



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Pesachim, Daf כח – Daf לז

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 כח-----28-----

VACHACHOMIM OMRIM MIFARER V'ZOREH...

- **Q:** Does the chametz only have to be crumbled when throwing it into the wind, or must it be crumbled if it will be thrown into the sea as well? The same question can be asked regarding disposing of avodah zarah. **R' Yose** says in a Mishna that avodah zarah must be ground and thrown into the wind or the sea (meaning the Dead Sea). Must it be ground before throwing to the wind or even before throwing into the Dead Sea as well? **A: Rabbah** said, it would make sense that avodah zarah need not be ground before being cast into the Dead Sea, because boats don't go there and therefore there is no concern that someone will find it. However, chametz, which may be thrown into any sea, should have to be crumbled before being thrown in. **R' Yosef** said, it should be the other way around! Avodah zarah doesn't get ruined from the water and therefore should have to be beground. Chametz gets ruined in the water anyway and therefore should not need to be crumbled.
  - There is a Braisa that says that chametz must be crumbled before being cast into the sea. There is another Braisa that says that avodah zarah must be ground before being thrown into the sea. **Rabbah** will say that the Braisa which discusses avodah zarah is discussing where it was thrown into a sea other than the Dead Sea, which is why it must be ground. **R' Yosef** will say that the Braisa which discusses chametz is discussing wheat kernels, which don't get ruined in the water and therefore must be crumbled first.

MISHNA

- Chametz of a goy that was kept by that goy over Pesach is mutar to benefit from after Pesach. Chametz of a Yid that was kept over Pesach is assur to benefit from after Pesach, because the pasuk says "lo yeira'eh lecha".

GEMARA

- A Braisa brings a 3-way machlokes regarding the issur of eating and benefitting from chametz. **R' Yehuda** says that one who eats or benefits from chametz on Erev Pesach after chatzos until nightfall, or eats or benefits after Pesach from chametz that was around on Pesach, is subject to a lav. One who eats chametz on Pesach is subject to a lav and kares. **R' Shimon** says that on Erev Pesach and after Pesach (for chametz that was around on Pesach) one is not even subject to a lav. One who eats or benefits from chametz on Pesach is subject to a lav and kares. **R' Yose Haglili** says, chametz is not prohibited from benefit even on Pesach. The Braisa continues, **R' Yehuda** learns the lav of chametz on Erev Pesach from the pasuk, "lo sochal alav chametz" (one can't eat chametz when he brings the Korban Pesach, which must be brought after chatzos). **R' Shimon** says that pasuk is used to compare chametz to matzah (mentioned in the next part of the pasuk) to teach that there is only a lav of chametz when there is a mitzvah to eat matzah (i.e. on Pesach).
  - The Gemara explains, there are 3 pesukim that discuss chametz: 1) "lo yei'acheil chametz", 2) "v'chol machmetzes lo socheilu", 3) "lo sochal alav chametz". **R' Yehuda** says, one teaches a lav for Erev Pesach, one for after Pesach, and one for on Pesach. **R' Shimon** says, one is for on Pesach, pasuk #2 is used by a Braisa to teach that even chametz which only became chametz through the help of something else (e.g. yeast), is also assur, and pasuk #1 is used by **R' Yose Haglili** in a Braisa to teach (based on the words of the next pasuk) that when the Yidden left Mitzrayim they only stayed away from chametz for one day.
    - **R' Yehuda** learns the halacha brought in the first Braisa (that even chametz which only became chametz through the help of something else is assur) from the fact that the pasuk refers to chametz using the word "machmetzes". With regard to the lesson taught by **R' Yose Haglili**, either **R' Yehuda** learns it from the placement of the psukim next to each other (even though it is used for something else), or he disagrees with **R' Yose Haglili**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**R' Yehuda** says that the pasuk comparing chametz to matzah teaches that there is an issur chametz even when there is no Beis Hamikdash and therefore no Korbon Pesach. **R' Shimon** learns this halacha from the extra pasuk of “ba’erev tochlu matzos”. **R' Yehuda** uses that pasuk to teach that one who is tamei or too far away to go to Yerushalayim to bring a Korbon Pesach, must still keep the mitzvah of eating matzah and marror. **R' Shimon** says, a pasuk is not needed for that, because they are no different than an uncircumcised person who does not bring a Korbon Pesach, but about whom we are taught that he must keep the mitzvah of eating matzah and marror.

