



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

Rava said: In truth our Mishnah is Rabbi Shimon; but Rabbi Shimon does indeed penalize him, since he transgresses ‘there shall not be seen’ and ‘there shall not be found’ with it.<sup>1</sup> As for Rava, it is well: hence it is taught: But that of an Israelite is forbidden [for general use], because it is said: neither shall there leaven be seen with you.<sup>2</sup> But according to Rav Acha bar Yaakov, he should state, because [it is said], no leavened bread shall be eaten? — Do you think that that refers to the second clause? [No,] it refers to the first clause, and he states thus: Leaven belonging to a gentile over which Pesach has passed is permitted for use, because it is said, neither shall there be leaven seen with you, [implying] your own you must not see, but you may see the leaven of strangers or of the Most High; and se’or of ‘eating’ is learnt from se’or of ‘seeing’.

Now they are consistent with their views. For it was stated: If one eats se’or belonging to a gentile over which Pesach has passed, according to Rabbi Yehudah’s view, — Rava said: He incurs lashes; while Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: He does not incur lashes. Rava said, He incurs lashes:

<sup>1</sup> Thus the Mishnah states the Rabbinic law, while in the Baraisa the Scriptural law is stated.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., as a penalty for violating this injunction.

<sup>3</sup> On committing me’ilah. The first Tanna holds that chametz belonging to hekdesch has a value even during Pesach. For he agrees with Rabbi Shimon that chametz kept during Pesach is Biblically permitted after Pesach, and though Rabbi Shimon penalizes its owner, that does not apply to hekdesch, since chametz of hekdesch falls within the permissive law ‘but you may see that of Heaven’. Thus this man, by eating it, has caused loss to the Temple treasury, and therefore he is liable to a me’ilah-

Rabbi Yehudah does not learn se’or of ‘eating’ from se’or of ‘seeing’. While Rav Acha bar Yaakov, said, He does not incur lashes: he learns se’or of ‘eating’ from se’or of ‘seeing’. (29a1 – 29a2)

But Rav Acha bar Yaakov retracted from that [view]. For it was taught: He who eats chametz of hekdesch during the Festival [Pesach] commits me’ilah; but some say: He does not commit me’ilah.<sup>3</sup> Who is [meant by] ‘some say’? — Said Rabbi Yochanan, It is Rabbi Nechunia ben ha-Kanah. For it was taught: Rabbi Nechunia ben ha-Kanah used to treat Yom Kippur as the Shabbos in regard to payment: just as [with] the Shabbos, he forfeits his life and is exempt from [payment], so [with] Yom Kippur, he forfeits his life and is exempt from payment.<sup>4</sup>

Rav Yosef said: They differ as to whether sacred food can be redeemed in order to feed dogs with it. He who says [that] he commits me’ilah holds: One may redeem sacred food in order to feed dogs with it; while he who rules [that] he does not commit me’ilah holds: One may not redeem [etc.].<sup>5</sup>

offering. But the second Tanna, while admitting this, holds that since he incurs kares for the eating of chametz, he is free from any lesser penalty.

<sup>4</sup> It is a principle that if a man commits an act involving the death penalty and a monetary compensation, he is exempted from the latter owing to the greater punishment.

<sup>5</sup> If these Tannaim held with Rabbi Shimon that during Pesach it is forbidden for general use, they would agree that he is not liable for me’ilah, since it was valueless when he actually ate it, notwithstanding that it would become valuable after Pesach. But they hold with Rabbi Yosi HaGellili that chametz is permitted

Rav Acha bar Rava recited this discussion in Rav Yosef's name in the following version: All agree that one may not redeem sacred food in order to feed it to dogs, but here they differ in this, viz., whether that which has indirect monetary value is as money. He who says [that] he commits me'ilah holds: That which has indirect monetary value is as money; while he who maintains [that] he does not commit me'ilah holds: That which has indirect monetary value is not as money.<sup>6</sup>

Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: All agree that that which has indirect monetary value is as money, but here they differ in the controversy of Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon. He who says [that] he is not liable for me'ilah holds as Rabbi Yehudah,<sup>7</sup> while he who rules [that] he is liable for me'ilah agrees with Rabbi Shimon.<sup>8</sup> But it was Rav Acha bar Yaakov himself who said that Rabbi Yehudah learns se'or of 'eating' from se'or of 'seeing'?<sup>9</sup> — Hence Rav Acha bar Yaakov retracted from that [statement].

Rav Ashi said: All hold that we may not redeem [etc.], and that which has indirect monetary value is not as money. But here they differ in the controversy of Rabbi Yosi HaGellili and the Rabbis. He who rules [that] he is liable to me'ilah holds as Rabbi Yosi;<sup>10</sup> while he who rules [that] he is not liable for me'ilah agrees with the Rabbis. (29a2 – 29b1)

for use during Pesach. Now, the only use to which chametz can be put then is to give it to dogs. This may be done with ordinary chametz, but there is a controversy in respect of sacred chametz. The first Tanna holds that it can be redeemed for that purpose: hence the chametz is valuable, and therefore the eater commits me'ilah. But the others ('some say') hold that sacred chametz may not be redeemed for dogs. Consequently, it has no value, and the eater does not commit me'ilah.

