

28 Menachem Av 5773
August 4, 2013



Pesachim Daf 45

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

Our *Gemora* invokes the famous rule, invoked often throughout Shas, that when the Torah teaches us the same lesson from two different verses regarding two different topics, it only applies to those specific topics. If the Torah would have wanted us to apply this lesson to other parts of the Torah whenever possible, it would have been sufficient to mention it in only one place in the Torah. The fact that the Torah stated it in two places, means that it is only applicable in those two places, but nowhere else. [*It is relevant here regarding the laws of combination.*]

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *Whatever shall touch (... shall be holy)*. You might think (*that it becomes like the chatas with mere contact*) even if it did not absorb; therefore it is written: *in its meat*, which indicates that it must be absorbed in its meat. You might think that if it touched part of a piece of meat, the entire piece is disqualified; therefore it is written: *Whatever shall touch*; only that which it touches becomes disqualified. *Shall be holy*: it should become like the *chatas* which touched it, so that if the *chatas* is disqualified, that which touches it becomes disqualified; while if it is qualified, it may be eaten only in accordance with its stringencies.

The *Gemora* explains that the dispute between Rabbi Akiva and the Rabbis is dependent on if these two verses are necessary. The Rabbis maintain: Both are indeed required; the verse is necessary by *chatas* to

show that the permitted combines with the forbidden, while *chullin* cannot be deduced from sacred sacrifices; and ‘an infusion’ intimates that the taste is as the substance itself, and from this you may draw a conclusion for the whole Torah. But Rabbi Akiva maintains: both are required for teaching that the permitted combines with the forbidden, so that they are two verses with the same teaching, and all instances of two verses that teach the same lesson do not illumine other instances.

Regarding the dough in the cracks of the kneading trough, if there is as much as an olive in one place, he is obligated to remove it; but if not, it is nullified through its smallness. And it is likewise in the matter of *tumah*: if he objects to it (being there), it interposes; but if he desires its preservation, it is like a kneading-trough (and does not interpose).

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: They learned this only of a place where the dough does not serve for sealing (the crack of the trough that it may now hold water); but where it serves for sealing it, he is not obligated to remove it.

The *Gemora* infers: It follows that where there is less than an olive, even if it does serve for sealing, he is not obligated to remove it.



Others recite it in reference to the second clause: But if not, it is nullified through its smallness. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: They learned this only of a place where the dough serves for sealing (the crack of the trough that it may now hold water); but where it does not serve for sealing it, he is obligated to remove it.

The *Gemora* infers: It follows that where there is as much as an olive, even where it serves for sealing, he is obligated to remove it.

The *Gemora* notes: A *braisa* was taught as the former version, and a *braisa* was taught as the latter version.

It was taught as the former version: Dough in the cracks of the kneading trough, where it serves for sealing, it does not interpose, and he (its owner) does not transgress (the prohibition of retaining chametz on Pesach). But if it is in a place where it does not serve for sealing, it interposes, and he transgresses. When are these words said? Where there is as much as an olive. But if there is less than an olive, even where it does not serve for sealing, it does not interpose, and he does not transgress. It was taught as the latter version: Dough in the cracks of a kneading trough, where it serves for sealing, it does not interpose, and he does not transgress; if it is in a place where it does not serve for sealing, it interposes, and he transgresses. When are these words said? When there is less than an olive; but if there is as much as an olive, even in a place where it serves for sealing, it interposes, and he transgresses.

The *Gemora* asks: Then these braises are contradictory?

Rav Huna said: Delete the more lenient *braisa* in favor of the more stringent one.

Rav Yosef said: You remove Tannaim (the first *braisa*) at random!?! This is a dispute amongst the Tannaim, for it was taught in a *braisa*: If a loaf became moldy, he is obligated to remove it, because it is fit to crumble and leaven many other doughs with it. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: When are these words said? If it is kept for eating. But a block of leaven which he put aside for sitting, he has nullified it. Now, since Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: He has nullified it, it follows that the first Tanna holds that he has not nullified it. This proves that he holds, wherever there is as much as an olive, even if he nullifies it, it is not nullified.

Abaye said to him: You have reconciled it where there is as much as an olive; yet have you reconciled it where there is less than an olive? Rather, both braises are the rulings of Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar, yet there is no difficulty: one is taught where it is in the place of kneading; the other was taught where it is not in the place of kneading.

