



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Pesachim, Daf ט – Daf י

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

#### -----Daf ט--7-----

- **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, if bread is found on Pesach, but it is so severely spoiled that it is not possible to tell whether it is chametz or matzah, if most of the bread in the box (throughout the year) where the bread was found is matzah, this bread is mutar.
  - **Q:** If we can tell that this piece is chametz, then we shouldn't follow rov. If we can't tell what it is, then why are we following rov? We should follow the last items to have been put into the box, which were clearly matzah (it is Pesach)!? We find that we say this concept regarding money found in the streets of Yerushalayim. We say that the money was lost the day it was found, because the streets were swept every day and all lost monies are presumably found the day they are lost!? **A:** The fact that the bread is so severely spoiled leads us to believe that it may have been in the box for quite some time, and we can't assume that it's from Pesach.
    - **Q:** If so, we should say it is chametz and not follow rov at all!? **A: Rabbah** said, the Braisa doesn't mean to follow rov. The Braisa means to say that if many days of Pesach have passed, so that it is possible that bread placed into this box at the beginning of Pesach could be so severely spoiled, then we can assume that it is from Pesach and is matzah.
      - **Q:** If so, it is obvious that it is matzah!? **A:** The Braisa is teaching that even if the bread is very severely spoiled, to the point that it looks like it must have been there from before Pesach, if many days of Pesach have passed, we can say that the addition of warm matzah on top of old matzah is what created this so severely spoiled bread, but it is actually matzah.
  - **Q:** Do we follow "what was put in last" rather than following rov? A Braisa says that if we are unsure whether a coin found in a box is regular money or ma'aser money, we follow rov. The Braisa does not say that we follow whatever was put in last!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa is discussing a case where we don't know what type of money was put in last. **R' Zvid** said that both types of coins were used in the box at the same time, separated into piles. So there is no "last" coins to follow. **R' Pappa** said, the coin was found in a hole in the box, so we can't assume that it was from the last coins placed into the box.
- **R' Yehuda** says that one must make a bracha on the bedika.
  - **Q:** What bracha does one make? **A: R' Pappi in the name of Rava** says, he says "l'vaer chametz" (to get rid of chametz). **R' Pappa in the name of Rava** says, he says "ahl biur chametz" (regarding getting rid of the chametz).
    - All agree that "l'vaer chametz" is future tense (which is the proper way to make a bracha). The machlokes is regarding "ahl biur chametz".
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that we make the bracha "ahl hamilah" when performing a bris. We see that it must be considered future tense!? **A:** There is no better way to make that bracha. If he would say "lamul", that would infer that he is the one who must give the milah, and that is not true.
      - **Q:** When the father of the baby is the mohel, he *is* the one who is supposed to do the milah, so he should say "lamul"!? **A:** The father of the baby who is the mohel actually would say "lamul".
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that we make the bracha "ahl hash'chita" when slaughtering. We see that it must be considered future tense!? **A:** There is no better way to make that bracha. If he would say "lish'chot", that would infer that he is the one who must slaughter, and that is not true.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** When one slaughters his own korban, he *is* the one who is supposed to do the slaughtering, so he should say “lish’chot”!? **A:** In that case he actually would say “lish’chot”.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, when taking a lulav one makes the bracha “ahl netilas lulav”. We see that it must be considered future tense!? **A:** Lulav is different, because the moment he lifts it he is already yotzeh, so he is truly making the bracha after performing the mitzvah.
  - **The Gemara paskens** that the proper bracha on the bedika is “ahl biur chametz”.
- **Q:** Where do we learn this concept that a bracha must be made before performance of the mitzvah? **A:** **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, all brachos on mitzvos must be made “oiver l’asiyan” (before they are performed).
  - **Q:** Where do we see the word “oiver” means “before”? **A:** **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a pasuk says “vayavor es hakushi” (he went before the kushi). **Abaye** said, a pasuk says “vehu ovar lifneihem” (he went before them). Another pasuk says “vayavor malkam lifneihem” (their king went before them).
  - **The Yeshiva of Rav** said, the 2 exceptions to this rule (that a bracha is made before performance) are the brachos made for tevila and for shofar.
    - **Q:** Tevila must be made after the mitzvah, because the person is not in a proper state to make a bracha before the tevila. Why is the bracha on shofar made after performance of the mitzvah? It can’t be because maybe the sound won’t come out right, because that thinking should apply to shechita and milah as well?! **A:** **R’ Chisda** said, only the bracha on tevila is an exception to the rule.

