



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. There is a dispute regarding one who fueled an oven with peels of orlah fruits or with straw of kelayim of the vineyard, if one baked bread in the oven, if the bread is forbidden or permitted.

If one fueled an oven with peels of orlah fruit or with straw of kelayim of the vineyard, if the oven was new, it is required to be broken, because heating new earthenware causes the oven to be completed, and if the oven is fueled by forbidden fuel, then the oven has the improvement caused by the forbidden fuel and must be broken. If the oven was old, however, then the oven merely requires cooling down before using it. Rebbe maintains that if one baked bread in the oven that was fueled with forbidden fuel, the bread is forbidden because the bread has within it the improvement caused by the forbidden fuel. The Chachamim, however, maintain that the heat comes from the fuel that was already consumed and therefore the bread is permitted. If one cooked the bread over the coals of these forbidden substances, then even Rebbe will agree that the bread is permitted, because the coals are considered consumed already and one can derive benefit from them.(26b)

2. There is a dispute if leaven of Chullin and leaven of terumah fell into a dough of Chullin and neither the Chullin dough nor the terumah dough

have enough to leaven the dough, and the Chullin dough and the terumah dough combined to leaven the dough, whether the dough becomes forbidden or not.

If leaven of Chullin and leaven of terumah fell into a dough of Chullin and neither the Chullin dough nor the terumah dough have enough to leaven the dough, and the Chullin dough and the terumah dough combined to leaven the dough, Rabbi Eliezer maintains that we follow the last leaven that fell in. If the terumah leaven fell in last, then we view the dough as terumah and only a Kohen who is tahor can eat the dough. If the Chullin leaven fell in last, then the dough is viewed as Chullin and can be eaten even by non-Kohanim. The Chachamim, however, maintain that whether the forbidden leaven falls in first, i.e. before the Chullin leaven falls in, or if the forbidden leaven falls in last, i.e. after the Chullin leaven, the dough will be only forbidden if there is sufficient forbidden leaven that can leaven the dough by itself. Abaye explains Rabbi Eliezer to mean that the dough is permitted when the Chullin leaven fell in last if one removed the forbidden leaven as soon as the permitted leaven fell in. In this case the dough only rose while there was permitted leaven in it, and even though the forbidden leaven contributed to the completion of the leavening, the removal of the forbidden leaven prior to the completion of the

leavening nullifies any effect that the forbidden leaven had on the leaving process of et dough. If one left the forbidden leaven in the dough, then the dough will be forbidden even if the permitted leaven fell in last. (26b -27a)

3. There is a dispute whether one can redeem items that were used for idolatry.

One who took branches from an asheirah tree (asheirah is a tree that is worshipped and is forbidden to derive benefit from), they are forbidden in benefit. If he used the branches as fuel for an oven, if the oven was new, it must be broken, and if the oven was old, the oven must be cooled before it is permitted to be used. If one baked bread in the oven before it cooled down, the bread is forbidden to derive benefit from. If one of the forbidden loaves of bread becomes mixed with other permitted loaves, and those loaves become mixed with other permitted loaves, all the loaves that became mixed together are forbidden to derive benefit from. This is because the forbidden loaf is not nullified by mixing with other loaves, and we are concerned that any of the loaves may be the forbidden loaf. Rabbi Eliezer maintains that one can throw the monetary value of the benefit that has become forbidden into the Dead Sea, thus permitting the loaf in benefit. The Chachamim disagree with Rabbi Eliezer and they maintain that any items related to idolatry cannot be redeemed. (27a)