Rav Ashi said: Do not assume that 'not in the place of kneading' means only on the outside of the trough, but it means even on the lip of the trough.

The *Gemora* asks: That is obvious!?

The *Gemora* answers: You might say that it sometimes overflows and reaches there; hence he informs us otherwise.

Rav Nachman said in the name of Rav: The halachah is as Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar.

The *Gemora* asks: That is not so, for Rav Yitzchak bar Ashi said in the name of Rav: If he plastered its surface with clay, he has nullified it. We may infer that it is only if he plastered it, but not if he did not plaster it!?

The *Gemora* answers: He who taught this ruling did not teach the other.

Others state: Rav Nachman said in the name of Rav: The halachah is not as Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar, for Rav Yitzchak bar Ashi said in the name of Rav: If he plastered its surface with clay, he has nullified it, etc. [We may infer that it is only if he plastered it, but not if he did not plaster it.]

Rav Nachman said in the name of Shmuel: If there are two half olives (of dough in the cracks of a kneading trough) and a thread of dough joins them, we consider: whenever the thread would be taken up these would be carried with it, he is obligated to remove them; but if not, he is not obligated to remove them.

Ulla said: This was said only of dough in a kneading trough; but if they are in the house, he is obligated to remove them. What is the reason? It is because he may sometimes sweep them and they will fall together.

Ulla said: They inquired in the West: What of a room and aloft; what of a room and the portico; what of two rooms, one within the other (where there was

half an olive in one and half in another)? The questions were left unresolved.

Chametz that is not fit to be eaten by dogs is no longer considered food which one must destroy before Pesach.

The *Gemora* in fact seems to quote an argument about this topic between the *Tanna Kamma* and Rabbi Nosson in a *braisa*. The *Gemora* supports the position of the *Tanna Kamma* from a *Mishna* in Taharos (8:6). The reason behind this is that such “food” is no longer considered food, but rather dirt. This is indeed the *halachah* (see Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim 442:2).

If a person put flour in part of a mixture that he prepared for tanning leather, the mixture turns inedible for a dog in three days. If he put animal skins in the mixture, it immediately becomes inedible.

The *Gemora* quotes a *braisa* that says that flour put into a mixture of ingredients, (*including liquid*) used to help tan leather becomes *chametz*. It therefore must be disposed of before *Pesach*, unless the mixture was prepared more than three days before *Pesach*. If it was prepared more than three days before *Pesach*, the mixture becomes inedible before *Pesach*, and can therefore be maintained. Rabbi Nosson says that this is only if the animal skins were not put in the batch, as this would make the entire batch inedible (*even for dogs*) right away.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Less than a K'zayis

The *Gemora* states that disposing of a *k'zayis* is the main obligation when it comes to ridding ourselves of *chametz* before *Pesach*. The only reason pieces that are less than a *k'zayis* must be disposed of is that they can combine to form a *k'zayis*.

The Taz (Orach Chaim 442:5) asks that this seems to depend on the reason for the mitzvah of “*bedikas chametz*” – “checking of *chametz*” before *Pesach*. According to Rashi (2a) that this is because we must be stringent not to see any *chametz* in our possession, it is understandable that we must not see a piece the size of a *k'zayis*. However, according to Tosfos (2a) that we check for *chametz* in order that we should not come to eat any *chametz* that is in our domain on *Pesach*, why is it only important to get rid of pieces that are a *k'zayis*? Even if someone eats a piece that is less than a *k'zayis*, he still transgresses the Torah prohibition against eating *chametz*!? This is because we know that anything that the Torah forbade us to eat cannot even be eaten in less than the amount forbidden by the Torah. The amount given by the Torah was only the amount one must eat in order to receive the punishment stated by the Torah for that sin. Why, then, do we not have to eradicate pieces of *chametz* that are less than a *k'zayis* from our domain according to Tosfos?

The Pnei Yehoshua gives a few answers to this question. One of these reasons is that even Tosfos understands that the reason we are so concerned to eradicate *chametz* is because people do not normally stay away from *chametz* (*they are used to eating it*). However, this type of *chametz* which is less than a *k'zayis* (*and often found on the floor*) is not usually the type of *chametz* that people tend to eat. Accordingly, there is no reason to apply this stringency.