be chayuv. The machlokes may be whether it is more important to rid the Mikdash of the tumah or to prevent additional items from become tamei.
 - **Q:** Maybe this is the source of the machlokes in the Mishna regarding the place from which a sheretz must be removed. **R' Shimon ben Nanas**, who holds that one may not remove a sheretz from the Azarah on Shabbos must hold that one would not be chayuv for bringing the sheretz in, and **R' Akiva**, who says it must be removed from the Azarah holds that he would be chayuv!? **A:** All agree that one would be chayuv for bringing the sheretz in. The machlokes is only regarding taking it out, and whether the issur of muktzeh would be waived to allow removal of the tumah.

-----Daf 77--105-----

- A Braisa says, all are allowed to enter the Heichel to build, make repairs, or remove tumah. However, the preferred method is that it be done by Kohanim. If that is not possible it should be done by Levi'im. If that is not possible it may be done by Yisra'eilim. In any case, the person entering must be tahor.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Huna** says that **R' Kahana** taught a version that was more “pro Kohanim”. He taught that the preferred method for making metal plates, which are made in the area between the Ulam and the Mizbe'ach is for an unblemished Kohen to do it. If that is not possible, a Kohen with a “mum” may enter the area to do it. The preferred method is that it be done by a tahor Kohen. If that is not possible, it may be done by a tamei Kohen. In all cases, it may only be done by a Kohen, and never by a non-Kohen.
 - **Q:** If given the choice between a Kohen who is tamei and a Kohen with a mum, which is preferred? **A: R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, the tamei Kohen should go in, because we find that there are times when a tamei Kohen may do the avodah for the tzibbur. **R' Elazar** said the Kohen with the mum is preferred, because he may eat kodashim (which a tamei Kohen may not).

R' SHIMON OMER...

- **R' Shimon's** statement in our Mishna is referring to a halacha he said in a Mishna (on Daf Nun Beis), that one who finds himself outside the techum, but within 15 amos to the techum, is allowed to enter the techum. This is so, because when measuring for the techum, they would intentionally mark the end of the techum 15 amos short of the full 2,000 amos, to prevent accidental stepping beyond the techum. (Therefore, when the **Chachomim** “give back” these 15 amos, they are giving back something that they had previously taken away).

SHELO HITIRU LICHA ELAH MISHUM SHEVUS

- The halacha referred to here is regarding the tying of a ripped string on an instrument of the Beis Hamikdash, regarding which **R' Shimon** said only the tying of a bow is mutar, not a knot, because a knot may lead to an issur D'Oraisa, whereas a bow cannot.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMOTZEI TEFILLIN!!!

HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA EIRUVIN V'HADRACH ALAN!!!

MAZAL TOV!!!