4. There is a dispute whether a forbidden factor and a permitted factor cause something to be permitted or forbidden.

Abaye said that if you say that Rebbi maintains that when a forbidden factor and a permitted factor cause something it is forbidden, then Rebbi follows the opinion of Rabi Eliezer. This means that regarding fueling an oven with orlah or kelayim of the vineyard, Rebbi maintains that if the oven was new, it must be broken. Just like Rebbi maintains that bread baked in this oven is forbidden, Rebbi also maintains that the oven is forbidden when fueled by forbidden substances; because Rebbi maintains that a forbidden factor combined with a permitted factor render something to be forbidden. Even if Rebbi were to hold that the combined forbidden factor with a permitted factor is permitted, and regarding fuel of orlah or of kelayim of the vineyard, Rebbi prohibits the bread because Rebbi maintains that the improvement of the wood is found within the bread and eating the bread is essentially benefiting from the benefit provided by the forbidden fuel, Rebbi would still agree that new earthenware bowls, cups or pitchers that are baked in an oven that was fueled with asheirah wood are forbidden and must be broken. This is because when one uses the completed utensil, he is benefiting from the improvement catalyzed by the forbidden cause. Rebbi and Rabbi Eliezer disagree regarding an earthenware oven or pot that was fashioned with forbidden wood. Rabbi Eliezer, who maintains that a forbidden factor and a permitted factor cause something to be forbidden, would maintain that this pot or oven is also forbidden. Rebbi, however, who maintains that when a forbidden factor and a permitted factor cause a product to be fashioned, it is permitted, then the pot or oven will be permitted, because the pot is used for cooking food, and this does not occur until the heat of permitted wood is added to the pot. Alternatively,



even according to Rabbi who maintains that a forbidden factor and a permitted factor that cause the completion of a product will be permitted, although a new oven will be permitted, a new pot will be forbidden, because the person will benefit from the pot containing the food before placing the pot on the fire. In such an instance one is deriving benefit from the pot by utilizing the pot as a container without employing the permitted cause. (27a)

5. Normally Shmuel maintains that the Halacha follows Rabbi over an individual disputant but not over many disputants.

It was taught in the name of Shmuel that an oven that was fueled with peels of orlah fruit or with straw of kelayim of the vineyard, if the oven was new, it must be broken. If the oven was old, it must cool down before using it. If one baked bread in the oven while being fueled with forbidden fuel, Rabbi maintains that the bread is permitted and the Chachamim maintain that the bread is forbidden. Although we previously learned that Rabbi maintains that the bread is forbidden and the Chachamim maintain that the bread is permitted, Shmuel has the opposite version of the rulings. Alternatively, Shmuel agrees that Rabbi is the one who maintains that the bread is forbidden. Normally, Shmuel maintains that the Halacha follows Rabbi over an individual colleague, but the Halacha does not follow Rabbi when he disagrees with many colleagues. In the case regarding bread baked with forbidden fuel, Shmuel maintains that the Halacha follows Rabbi even over many of his colleagues. For this reason, Shmuel taught the rulings in reverse, with the Chachamim forbidding the bread, so people would not come to follow the majority

opinion that permits the bread baked with the forbidden fuel. Declaring that the Halacha follows the minority opinion of Rabbi would not be accepted by people, so Shmuel specifically reversed the rulings and people would now think that it is the Chachamim who forbade the bread, as this is the final Halacha. (27a)

6. Rabbi forbids deriving benefit from bread cooked over coals of forbidden substances if the flame is opposite the fire when the bread is being baked.

We learned that if one cooked the bread over the coals of the forbidden substances, then everyone agrees that the bread is permitted. One opinion maintains that this was only said regarding coals whose flames have died down, as these coals are viewed as being consumed and are no longer forbidden, so Rabbi agrees that the bread is permitted. If the bread is baked over coals that are still flickering, Rabbi will maintain that the bread is forbidden. A dissenting opinion maintains that Rabbi even permits bread baked on coals that are still flickering, as even these coals are considered to be consumed. The opinion that maintains that Rabbi forbids the bread baked over flickering coals is understood because the improvement of the wood is within the beard, as opposed to baking over smoldering coals that Rabbi permits. The opinion that maintains that Rabbi permits the bread even when baked over flickering coals will maintain that Rabbi will forbid the bread because of the improvement of the wood contained within the bread when the flames opposite the bread during the baking. Since the wood is still on fire and not yet consumed, Rabbi

will maintain that the improvement of the wood is contained within the bread. The Chachamim who disagree with Rabbi and will permit the bread even if the wood that is aflame is opposite the bread will forbid the bread in the case of a stool that is fashioned out of forbidden wood. Although the Chachamim permit one to benefit from the burning of the wood, they still forbid one to benefit from the actual wood itself. (27a)

7. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that hekdesch that was misappropriated unintentionally loses its sanctity and if misappropriated intentionally, it does not lose its sanctity.