-----Daf **ו**---29-----

- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to follow neither **R' Yehuda** (according to him even a goy’s chametz would be assur after Pesach), nor **R' Shimon** (according to him even a Yid’s chametz is not assur after Pesach), nor **R' Yose Haglili** (according to him chametz is mutar for benefit even on Pesach). If so, who does our Mishna follow!? **A: R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, and he learns from the issur of “bal yei’raeh”, that just like that issur doesn’t apply to the chametz of a goy or of hekdesch, so too the chametz of a goy or hekdesch may be eaten and benefitted from after Pesach as well. The reason the Mishna spoke in terms of benefit (although eating would be mutar as well) is because it needed to speak in terms of benefit when discussing the chametz of a Yid. The reason the Mishna spoke of the chametz of a goy *after* Pesach (even though it would be mutar during Pesach as well) is because it needed to speak in terms of after Pesach when discussing the chametz of a Yid. **A2: Rava** said, the Mishna follows **R' Shimon**, and although **R' Shimon** says the chametz after Pesach is mutar D’Oraisa, he agrees that it is assur D’Rabanan as a penalty for the Yid having committed bal yei’raeh and bal yimatzei.
  - **Q:** According to **Rava** the Mishna makes sense when it says the reason the chametz of a Yid is assur is because the Torah says “lo yei’raeh”. According to **R' Acha bar Yaakov**, the reason should be “lo yei’acheil chametz”!? **A:** When the Mishna quotes the pasuk of “lo yei’raeh”, it is doing so as a source for the halacha that a goy’s chametz is mutar.
  - We find that **Rava** says, according to **R' Yehuda** one gets malkus for eating the chametz of a goy (because according to **Rava**, a goy’s chametz was never excluded through a comparison to “lo yei’raeh”). **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says that he would not get malkus (because he says the goy’s chametz is excluded by a comparison to “lo yei’raeh”).
  - The Gemara proves that **R' Acha bar Yaakov** retracted his view. A Braisa says, if one eats the chametz of hekdesch on Pesach, he has committed “me’ilah”. Others say that he has not committed me’iah. Who are the “others” mentioned in the Braisa?
    - **R' Yochanan** said it is **R' Nechunia ben Hakana**, who says that when one does an act which carries a financial, as well as a capital, punishment, the capital punishment makes him patur from paying the financial punishment. Therefore, since he is chayuv kares for eating chametz, he is not chayuv to pay for me’ilah as well.
    - **R' Yosef** said, the Braisa follows **R' Yose Haglili** that chametz is mutar for benefit on Pesach. The first view in the Braisa says that one may redeem the hekdesch to feed to his dogs, and as such it has value and therefore is subject to me’ilah. The “others” say one may only redeem hekdesch for a Yid to eat, and therefore it has no current value.
    - **R' Acha bar Rava** said that **R' Yosef** said all agree that hekdesch may not be redeemed for that purpose. All also agree with **R' Shimon** that on Pesach the chametz has no value (it is assur for benefit) but that after Pesach it will be mutar. The first view is that eventual value means there is current value (and therefore there is me’ilah). The “others” say that eventual value is not considered to be current value.
    - **R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, all agree that eventual value is considered to be current value. The first view holds like **R' Shimon**, and since the chametz will be mutar after Pesach, there is value now. The “others” hold like **R' Yehuda**, and since the chametz will never be mutar, it is considered to be totally worthless.
      - **Q: R' Acha bar Yaakov** said that **R' Yehuda** allows benefitting from the chametz of hekdesch!? **A:** It must be that **R' Acha bar Yaakov** retracted his view.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ashi** said, the first view holds like **R' Yose Haglili**, that chametz on Pesach is mutar for benefit, and the “others” hold like the **Rabanan** that it is assur to benefit from and thus worthless. However, all agree that eventual value is not considered current value.
- **Rav** said, if chametz is mixed into mutar food on Pesach, whether it is mixed into food of like kind, or of unlike kind, the mixture is assur. If chametz that was around on Pesach gets mixed after Pesach, if it gets mixed in like-kind food, it is assur. If it gets mixed in unlike kind food, if the permitted food is the majority, it is mutar.
  - **Rav** must be discussing where the chametz does not even give flavor into the mixture, because if it did, the mixture would be assur.
  - The reason for **Rav's** views are as follows: **Rav** holds that a like-kind mixture of a prohibited item is prohibited even if there is only a minute amount of prohibited item. Therefore, during Pesach, such a mixture is assur. He also says that during Pesach an unlike-kind mixture is assur as a gezeirah for a like-kind mixture. He says that a like-kind mixture is assur even after Pesach because he follows **R' Yehuda** who says the chametz is subject to a lav at that time as well. He says that an unlike-kind mixture would be mutar at that time because he will not be goizer in that case (there is no kares).
- **Shmuel** said, if chametz is mixed into mutar food on Pesach, if it is mixed into food of like kind, the mixture is assur. If it is mixed into unlike-kind, it is mutar. If chametz that was around on Pesach gets mixed after Pesach, whether it gets mixed in like-kind food or unlike-kind, it is mutar.
  - The reason for **Shmuel's** views are as follows: **Shmuel** holds that a like-kind mixture of a prohibited item is prohibited even if there is only a minute amount of prohibited item. Therefore, during Pesach, such a mixture is assur. However, unlike **Rav**, he is not goizer and therefore if it is mixed with unlike-kind and there is not enough to cause a taste in the mixture, it is mutar. He says that all mixtures are mutar after Pesach, because he holds like **R' Shimon**.
- **R' Yochanan** said, if chametz is mixed into mutar food on Pesach, whether it is mixed into food of like kind, or of unlike kind, the mixture is assur only if the prohibited item gives taste into the mixture. If chametz that was around on Pesach gets mixed after Pesach, whether it gets mixed in like-kind food or unlike-kind, it is mutar.
  - The reason for **R' Yochanan's** views are as follows: **R' Yochanan** holds that all mixtures are assur only if the prohibited item gives a taste into the mixture. He says that all mixtures are mutar after Pesach, because he holds like **R' Shimon**.
- **Rava** paskens like **Rav** regarding a mixture on Pesach, and paskens like **R' Shimon** regarding mixtures after Pesach.
  - **Q: Rava** said that **R' Shimon** agrees that chametz after Pesach is assur as a penalty for having committed bal yeirah and bal yimatzei!? **A:** The penalty only applies for chametz that is whole, not when it is part of a mixture.