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Pesachim, Daf כ – Daf י

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ--2-----

MESECHTA PESACHIM

PEREK OHR L'ARBA'AH ASAR -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- On the night (“ohr”) going into the 14th day of Nissan, one must search for chametz by candlelight. Anyplace into which chametz is not brought need not be checked for chametz. When the Chachomim (later in the Mishna) argue regarding checking for chametz in a wine cellar, it was regarding a wine cellar into which chametz is brought.
- **B”S** say, when checking the wine cellar for chametz, one must check 2 rows of the entire front of the cellar (to be explained in the Gemara). **B”H** say, one must check the two outer rows, which are the two upper rows.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the meaning of the word “ohr” (the Mishna uses that word to describe the time on the 14th of Nissan that the bedika must take place)? **A: R’ Huna** says it means “light” (presumably referring to morning), and **R’ Yehuda** says it means “night” (referring to nighttime).
 - **Q:** A pasuk says “Haboker ohr” (“In the morning, which is called ‘ohr’”). We see it refers to morning!? **A:** There is no question that the word “ohr” means light. However, when used as a noun, referring to a time of the day, it means night. The pasuk here is saying that when the morning became light (which is the proper time to travel), Yosef sent the brothers on their way.
 - **Q:** A pasuk says “U’chi’ohr boker”. That seems to refer to morning as “ohr”, using the word as a noun!? **A:** The pasuk is referring to the light of the morning, and is not a stand-alone word being used as a noun.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Hashem called “La’ohr yom”. We see ohr is day!? **A:** The pasuk means to say that Hashem called the time that it was getting light, “day”, but again, ohr is not being used as a noun.
 - **Q:** If so, when the pasuk says “V’luchoshech kara layla”, that should mean that Hashem called the time that it was getting dark, “night”. However, we pasken that the time period of it *getting* dark is still called “day”!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk means that Hashem called for “light” (the source of the light He had created) and told it to “serve” (dominate) during the daytime. He then called “darkness” and told it to “serve” during the nighttime. However, when ohr is used as a noun referring to a period of time, it may refer to nighttime.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says “Haleluhu kol kochvei ohr”. Stars appear at night, so we see that “ohr” must refer to nighttime!? **A:** The pasuk means “the stars that give light”, not to the “stars of the night”.
 - **Q:** That would mean that only the stars that give light need to praise Hashem, but the pasuk says “Haleluhu kol tziva’av”, **all** creations must praise Hashem!? **A:** Rather, the pasuk is teaching that the light of stars is considered “light”. Meaning, that if someone promises not to benefit from light, he may also not benefit from the light of the stars.
 - **Q:** A pasuk says “At ‘ohr’ the murderer gets up and kills the poor, and at night he is like a robber”. The contrast between “ohr” and night suggests that “ohr” refers to day!? **A:** The pasuk means that if one encounters an intruder, and it is clear to him as “light”, that this intruder would murder if he felt the need, one may treat him like a murderer and kill him. If it is unclear to him “like night”, he may not kill him.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that the night “yearns for ‘ohr’ but there is none”. This would suggest that “ohr” is day!? **A:** The pasuk is discussing Iyuv’s curse to himself that he should look for light and not find it.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The pasuk says that Dovid Hamelech says, “The night became ‘ohr’ around me”. This would suggest that “ohr” means day!? **A:** Dovid was saying that this world, which is comparable to night, became “light” around him (Hashem made it clear to all that Dovid was forgiven for his sin).
- **Q:** A Mishna says, **R’ Yehuda** says, one must search for chametz on the “ohr” of the 14th, on the morning of the 14th, and at the time of destroying the chametz. From here we see that “ohr” means night!? **A:** **This is a clear proof.**
- **Q:** A Braisa says, at what point does doing work become assur on the 14th of Nissan? **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** says, from the time of “ohr”. **R’ Yehuda** says, from sunrise. **R’ Eliezer** said to **R’ Yehuda**, we don’t find that a day is partially assur and partially mutar do to do work! **R’ Yehuda** replied, we find that the day is split regarding the eating of chametz (the first part of the day is mutar and the later part of the day is assur)! We see from this Braisa that **R’ Eliezer** refers to night as “ohr”!? **A:** **R’ Eliezer** refers to amud hashachar (daybreak) as “ohr”.
 - **Q:** If so, he himself has part of the day (i.e. the previous night) mutar to do work and part of the day assur!? **A:** We find instances where the night and day are treated differently (e.g. a fast day where eating is mutar at night but not by day), but we don’t find such a distinction with regard to daytime hours.
 - **Q:** **R’ Yehuda** seems to have answered **R’ Eliezer’s** question very well. What would **R’ Eliezer** respond? **A:** **R’ Eliezer** was referring to a halacha D’Rabanan, that we don’t find that the **Rabanan** make a distinction between parts of a day. **R’ Yehuda’s** answer is a halacha D’Oraisa!
 - **R’ Yehuda** would answer that the **Rabanan** restrict eating chametz earlier in the day than the Torah, and therefore we do find that they make a distinction regarding parts of the day.
 - **R’ Eliezer** would say that the **Rabanan** do so when dealing with a halacha that has a basis in the Torah. The prohibition to work on the 14th of Nissan is entirely D’Rabanan.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that torches are lit to symbolize that it is Rosh Chodesh (when Rosh Chodesh is on the 30th day of the month). The torches are lit on the “ohr” of the 30th day. We see that “ohr” means night!? **A:** **This is a clear proof.**
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a Kohen was busy on the Mizbe’ach throughout the night, then “l’orah” he needs to wash his hands and feet. We see that “ohr” means day!? **A:** “Ohr” means night, “orah” is a different word, which means day.
- **Q:** **Mar Zutra** quotes a Mishna which says, if a woman miscarries on the “ohr” of the 81st day after having given birth to a girl, **B”S** say she does not need to bring a second korbon, and **B”H** say that she must. **B”H** said to **B”S**, why should the “ohr” of the 81st day be treated differently than the day of the 81st day! We clearly see that **B”H** refer to night as “ohr”!? **A:** **This is a clear proof.**

