



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

An animal that is subject to *arnuna*, the royal tax, is exempt from the laws of *bechor*.

They inquired of Rava: Regarding an animal which is subject to *arnuna*, the royal tax, is it subject to the laws of *bechor* or not? If the Jewish owner can pay the gentile money instead of his share in the animal, then the animal is certainly subject to the laws of *bechor* (*the firstborn male offspring of a kosher domestic animal that belongs to a Jew becomes sanctified at birth and must be given to a Kohen; an animal that is owned by a Jew and a gentile in partnership is not subject to the laws of bechor*). The inquiry was regarding a case where the Jew cannot avoid allowing the gentile to have a share in the animal by paying the gentile money, what is the law? He replied: The animal is exempt from the laws of *bechor*. The Gemara asks from a braisa that teaches that the animal is subject to the laws of *bechor*. The Gemara answers that the braisa refers to a case where he can pay the gentile for his share in the animal. [If the gentile does not have a share in the animal, the animal is subject to the laws of *bechor*.] (6a)

Dough that is subject to the royal tax is also subject to the obligation of *challah*.

Another version in the *Gemora* is that Rava said that an animal that is subject to the royal tax is exempt from the laws of *bechor*, and this is true even if the Jew can pay the gentile with money for his share in the animal. Regarding

dough that is subject to the royal tax, the *halachah* is that the dough is subject to the obligation of *challah*. [*Challah is the portion of due that is of a minimum size that must be given to the Koehn. The dough must be from the five species of grain, which are wheat, barley rye, oats and spelt. Dough that is owned by a gentile is not subject to the laws of challah.*] This is so even if the Jew cannot remove the gentile from his share in the dough by paying him money. What is the reason? The difference between the case of the dough and the case of the animal is that regarding an animal, it is well known that the king has a share in the dough, whereas it is not well known that the king has a share in the dough. An outside observer might think that the *challah* is being eaten without having *challah* separated from the dough. For this reason, the Chachamim required that *challah* away be taken from the dough. (6a)

If a gentile went into the courtyard of a Jew with dough in his hand, the Jew is not required to remove it.

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: If a gentile entered the courtyard of a Jew on Pesach with *chametz* in his hand, the Jew is not required to dispose of it.¹ If, however, the gentile deposited the *chametz* with the Jew,² the Jew must remove the *chametz* from his possession. If the Jew set aside a special room for the *chametz*,³ the Jew is not required to remove the *chametz*, because it is said: *it shall not be found*. What is he saying?⁴ Rav Pappa says that this

¹ I.e., He is not required to ask the gentile to leave his house, as a Jew is permitted to see the *chametz* of a gentile on Pesach.

² Thereby having the Jew responsible for the *chametz*.

³ And in this way the Jew has not accepted responsibility for the *chametz*.

⁴ If anything the quotation intimates the reverse.

last statement is referring to the beginning of the braisa and this is what he is saying: if the gentile deposits the *chametz* with the Jew, the Jew must remove it because it is said: *it shall not be found*. Rav Ashi says that it is referring to the end of the braisa and this is what he is saying: if the Jew set aside a room for the *chametz* of the gentile, the Jew is not required to remove the *chametz*, because it is said: *it shall not be found in your homes*, and this is not his [house], for when the gentile carries in [the *chametz*], he carries it into his own house.⁵

Shall we say that renting confers a title?⁶ But surely we learned: Even in the place where they [the Sages] permitted renting [to a gentile], they did not permit [renting] for a dwelling-house, because he [the gentile] introduces [his] idols therein. Now if you should think that renting confers a title, when he introduces [the idols] he introduces [them] into his own house? — Here it is different, because the Divine Law expresses it in the form of ‘there shall not be found’, [implying] that which is found in your hand [is forbidden], which excludes this [case], since it is not found in your hand. (6a)

In one finds *chametz* in his house on Yom Tov, he should cover it with a vessel so that he does not mistakenly come to eat it.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If one finds *chametz* in his house on Pesach, he should cover the *chametz* with a vessel.⁷ If the *chametz* was *hekdesh* (*consecrated for the Bais HaMikdash*), however, then he is not even required to cover the *chametz* with a vessel. What is the reason? Because even during the rest of the year people distance

⁵ The gentile is in essence bringing *chametz* into his own house, and the *chametz* is not the Jew’s because he did not accept responsibility for it.

