



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

### Nazir Daf Lamed Vuv

- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, regarding all issurim in the Torah the permitted items does not combine with the prohibited item to reach the minimum required amount needed for liability, except regarding nazir, where the pasuk says "mishras", which teaches that even a permitted thing infused with issur is assur (e.g. bread soaked in wine, if the wine and bread together make up a kezayis, he is chayuv). **Zeiri** said that the combination principle also applies regarding the issur to burn chametz on the Mizbe'ach. If one burns a kezayis on the Mizbe'ach, and the kezayis is a combination of chametz and matzah, he would be chayuv.
  - **Q: Zeiri** must hold like **R' Elazar** who says that use of the word "kol" teaches that even mixtures are included in the issur (and the word "kol" is used regarding burning chametz on the Mizbe'ach). If so, why doesn't **Zeiri** say the same halacha regarding eating chametz, where the pasuk also uses the word "kol"? **A:** He actually does hold that way regarding eating chametz as well. The reason he only said his halacha regarding burning chametz on the Mizbe'ach was to exclude the view of **Abaye** who says that one would be chayuv for burning even less than a kezayis in total on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q: R' Dimi** repeated the statement of **R' Yochanan**. **Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that if a "tevil yom" (a person who needs sunset to become tahor, and can make terumah tamei but can't make chullin tamei) touches a thick mixture where the grain is chullin but is spiced with terumah spices, the area that is touched becomes tamei. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** explained, the reason it becomes tamei is because a non-Kohen who eats a kezayis would get malkus. Now, to give him malkus for eating a kezayis when only the spices are terumah must mean that we hold that the chullin is combined to the terumah to reach the size of the kezayis!? **A: R' Dimi** answered, **R' Yochanan** means that he would get malkus if he ate enough so that he would eat a kezayis of actual terumah spices "bikdei achilas pras", but not that the chullin combines to the terumah.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, that means that you (**R' Dimi**) hold that "kidei achilas pras" is a concept with foundation in D'Oraisa!? If so, why do the **Rabanan** argue and say that one is not chayuv for eating "kutach" (a dip that has chametz) on Pesach? One can eat enough kutach to have eaten a kezayis of the chametz bikdei achilas pras!? **A:** Since it is a dip, it cannot be eaten quickly enough to have a kezayis of chametz in that timeframe. If he just gulps it down, that would be considered an abnormal act and would not be labeled as "eating".
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, if there are two spice mortars – one that has chullin and one that has terumah, and there are two pots next to them – one that has chullin and one that has terumah, and the spices fell into the pots, but we don't know which spices fell into which pot, they are both mutar (they retain their previous status as chullin or terumah), because we say that the terumah spices fell into the terumah pot and that the chullin spices fell into the chullin pot. Now, if you are correct that kidei achilas pras is D'Oraisa, how can we be so lenient and make that assumption!? **A: R' Dimi** said, the other alternative would be to say that the reason for this is that chullin combines to the terumah. However, even if that is the reason, it still does not explain how we can be meikel and make this assumption that the terumah fell into the terumah.....! Rather, we must say that the reason we are meikel is because the terumah obligation on spices is only D'Rabanan. Therefore, it may be that the concept of

kidei achilas pras is D'Oraisa, and the reason we are meikel is because the terumah obligation is D'Rabanan.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, if there are two boxes – one containing grain of terumah and one containing grain of chullin, and there are two se'ah size containers in front of them - one containing grain of terumah and one containing grain of chullin, and the containers fell into the boxes, we say that the terumah fell into the terumah and the chullin fell into the chullin. **Abaye** said, according to me that the reason for this is based on the fact that the permitted combines with the prohibited, the reason we are meikel here is that there is a lot more chullin than the terumah that may have fallen into it, and because of that we would not say that the chullin combines with the terumah in such a case. However, according to you who says that the logic is kidei achilas pras, there should be no difference if the amount of chullin is severely greater than the terumah!? **A: R' Dimi** said, kidei achilas pras is a D'Oraisa concept. However, the reason we are meikel in this Braisa is because it is discussing terumah in today's times, and terumah in today's times is only D'Rabanan.