



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. A person is detached from *chadash* but is not detached from *chametz*.

We learned that Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one cannot handle a forbidden food because he may come to eat from it, yet we learned in a Mishnah that once the *omer* offering (the *omer* offering was a *minchah* offering brought on the sixteenth day of Nissan, which is the second day of Pesach; the *omer* was comprised of fine barely flour that was made from that year’s new crop) was offered, people would find that very day that the marketplaces of Jerusalem contained regular flour and oven-dried grain from the new crop (known as *chadash*, which could not be used until the *omer* was offered), and Rabbi Meir maintains that this practice was done against the will of the Chachamim. [*The flour was being sold immediately after the omer had been offered, so the grain had obviously been picked, ground, and dried in an oven before Pesach.*] Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that the Chachamim did not object to this practice out of a concern that one working with the new grain may come to eat it before the *omer* was offered.

Said Rabah: Chadash is different, since you permit it to him only by means of plucking,¹ he remembers.² Said Abaye to him: That is well at the time of plucking, [but] what can be said of the grinding and sifting? — That is no difficulty:

¹ The new grain may not be reaped at all before the bringing of the ‘omer’, but must be plucked by hand.

² That it may not be eaten.

³ The sieve is reversed. The unusual ways in which these are done serve as reminders.

grinding [is done] with a hand mill; sifting [is done] on the back of the sieve.³ But as to what we learned: ‘one may reap an artificially irrigated field and [the grain] in the valleys, but one may not stack [the grain]’, and we established this as [agreeing with] Rabbi Yehudah, what can be said?

Abaye suggests that with regard to *chadash*, a person is detached from the new grain because a person will not eat from the new grain all year round, so there is no reason to suspect that by handling the new grain he will come to eat from it without thinking. Regarding *chametz*, however, a person is accustomed to eating *chametz* throughout the year, so we are concerned that if he would find *chametz* after it is prohibited, he may come to eat it, so Rabbi Yehudah decreed that one should not search for *chametz* on the fourteenth after *chametz* is prohibited.

Rava demurred: Rabbi Yehudah is self-contradictory. while the Rabbis are not self-contradictory?⁴ — Rather, said Rava: Rabbi Yehudah is not self-contradictory, as we have answered. The Rabbis too are not self-contradictory: he himself is seeking it in order to burn it, shall he then eat of it?

⁴ That you seek to reconcile Rabbi Yehudah’s views only. Yet surely the Rabbis too need harmonizing, for whereas the Rabbis do not preventively forbid in the case of *chametz*, they do so here, as Rabbi Meir states, ‘They did not act with the consent of the Sages’.

Rav Ashi said: Rabbi Yehudah is not self-contradictory, [for] we learned, ‘flour and parched grain.’⁵ But this [answer] of Rav Ashi is a fiction; for this is well from [the time when it is] oven parched and onwards; ‘but from the beginning until it is parched grain, what can be said? And should you answer, [It is gathered] by plucking, as Rava [answered], then what can be said of [what we learnt that] ‘one may reap an artificially irrigated field and [the grain in] the valleys’, which we established as [agreeing with] Rabbi Yehudah? Hence Rav Ashi's [answer] is a fiction. (10b -11a)

2. There is a dispute if on Shabbos one can perforate an eggshell and fill it with oil and place the eggshell next to a lamp so the oil will drip into the burning lamp.

But, wherever one does not [normally] hold aloof, did Rabbi Yehudah preventively forbid? Surely we learned: The Chachamim maintain that one cannot perforate an eggshell on Shabbos, fill the shell with oil, and place the shell next to a lamp, in order that the oil in the shell drips into the lamp.⁶ And this is true even if it's earthenware. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that this is permitted.⁷ The Gemora answers: Rabbi Yehudah permits using this lamp, because the stringency of Shabbos causes people to detach themselves from any Shabbos prohibition. Rabbi Yehudah reasons that a person will not make a mistake and take from the oil.

The Gemora notes a contradiction regarding Shabbos: It was taught in a Baraisa: The Chachamim maintain that if

⁵ Which are not fit for eating.