-----Daf ל---3-----

- The Gemara continues bringing proofs whether the word “ohr” means day or night.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that we would think that a korbon which may be eaten for 2 days (a shlomim) should be allowed to be eaten “ohr lishishi”, (the night going into the 3rd day). Just like a korbon which may be eaten for one day may be eaten the night that follows the day, the same should be for a korbon which may be eaten for 2 days. We learn from a pasuk that this is not so. In any case, we see that “ohr” means night! **A:** **This is a clear proof.**
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that “ohr” of Yom Kippur the “shmoneh esrei” consists of 7 brachos and viduy, the same is for shachris, musaf and mincha. We see that “ohr” means night!? **A:** **This is a clear proof.**
 - **Q:** The Yeshiva of **Shmuel** taught a Braisa that the bedika for the chametz must be done on the night of the 14th of Nissan. From here we see that our Mishna clearly means night!?
- From all the above, it is clear that both **R’ Huna** and **R’ Yehuda** agree that “ohr” means night. Each one just refers to night by the terminology used in the place where they lived. In **R’ Huna’s** place they called night, “light”. In **R’ Yehuda’s** place they simply called it “night”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why didn't our Mishna say "night" instead of "ohr"? **A:** It wanted to use a finer terminology. Like **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says, a person should not allow not fine expressions out of his mouth, because we find that the Torah wrote an additional 8 letters in the pasuk just so that it should use a finer terminology (the pasuk says "asher einena tehorah" instead of simply saying "tamei"). **R' Pappa** says a pasuk has an additional 9 letters. **Ravina** says a pasuk has an additional 10 letters. **R' Acha bar Yakov** says a pasuk has an additional 18 letters.
 - The Yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that says, a person should always speak using a finer terminology, as we see the Torah says all that a zav rides on becomes tamei, and all that a zavah sits on becomes tamei. Speaking about a woman riding is not fine and the Torah therefore avoids doing so. Also, a pasuk says to choose the language of the wise. Another pasuk says, my lips speak finer knowledge.
 - **Q:** Why did the Braisa feel the need to bring the 2 pesukim as additional proofs? **A:** We would think this concept only applies to the Torah, therefore we have the first pasuk, which teaches that Rabanan should speak in this way as well. The second pasuk then teaches that everyone should speak this way, even regarding mundane matters.
 - **Q:** We find that the pasuk says that Rivka rode on a camel!? **A:** Because a camel is so high, it is typical for a woman to ride it in a normal way (not side saddle).
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Moshe took his wife and children and had them ride on a donkey!? **A:** That was said regarding the riding of his children.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Avigayil rode on a donkey!? **A:** That was either because she was riding at night, when it is normal for women to ride out of fear of the darkness, or it was due to the fear of going to meet Dovid Hamelech, or it was because of the fear of riding down a mountain.
 - **Q:** We find many places in the Torah that the pasuk simply says "tamei"! **A:** When both phrases are of the same length, the Torah chooses the finer one. If the finer one is longer, it chooses the other, shorter one. This is like **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, a person should always be succinct in the way that he teaches students.
 - There were 2 talmidim learning by **Rav**. After learning a particular day, one said, the learning has made us tired like "another thing" (i.e. a pig). The other said, the learning has made us tired like a goat. **Rav** would not speak to the first one.
 - There were 2 talmidim learning by **Hillel**. One asked a question using the word "tamei", while the other asked the same question saying "not tahor". **Hillel** said, I am certain that this one (the one who asked "not tahor") will become a poisek in Klal Yisroel.
 - There were 3 Kohanim, each of who received a piece of the Lechem Hapanim. One said, I got a piece the size of a bean. The second said, I got a piece the size of an olive. The 3rd said, I got a piece the size of lizard's tail (a sheretz). Based on his choice of words, they checked into this Kohen and found that he was actually passul to do the Avodah.
 - **Q:** We have learned that once a Kohen does the Avodah, we don't check into his qualifications, because he would never have been allowed to do the Avodah without being thoroughly checked first!? **A:** They didn't find him to be passul because of his genealogy, they found him to be passul because of his lack of respect for the Avodah. **A2:** Typically we do not check, but this Kohen caused the checking because of his actions (i.e. words).
 - There was a goy who would go to Yerushalayim (posing as a Jew) and would receive a portion of the Korbon Pesach. He went to **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah** and said, the pasuk says that a goy may not eat from the Korbon Pesach, and yet I eat from the best parts of it! **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah** said to him, if they have never given you a piece of the tail to eat, then they have never given you the best part. You should ask for the tail. That year he went and asked for a piece of the tail. The tail is burned on the Mizbe'ach, and his lack of this knowledge caused them to question him. He said that he was told to ask for the tail by **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah**. They checked into