Rabbi Yehudah maintains that hekdesch that was misappropriated unintentionally loses its sanctity, but if the hekdesch is misappropriated intentionally, then it does not lose its sanctity. The reason that hekdesch does not lose its sanctity if misappropriated intentionally is because since hekdesch that is misappropriated knowingly is not subject to the laws of meilah, it does not lose its status of sanctity. Similarly, if one fuels an oven with wood of hekdesch and then baked bread in the oven, the bread will be forbidden. This is because we are dealing with wood that was consecrated with the intention of buying a shelamim offering with money, and the consecrated wood has the sanctity of a shelamim. A shelamim is not subject to the laws of meilah, as shelamim are considered kodashim kalim (lighter consecrated offerings) and most of the shelamim offering is eaten by its owner. Since the shelamim is not subject to the laws of meilah, even when misappropriated intentionally, a shelamim offering or wood that

contains the sanctity of a shelamim will not lose its sanctity. (27b)

8. Anything that is required to be burned, its ash is permitted.

Anything that is required to be burned, its ash is permitted, except for the wood of asheirah. This is because regarding items related to idolatry, the Torah states that nothing of the idolatrous item shall remain in one's possession, and this includes even the coals or ashes of the idolatrous item. Similarly, the ash of hekdesch is also forbidden, although the item of hekdesch was burned and this constitutes meilah, which should cause the item to lose its sanctity. The Gemara explains that meilah did not occur because a fire broke out on its own in the wood of hekdesch and therefore its ash is forbidden. Alternatively, we are discussing ash of hekdesch that is put away, i.e. the terumah of the ash, where the Torah indicates that since the ash has to be placed next to the mizbeiach, it always retains its sanctity and one cannot benefit from the ash. (27b)

9. Any kal vachomer that will be used initially as stringency but will in the end be a leniency is not a valid kal vachomer.

Rabbi Yehudah maintains that chametz can only be removed by burning the chametz. This is based on the logic of a kal vachomer, as follows: If nossar, which one does not violate the prohibition of not seeing and not finding it, nonetheless requires burning, so chametz, which one violates the prohibition of seeing and finding it in his possession, certainly chametz should require burning. The Chachamim disagree,



because the Chachamim maintain that any kal vachomer that is initially employed to derive a stringency and consequently results in a leniency, is not a legitimate kal vachomer. The kal vachomer employed by Rabi Yehudah results in a leniency, because if one does not have wood with which to burn the chametz, he cannot sit idle and not remove the chametz, as the Torah states that leaven must be removed from ones home, and this implies that one must remove chametz with whatever means he has at his disposal. (27b)

10. Nossar and chametz are forbidden in consumption and benefit and are punishable by kares.

Rabbi Yehudah offers a different proof that removal of chametz must be through burning. We know that nossar is forbidden in consumption, and chametz is forbidden in consumption. Just like nossar must be disposed of through burning, so too chametz should be disposed of through burning. The Chachamim counter that neveilah is also prohibited in consumption yet does not have to be disposed of through burning. (In fact, neveilah does not require disposal at all.) Rabbi Yehudah draws a distinction between neveilah that is not prohibited in benefit, as opposed to nossar and chametz which both are prohibited in consumption and benefit. Just like nossar requires burning, so too chametz should require burning. The Chachamim counter with an ox liable stoning, which although prohibited in consumption and benefit, does not require burning. Rabbi Yehudah responds that an ox is in contrast to nossar and chametz that are prohibited in consumption and benefit and are punishable by kares

(excision). Just like nossar requires burning, also chametz should require burning. (27b)

DAILY MASHAL

Burning the Chametz

and the Evil inclination

The Gemara states that Rabbi Yehudah maintains that chametz must be disposed of by burning it. It is well known that chametz is an allegory for the Evil Inclination. When one is faced with a strong temptation to sin, it is not sufficient to shrug off the temptation. One must actually eliminate the temptation. How is this best accomplished? The Gemara offers us the secret. HaShem created the Evil Inclination, and He created the Torah as its antidote. If one sees "the disgusting one," i.e. the Evil Inclination, who attempts to seduce him to sin, he should drag the Evil Inclination into the Study Hall, and there the Evil Inclination will be consumed by the fire of Torah study.