### LEOR HANER...

- **Q:** How do we know that the bedika must be done by candlelight? **A:** **R’ Chisda** said, by chametz it says “metzia” (finding). Another pasuk uses the same word and also says “vayichapes” (searching). We see that “finding” is done by “searching”. Another pasuk says “vayichapes” and “neros”, teaching that searching is done with candles. Another pasuk says “ner” and “chopes”, so we see that there is a connection from “neiros” to “ner” (they are both used when discussing searching). From all this, we learn that chametz must be searched for by candlelight.
  - **Q:** Why do we need the last pasuk? We already have a connection of searching to neiros!? **A:** The first pasuk quoted is talking about Hashem searching in Yerushalayim by candlelight. We would think that was said because Hashem is “not looking with a good light”, because He doesn’t want to find all the aveiros, but a true searching should be done with a torch. Therefore, we bring the second pasuk which teaches that searching is done by candlelight (and so is bedikas chametz).
  - A Braisa says, based on these pesukim, the bedika may not be done by sunlight, moonlight, or by the light of a torch, rather it may only be done by candlelight.
    - **Q:** When may one not use sunlight for bedika? If we are discussing bedika in a chatzer, **Rava** says a chatzer does not need a bedika, because the birds eat the food! If it is being done in a structure without walls, **Rava** said that sunlight may be used for such a bedika! **A:** It refers to using sunlight via a skylight in a room, to the sides of the skylight (directly opposite the skylight would be mutar like a structure without walls).
    - **Q:** We find that a torch is a better light than a candle. Why can’t a torch be used!? **A:** **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a candle can be brought into the cracks and crevices, whereas a torch cannot. **R’ Zvid** said, a torch’s useful light is behind the one carrying it (in front is too bright to be useful). **R’ Pappa** said, one is afraid to use a torch for fear of burning his house down and will therefore not properly search. **Ravina** said, candlelight produces a steady flame, whereas a torch flickers.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What does “kol” come to include? **A:** The places that were taught in a Braisa as not needing a bedika: holes in the walls of a house that are very high up or very low down, the slanted roof of an extension, the roof of a closet, an animal barn, a chicken coop, and a place where one stores straw, wine or oil. **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says, a bed that stands off the ground, used as a partition in a house, does need a bedika underneath.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there is a hole in the wall between 2 houses, each homeowner must do a bedika as far into the wall as his hand can reach, and he should then be mevatel anything beyond that. **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if a bed is used as a partition in a house, and items are placed underneath the bed, but a space exists between the bed and the items, no bedika is needed. This Braisa contradicts the previous one regarding both halachos!? **A:** This Braisa is discussing holes that are not very high or low, and is discussing a bed that has very little space under it.
  - **Q:** A Braisa said that storehouses of wine do need a bedika, but storehouses of oil do not!? **A:** This Braisa is discussing the type of storehouse that one goes to in middle of the meal if he needs more wine (and it is therefore possible that he goes there with chametz in his hand).
    - **Q:** If so, the storehouse of oil should also need a bedika!? **A:** People know how much oil will be needed for a meal and therefore don’t go to the storehouse for more during the meal.
    - **R’ Chiya** taught a Braisa, that storehouses of beer in Bavel have the same halacha as storehouses of wine in Eretz Yisrael.
  - **R’ Chisda** said, a closet where fish are kept does not need a bedika.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that it does!? **A:** **R’ Chisda** is discussing large fish, so more is not taken during a meal. The Braisa is discussing small fish, where people go back to get more during a meal.
  - **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** said, a storehouse of salt and a storehouse of wax both need bedika. **R’ Pappa** said, a storehouse of wood and a storehouse of dates both need bedika.
- A Braisa says, one is not obligated to stick his hands into a hole or crevice to do a bedika, because of the danger it entails.
  - **Q:** What is the danger? If there is a danger of scorpions, how did he use the hole in the first place (to place the chametz there that now requires the bedika to be done)? **A:** The Braisa is discussing the case of a wall that collapsed, and now has scorpions (but didn’t have before).
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that chametz upon which a house fell is considered destroyed, and one need not look for it to destroy it!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where it is deep enough that it cannot be smelled by a dog. The Braisa is discussing where it is not covered that well.
    - **Q:** **R’ Elazar** says that harm does not befall one doing a mitzvah!? **A:** **R’ Ashi** said, we are concerned that he may have lost an item in the hole in the wall, and as he is doing the bedika he will also look for that lost item. If so, his searching is not being done solely for a mitzvah.
      - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one performs a mitzvah with intentions other than for the mitzvah, the mitzvah is still considered to be complete. If so, in **R’ Ashi’s** case he should still have full protection of the mitzvah!? **A:** We are afraid that after he finishes searching for chometz (when he no longer has the protection of the mitzvah) he will continue searching for the lost item.
    - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchok** said, the danger is from goyim. This is the same thing that **Pleimo** said as well.
      - **Q:** If the danger is because the goy will think the Yid is doing kishuf, how did the Yid ever use the hole in the first place!? **A:** He used it during the day with natural light. Now he is checking at night with a candle, so it is different.
        - **Q:** **R’ Elazar** said that harm does not befall one doing a mitzvah!? **A:** The protection from a mitzvah does not protect one when he is in the path of likely harm.
      - They asked **Rav** if the yeshiva boys should travel to the yeshiva when it is dark outside (it is dangerous). **Rav** said they absolutely should. They asked, what about going home from Yeshiva in the dark? **Rav** said he did not know.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar** says the performance of a mitzvah offers protection on the way to do the mitzvah and on the way back.
  - This follows a Braisa that learns this from the mitzvah of “oleh regel”. The Torah says that a person’s property will be protected when he goes to be oleh regel, and for the time it takes him to come back.
- **R' Avin bar R' Ada in the name of R' Yitzchok** said, the reason the Ginosar fruits (very high quality fruits) don’t grow in Yerushalayim is so that people who are oleh regel shouldn’t say that the trip was worth it just to get those high quality fruits, which would make the entire mitzvah as having been done not for the sake of the mitzvah. **R' Dustai the son of R' Yannai** said a similar idea as to why the hot springs of Teveria are not located in Yerushalayim.

### UVAMEH AMRU SHTEI SHUROS...

- **Q:** Who mentioned anything about a wine cellar that caused the Tanna to mention it? **A:** The Mishna said that places where chametz is not brought do not need a bedika. This means that wine cellars do not need a bedika. The Mishna therefore asks, with regard to what was there a machlokes regarding how much of a wine cellar must be checked for chametz? It was regarding a cellar into which chametz is brought.

### BEIS SHAMMAI OMRIM SHTEI SHUROS...

- **R' Yehuda** said, this refers to the complete “wall” of barrels (from floor to ceiling) at the front of the cellar, and the complete “wall” of barrels behind it. **R' Yochanan** says it refers to the “wall” of barrels at the front of the cellar and the top layer of barrels of all rows of barrels beyond that.