### -----Daf ל--30-----

- **Rav** says, earthenware pots in which chametz was cooked must be broken before Pesach (there is no way to kasher them, and any chametz in them will become assur as having been owned by a Yid on Pesach).
  - **Q:** According to how **Rav** paskened previously, he should be able to keep the pot until after Pesach and then use it to cook an unlike-kind food. **A: Rav** doesn't allow that because of a gezeirah that he may come to cook like-kind food in the pot.
- **Shmuel** says, earthenware pots in which chametz was cooked may be used after Pesach to cook any food (like or unlike kind).
  - **Shmuel** would tell the sellers of new pots after Pesach, “make sure you charge only fair prices, because if you don't, I will go tell all that the halacha follows **R' Shimon** and people may therefore use their old pots (and will not need new pots)”.
    - **Q:** Why didn't he say that the halacha follows **R' Shimon** anyway? **A:** He was in the place where **Rav** was the ruv, and therefore did not pasken against what **Rav** held.
- **Rava bar Ahilai** prohibited eating bread baked in an oven that was greased (no matter how long before, because it is impossible to remove the grease) with fats (making the oven “fleishig”) out of concern that he may dip that bread into a dairy dip.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says, one may not knead a dough with milk, and if he does, the bread becomes assur, because we are concerned that he will eat the bread with meat. Similarly, one may not grease an oven (in which he bakes bread) with animal fats, and if he does, any bread baked in that oven is assur unless the oven is fired up beforehand to remove the grease. We see from the Braisa that it is possible to rid the oven of the grease!? **A:** **TIYUFTA** of **Rava bar Ahilai**.
  - **Q:** **Ravina** asked, if **Rava bar Ahilai** was proven as being incorrect, why did **Rav** say that the earthenware pot must be broken? Why can't he burn out the chametz just like the Braisa says can be done for the oven!? **A:** **R' Ashi** answered: the Braisa is discussing a metal oven (which purges what it had absorbed), but an earthenware pot does not do so; or we can say even the Braisa is discussing an earthenware oven, but an oven, which is fired up from the inside, has more intense heat and can therefore purge all it had absorbed. A pot is heated on the outside and therefore is not effective in purging it all. Firing up a pot from the inside will often make it break, so people would not do that either.
- **Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, what must be done on Pesach with knives that were used for chametz? **R' Ashi** said, I have new knives made for Pesach. **Ravina** asked, for people who cannot have that done, what should they do? **R' Ashi** said, I meant that I make my knives "as" new. I wrap the wooden handle in clay (to prevent it from getting burned) and I place the blade into a flame. I then dip the wooden handle into boiling water.
  - The Gemara paskens that the handle and the blade only need to be dipped into boiling water, in the pot in which the water was cooked up.
- **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, a wooden mixing spoon (used to mix the contents of a pot) needs to be dipped in boiling water in the pot in which the water was cooked up. He obviously holds that purging must be done in the form in which the absorbing was done.
  - **Q:** **Mareimar** was asked, earthenware keilim which have a metal glossy finish on them, may they be used on Pesach after having been used for chametz? Do we say that the metal finish prevents the earthenware from absorbing the chametz? Green keilim are made of a super absorptive material and even with a metal coating, they clearly cannot be purged and used on Pesach. The question is regarding the white and black ones. Also, if there are cracks, it clearly cannot be used. The question is regarding smooth ones with no cracks. **A:** **Mareimar** said, I see that even these keilim become moist on the exterior, which means that they surely absorb. Since earthenware can never fully purge, they will be assur.
    - **Q:** Why is it that we allow these types of keilim which had "yayin nesech" in them? **A:** The chametz keilim were used with heat. The keilim used for yayin nesech were only used for cold.
    - **Rava bar Abba in the name of R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Shmuel** said, any keili which was only used for cold chametz may be used on Pesach, except for the keili that is used to hold yeast. The yeast keili is different because the yeast's fermentation process causes it to be absorbed into the keili.
      - **Rava** says, the kneading bowls of Mechuza, which are often used for yeast, have a din like keilim used for yeast.
        - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that since these kneading bowls are wide, there is enough ventilation and air flow to prevent absorption. **Rava** teaches that it is nonetheless assur.