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

this person, realized that he was a goy, and had him killed. They sent a message to **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah**, you may be in Netzivin, but your net is spread in Yerushalayim.

- **R' Kahana** was sick, so the **Rabanan** sent **R' Yehoshua the son of R' Idi** to go check on his condition. He went and found out that **R' Kahana** had passed away. He tore his clothing, but turned his clothing around so that the **Rabanan** should not see the tear when he approached (he did not want them to suffer from shock). He returned to them crying. They asked, did **R' Kahana** pass away? He said, I didn't say anything, because one should not be the bearer of bad news.
- **Yochanan Chakuka'ah** went to the village to check on the grain. When he returned, the people asked him, is the wheat crop good? He answered, the barley crop is good (because he didn't want to be the bearer of bad news that the wheat crop wasn't good). They said to him, go tell that to the horses and donkeys (they eat barley).
 - **Q:** What should he have told them that would have been better? **A:** He should have said, last year the wheat crop was good. Or, the bean crop is good (at least that is food eaten by humans).

-----Daf 7--4-----

- **Rav** was the son of the brother of **R' Chiya** (brother from the father) and the son of the sister of **R' Chiya** (sister from the mother). When **Rav** travelled to Eretz Yisrael and met **R' Chiya**, **R' Chiya** asked, is your father Eivo still alive? **Rav** asked back, is my mother still alive (why don't you ask me about my mother? **Rav** did not want to bring the news that his father had passed away)? **R' Chiya** then asked, is Ima, your mother, still alive? **Rav** asked back, is my father still alive? Understanding what was going on, **R' Chiya** told his attendant to remove his shoes and to then carry his keilim to the bathhouse (he would go take a bath). We learn from this that: an avel may not wear shoes; one who hears about a relative's passing more than 30 days after the passing only sits shiva for one day; the one day need only be a partial day, not a full day.
- There was a person who would always insist on going to court for any argument. They said, he must come from shevet Dan, about who the pasuk says will be judges.
 - There was a person who seemed enamored with the shore. They checked and found that he came from shevet Zevulun, who lived at the shore.
- **Q:** We said that all agree that the bedika is done the night of the 14th. Since one may eat chametz until chatzos (D'Oraisa), why can't the bedika be done in the hour before chatzos? Even if we want to say that it is proper to do mitzvos as early as possible, the bedika should be done first thing in the morning, not the night before!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it is done the night before, because that is when people are home and available to do the bedika, and because that is when the light of the candle is most effective.
 - **Abaye** said, therefore, a person should not even begin his nighttime learning on the 14th until he does his bedika, so that it should not be mistakenly forgotten to be done.
- **Q:** They asked **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak**, if one rents a house on the 14th of Nissan, who must do the bedika: the landlord (it is his chametz) or the tenant (it is now his house)? **A:** A Braisa says, when one rents a house, the tenant must put up a mezuzah. The same should be with the bedika.
 - **Q: R' Mesharshiya** said, the reason for the halacha about mezuzah is because mezuzah is the obligation of the resident! Chametz is different!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a Braisa says that if the keys were handed over to the tenant after the night of the 14th had begun, the landlord must do the bedika. If they were handed over before, the tenant must do the bedika.
- **Q:** They asked **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak**, if one rents a house on the morning of the 14th, is there a chazaka that a bedika was done or not? This is relevant when the landlord is not around to be asked whether a bedika was done. **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a Braisa says, all are believed regarding the destroying of the chametz, even women, slaves and minors. How could the Braisa give them credibility? It must be that there is a chazakah that a bedika was done, which is why we are not relying on their say so.
 - **Q:** If we are relying on a chazaka, why does the Braisa say that they are believed? It's based on a chazaka, not their say so!? If anything, from the fact that we need their say so, this must be a proof that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