### BEIS HILLEL OMRIM SHTEI SHUROS HACHITZONOS SHEHEIN HA'ELYONOS

- **Rav** said, this refers to the top 2 rows of barrels from the “wall” of barrels at the front of the cellar. **Shmuel** said, it refers to the top row of that “wall” and the top row of the “wall” behind it.
  - **R' Chiya** taught like **Rav's** view. All others taught like **Shmuel**. The Gemara paskens like **Shmuel**.

## -----Daf 9-----

### MISHNA

- We are not concerned that a weasel may have dragged chametz from one house (which had chametz) to another (in which a bedika was already done), or from one place (which did not yet get a bedika) to another (which already had a bedika) in a house. If we would be so concerned, we would also have to be concerned that this would take place from the house of one chatzer to another, and from the house of one city to the house of another city. There would be no end to that concern.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** We are not concerned that maybe a weasel dragged over chametz. However, it would seem from the Mishna that if we saw a weasel drag chametz over, we would require another bedika. Why don't we assume that the weasel ate all the chametz? We find that a Mishna says, although we are concerned that goyim bury their stillborn babies (which give off tumah) in their houses, if pigs and weasels have access to those areas, we can assume the stillborn is gone (because the animals eat it). We should say the same thing regarding the chametz as well!? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, weasels will not leave over anything when they eat meat, but leave over when they eat bread. That is why a bedika is required. **A2:** **Rava** said, in the case of the stillborn, we are not certain a stillborn was even buried there. Therefore, since there is also the possibility that it was eaten, we can assume that it is not there. However, when we are certain that the weasel brought in chametz, we can't simply assume that it was eaten, because a “possibility” can't change the status of something that was certain.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if a “chaver” dies and leaves over a storehouse of produce, the produce is considered to be ready to eat (i.e. all ma'aser is assumed to have been given). Now, the produce had a definite status of “tevel”, and yet, the *possibility* that the chaver gave ma'aser is enough to remove that definite status!? **A:** We say like **R' Chanina Choza'ah**, that a chaver has *certainly* given ma'aser from anything in his possession. Therefore, it is a certainty that is changing the original, certain status. **A2:** It is only a possibility that it was tevel, because **R' Oshaya** says that a person can bring his produce into his house before the threshing and in that way circumvent the ma'aser obligation. Based on that, it is only a

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

*possibility* that the produce is tevel, and therefore, the possibility that he gave ma'aser can change the status of the possible level.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, there was a story where a woman threw a stillborn into a ditch, and a Kohen bent over the ditch (possibly making himself an "ohel" over the stillborn) to determine if the stillborn was a boy or a girl (because there are different halachos of tumah and tahara depending on the gender of the child). Although the Kohen should have become tamei by doing so, the **Chachomim** said he was tahor, because there were weasels in that ditch (and we assume that the stillborn was dragged away before the Kohen bent over the ditch). In this case the stillborn was *definitely* thrown into the ditch, and yet, the **Chachomim** said that the Kohen is tahor because of the *possibility* that the stillborn was dragged away!? **A:** The story was that the woman threw an afterbirth into the ditch, but it was not certain whether it had the status of a child (in which case it would give off tumah) or not. Therefore, it never had the status of being certainly tamei. **A2:** It was certainly tamei, but it is also a certainty that the weasel dragged it away, because it does so immediately. One certainty can change the status of another certainty.
  - **Q:** The Braisa says the kohen bent over to see whether it was a boy or a girl. That means it surely developed enough to have the status of a child!? **A:** The Braisa means that the Kohen bent over to see whether the thing thrown in had the status of a child, and if it did, to see whether it was a male or a female.
- **Q:** From the Mishna it seems that we are not concerned that maybe a weasel dragged the chametz to another place. However, the next Mishna says, whatever chametz one wants to leave over after the bedika, he should be sure to leave it in a secure place, so that he does not have to do another bedika. Presumably this means, that if the chametz is not left in a secure place we must be concerned that it will get dragged by a weasel to another area!? **A: Abaye** said, our Mishna is discussing on the 13<sup>th</sup> of Nisbon. At that time the weasel does not notice any shortage of bread and therefore will not store any. Whatever it takes, it eats completely. The next Mishna is discussing the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisbon. At that time the weasel knows that there will not be much bread, and it therefore stores some of the bread that it takes.
  - **Q: Rava** asks, is the weasel a prophet that it knows that there will be no bread on the 14<sup>th</sup>? **A: Rava** said, the reason the chametz left over on the 14<sup>th</sup> must be kept in a safe place is because we don't want a weasel to come in front of us and drag some away, which would require another bedika. However, we are not concerned that a weasel dragged something away unless we actually see it happen.
  - **A: R' Mari** said, the reason the chametz must be put in a safe place is so that he should not put away 10 pieces of bread and come back later to find only 9 pieces. In that case we would certainly have to be concerned that a piece was dragged away by a weasel.
- If one had 9 piles of matzah and one pile of chametz, and a mouse took a piece from one of the piles and brought it into a house that was already checked for chametz (we don't know from which pile the mouse took it), the halacha would be the same as the case when there are 9 kosher butcher shops and one non-kosher, and one took a piece of meat from one of them, but doesn't know from which store he took the meat. In that case the halacha is that the meat is assur because of the principle that "kol kavua k'mechtza ahl mechtza dami". Therefore, in the case of the mouse, the house would have to be checked again.
  - If there was a piece separated from the piles and a mouse took that piece into a house that was already checked for chametz, and we don't know which pile that piece came from, that would be the same halacha as the case of the 10 butcher shops, above, where a piece of meat was found outside of the stores. In that case the halacha is that the meat is mutar, because we follow the majority based on the principle of "kol d'parish m'rubah parish". Therefore, in this case of the mouse, the house would not have to be checked again.
- If there are 2 piles – one of matzah and one of chametz – which are in front of 2 houses – one which was already checked for chametz and one which had not yet been checked – and 2 mice came, one taking a piece from one pile and going into one of the houses and the other taking a piece from the other pile and going into the other house, without us knowing where the contents of each pile ended up, that would be the same halacha as the case of "2 boxes". A Braisa says, if there are 2 large boxes of produce – one of chullin and one of terumah – and

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

in front of them are 2 containers of produce – one of chullin and one of terumah – and one container fell into one box, and the other container fell into the other box, the box of chullin produce remains mutar, because we say that the chullin fell into the chullin and the terumah fell into the terumah. Here too, we would say that the mouse with the chametz went into the house that was not yet checked, and the mouse with the matzah went into the house that was already checked.