-----Daf 31-----

### MISHNA

- If a goy lends money to a Yid before Pesach, with a lien on the Yid's chametz, that chametz is mutar b'hana'ah after Pesach.
- If a Yid lends money to a goy before Pesach, with a lien on the goy's chametz, that chametz is assur b'hana'ah after Pesach.

### GEMARA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- With regard to a creditor who has a lien on the borrower's property, and the borrower defaults on the loan, **Abaye** says the creditor is considered to own the property retroactively from the date of the lien. **Rava** says he owns the property from the time of collection.
  - Both agree that if the borrower is makdish or sells the land between the time of the lien and the default, the creditor may repossess the land. The machlokes is where the *creditor* was makdish or sold the land during this time. **Abaye** says, at the time of default it turns out that the creditor owned it from the time of the lien and his being makdish or sale is effective. **Rava** says he does not own it until the time of default and therefore the sale or the act of being makdish are not effective.
  - **Q: Rami bar Chama** said, if Reuven sold a field to Shimon with a guarantee (that if the field is taken away from Shimon by creditors of Reuven, Reuven will reimburse Shimon for the purchase price), and accepted a note from Shimon as payment, but also placed a lien on the field to secure the note, and then Reuven died, at which time creditors of Reuven came to repossess the field as repayment of a loan, and Shimon paid the amount of the loan to the creditors, thereby keeping him in possession of the field, the children of Reuven can tell Shimon that they will not pay him for the amount that it cost him to retain the field, and they can also demand payment of the purchase note from Shimon as well. They can tell Shimon that one may only demand payment from inheritors for a debt of the deceased when there is real property that can be used as payment. Therefore, they would not have had to pay the creditor which Shimon already paid. **Rava** said, if Shimon is smart, he should pay the purchase note with the land that was purchased, and then take it back under Reuven's guarantee, because **R' Nachman** said, land which inheritors received as repayment for a loan to the estate after the creditor has passed away, is subject to claims against the estate. Now, that should only be correct if one would hold that a creditor takes possession of the property under the lien retroactively, because that would mean that it is as if the creditor was in possession of this land before he died. However, **Rava** had said that it does not!? **A:** Through the concept of "Shibuda d'R' **Nosson**", land purchased by Shimon, which is under lien to Reuven is considered to also be under lien to Reuven's creditors (of which one is Shimon, based on the guarantee given to him by Reuven).
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says, if a goy lends money to a Yid before Pesach, with a lien on the Yid's chametz, that chametz is mutar b'hana'ah after Pesach. According to **Rava**, since the goy is considered to own the chametz only from the time of default, the chametz should be assur, because it is owned by the Yid on Pesach!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the chametz was physically given over to the goy as security. When given over as security, it is considered to be owned by the creditor at the time it is given over.
  - Maybe we can say that the machlokes between **Abaye and Rava** is a machlokes Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if a Yid lends money to a goy before Pesach and places a lien on his chametz, after Pesach the chametz is mutar b'hana'ah. **R' Meir** says it is assur. It must be that **R' Meir** holds like **Abaye**, and the **T"K** holds like **Rava**?
    - If this is correct, how do we explain the next part of the Braisa? The Braisa says, if a goy lends money to a Yid before Pesach and places a lien on his chametz, all agree that the chametz is assur after Pesach. According to what we just said, the two views should hold the opposite in this case!? Rather, the case must be that the chametz was given over as security, and the **T"K** and **R' Meir** argue in the halacha of **R' Yitzchak**, who says that a creditor is koneh security that is given to him. The **T"K** says that this halacha is only true when the creditor and debtor are both Yidden. **R' Meir** says, as long as the creditor is a Yid, this halacha applies. All would agree that when the creditor is a goy, he is not koneh the security, which is why the Braisa says that the chametz is assur in that case.