⁶ So that the house becomes legally the gentile’s.

⁷ So he does not mistakenly come to eat it. We are not concerned with his keeping the *chametz* in his house, because we will learn later (6b) that one must nullify his *chametz* before Pesach. He cannot remove the *chametz* on Pesach, because since the *chametz* has no use, it is rendered *muktzeh*, so he must cover it with a vessel to remind him that he is forbidden to eat it.

themselves from items that are *hekdesh* and we are not concerned that he will come to eat it on Pesach. (6a)

If one has *chametz* of a gentile in his house, he should make a partition that is ten tefachim high to serve as a reminder not to eat the *chametz*.

And Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If one has *chametz* of a gentile in his house,⁸ he should make for the *chametz* a partition ten *tefachim* high that will serve as a reminder [not to eat the *chametz*].⁹ If the *chametz* is of *hekdesh*, however, then he is not required to make a partition for it. What is the reason? Because people distance themselves from items of *hekdesh* all year around. (6a)

One who sets out on a journey before thirty days prior to Pesach is not obligated to remove his *chametz*.

And Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: One who sets out to sea and one who journeys a far distance on a caravan, if he sets out on his journey prior to thirty days before Pesach, he is not required to remove his *chametz*. If, however, he sets out on his journey within thirty days before Pesach, then he is required to remove his *chametz*.¹⁰

Abaye said: When we say that if he sets out on his journey within thirty days before Pesach, he is obligated to remove his *chametz*, this was only said if he planned on returning home during Pesach. If he does not plan on returning to his home during Pesach, then he is not required to remove his *chametz*. Said Rava to him: But if his intention is to

⁸ And he is allowed to retain the *chametz* in his possession because he did not accept responsibility for it.

⁹ The partition should be made before Pesach so that he will not mistakenly come to eat the *chametz* on Pesach.

¹⁰ Even when Pesach arrives, he is not liable for owning *chametz*, because he will not be able to access the *chametz*, and the *chametz* is considered to be eliminated. This is similar to *chametz* that is buried under a heap of rubble which the *Mishna* (31b) rules that it is rendered to be eliminated.

return, even [if he sets out] on Rosh Hashanah too?¹¹ Rather, said Rava: When you say: if before thirty days he is not bound to remove it, we said this only where it is not his intention to return; but if his intention is to return, even [if he sets out] on Rosh Hashanah too.

Now Rava is consistent with his view. For Rava said: If one turns his house into a granary before thirty days [prior to Pesach], he is not bound to remove [the chametz]; if within thirty days, he is bound to remove it; and even before thirty days too, we said this only when it is not his intention to clear it [the store of provisions] away; but if his intention is to clear it away, even before thirty days too he is bound to remove it.

What business have these thirty days? — As it was taught: Questions are asked and lectures are given on the laws of Pesach for thirty days before Pesach. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Two weeks. What is the reason of the Tanna Kamma? For Moshe stood on the day when the first Pesach offering was brought,¹² and he instructed the Jewish People regarding the laws of the Pesach Sheini.¹³ As it is said: Moreover, let the children of Israel keep the Pesach in its appointed season; and it is written: And there were certain men, who were tamei by the dead body of a man.¹⁴ And Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel will tell you that because he was engaged in the laws of Pesach, he instructed them in all the laws of Pesach. What is the reason of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel? For Moshe stood on Rosh Chodesh,¹⁵ and instructed the Jewish People regarding the Pesach offering¹⁶ as it is said: This month shall be unto you the beginning of months. And it is written: Speak to the entire assembly of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to their father's houses, etc. — But how do you know that he was standing at the beginning of

¹¹ He must still remove it, since he will be in the house on Pesach.

¹² Which was the fourteenth of Nissan.

¹³ Which was brought on the fourteenth of Iyar.