⁶ The reason this is forbidden is because we are concerned that the person may remove oil from the shell for another use and this is a violation of the *melachah* of extinguishing.

⁷ The reason of the Rabbis is lest he take the oil for eating, which, constitutes extinguishing. Rabbi Yehudah permits it, though one does not normally abstain from oil.

⁸ Because Rabbi Yehudah is concerned that while tying the two ends together, he may come to fashion a regular knot instead of a bow.

the rope of a pail snapped on Shabbos, one is forbidden to tie the ends of the rope into a knot, because one is prohibited from tying a knot on Shabbos. Rather, one should tie the ends of the rope with a bow. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that one can wind a hollow belt or garter around the torn ends as long as he does not fashion the ends of the rope into a bow.⁸ [Thus] Rabbi Yehudah's [views] are self-contradictory, and similarly the Chachamim's? — The Chachamim's [views] are not self-contradictory: oil [from one source] can be interchanged with oil [from another]; whereas looping cannot be mistaken for knotting.⁹ Rabbi Yehudah's [views] are not self-contradictory; Rabbi Yehudah's reason is not that he forbids looping on account of knotting, but because looping itself is [a form of] knotting.¹⁰

Now, the Chachamim may contradict the Chachamim. For we learned: The Chachamim maintain that one can tie a pail to the top of a well with a garter [using a regular knot because he will not forget about his garter, and he will replace the garter with a normal rope after Shabbos. Such a knot that is not permanent is permitted to fashion on Shabbos]. One cannot tie a regular rope to the pail, however [because we are concerned that he may leave the rope there permanently and then he is in violation of tying a permanent knot on Shabbos]. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one can even tie the pail to the top of the well with a rope.

Now what kind of rope is meant: Shall we say an ordinary [bucket] rope: [how does it state] ‘Rabbi Yehudah permits it’, — surely it is a permanent knot, for he will certainly

⁹ Although the Chachamim ruled that one cannot perforate the eggshell and place it next to the lamp to allow the oil to drip, that is because one will confuse oil that he normally uses with the oil in the shell, and he will come to remove then oil from the shell. With regard to tying, however, the Chachamim maintain that one will not confuse tying a bow with tying a knot.

¹⁰ Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that tying a bow is not forbidden because one may come to tie a knot, but rather because tying a bow is also under the prohibition of tying a knot.

come to abandon it? Hence it is obvious that a weaver's [rope is meant]. and [yet] the Chachamim preventively forbid a weaver's rope on account of an ordinary rope? — Even so, one rope may be mistaken for another, [whereas] looping cannot be mistaken for knotting.¹¹ (11a)

But, wherever one [normally] holds aloof from it, does Rabbi Yehudah not preventively forbid? Surely we learned: A *bechor* animal¹² that was seized by a congestion of blood, even if we leave the animal alone and it will die, we still cannot let its blood; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah.¹³ The Chachamim, however, maintain that one can let the blood of the *bechor*, as long as he does not make a blemish on it. — There, because one is excited about his property, if you permit him [to bleed it] in a place where a blemish is not inflicted, he will come to do it in a place where a blemish is inflicted. But the Chachamim [argue]: if you do not permit him at all, he is all the more likely to come to act [thus].¹⁴

Yet do we say according to Rabbi Yehudah. A man is excited over his property? Surely we learned: Rabbi

¹¹ The *Gemora* explains that the rope referred to here is a weaver's rope, which one will not leave tied to the pail because it is not strong or because the weaver will not allow the rope to remain there because he requires the rope for his work. The Chachamim forbid one to tie the pail with a weaver's rope because if we permit him to tie the pail with a weaver's rope, he may come to tie the pail with a regular rope which is forbidden. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that because of the stringency of Shabbos one will not come to tie the pail with a regular rope.

¹² The firstborn male offspring of a cow, sheep or goat that is owned by a Jew is consecrated automatically and must be given to a Kohen who offers it as a sacrifice and then eats the meat. If the *bechor* becomes blemished, it cannot be offered as a sacrifice, and the Kohen merely slaughters the animal and eats the meat. One cannot intentionally cause a blemish to the *bechor*.