      - **Q:** If a goy is not koneh the security, how does our Mishna say that when the goy is the creditor, the chametz is mutar after Pesach!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the borrower said that he wants the goy to be koneh the security at the time that he gives it to him to hold.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says that when chametz is found in a store after Pesach, we assume it is from the chametz inventory that stands to be sold, and not from the workers in the store. Therefore, if the store is owned by a Yid, the chametz is assur, even if the workers are goyim. If the store is owned by a goy the chametz is mutar even if the workers are Yidden.

### MISHNA

- If a ruin falls on chametz, it is considered to be out of the owner's possession. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, this is only if it is deep enough that a dog could not smell it.

### GEMARA

- **R' Chisda** said that he still must be mevatel the chametz (in case it gets uncovered).
- A Braisa says that a dog has the ability to smell something that is buried up to 3 tefachim deep in the ground.
  - **Q: R' Acha the son of R' Yosef** asked **R' Ashi**, when **Shmuel** said that the proper way to guard money is by burying it in the ground, must it be buried 3 tefachim deep? **A: R' Ashi** said, here we are not concerned for the sniffing of a dog, so it need not be 3 tefachim deep.
    - **Q: How deep does the money have to be buried? A: R' Pappa from Sichra** said, one tefach deep.

## -----Daf לב-----32-----

### MISHNA

- One who eats chametz terumah on Pesach, if it was done b'shogeg (he didn't realize he was eating terumah), he must pay the principle plus a fifth. If it was done b'meizid (he knew it was terumah), he does not need to pay even principle, and if the terumah was tamei (in which case the Kohen may anyway only use it to fuel a fire) he need not pay its value as fuel.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** When one has to pay a Kohen for the principle and a fifth for having eaten terumah b'shogeg, does he need to pay in produce of the same volume or does it need to be of the same value? If the value of the terumah eaten has decreased from the time of the eating, he surely must still pay the value at the time of the eating, just as would any thief. The question is when the value of the produce has increased. Must he give the same volume of produce even though that would now have a higher value, or may he give produce of the same value?
  - **A: R' Yosef** says we can answer this from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if one eats figs of terumah b'shogeg and repays the Kohen with dates, "tavo alav bracha" (he has done a good thing). This must mean that he pays back the same volume of the figs in dates. Since dates are more expensive, he has done a good thing. However, if we say he must only repay the value of what was eaten, why is it considered to be a good thing that he paid back the value in dates rather than figs? It must be that the repayment must be the same volume as what was eaten.
    - **Abaye** said this is not a proof. It could be that he only pays an amount of dates equal in value to the figs that were eaten. The reason it is considered to be a good thing is that dates are a more sellable item than figs, and therefore give the Kohen more opportunity to sell.
  - **A:** Our Mishna said that if one eats terumah of chametz on Pesach b'shogeg, he must pay principle and a fifth. Chametz has no value on Pesach, so it must be that he pays produce of the same volume, irrespective of value!
    - The Gemara says this is not a proof. Our Mishna may follow **R' Yose Haglili**, who says that one may benefit from chametz on Pesach, and therefore the chametz terumah does have value.
      - **Q:** If the Mishna follows **R' Yose Haglili**, why does it say that if he ate the terumah b'meizid he is patur from paying (presumably because it has no value, and when done b'meizid all agree that he only pays principle for the value of what was eaten)!? **A:** He holds like **R' Nechunia ben Hakana** who says that when one is chayuv a capital