there is no chazaka!? **A:** It could be that there is a chazaka, but the Braisa is talking about a case where we know for certain that a bedika was not done (e.g. the owner is out of town). In that case, since bedikas chametz is only a D'Rabanan, the **Rabanan** gave credibility regarding this halacha to women, slaves and minors.

- **Q:** If one rented a house on the 14th under the presumption that a bedika was done, and it turned out that a bedika was not done, is that considered to be a transaction that took place as a mistake and the tenant may therefore back out? **A: Abaye** said, whether the house is in an area that people do the bedika themselves, or in an area that people are hired to do the bedika, in either case it is not a “mekach ta’us” because a person is happy to be given the opportunity to perform a mitzvah with his body and with his money.
- **Q:** A Mishna says that all agree that D’Oraisa one may only eat chametz on Erev Pesach up until midday. Where do we learn this from? **A: Abaye** said, one pasuk says chametz may not be found in your house for 7 days (which encompasses every minute of the 7 days of Pesach). Another pasuk says “Bayom Harishon”, on the first day you must get rid of the chametz. That can’t mean the first day of Yom Tov, because the first pasuk teaches that you may have no chametz then. It must refer to the Erev Pesach.
 - **Q:** The first pasuk says “yamim” (days). We would think that chametz is only a problem during the daytime, but not the nights. Maybe the second pasuk is teaching that the nights are included in the issur of chametz, except for the first night, during which one has the mitzvah to get rid of the chametz!? **A:** We would not say that, because the Torah compares getting rid of the chametz to the eating of chametz, and compares the eating of chametz to the eating of matzah. The pasuk regarding eating matzah says that it must be done “B’erev”, at night. Therefore, the issur of chametz already exists on the first night of Pesach, and the pasuk must be teaching that the chametz is to be destroyed on Erev Pesach.
 - **Q:** Maybe the chametz is to be destroyed on the night going into the 14th, or on the morning of the 14th!? Why do we say that one may eat chametz until midday!? **A:** The pasuk says “Ach”, which acts as a limitation and teaches that only part of the day is assur to eat chametz.
 - The Yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael** said, the pasuk refers to the 14th day as “Rishon”. Therefore, when it says “Bayom Harishon” one must get rid of the chametz, it refers to the 14th of Nissan.