¹³ The reason Rabbi Yehudah forbids one to let the animal's blood, although the bloodletting can be accomplished without making a permanent blemish, is because one may come to inflict the animal with a permanent blemish. Although people are detached from items that are consecrated, we are concerned that the Kohen does not want the animal to die, and he will not

Yehudah says that one cannot perform *kiddur* on Shabbos or Yom Tov.¹⁵ The reason he cannot curry the animal with a metal comb is because it may inflict a wound on the animal. One can, however, perform *kirtzuf*, which is also a form of currying, albeit with a wooden comb that has thick teeth, because such a procedure will not inflict a wound on the animal. The Chachamim, however, maintain that one cannot curry with a metal or wooden comb. Now it was taught: What is currying and what is scraping? Currying is with a small-toothed comb and it makes a wound; scraping is with a large-toothed comb and does not make a wound.¹⁶ — There, since it will die if left alone, we say that a man is excited about his property; here, if he leaves it there is merely discomfort, we do not say, a man is excited about his money. Now as to Rabbi Yehudah; wherein is the difference that he preventively prohibits in the case of chametz but does not preventively forbid in the case of scraping? — One bread can be mistaken for another bread, [but] currying cannot be mistaken for scraping.¹⁷ (11a - 11b)

be careful when performing the incision, and he may come to make a permanent blemish in the animal.

¹⁴ The Chachamim reason that if he is not allowed to make any incision on the *bechor*, his desire to save money will be overpowering, and he may come to make an incision in a place which would result in a blemish.

¹⁵ Which is to curry an animal with a metal comb that has thin teeth to remove mud and dirt in the animal's hide which causes it pain.

¹⁶ Thus Rabbi Yehudah does not argue that if you permit one the other will be used, because a man is anxious to keep his property in good condition.

¹⁷ The reason Rabbi Yehudah permits currying with a wooden comb and is not concerned that he may use a metal comb is because even if the animal is left uncurried, the animal is not in danger, just in a state of discomfort, so we do not say one will be in turmoil over his money. We can thus be assured that he will only use a wooden comb to curry the animal. Currying with a wooden comb will not cause one to become confused with currying with a metal comb. The Chachamim, however, maintain that currying with a wooden comb can cause one to become confused with currying with a metal comb.

3. There is a dispute regarding when the time that one is forbidden to eat *chametz* on the eve of Pesach starts.

MISHNAH: Rabbi Meir maintains that one can eat *chametz* throughout the whole fifth hour on the fourteenth of Nissan, and one must burn the *chametz* at the beginning of the sixth hour.¹⁸ Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that one is permitted to eat *chametz* the entire fourth hour, and one cannot eat *chametz* during the entire fifth hour.¹⁹ One must burn the *chametz* at the onset of the sixth hour.²⁰ Rabbi Yehudah said further that there were two loaves of *chametz* used for the *todah* offering that were placed on a bench in the Bais HaMikdash on the eve of Pesach. People could eat *chametz* as long as the loaves remained on the bench. When a messenger of the court would remove one of the loaves at the onset of the fifth hour, *chametz* would not be eaten or burned. When both loaves were removed, everyone would start burning their *chametz*. Rabban Gamliel maintains that non-sacred *chametz* may be eaten the whole fifth hour and *terumah* that is *chametz* can be eaten the entire fifth hour, because *terumah* cannot be destroyed, so one is given an additional hour to eat *terumah*. All *chametz* must be burned at the beginning of the sixth hour. (11b)

4. Rabbi Meir maintains that one does not err at all in calculating time whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that a person errs half an hour.

The Mishnah in Sanhedrin states that if one witness says that a capital offense occurred on the second day of the month and the other witness says that the incident occurred on the third day of the month, their testimony is

¹⁸ Chametz is biblically permitted in the sixth hour, but the Chachamim were concerned that one may make a miscalculation and assume that the seventh hour is really the sixth hour. The Chachamim therefore decreed that one burn the *chametz* at the onset of the sixth hour, thus ensuring that he will not violate the biblical prohibition.