- **Q:** Maybe we are only lenient in this way by Terumah D'Rabanan (after the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash). However, regarding chametz, which is a D'Oraisa, maybe we are machmir!? **A:** Bedikas chametz is only D'Rabanan.

### -----Daf 10-----

- If there is a pile of chametz, and in front of it are 2 houses that were both already checked for chametz, and a mouse came and took something from the pile into one of the houses, but we don't know which one it went into, this would have the same halacha as the case of "2 roads". A Mishna says, if there are 2 roads, one of which has a meis buried under it in a way that one walking down that road will surely become tamei meis, and there are 2 people, each of which went down one of the roads, so that one of them must surely be tamei, but we don't know which one, the halacha is as follows. **R' Yehuda** says, if each of the people ask about their status separately, we can tell each of them that they are tahor. If they ask together, we must tell them that they are tamei. **R' Yose** says, in both cases we must tell them that they are tamei. **Rava** explained, that **R' Yehuda and R' Yose** agree that if they ask together we tell them they are tamei and if they ask separately we tell them that they are tahor. The machlokes is when one comes to ask, but he asks about himself and the other individual. In that case **R' Yehuda** says it is as if he is only asking about himself and he is told that he is tahor. **R' Yose** says that it is considered as if both have come to ask together, and they are told that they are tamei.
  - The same halacha would apply to the houses. If they ask separately, neither would need another bedika. If they ask together, they would. If one asks regarding both of them, that would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Yehuda and R' Yose**.
- If we saw a mouse with chametz running, and we are not sure whether or not it ran into a house that was already checked for chametz, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and the **Rabanan** regarding the case of open fields. A Mishna says, when there are many adjacent, open fields, and one of them has a meis buried in it, and one enters the fields during the winter (when people are not allowed to enter other people's fields and it therefore has the status of a reshus hayachid), but is not sure whether he entered the field with the tumah in it, **R' Eliezer** says he is tahor, because when one is unsure whether he entered a place of tumah, he is tahor, and it is only when one is unsure whether he touched tumah that he is tamei. The **Rabanan** say he is tamei.
  - Here, we are unsure whether the mouse even went into the house, so he will not have to do another bedika (even the **Rabanan** would agree in this case because bedika is only D'Rabanan).
- If a mouse with chametz went into a house, and the homeowner did another bedika but found no chametz, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Meir** and the **Rabanan**. A Mishna says, **R' Meir** says, anything that has a chazaka of tumah cannot break that status until we can determine the whereabouts of that tumah. The **Rabanan** say that we must dig down until we reach rock or virgin soil, and if we don't find the tumah at that point, we can assume that it was removed.
  - Similarly, if the house was searched for chametz and none was found we can assume that it was removed from the house even according to **R' Meir**, because bedikas chametz is only D'Rabanan.
- If a mouse with chametz went into a house, and the homeowner did another bedika and found chametz (but doesn't know for sure if it is the chametz brought in by the mouse), the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **Rebbi** and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**. A Braisa says, if a grave was "lost" in a field, one who enters the field is tamei. If a grave is then found in the field, **Rebbi** says that we assume it is the grave that was lost and one who walks into the field does not become tamei. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, we can't assume it is the same grave and must continue to search the entire field.
  - Similarly, whether we assume that the chametz found is the chametz that was brought in would be subject to this machlokes as well.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If one left over 9 pieces of chametz and later found 10 pieces, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **Rebbi** and the **Rabanan**. A Braisa says, if one put a maneh of ma'aser money into a box and later found 2 maneh in the box, **Rebbi** says we assume one maneh is ma'aser and the other is chullin. The **Rabanan** say we assume the ma'aser was removed and that both maneh are chullin.
  - Similarly, in this case the **Rabanan** would say we assume the 9 pieces that he put down are somewhere else and these 10 are new ones. Therefore, he will need to search for the 9 pieces of chametz. **Rebbi** would say that his original 9 are here and someone added one piece, and no bedika needs to be done.
- If one left over 10 pieces of chametz and later found 9, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **Rebbi** and the **Rabanan**. The end of the previous Braisa says, if one put 2 maneh of ma'aser money into a box and later found only one maneh in the box, **Rebbi** says we assume one maneh was taken and the remaining maneh is ma'aser. The **Rabanan** say we assume all the ma'aser was removed and the maneh found in the box is chullin.
  - Similarly, the **Rabanan** would say the 9 pieces found are not from those originally left and he therefore needs to find the missing 10 pieces of chametz, and **Rebbi** would say that they are and he only needs to find the one missing piece.
- If one placed chametz in one corner and later found the chametz in another corner, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** and the **Rabanan**. A Braisa says that if one finds keilim in his house missing or moved around, the **Rabanan** say we must assume that someone came in and moved it. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says we assume the owner himself moved it and forgot that he did so.
  - Similarly, the **Rabanan** would say that we have to assume that a mouse moved the chametz, and the chametz found may not be the same chametz that was left. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says that we assume the owner moved it, and therefore no new bedika would be necessary.
- **Rava** said, if a mouse entered a house with bread in its mouth, and the owner searched after it for chametz and found crumbs, he still must do another bedika, because it is not normal for a mouse to crumble the bread, therefore the bread must still be somewhere in the house.
- **Rava** said, if a child walked into the house with bread in its hand, and the owner searched after it for chametz and found crumbs, no further bedika is necessary, because a child typically does crumble the bread, and we can assume that this is the bread that the child brought in.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if a mouse walks into a house with bread in its mouth, and a mouse walks out with bread in its mouth, can we assume it is the same mouse and piece of bread or not? **Q2:** If we assume that it is the same mouse and bread, what if it was a white mouse that went into the house and a black mouse that came out of the house, can we say that the black mouse grabbed it from the white mouse or do we say that it is a different piece of bread? **Q3:** If we say that one mouse would not take from another mouse, what if a mouse went in with bread and a weasel came out with bread, do we say that the weasel surely took it from the mouse, or do we say that if it took the bread from the mouse it would have killed the mouse and came out with the mouse in its mouth as well? **Q4:** If we say that the mouse would have to be in the weasel's mouth as well, what if a mouse entered with bread and a weasel came out with the mouse and the bread in the weasel's mouth? Do we say that the bread was surely that of the mouse, or do we say that if it was from the mouse it would still be in the mouse's mouth, or do we say that the mouse dropped it out of fright and it truly is the bread of the mouse? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: Rava** asked, if there is bread on a beam near the ceiling, does one have to get a ladder to bring it down or is a simple bitul enough? Do we say that since it will not fall down there is no concern that he will come to eat it on Pesach, or do we say that since there is a chance that it can fall down, he must take it down before Pesach? **Q2:** If we say he must take it down because of the chance that it will fall, what if there is chametz down in a "bor", does he need to get a ladder to remove it? Do we say that since it will not come up on its own there is no concern that he will eat it, or do we say that he may go down there on Pesach, so he must get rid of it now? **Q3:** What if there is bread in the mouth of a snake, does one need to hire a professional to get the bread from the snake, or do we say that the **Rabanan** only required things that a person can do on his own, not things that he must spend money to hire others to do for him? **A: TEIKU**