-----Daf 17-----5-----

- **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the pasuk that says the chametz must be gotten rid of “Bayom Harishon” refers to Erev Pesach because “Rishon” means “prior” (the day prior to Pesach) as we see in other pesukim.
 - **Q:** If so, when the pasuk says one should take a lulav and esrog “bayom harishon”, that would mean it should be taken on Erev Succos!? **A:** There the pasuk says that the Yom Tov should be for “Shivas Yomim” (7 days). The pasuk teaches that just as the “7th day” referred to in the pasuk means the 7th day of Yom Tov, so too the “first day” referred to in the pasuk means the first day of Yom Tov.
 - **Q:** By Pesach it also says “Shivas Yomim”, and so we should say the same thing, which would mean that “Harishon” refers to the first day of Yom Tov, not Erev Yom Tov!? **A:** The fact that the pasuk says “**HA**rishon” teaches that it refers to Erev Yom Tov.
 - **Q:** Why does the pasuk say “**HA**rishon” in the pasuk of lulav!? **Q2:** Another pasuk, regarding the issur to do melacha on Succos, says “Bayom **HA**rishon...U’vayom Hashmini”. According to the last answer, it should be assur to do melacha on Erev Succos!? **A:** The words “Uvayom hashmini” teach that just like they refer to the 8th day of Yom Tov, the “harishon” refers to the first day of Yom Tov. And the reason the pasuk says “**HA**rishon” is to teach that melacha is mutar on Chol Hamoed.
 - **Q:** We know Chol Hamoed is mutar from the fact that the pasuk says the first day and the 8th day are assur!? **A:** Since the pasuk says “**U**vayom hashmini”, it seems to add on to the previous days, saying that Chold Hamoed is assur as well. That is why we need the “**HA**rishon” to say that Chol Hamoed is mutar.
 - **Q:** Why didn’t the Torah just not write the extra ‘vav’ and then not need the extra ‘hey’!? **Q2:** Also, Erev Pesach should be assur to do melacha, because the pasuk

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

regarding issur melacha says “Bayom **HA**rishon”!? **A:** The word “rishon” in each of these 3 cases (lulav, melacha on Succos, melacha on Pesach) comes to teach an entirely different drasha, that one who keeps these 3 halachos merits the killing of Esav, the building of the Beis Hamikdash and the name of Moshiach. The one remaining “**HA**rishon” of destroying the chametz teaches that it is done on Erev Pesach.

- **Rava** says, the pasuk says that the Korbon Pesach may not be slaughtered when you are in possession of chametz. Since the Korbon is slaughtered on Erev Pesach, we learn that the time one must get rid of the chametz in on Erev Pesach as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe everyone can have chametz until they shecht their korbon (and chametz need not be destroyed by chatzos as we have been saying)!? **A:** The pasuk means, that at the time when the Korbon may be brought (at chatzos) the chametz must be destroyed.
 - A Braisa supports **Rava**. The Braisa says that **R’ Yishmael** learns that Erev Pesach is the time to destroy the chametz from the same pasuk as **Rava**. The Braisa continues and says that **R’ Akiva** says, it must be talking about Erev Pesach, because one must destroy the chametz by burning it, and burning on Yom Tov is assur as a melacha. Therefore, it must be referring to Erev Yom Tov. **R’ Yose** says, it must refer to Erev Yom Tov, because the pasuk says “Ach”, which means that part of the day is mutar to have chametz and part of the day is assur. On Pesach itself, the entire day is assur to have chametz, so the pasuk must be referring to Erev Yom Tov.
 - **Rava** said, from **R’ Akiva’s** statement we learn 3 things: that the chametz must be destroyed by burning; that the melacha of burning carries the same punishment as all other melachos and it is singled out from the others in a pasuk to teach that one who performs any one melacha is chayuv; that we don’t say that just because burning on Yom Tov is mutar for cooking it is also mutar for non-cooking purposes.
- A Braisa says: A pasuk says that for 7 days “Se’or should not be found in your houses”. This seems unnecessary, because another pasuk says, “Se’or should not be seen to you in all your borders”. However, this second pasuk says “should not be seen **to you**”, which would mean that you may have chametz of a goy or of hekdesh, and that you may hide your own chametz so that it is not “seen”, and you can watch a goy’s chametz because it is not yours. That’s why the Torah had to tell us “It should not be found”, which means anyone’s chametz, whether hidden or in the open. We would think a goy’s chametz is only a problem when it is a goy who is not under our control and does not live in our chatzer. How do we know that it is assur to have the chametz of a goy who is under our control and in our chatzer? To teach this the pasuk says chametz “may not be found in your houses”. How do we know the issur extends to areas outside of the house (e.g. ditches, storage places)? The pasuk says “in all your borders”. We would think that in a house (which is included in both pesukim, because it is in a house and in the borders) one is subject to the issur of finding and seeing and one would not be allowed hide his own chametz or have chametz of a goy. However, if it is only “in the borders”, maybe only one’s own chametz is assur? There is a gezeirah shava from the word “Se’or”, written in both pesukim, to teach that the halachos of each pasuk apply to the situations in both pesukim.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said, we would know that the chametz of a goy not under our control and not in our chatzer is assur, and the pasuk teaches us that even the chametz of a goy under our control and in our chatzer is also assur. If anything, the second category of goy is the one that we would not need an extra pasuk for!? **A: Abaye** says, the order of the Braisa should be switched. **Rava** says that it is going on the earlier part of the Braisa. The Braisa said, we would think there is only an issur to see your own chametz, but there are times when the chametz of a goy (who is not under our control) is mutar to have (to be explained later). On that part, the Braisa asks, how do we know that this leniency applies to goyim under our control as well? The Braisa answers that the pasuk says “Lecha” (yours) twice, to teach that the leniency applies to such a goy as well.
 - **Q:** The Braisa seems to say that one may only not have his own chametz. Then the Braisa says that the pasuk of “you shall not find” teaches that one may not hold the chametz of a goy!? **A:** He may not keep a goy’s chametz if he is responsible for its safekeeping (he will have to pay for it if it gets lost or destroyed). If he has not accepted responsibility, he may keep a goy’s chametz.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** That makes sense if one holds that something which can cause a monetary loss or benefit of money is considered to belong to that person (if he accepts responsibility, because the chametz may cost him money if it gets lost, it is now considered to be in his possession as well). If one doesn't follow that view, why would it be assur just because he is financially responsible!? **A:** The pasuk of "you shall not find" teaches a chumra that it is assur in this case.
- **Another version** says, according to the view that financial responsibility does not equate to ownership, it makes sense why we need the pasuk to teach that with regard to chametz it does. However, if one does equate financial responsibility to ownership, why do we need the pasuk? The Gemara answers, even according to that view we would think that ownership only takes place once the item is lost or destroyed, but until then it would not be a problem to have the chametz in one's house.
- **Q: Rava** was asked, when the king takes a percentage of every first-born animal, would that make the animal patur from the halachos of bechor (if a goy is a part owner in a first-born, the laws of bechor do not apply)? If the person can pay money to the king in its place, it is certainly chayuv in bechor. The question is where he cannot. **A: Rava** said, the animal would be patur. A Braisa that says the animal is chayuv must be referring to where he can give money in its place.
 - **Another version** says, **Rava** said, an animal is patur from bechor even if he can give money in its place, but the dough of a Jew (when the king takes a percentage of each dough made) is chayuv in challah (even though a dough owned in part by a goy is patur from challah) even if he can give money in its place, because people will not realize the dough is part owned by the goy (it is not public knowledge) and therefore he must give challah so people will not think he is not keeping the halachos.