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

punishment and a financial punishment for the same act, he is patur from the financial punishment. Therefore, since he gets kares for eating the chametz, he is patur from having to pay the Kohen.

- **A:** It may be that it is the subject of a machlokes Tanna'im. A Braisa says that **R' Akiva** said, one who eats chametz terumah on Pesach is patur from having to pay the Kohen. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** said he is chayuv. **Abaye** explains, that both hold that chametz is assur b'hana'ah on Pesach. The machlokes is that **R' Akiva** says that one pays for the value of the terumah eaten, and since chametz on Pesach has no value, nothing needs to be repaid. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** says that one pays for the volume of produce that he ate and he therefore must pay here as well.
- A Braisa says, if one eats a kezayis of terumah b'shogeg, he must pay the principle and a fifth (the pasuk requiring payment of a fifth uses the terminology of "eating", which generally refers to a kezayis). **Abba Shaul** says he must eat terumah in the value of a perutah (the pasuk says that the eater must "give" the fifth to the Kohen, and "giving" in a pasuk generally refers to the value of a perutah).
  - **Q:** How does **Abba Shaul** deal with the terminology of "eating" used in the pasuk? **A:** He says that comes to exclude one who damages terumah (doesn't consume it) from having to pay the additional fifth.
  - **Q:** How does the **T"K** deal with the use of the word "give" in the pasuk? **A:** That teaches that the payment must be in a form that is fit to become kadosh as terumah (e.g. produce).
- A Braisa says, if one eats less than a kezayis of terumah b'shogeg, he must pay principle, but not the additional fifth.
  - **Q:** What is the case of the Braisa? If the terumah was worth less than a perutah, he should not even have to pay for the principle. If the terumah was worth a perutah, he should have to pay the fifth as well!? **A:** The case is that the terumah was worth a perutah. However, since it is smaller than a kezayis, he only needs to pay the principle.
  - The **Rabanan** said to **R' Pappa**, this Braisa does not follow **Abba Shaul**, because according to him, since the terumah was worth a perutah, he should have to pay the additional fifth as well. **R' Pappa** said, the Braisa may even follow **Abba Shaul**, because he holds that the terumah must be a kezayis **and** the value of a perutah in order to make him liable for the fifth.
    - **Q:** From the way the **Rabanan** answer **Abba Shaul** in a Braisa, it is clear that **Abba Shaul** only requires that the terumah be valued at a perutah to create liability of the fifth!? **A:** **TIYUFTA** of **R' Pappa**.
      - **R' Pappa** himself retracted his view that **Abba Shaul** requires that the terumah be valued at a perutah **and** that it be the size of a kezayis to create liability of a fifth. We find that **R' Pappa** (while explaining a Braisa) clearly says that **Abba Shaul** only requires the terumah to be valued at a perutah to create liability for the additional fifth.

-----Daf ל"ג-----33-----

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** had asked, that at first the Braisa (brought down to show that **R' Pappa** retracted his view, and which discusses the possibility of learning that me'ilah should be patur when done b'meized from the fact that a korbon chatas is never brought when an aveirah is done b'meized) considers kares to be more stringent than "misa bidei shamayim" and then changes and says that the reverse is true. The Gemara brings 2 additional answers to this question.
  - **Mar the son of Ravana** said, the Braisa actually meant to say that me'ilah can't be learned from other averios, because by the other aveiros an unintentional act does not get the status of an intentional one (e.g. if on Shabbos one intends to cut a fruit detached from the ground, and by mistake cuts one that is still attached to the ground, he is patur). By me'ilah, an unintentional act does get the status of an intentional one (if one covers himself with material that he thinks does not belong to hekdesch, and in fact it does, he is chayuv). This is why a pasuk was needed to teach that an intentional act of benefitting from hekdesch will not be chayuv as me'ilah, and we can't learn it out from a regular chatas.
  - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa actually meant to say that me'ilah can't be learned from other averios, because by the other aveiros one who is preoccupied with doing a different act altogether will