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda** says one must do a bedika on the night going into the 14<sup>th</sup>, the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>, and at the time that he destroys the chametz. The **Chachomim** say, if one did not do a bedika at night, he does it in the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>. If he didn't do it then either, he does it at the time of destroying the chametz. If he didn't do it then, he does it later on the 14<sup>th</sup> before nightfall.
- Whatever chametz one leaves over after the bedika should be left in a secure place so that he should not be required to do another bedika.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does **R' Yehuda** says that 3 bedikos must be done? **A:** **R' Chisda** and **Rabbah bar R' Huna** explain, it is because of the 3 words used in the Torah to refer to the destruction of the chametz – “yeira'eh”, “yimatzei”, “tashbisu”.
  - **Q:** **R' Yosef** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says, if one was not bodek during these 3 times, he can no longer do a bedika. It seems that he only argues about a bedika after these times, but agrees that only one bedika needs to be done!? **A:** All agree that only one bedika needs to be done. **R' Yehuda** says one may not do a bedika once the issur chametz has begun, because we are concerned that if he is searching for chametz he may eat the chametz that he finds. The **Rabanan** say that we are not concerned for that and therefore a bedika may be done after the issur chametz has begun.

## -----Daf X'---11-----

- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yehuda** is goizer against doing a bedika after the time for issur chametz because we are afraid that he may eat from the chametz that he finds? A Mishna says, as soon as the Korbon Omer was brought (permitting the new grain), the markets of Yerushalayim were full of flour and grain dried in an oven from the new crop. (This means the produce was cut, grinded and dried before Yom Tov began, when eating from this produce was assur). **R' Meir** says this was done against the will of the **Chachomim**. **R' Yehuda** says, the **Chachomim** did not have a problem with this. We see from here that **R' Yehuda** is not goizer that they may come to eat from the produce as they are handling it!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, since before the bringing of the Korbon Omer one may only detach the new produce from the ground by pulling it out of the ground by hand, that unusual method will remind him that he may not eat from it.
  - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, that would help during the time that he is pulling it out of the ground, why was **R' Yehuda** not goizer against grinding and sifting of the flour!? **A:** These processes were also done in an unusual manner (the grinding was done with a hand grinder and the sifting was done on an upside-down sifter) which act as a reminder for him not to eat from the new produce.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that one may cut produce from irrigated fields and fields in the valley in the usual manner (although it is assur to eat that produce before the bringing of the Omer), although he may not pile the produce, and the Gemara there establishes that the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**. We see that he is not goizer that they may come to eat from the produce that they are handling in a normal manner!? **A:** **Abaye** explains that people separate themselves from eating chadash and will therefore not come to eat from it. However, people are accustomed to eating chametz all year long and we must therefore be concerned that one will eat from the chametz.
- **Q:** **Rava** asked, the Gemara said that the **Rabanan** allow a bedika to be done after the issur chametz has begun and we are not concerned that he will come to eat from it. Yet, the **Rabanan** (the shita of **R' Meir**) did not allow the handling of the new produce out of concern that one would come to eat from it!? **A:** The **Rabanan** say, with regard to chametz, the person is searching for it to destroy it! He will therefore certainly not come to eat from it.
  - **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the reason **R' Yehuda** is not goizer in the case of flour and dried grain of the new produce is because those are not fit to be eaten, so there is no reason to be goizer.
    - The Gemara says that this is a mistaken answer, because the raw produce (before it is grinded or dried) is fit to be eaten.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yehuda** is goizer in a situation where people are accustomed to doing a particular thing? A Mishna says that although the **Rabanan** do not allow it, **R' Yehuda** allows one to fill an eggshell with oil so that it drips into an oil lamp on Shabbos, and he is not concerned that the person will take some of that oil for eating (which is something people are accustomed to do), which would be an issur D'Oraisa of extinguishing!? **A:** Over there he is not goizer, because the stringency of Shabbos will prevent one from doing that.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the **Rabanan** allow one to tie the broken rope of a pail with a bow (they are not goizer that one may come to make a knot) and **R' Yehuda** does not allow a bow to be made (we see he is goizer for Shabbos)!? **A:** The **Rabanan** are goizer in the case of the oil because people would confuse one oil for the other and may come to use the oil from the eggshell. However, people would not confuse the allowance to make a bow as an allowance to make a knot as well. With regard to **R' Yehudah**, the reason he does not allow a bow is not because of a gezeirah, it is because he holds that a bow is considered to be a knot and is assur D'Oraisa.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that the **Rabanan** do not allow using a rope to tie the pail even if it is a rope that will not be left there permanently (so would not lead to a knot which would be assur D'Oraisa). We see they are goizer even in this case!? **A:** They are goizer because people would confuse allowing the tying of a rope that will not be left permanently with the tying of a rope that will be left there permanently.
- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yehuda** is not goizer whenever people are not accustomed to doing a particular thing? A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** prohibits letting blood from a bechor, even though the bechor may die if it is not done, because he is goizer that one may make a permanent “mum” in the bechor, which would be assur. He is goizer even though people typically are “separated” from kodashim!? **A:** He is goizer in that case, because the person is very worried about the animal dying and the financial loss that would entail. In that state he may come to make a “mum”.
  - **Q:** We see from a Braisa that **R' Yehuda** does not say that the loss of money is a reason to be goizer, because he allows combing an animal with a comb that has thick teeth (which won't make a wound to the animal) but doesn't allow using a comb with thinner teeth, although the **Rabanan** allow neither to be used!? **A:** In that case, the combing alleviates the animal's pain, but the animal is never at risk of dying, that's why he is not in a state that would cause us to be goizer.
  - **Q:** Why is **R' Yehuda** goizer by chametz but not by combing? **A:** People do not confuse the 2 types of combs. They would get confused with the chametz since they eat it all year long.

### MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says one may eat chametz the entire 5<sup>th</sup> hour of Erev Pesach, and must burn the chametz at the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour (even though D'Oraisa it is mutar to eat chametz throughout the entire 6<sup>th</sup> hour). **R' Yehuda** says one may eat the entire 4<sup>th</sup> hour, the 5<sup>th</sup> hour is “left hanging” (he may not eat chametz but he may benefit from the chametz by giving it to his animals, etc.) and he must burn the chametz in the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour.
- **R' Yehuda** also said, they would place 2 challos from a passul Korbon Todah on a bench on the Har Habayis on Erev Pesach. As long as both were there, people knew they were allowed to eat chametz. At the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> hour, Beis Din would send someone to remove one challah, and all would know that eating chametz is no longer permitted, but benefitting from the chametz was still allowed. At the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour, the second challah would be removed, and all would know to begin burning their chametz.
- **R' Gamliel** says, chullin may be eaten throughout the entire 4<sup>th</sup> hour, terumah may be eaten throughout the entire 5<sup>th</sup> hour, and all must be burned at the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour.

### GEMARA

- A Mishna says, if 2 witnesses say testimony on an occurrence, but their versions of the story differ as to the time that the occurrence took place, **R' Meir** says, if one said it happened in the second hour of the day and the other said it happened in the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour of the day, the testimony is accepted (because they are saying the same testimony and one or both is mistaken as to the time). If one says in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the other says in the 5<sup>th</sup>, it is not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

accepted (such a discrepancy is beyond the amount of time that people make a mistake). **R' Yehuda** says, in that case the testimony is accepted as well. But, if one says it took place during the 5<sup>th</sup> hour and one says during the 7<sup>th</sup> hour, the testimony is not accepted, because during the 5<sup>th</sup> hour the sun is in the east and during the 7<sup>th</sup> the sun is in the west. We cannot attribute the difference to a mistake in telling time.

- **Abaye** said, upon analysis we can see that **R' Meir** says that people don't err in telling time, and the reason the testimony is accepted when one says "in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hour" and the other says "in the 3<sup>rd</sup>" is because, although they were referring to the exact same moment, one referred to it as the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hour and the other referred to it as the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour. **R' Yehuda** says that people err in telling time up to half an hour. The incident actually took place at the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> hour. One erred a half hour early and said that it happened at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup>. The other erred a half hour late and said that it occurred at the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup>.
  - **[Another version of Abaye** is that he says, according to **R' Meir**, a person only errs in telling time by a slight amount. The incident took place either at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hour or the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour, and one of the witnesses was off by a slight amount. According to **R' Yehuda**, a person can err in telling time by up to an hour and a slight amount. The incident took place either at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour or at the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> hour, and one of the witnesses was off by an hour and a slight amount.]
  - **Q: Rava** asked, by assuming that when the witness said "the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour", he meant the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour, and that the witness who said "the 5<sup>th</sup> hour" meant the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> hour, we would kill someone based on that!? It's possible that he meant the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour or the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> hour, in which case the testimony would not be accepted! A pasuk teaches that we look for ways to prevent their testimony from punishing someone, so how can we say that we accept their testimony in this case!? **A: Rava** therefore said, according to **R' Meir** a person can err up to 2 hours less a slight amount (and therefore a difference in the testimony of this amount will still have the testimony accepted). The incident took place at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hour or at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup>, and one of the witnesses is mistaken by slightly less than 2 hours. According to **R' Yehuda**, a person can err by slightly less than 3 hours. The incident took place either at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> or at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup>. One of the witnesses is off by slightly less than 3 hours. The testimony is accepted because they both saw the incident and are just mistaken as to the time.