-----Daf 1---6-----

- A Braisa says, if a goy walks into the chatzer of a Yid with chametz, the Yid does not need to get rid of that chametz (i.e. he does not need to ask the goy to leave the house). If a goy gave chametz to a Yid for safekeeping, the Yid must get rid of the chametz. If the Yid designated a room for the chametz of the goy, he need not get rid of it, because the pasuk says "lo yimatzei".
 - **Q:** That pasuk seems to say that one MUST get rid of the chametz, so how can it be the source of NOT having to get rid of the chametz? **A: R' Pappa** said, the pasuk is brought as the source for getting rid of the chametz when it is given to the Yid for safekeeping (the second part of the Braisa). **R' Ashi** said, the pasuk is explaining the last part of the Braisa. The Braisa said that if the Yid designates a room for the goy, he need not get rid of the chametz. This is because the pasuk says "Lo yimatzei bivateichem" – in your houses you may not have chametz, but this is not considered to be your house, because you have designated the room for the goy.
 - **Q:** We find (regarding avodah zarah being brought into a house that is rented from a Yid to a goy) that renting is not considered to be "ownership", which would mean that the Yid is still considered to own this room!? **A:** The pasuk says "Lo yimatzei" – it shall not be found. If the chametz is in a designated room, it is not considered to be found in your possession.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if one finds chametz in his house on Yom Tov, he should cover it with a keili (so that he not come to eat it on Yom Tov, and then burn it after Yom Tov).
 - **Rava** says, if it is chametz of hekdesch it need not be covered with a keili on Yom Tov, because people will not come to eat something that belongs to hekdesch.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if one has chametz of a goy in his house, he must make a wall of 10 tefachim around it as a reminder not to eat from it. If the chametz is of hekdesch, no wall is necessary, because people will not eat something belonging to hekdesch.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, someone who travels from his home more than 30 days before Pesach does not need to get rid of his chametz before he leaves. If he leaves within 30 days, he must get rid of the chametz before he leaves.
 - **Abaye** said, when he leaves within 30 days to Pesach, he only must get rid of the chametz if he intends to return to the house on Pesach. **Rava** said, if he plans to return on Pesach, then he must get rid of the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