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

not be chayuv if he mistakenly does a forbidden act (e.g. if on Shabbos one intends to lift a fruit detached from the ground, and by mistake cuts one that is still attached to the ground, he is patur). By me'ilah, he would be chayuv even in such a case (e.g. if he sticks out his hand to take a keili and his hand got smeared with oil of hekdesch, he is chayuv). This is why a pasuk was needed to teach that an intentional act of benefitting from hekdesch will not be chayuv as me'ilah, and we can't learn it out from a regular chatas.

- A Braisa had said, the only way that chametz can get the status of terumah on Pesach is if produce was separated as terumah and *then* became chametz. However, if one separated terumah from chametz on Pesach, it does not get terumah status to begin with.
  - **Q:** Where do we know this from? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the pasuk says "titein *lo*" (you must give the terumah to *him* – the Kohen), which teaches us that it should not be given in a way that its only use is "l'oro" – to be burned.
    - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, a Mishna says that one may not separate terumah from tamei produce for produce that is tahor, but if it was done b'shogeg, it does get terumah status. According to what was just said it should not!? **A:** When dealing with tumah, since the produce was fit to be terumah at one point (before it became tamei) it gets terumah status. Chametz on Pesach was never fit to become terumah and therefore doesn't get terumah status.
      - **Q:** If it was never fit to become terumah, it must be that it became chametz while still attached to the ground. But, if it was detached before becoming chametz it seems that it could become terumah? The Mishna is talking only about the unusual case where it became chametz while still attached to the ground!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, "Yes, that is the case and the other **Rabanan** have agreed with me".
        - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said that the Mishna is even discussing where the produce became chametz after being detached from the ground. The reason it doesn't get terumah status is because the pasuk discussing terumah says "reishis", which means that the produce remaining after the terumah is taken must be permitted for a Yisrael to eat. Here it is not, because it is chametz, and therefore the separated produce does not get terumah status.
- **R' Acha bar R' Avya** sat before **R' Chisda** and said that **R' Yochanan** said that grapes that became tamei should be pressed so that less than an egg-sized amount of juice comes out at a time, and this juice (wine) will not become tamei and can even be used on the Mizbe'ach.
  - It must be that **R' Yochanan** holds that the juice is considered a separate entity than the grape (it is just held in it). Therefore, it does not become tamei along with the grape. It would only become tamei when squeezed out. Since it is being squeezed less than the size of an egg, it does not become tamei then either.
    - **Q:** Why does it need to be *less* than the size of an egg? Even if exactly the size of an egg the same halacha should apply!? We find that a Mishna says that a tamei meis that squeezed juice in an amount equal to an egg, the juice is tahor!? **A:** That Mishna is talking after the squeezing already happened (di'eved) and therefore it is allowed. The Braisa is discussing l'chatchila, and that is not allowed, as a gezeirah that he may end up squeezing an amount larger than the size of an egg.
  - **R' Chisda** said that **R' Yochanan** is not correct, and the wine of the grapes retain tumah status upon being squeezed.
    - **R' Chisda** must hold that juice is absorbed in (and therefore part of) the grape. Therefore, it becomes tamei along with the grape.
    - **Q: R' Acha bar Avya** asked, we have the Mishna that says that if the tamei meis squeezes only an egg-sized amount of juice, it is tahor. That shows that it must be that the juice is a separate entity than the grape itself!? **A: R' Chisda** said, the Mishna is discussing grapes that were not muchshar l'kabel tumah until the juice was squeezed, and since the juice is less than the size of an egg, it cannot become tamei.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Chisda** brings a proof from the Braisa brought down earlier in the Gemara, where **R' Akiva** says that juice of grapes and berries have no use when the fruits are tamei. Why can't they just be squeezed out less than the size of an egg at a time? It must be that the juice becomes tamei along with the fruit!
  - **Rava** said, it may be that the juice is truly not tamei. The reason **R' Akiva** says that there is no use is because we don't allow the Kohen to squeeze the juice, because we are concerned that it may lead him to eat the tamei fruit.
  - **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa allows the fueling of a fire with tamei bread and oil of terumah. We see that we are not concerned that he may come to eat them!? **A:** The bread is thrown among the dirty wood and therefore will not be eaten. The oil must be kept in disgusting keilim, so that it too will not come to be eaten. That is why in those cases it is mutar.
- The Braisa just quoted allowed the fueling of a fire with tamei bread and oil of terumah. **Abaye in the name of Chizkiya** said, this allowance is limited to bread, which becomes disgusting when put among the wood. However, kernels of wheat would not be allowed, because one may come to eat them. **R' Yochanan** said, even kernels of wheat may be used. The Gemara says, this is limited to kernels of wheat that were first cooked and therefore also become disgusting when thrown among the firewood.