### -----Daf ב'---12-----

- **Q:** A Mishna says that Beis Din would examine witnesses who were saying testimony in a capital case with 7 "chakiros". They would ask them to give the following information about the incident witnessed: which shmitta cycle, which year of the cycle, which month, how many days into the month, what day of the week, what hour of the day, and the location. The Mishna continues, that Beis Din also asked the witnesses "bedikos", which were questions beyond these 7. With regard to chakiros, if a witness answers that he does not know, the testimony is not accepted. However, a witness may say he doesn't know the answer to bedikos, and the testimony will still stand. The Gemara there explained, that saying "I don't know" to the chakiros would make it impossible for a second pair of witnesses to come and say that the first set of witnesses are lying based on the fact that the first set were somewhere else at the time of the reported incident ("hazamah"). Now, if what we said earlier is correct, that even witnesses are allowed to be off in their telling of the time by 2 or 3 hours (according to **R' Meir** or **R' Yehuda**), there can be no hazamah on the chakira of "what hour of the day" either, because they can always claim that they were mistaken by a couple of hours (so the second set's claim that the first set was not at that location at the claimed time can be agreed to and explained that the incident took place a couple of hours later or earlier)!? **A:** The second set of witnesses must claim that the first set was at a different location than the reported incident for the time claimed as the time of the incident, **plus** the time allowed for a mistake regarding time. According to **R' Meir** they will have to say the first set was elsewhere for 2 hours before and after the reported time, and according to **R' Yehuda** the second set's testimony must include 3 hours before and after the reported time.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Our Mishna says that according to **R' Meir** one must stop eating chametz after the 5<sup>th</sup> hour (even though D'Oraisa one has until the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour), and according to **R' Yehuda** he must stop eating at the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> hour.
  - **Q:** According to **Abaye**, who says that **R' Meir's** view is that one does not err with regard to time at all, why can't he eat until the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour!? Even according to the version that **Abaye** says **R' Meir's** view is that one errs by a slight amount, he should be able to eat until right before the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour!? Also, according to **Abaye** that **R' Yehuda's** view is that one errs up to half an hour with regard to time, he should be able to eat until the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour!? Even according to the version that **Abaye** says that **R' Yehuda's** view is that a person errs up to an hour plus a slight amount, he should be able to eat up until right before the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> hour!? **A:** **Abaye** said, witnesses are more careful people, and they only err those small amounts. The general population may err even more than that. Therefore, regarding chametz we have to allow for the possibility of even larger mistakes.
  - **Q:** According to **Rava**, who says that **R' Meir's** view is that people err slightly less than 2 hours, he should have to stop eating at the very beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> hour!? **A:** Chametz is not assur until the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> hour, at which time the sun is in the west. Therefore, we can let him eat the entire 5<sup>th</sup> hour, because the sun is in the east and he will not make a mistake to the 7<sup>th</sup> hour.
    - **Q:** If so, let him eat the entire 6<sup>th</sup> hour as well!? **A:** **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, at the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour the sun is pretty much directly overhead, and it is difficult to tell whether it is in the east or west. Therefore, one may confuse the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> with the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup>. To prevent that, we say that he may not eat chametz the entire 6<sup>th</sup> hour.
  - **Q:** According to **Rava**, who says that **R' Yehuda's** view is that people err slightly less than 3 hours, he should have to stop eating at the very beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> hour!? **A:** At the 4<sup>th</sup> hour the sun is still well in the east, so there is no risk that he will confuse that with the 7<sup>th</sup> hour, at which time the sun is in the west.
    - **Q:** If so, let him eat the entire 5<sup>th</sup> hour as well!? **A:** **Abaye** answers that witnesses are more careful people and wouldn't make this mistake, but the general population may. Therefore, we prohibit the chametz after the 4<sup>th</sup> hour. **A2:** **Rava** answers that the reason **R' Yehuda** prohibits eating chametz after the 4<sup>th</sup> hour is not because of the inaccuracies of telling time. It is because he holds that one must destroy the chametz by burning it. Therefore, the **Rabanan** prohibited eating chametz after the 4<sup>th</sup> hour so that people will have the 5<sup>th</sup> hour to go and collect wood to use for burning the chametz, which will be done at the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> hour.
      - **Q:** **Ravina** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** allows any form of destruction of the chametz once the time for destroying the chametz has arrived!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the reason why **R' Yehuda** prohibits eating chametz after the 4<sup>th</sup> hour is for the case of a cloudy day, when the position of the sun cannot be easily determined and is therefore easily confused.
        - **Q:** If so, who doesn't he prohibit eating the chametz during the 4<sup>th</sup> hour as well!? **A:** **R' Pappa** says, the 4<sup>th</sup> hour is when most people eat breakfast, so they will not confuse that time (their bodies know that time well).
  - A Braisa says, "Ludim" eat during the first hour of the day, thieves eat during the second hour, inheritors of wealth (who don't work) eat during the 3<sup>rd</sup> hour, workers eat during the 4<sup>th</sup> hour, talmidei chachomim eat during the 5<sup>th</sup> hour, all others eat during the 6<sup>th</sup> hour.
    - **Q:** We just said that **R' Pappa** said most people eat in the 4<sup>th</sup> hour!? **A:** Change the Braisa to say, most people eat in the 4<sup>th</sup> hour, workers eat in the 5<sup>th</sup> hour, and talmidei chachomim eat in the 6<sup>th</sup> hour.
    - The Braisa continues, that eating breakfast after the 6<sup>th</sup> hour is no longer beneficial. **Abaye** said, that is only if he fasted up until that time.
  - **R' Ashi** said, the same machlokes that exists between **R' Meir** and **R' Yehuda** with regard to testimony (how much they err in telling time) also exists regarding eating chametz.
    - **Q:** That is obvious!? **A:** **R' Ashi** means to say that **R' Meir** and **R' Yehuda** are consistent in their views. The reason the time allowed for erring is different between testimony and chametz is the reasons we

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

gave above. It is not because the Mishnayos of testimony and chametz argue with each other in regard to what they held.