¹⁴ Moshe instructed them thirty days prior to the offering of Pesach Sheini. From the fact that Moshe explained the laws of

the month; perhaps he was standing on the fourth or the fifth of the month? Rather, said Rabbah bar Shimi in Ravina's name, [It is deduced] from here: And Hashem spoke to Moshe in the Wilderness of Sinai in the second year in the first month, and it is written: and the Children of Israel shall make the Pesach offering in its proper time. But here too, how do you know that he was standing at the beginning of the month; perhaps he was standing on the fourth or the fifth of the month? — Said Rav Ncahman bar Yitzchak: [The implication of] 'wilderness' [here] is learned from 'wilderness' [elsewhere]. Here it is written, 'in the wilderness of Sinai,' while there it is written, And Hashem spoke to Moshe in the wilderness of Sinai, in the tent of meeting, on the first day of the second month: just as there [it was] at the beginning of the month, so here too at the beginning of the month. (6a – 6b)

The Gemara asks: Now, let [the events of] the first month be written first, and then that of the second month? — Said Rav Menashya bar Tachlifa in Rav's name: This proves that there is no chronological order in the Torah. Rav Pappa observed: This was said only of two subjects; but in the same subject what is earlier is earlier and what is later is later. For should you not say thus, [how, then, apply the principle that] when a general proposition is followed by a particular specification the general proposition comprises only what is contained in the particular specification; perhaps it is a particular specification followed by a general proposition! Moreover, [it is a principle that] when a particular specification is followed by a general proposition, the generalization becomes an addition to the specification, [here too] perhaps it is a generalization followed by a particularization! But if so, the same [question] applies even to two subjects? Now, that is well on the view that [when] a generalization and a specification [are] at a distance from each other, we do

Pesach Sheini then, we can infer that the laws pertaining to the upcoming holiday should be taught thirty days in advance.

¹⁵ The first of Nissan.

¹⁶ That they would bring two weeks later, on the fourteenth day of Nissan.



not interpret them as a generalization followed by a specification, then it is correct. But on the view that we do interpret [them thus], what can be said? — Even on the view that we do interpret, that is only [when they occur] in the same subject; but [when] in two subjects we do not interpret [them thus]. (6b)

One who searches for *chametz* must nullify the *chametz* after the search.

And Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: One who searches for *chametz* should nullify the *chametz* immediately after conducting the search.¹⁷ What is the reason? The requirement to nullify the *chametz* is not because of crumbs that he is unaware of, because crumbs are not considered to be significant.¹⁸ And if you will say that the crumbs are safeguarded along with the rest of his house, but it was taught [otherwise] in a braisa: [If there are in a man's field] late figs, while he guards his field on account of the grapes; or if there are late grapes, while he guards his field on account of his cucumbers and gourds,¹⁹ when the owner is particular about them, they are forbidden [to a stranger] as theft and are subject to tithes; when the owner is not particular about them, they are not forbidden as theft and are exempt from tithes!²⁰ — Rather, said Rava, the reason that he must nullify the *chametz* is a rabbinical decree because he may find a nice roll that was overlooked while searching for the *chametz*, and he will have his mind on it.²¹ — But let him nullify it when he finds it? - Perhaps he will find it once he is forbidden to retain *chametz*, and it is not now [legally] in his possession, and he cannot nullify it, for Rabbi Elozar said: Two things are not in a man's ownership, yet the Torah regarded them as though they were in his ownership. And these are they: a

¹⁷ He should say *any chametz in this house is hereby nullified*.

¹⁸ And even if he does not nullify the crumbs, he will not be liable for them.

¹⁹ The late figs and grapes which remain after the harvest never fully ripen. Here they are in a field which is guarded from intruders not for their sake but because it contains other crops yet to be gathered.

pit in public ground and *chametz* from six hours and onwards. - Then let him nullify it at the fourth or the fifth [hour]? — Since it is neither the time of the prohibition nor the time of searching, he may transgress and not nullify it. (6b)

HALACHOS FROM THE DAF

Hilchos Bedikas Chametz

1. Introduction

The Torah commands us with two separate mitzvos to rid our property of *chametz*: “For seven days, leaven must not be found in your homes” (Shemos 12:19) and “You shall not see *chametz*, and you shall not see leaven in all your boundaries” (Shemos 13:7).