<sup>6</sup> On this version both Tannaim agree with Rabbi Shimon. Thus it has no present value at all, save an indirect value, since it can be used after Pesach, and they disagree as to whether this deferred value can be regarded as immediate value.

<sup>7</sup> That all benefit is forbidden to an Israelite even after Pesach.

Rav said: Chametz, in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different<sup>11</sup> kind, is forbidden; when not in its time, [if mixed] with its own kind, it is forbidden; [if with] a different kind, it is permitted. What are we discussing: Shall we say, where it imparts [its] taste [to the mixture], then [how state] when not in its time, if [mixed] with a different kind it is permitted? Surely it imparts taste!<sup>12</sup> — Rather it refers to a minute quantity [of chametz]:<sup>13</sup> 'chametz in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, is forbidden', Rav being consistent with his view. For Rav and Shmuel both said: All forbidden things of the Torah, [if mixed] with their own kind, [render forbidden the mixture even] when there is a minute quantity; [if] with a different kind, [only] when [the forbidden element] imparts its taste. Now Rav forbade chametz in its time [when mixed] with a different kind on account of [a mixture with] its own kind. When not in its period [and mixed] with its own kind, it [the mixture] is forbidden in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah: but [when chametz has no monetary value at all; nor has it any indirect monetary value, since it cannot be redeemed to feed it to dogs by selling it to a non-Jew for the purpose. mixed] with a different kind it is permitted, because [to forbid it] when not in its time and [mixed] with a different kind on account of [a mixture] with its own kind, — to that extent we do not enact a preventive measure.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> That it is permissible for general use after Pesach, even to an Israelite, and that it has a monetary value.

<sup>9</sup> Whereby chametz of hekdesch is permitted for use during Pesach even according to Rabbi Yehudah.

<sup>10</sup> That benefit is permitted even during Pesach. This chametz could be redeemed and used as fuel.

<sup>11</sup> Lit., 'not with its kind' — and similarly in the whole passage.

<sup>12</sup> It is a general principle that if something forbidden is mixed with something permitted and imparts its taste into it, the whole mixture is prohibited.

<sup>13</sup> Insufficient to impart a flavor to the other.

<sup>14</sup> Gazar means to enact a preventive measure, i.e., to forbid one case which should be permitted because it might otherwise be



Shmuel said: Chametz, in its time, [if mixed] with its own kind, is forbidden; if with a different kind, it is permitted. When not in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, it is permitted. 'Chametz, in its time, [if mixed] with its own kind, is forbidden.' Shmuel is consistent with his view. For Rav and Shmuel both said: All prohibited things of the Torah, [if mixed] with their own kind, [render forbidden the mixture even] when there is a minute quantity; [if mixed] with a different kind, [only] when [the forbidden element] imparts [its] flavor. Now he does not forbid [chametz mixed] with a different kind on account of [a mixture with] its own kind. 'When not in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, it is permitted,' — in accordance with Rabbi Shimon.

While Rabbi Yochanan said: Chametz, in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, is forbidden when it imparts [its] taste; when not in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, it is permitted. 'Chametz, in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, [is forbidden] when it imparts [its] taste.' Rabbi Yochanan is consistent with his view. For Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish both maintain: All forbidden things in the Torah, whether [mixed] with their own kind or with a different kind, [render forbidden the mixture only] when they impart [their] taste.' 'When not in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, it is permitted,' - in accordance with Rabbi Shimon. (29b2 – 29b4)

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Chametz and Liberation*

The Gemara states that Rabbi Yose HaGlili maintains that regarding the Exodus from Egypt, the prohibition of consuming chametz was only in effect for one day. This is

---

thought that another case, which is actually forbidden, is permitted too.

based on the juxtaposition of the verse that states: no chametz shall be eaten to the verse that states: today you are leaving Egypt. This teaches us that regarding the Exodus from Egypt, they were only prohibited from eating chametz for the day that they left Egypt.

One must wonder what relevance this teaching has to the present. Does it really make a difference if the Jewish People were prohibited from eating chametz upon liberation?

The answer to this question is the essence of the Exodus and the festival of Pesach that we celebrate to commemorate our liberation. It is well known that chametz symbolizes the Yetzer Hara. The Jewish People were not merely enslaved physically in Egypt. Rather, they had reached the nadir of depravity, and there was almost no hope for them to be liberated. HaShem had compassion on His beloved nation and redeemed them with His outstretched hand and His Mighty Arm. The forces of evil were vanquished, and the entire universe was liberated on the first official Pesach in history.

What better way to commemorate this momentous day than to prohibit the Jewish People from eating chametz? When we abstain from chametz, we are reflecting on our victory over the Yetzer Hara. This victory allows us to serve HaShem with love, and experience every year the true liberation from the forces of evil.