- **R' Simi bar Ashi** said, we only accept the testimony of the witnesses if the discrepancy is off by a couple of hours during the day. However, if one says the incident took place before sunrise and the other says it was after sunrise, the testimony is not accepted.
  - **Q:** This is obvious!? **A:** The chiddush is, even if one said it took place before sunrise and one said it was *during* sunrise, the testimony is not accepted.
    - **Q:** That is also obvious!? **A:** We would think they are both referring to the same time, and the one who said it was during sunrise saw the rays of light that come before sunrise and thought it was actually sunrise. **R' Simi bar Ashi** therefore teaches that we don't say that, and the testimony is therefore not accepted.

### -----Daf ל"ג---13-----

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rav** paskens like **R' Yehuda** of our Mishna.
  - **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, you should pasken like **R' Meir**, because there is an anonymous Mishna that says like him!? A Mishna says, as long as it is mutar to eat chametz, it is mutar to give the animals to eat. This seems to mean that when it is assur for one to eat chametz, he may not feed it to his animals. This follows the view of **R' Meir**!? **A:** That Mishna actually follows the view of **R' Gamliel**. That is why the Mishna says “when it is *mutar* to eat”, meaning, when it is mutar for someone else to eat (i.e. a Kohen to eat terumah during the 5<sup>th</sup> hour), it is mutar to give the animals chametz of chullin as well.
    - **Q:** Why doesn't he pasken like **R' Gamliel**, since he is the “middle road” shita by agreeing with **R' Meir** when dealing with terumah and agreeing with **R' Yehuda** when dealing with chullin!? **A:** Noone made a differentiation between terumah and chullin except for **R' Gamliel**. Therefore, **R' Gamliel** is not considered to be a “middle ground”, he is considered to be a stand-alone, third shita. **A2: Rav** follows the view of a Braisa that paskens like **R' Elazar ben Yehuda from Barsosa in the name of R' Yehoshua**, who says among other things, that one must stop eating chametz by the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> hour.
      - **R' Pappa in the name of Rava** said, it could be that the Braisa only paskens like him in regard to the other things he said (that when Erev Pesach is Shabbos one should burn even the terumah that is chametz before Shabbos begins), but not regarding his time for the issur of eating chametz.
  - **Rebbi** also seems to hold like **R' Nachman**. Because **Rebbi** did not allow the guardian of chametz to sell the chametz he was guarding (one may not sell items he is guarding unless it is to prevent a serious loss to the owner) until the 5<sup>th</sup> hour on Erev Pesach. Presumably he allowed the sale at that time to a goy, and we see that **Rebbi** must have held like **R' Yehuda**!
    - **R' Yosef** says, it could be that **Rebbi** held like **R' Meir** and allowed the sale to a Yid in the 5<sup>th</sup> hour.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, if so, why did he have to sell the chametz? Why couldn't he just eat it himself and reimburse the owner!? **A:** Doing so would arouse suspicion that he paid less than fair market value, thus short-changing the owner.
      - **R' Adda bar Masna** said to **R' Yosef**, you specifically told us that **Rebbi** had told the guardian to sell it during the 5<sup>th</sup> hour to goyim, which would be a clear proof that **Rebbi** held like **R' Yehuda**.
    - **R' Yosef** said, this shita of **Rebbi** that one may sell the items he is guarding when they are losing all their value follows **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in a Mishna. However, the T”K there says that the items may not be sold. **Abaye** said, **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan** said that the T”K would agree that one may sell the items if their value decreases more than the norm, and would therefore clearly agree in this case where the chametz stood to be worthless.

V'OD AMAR R' YEHUDA SHTEI CHALLOS...

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Someone taught a Braisa to **R' Yehuda** that said that the challos were put on the benches. **R' Yehuda** said, they would not be visible if put on a bench and would therefore serve no purpose! Rather, the Braisa must mean that they were put on the roof above the benches.

### PESULOS...

- **Q:** Why were there passul challos of a todah every year on Erev Pesach? **A:** **R' Chanina** said, a Braisa teaches that it is assur to bring a Korbon Todah on Erev Pesach (since the chametz challos that are brought with it would become assur to eat a few hours into the day). Because of this, many Korbon Todos were brought the day before Erev Pesach. So many were brought that there were always some challos which could not be eaten by that night and were left over to the morning, thereby becoming passul. **A2:** **R' Yannai** said, the challos were not passul, they just couldn't be eaten because the Korbon they were brought for never ended up being slaughtered.
  - **Q:** Why didn't they shecht the animal!? **A:** The animal was lost.
  - **Q:** Why didn't they bring another animal? **A:** It was a case where the one bringing the korbon said "This is the todah and these are the challos", in which case **Rabbah** said that if the animal gets lost we do not bring another one.
  - **Q:** Why didn't they redeem the challos and make them chullin? **A:** What happened was that the animal was slaughtered, but the blood spilled before being offered on the Mizbe'ach, in which case the challos become kadosh, but may not be eaten until the blood is actually offered on the Mizbe'ach.
    - This follows **Rebbi** who says that the shechita of the korbon alone makes the accompanying breads kadosh, but eating them remains forbidden until the blood is offered on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Shimon ben Elazar**, on the other hand, says that the bread does not become kadosh until the blood is offered as well.
      - It could be that this would follow **R' Shimon ben Elazar** as well. This case is talking about where the blood was accepted in a keili and then spilled, and he holds that since when the blood is in the keili it is fit to be offered, it is already considered as offered for this purpose.
- A Braisa says that **R' Elazar** said that the challos used were actually not passul.
- A Braisa says that **Abba Shaul** said, the sign as to when eating was permitted was not done using challos, it was done using oxen. Beis Din would have 2 oxen plowing on Har Hazeisim. When the messenger took one ox away, the people knew they could no longer eat chametz but could still benefit from it. When the second ox was removed, the people would begin to burn their chametz.