chametz even if he is travelling away on Rosh Hashanah! Rather, when we say that if he leaves more than 30 days before Pesach he need not get rid of his chametz, that is only if he does not intend to return to his house on Pesach. If he does, he must get rid of the chametz before he leaves.

- The reason for the “30 day” timeline is like a Braisa says, we are to learn the halachos of Pesach (and otherwise concern himself with Pesach matters) beginning 30 days before Pesach. **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says it is done for 2 weeks before Pesach.
 - The **T”K** says it is 30 days because we find that Moshe taught about Pesach Sheni on Pesach Rishon (which was 30 days prior). **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says, that was done only because he was already dealing with general Pesach matters, so he dealt with Pesach Sheni matters at that time as well.
 - **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says it is 2 weeks because we find that Moshe spoke about Pesach on Rosh Chodesh Nisnon (2 weeks prior to Pesach).
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Moshe spoke to them about Pesach in Nisnon. It doesn’t say it was Rosh Chodesh!? **A: Rabbah bar Simi in the name of Ravina** said, we learn it from another pasuk that says that Hashem spoke to Moshe in Nisnon about making a Korbon Pesach.
 - **Q:** There too it does not say that it was Rosh Chodesh!? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a gezeira shava teaches that it was said on Rosh Chodesh.
 - **Q:** Why does the Torah discuss the story of counting the Yidden before the story of the Korbon Pesach? The Korbon Pesach took place a month before the counting!? **A: R’ Menashye bar Tachlifa in the name of Rav** said, we see from here that there is no chronological order in the Torah. **R’ Pappa** said, this is only if they are 2 different issues. Within a single issue there is chronological order. If we don’t say that, we could never say a “klal u’prat” or the reverse, because we would not know which belongs first and which second.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, one who does a bedika must be mevatel the chametz after the bedika.
 - **Q:** Why must he be mevatel? It can’t be because of the crumbs he left behind, because they are insignificant!? It can’t be that since he locks his door to protect the rest of his house, he thereby protects the crumbs and makes them significant, because a Braisa says that is not true!? **A: Rava** says, we are afraid that he will find a good piece of chametz that he will not destroy immediately, because it is somewhat significant. If he hadn’t done bitul, he would be liable for having chametz at that time.
 - **Q:** Why can’t he be mevatel it when he finds it? **A:** We are afraid that he will not find it until after the time that chametz becomes assur. At that time, the chametz does not belong to him, and he therefore cannot do bitul anymore. (Although it is in his possession in the sense that he would be liable for chametz, it is not his in the sense that he cannot do bitul).
 - **Q:** Why does he have to be mevatel at night? Why can’t he be mevatel in the morning? **A:** Since it is not the time of bedika or the time of issur chametz, we are afraid that he will forget.
 - **Q:** Why can’t he be mevatel at the 6th hour (the time of issur chametz)?! **A:** At that point it is already assur D’Rabanan, and it is assur as if it would be D’Oraisa, and it therefore no longer belongs to him to be mevatel.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one is sitting in Beis Medrash on Pesach and remembers that he has chametz in his house, he can be mevatel it, whether it is Shabbos or Yom Tov. We see that he can do bitul on Yom Tov, which by definition is a time in which the chametz is already assur!? **A: R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, the Braisa is discussing a student who left dough that was rising on Pesach. We allow him to be mevatel it before it actually becomes chametz. However, one could not be mevatel actual chametz on Pesach.