### -----Daf 77--34-----

- **Q: Abaye bar Avin and R' Chananya bar Avin** were learning Mesechta Terumos by **Rabbah**. **Rava bar Masna** asked them, a Mishna there says, "Terumah plants that became tamei and were then replanted, are considered tahor with regard to making other things tamei, but may not be eaten". **Rava bar Masna** asked, if they are tahor, why are they assur to be eaten!? **A:** They answered that **Rabbah** said, the Mishna means it is assur for a non-Kohen to eat. However, a Kohen may eat these plants.
  - **Q:** What would the chiddush of that be? It can't be teaching that the new growth of terumah has terumah status, or even that the new growth of the growth of terumah has terumah status, because those halachos are taught in a Mishna!? **A: R' Masna** said that **R' Sheishes** explained that the Mishna in Terumos means to say that the Kohanim may not eat the terumah. The reason they may not is because the Kohen was "masi'ach das" (didn't pay attention to it) from it, which makes the terumah passul.
    - **Q:** That makes sense according to **Reish Lakish**, who says that "hesech hadas" is its own form of invalidity. However, according to **R' Yochanan**, who says that hesech hadas is a form of tumah invalidity, why doesn't it become mutar for the Kohen to eat once it is replanted!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, the idea that something which is replanted loses its tumah was never said with regard to terumah, because of the stringencies that the **Rabanan** placed upon it. We find this to be the case regarding water that became tamei and was then put in contact with a mikveh, which would cause the water loses its tumah, unless the water was water of kodesh.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, was this stringency only put on water that became kadosh through placement in a keili of kodesh, or even on water that was made kodesh via a verbal declaration? **A: R' Dimi** said, we have not learned an answer to this question directly, but have learned a similar situation that may shed light on this question. **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if tamei grapes are pressed and the juice is made kadosh afterwards, we consider the juice to be separate and distinct from the grapes and the juice is tahor. If, however, the tamei grapes were made kadosh and were then pressed, the juice is considered tamei. Now, grapes are made kadosh via verbal declaration, not by placement in a keili of kodesh, and still the **Rabanan** placed this stringency on it.
        - **R' Yosef** said, **R' Yochanan** is discussing grapes of terumah, not kodashim. The verbal declaration of terumah is the equivalent of making kodashim by placing it in a keili of kodashim. Therefore, we have no proof that verbal declaration of kodashim will bring the additional stringencies of the **Rabanan**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Here, **R' Yochanan** doesn't seem to limit the juice that can be squeezed at one time, but before he said it must be less than the size of an egg at a time!? **A:** Here too, he means that it can only be that much at a time. **A2:** Earlier he was discussing where a rishon touched the grapes, which then made the grapes a sheini, which would have the ability to make the juice tamei as a shlishi. In the statement of **R' Yochanan** just quoted, the grapes were touched by a sheini, making the grapes a shlishi and therefore unable to make the juice tamei.
- **Rava** said we find this concept of additional stringencies in a Braisa. The Braisa says, one part of the pasuk seems to say that the water used for the parah adumah ashes must be placed into a kadosh keili directly from the spring. Yet, another says that it can be taken out of the spring and then placed into the keili!? It must be that this is an additional stringency of the **Rabanan** placed on kodashim.
- **R' Simi bar Ashi** said we see this from a Mishna. The Mishna says that a metzora who goes to the mikvah on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of his tahara may eat ma'aser immediately. After sunset he may eat terumah, but still can't yet eat kodashim. We see that the Torah placed an additional stringency when dealing with kodashim.
- **R' Ashi** said we see this from a Braisa. The Braisa says that the wood and levonah of kodashim become tamei as food. They are not edible, and yet they can get food tumah. It must be that this is an additional stringency placed on kodashim.