¹⁹ One does not have to burn the *chametz* then, and he can have benefit from the *chametz*, like by feeding it to his animal.

valid, because we can assume that the witness who said that the incident occurred on the third of the month was not aware that the previous month was thirty days, and the other witness knows that the previous month was thirty days and Rosh Chodesh was established on the thirty-first day of the month. The day that the witness assumed was the first of the month was really the thirtieth of the month. Subsequently, the witness assumed to be the third of the new month was really only the second day. As this is a common mistake, we accept their testimony. If one witness said that the incident occurred on the third of the month and the second witness said that the incident occurred on the fifth of the month, their testimony is invalidated, because people are never two days off in their calculation of dates. If one witness said that the capital offense occurred in the second hour of the day and one says that it occurred in the third hour of the day, their testimony is valid. If one witness said that the incident occurred in the third hour and one witness said that the incident occurred in the fifth hour, Rabbi Meir maintains that the testimony is invalid, and Rabbi Yehudah maintains that their testimony is valid. Nonetheless, even Rabbi Yehudah agrees that if one witness said that the incident occurred in the fifth hour and the second witness said that the incident occurred in the seventh hour, the testimony is invalid, because in the fifth hour the sun is in the east, whereas in the seventh hour, the sun is in the west.

Abaye explains that the dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah is as follows: According to Rabbi Meir, one does not err at all, and according to Rabbi Yehudah, a person errs by a half an hour. According to Rabbi Meir, one does not err at all, and we assume that the incident mentioned in the first case occurred at the end of the

²⁰ The Chachamim allowed one to benefit from the *chametz* until the sixth hour, as banning it before then would cause a person a monetary loss. One cannot benefit from the *chametz* in the sixth hour, because he may confuse the sixth hour with the seventh hour, when one cannot eat or derive benefit from the *chametz*.

second hour, which is the beginning of the third hour. One witness meant the end of the second hour, while the second witness meant the third hour. According to Rabbi Yehudah, a person errs by a half an hour, so we assume the incident occurred in middle of the fourth hour, which is three and a half hours after the start of the day. The first witness who said the incident occurred in the third hour meant at the end of the third hour, which is the beginning of the fourth hour, so he erred a half an hour early, and the witness who said the incident occurred during the fifth hour meant at the start of the fifth hour, so he erred a half an hour late.

Alternatively, Abaye says that according to Rabbi Meir, one errs slightly, whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one errs an hour and a little bit. According to Rabbi Meir, one errs slightly, as the incident occurred at the end of the second hour or at the beginning of the third hour, and one erred slightly, whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one errs an hour and a little bit, and the incident occurred at the end of the third hour or at the beginning of the fifth hour, and one of the witnesses erred by an hour and a little bit. (11b)

DAILY MASHAL

Time Management

The *Gemora* discusses the amount of leeway that one is granted with regard to erring in the time of day. This is of vital significance regarding the prohibition of eating *chametz* on the fourteenth of Nissan and the obligation to burn the *chametz* on that day.

It is interesting to note that the commentators state that the first thing that was created in the world was time. Rashi at the beginning of the Book of Breishis poses the famous question of why the Torah did not commence with the laws of Rosh Chodesh, which was essentially the first

mitzvah the Jewish People as a whole received from Hashem. The answer that Rashi writes is that Hashem wished to convey the message that the world belongs to Hashem and if the gentiles claim that the Jewish People stole Eretz Yisroel from them, we merely have to point to the Book of Breishis and show them that Hashem created the world and chose to give the Land to whomever He saw fit.

This teaches us that in order to merit the Land, and to fulfill the Torah properly, one must observe the Torah in a timely fashion. This is reflected in the statement of the *Gemora*²¹ that had the Jewish People not sinned, they would only have received the Five Books of Moshe and the Book of Yehoshua, which contains the details of Eretz Yisroel.

The Maharal²² explains that the Torah teaches us how to live an orderly life, and the Book of Yehoshua details the inheritance of Eretz Yisroel. In a similar vein we can say that just like Breishis sets the tone for time, so too Rosh Chodesh and its associated laws reflect on the significance of time. The Exodus from Egypt in a sense was the birth of the Jewish People, and thus once again time was created anew, and the Jewish People were given new responsibilities that they did not have previously.

²¹ Nedarim 22b

²² Ibid