According to Torah law: to avoid transgressing these two prohibitions, it is sufficient to perform either bitul or biur. Bitul entails abandoning ownership of one's *chametz*. Since the *chametz* is no longer his, he may keep it in his home without violating these prohibitions. Biur means to search one's property for *chametz* and destroy it. If a person searches his property according to the guidelines set out by the halacha, even if he overlooks some *chametz* which remained in his property over Pesach, he has not violated the above prohibitions, provided that he had no knowledge of its existence.

By Rabbinic Law: The Sages ruled that is not sufficient to follow only one of the above practices; one must perform them both. The Sages did not wish to rely on bitul *chametz* alone for several reasons. Firstly, bitul depends upon a person making a resolute decision to abandon ownership

²⁰ Because they are regarded as ownerless, and such are exempt from tithes. Thus though they are incidentally guarded, that does not give them any value, and the same should apply here.

²¹ He will thus be reluctant to destroy the roll, and during the moment of hesitation, he will be liable for owning the *chametz*. When he nullifies the *chametz*, he is not liable for the roll, because he has already fulfilled the commandment to remove the *chametz*.

of his *chametz*. Our Sages feared that a person may have reservations against forsaking expensive *chametz*, and he will not perform the bitul whole-heartedly. Another reason offered, is that since people are accustomed to eating *chametz* throughout the year, if one would only perform bitul and leave the *chametz* in his property, he might accidentally come to eat it. For these reasons, they ruled that one must not rely on bitul, but he must actually dispose of the *chametz*. It is similarly insufficient to rely on biur *chametz* alone. A person may overlook a piece of *chametz* during his bedika on erev Pesach. He may then come across it on Pesach and hesitate to destroy it. Due to that moment of hesitation, after he had already discovered the *chametz*, he would transgress the Torah prohibition against owning *chametz*. Therefore, our Sages ruled that bitul must also be performed, in order to disown even the unknown *chametz* from one's possession.

Searching for *chametz*:

1. In order to rid one's property of all *chametz*, our Sages instituted the practice of searching for *chametz* on the night of the fourteenth of Nisan.
2. Wherever *chametz* is brought over the course of the year must be searched during bedikas *chametz*. Even those places where *chametz* is not generally stored or eaten, but one might have brought *chametz* there incidentally, must also be checked.
3. Therefore, the rooms and closets of a house must be checked. Even if a person is certain that he has never eaten or stored *chametz* in a certain place, he may have entered there during the course of a meal and either left *chametz* there and forgotten about it, or accidentally dropped a piece.

Places where *chametz* is not brought:

1. Places where *chametz* is generally not kept, and one would not enter with *chametz* during a meal, need not be checked unless one knows that he did bring in *chametz* over the course of the year.

2. In the time of the *Gemora*, people stored things in the crevices of the walls. *Chametz* was generally stored in easily accessible crevices. It was not stored in holes lower than three tefachim, or higher than one could conveniently reach. Therefore, our Sages did not require searching these areas unless one knows that he did store *chametz* there, even once during the year. In our own times, this may apply (depending on the circumstances) to the tops of cabinets and the like, where people never store *chametz*. These areas need not be searched for *chametz*, unless one knows that he stored *chametz* there even once during the year.

3. In a house with children, even those places where *chametz* is not generally kept must be searched, since the children may have brought *chametz* there.

DAILY MASHAL

The Torah is not written in chronological order

The *Gemora* states that the Torah is not written in chronological order. Although the Ways of Hashem are concealed from us, Rabbeinu Bachye offers us a glimpse into the wonders of Hashem. Rabbeinu Bachye²² quotes a Medrash²³ that states that if the Torah had been written in its proper order, then a person would have the ability to resurrect the dead and perform other miracles. Rabbeinu Bachye adds that now that the Torah was not written in chronological order, a person merits through the study of Torah a share in the World to Come. Moshe Rabbeinu acquired all his knowledge and insight from the Torah, and Shlomo HaMelech, who is referred to as the smartest man that ever lived, also acquired his vast amount of knowledge from the Torah.

²² Introduction to commentary on Chumash

²³ Medrash Tehillim 3