



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

Abaye said: Should you say that the product of two causes is forbidden, then Rebbe is identical [in view] with Rabbi Eliezer.<sup>1</sup> But should you say. The product of two causes is permitted,<sup>2</sup> while here [Rebbe forbids the bread] because there is the improvement of the fuel in the bread, then plates, goblets, and flasks<sup>3</sup> are forbidden.<sup>4</sup> They differ only in respect of an oven and a pot.<sup>5</sup> On the view [that] the product of two causes is forbidden, these are forbidden; on the view [that] the product of two causes is permitted, these are permitted. Others state: Even on the view [that] the product of two causes is permitted, the pot is forbidden, for it receives the stew before the permitted fuel is placed.<sup>6</sup> (27a2 – 27a3)

Rav Yosef said in Rav Yehudah's name in Shmuel's name: If an oven was fired [heated] with shells of orlah or with stubble of kil'ayim of the vineyard, if new, it must be demolished; if old, it must be allowed to cool. If he baked bread in it, — Rebbe said: The bread is permitted; but the Sages maintain: The bread is

forbidden. But the reverse was taught! — Shmuel learned it the reverse. Alternatively, in general Shmuel holds [that] the halachah is as Rebbe as against his, but not as against his colleagues, but here [he holds], even against his colleagues, and so he reasoned, I will recite it reversed, in order that the Rabbis may stand [as ruling] stringently.<sup>7</sup> (27a3)

‘If he baked it upon the coals all agree that the bread is permitted’. Rav Yehudah in Shmuel's name, and Rabbi Chiya bar Ashi in Rabbi Yochanan's name [differ]. One says: They learned [this] only of dying coals, but live<sup>8</sup> coals are forbidden;<sup>9</sup> while the other maintains: Even live coals too are permitted. As for the view that live [coals] are forbidden, it is well, [the reason being] because there is the improvement of the fuel in the bread.<sup>10</sup> But on the view that even live [coals] are permitted, then how is the bread which is forbidden because there is the improvement of the fuel in the bread conceivable according to Rebbe?<sup>11</sup> — Said Rav

<sup>1</sup> I.e., if the Baraisa is to be explained thus: just as Rebbe forbids the bread baked by the heat of the nutshells of orlah, so he also forbids the new oven that is fired by same, because he holds that the product of two causes is forbidden. Hence the whole Baraisa states Rebbe's ruling, his view being identical with Rabbi Eliezer's. Consequently, the problem which he proceeds to state does not arise.

<sup>2</sup> Hence the first clause stating that a new oven must be destroyed cannot agree with Rebbe, but only with Rabbi Eliezer.

<sup>3</sup> Of earthenware, which received their final hardening in a kiln heated by forbidden fuel.

<sup>4</sup> On all views. For they have been made fit for use and will be used without any further improvements, and there is direct benefit from forbidden matter.

<sup>5</sup> Both of which must be heated again before food is cooked or baked in them.

<sup>6</sup> The food for stewing is placed in the pot before the heat is applied to it. The mere placing is regarded as benefit, and this was made possible solely by the forbidden fuel.

<sup>7</sup> And so that people might accept the stringent ruling.

<sup>8</sup> Lit., ‘whispering’. When the coals are burning brightly they seem to be moving and whispering to each other.

<sup>9</sup> I.e., the bread is forbidden in Rebbe's view.

<sup>10</sup> For the fuel is regarded as still in existence and directly baking the bread.

<sup>11</sup> For obviously the bread does not bake until the fuel burns up, and by then it is a mass of coals.

Pappa: When the flame is opposite it.<sup>12</sup> From there it follows that the Rabbis who disagree with him permit it even when the flame is opposite it; then how is forbidden fuel conceivable according to the Rabbis?<sup>13</sup> — Said Rav Ammi bar Chama: In the case of a bench.<sup>14</sup> (27a3 – 27b1)

Rami bar Chama asked Rav Chisda: If an oven was heated with wood of hekdesch and bread is baked in it, what [is the law] according to the Rabbis who permit in the first case?<sup>15</sup> — The bread is forbidden, he replied. And what is the difference between this and orlah'? — Said Rava: How can you compare? Orlah is annulled in two hundred [times its own quantity]; hekdesch is not annulled even in one thousand [times its quantity].<sup>16</sup> But said Rava, If there is a difficulty, this is the difficulty: Surely he who fires [the oven] commits me'ilah, and wherever he who fires [the oven] commits me'ilah, it [the fuel] passes out to chullin?<sup>17</sup> — Said Rav Pappa: We treat here of wood of a shelamim,<sup>18</sup> and in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, who maintained: Hekdesch, if [misappropriated for secular use] unwittingly, becomes chullin; if deliberately, it does not become chullin. Now what is the reason that if deliberately it does not [become chullin]? Since it does not involve a me'ilah-offering,<sup>19</sup> it does not pass out to chullin; so shelamim offerings too, since it [the misappropriation of this type

of sacrifice] does not involve a me'ilah-offering, it does not pass out to chullin. — Yet whenever he that fires [the oven] commits me'ilah, it [the fuel] passes out to chullin? But it was taught: [In the case of] all which are burnt,<sup>20</sup> their ashes are permitted [for use], except the wood of an asheirah, while the ashes of hekdesch are forbidden forever? — Said Rami bar Chama: E.g., if a fire fell of its own accord on wood of hekdesch, so that there is no man to be liable for me'ilah.<sup>21</sup> Rav Shemayah said: It refers to those [ashes] which must be hidden,<sup>22</sup> for it was taught: And he shall put them [the ashes] gently; and he shall put them — its entirety; and he shall put them [means] that he must not scatter them. (27b1 – 27b3)

Rabbi Yehudah said: There is no removal etc. It was taught: Rabbi Yehudah said: There is no removal of chametz save by burning, and logic impels this: if nossar, which is not subject to 'there shall not be seen' and 'there shall not be found', requires burning, then chametz, which is subject to 'there shall not be seen' and 'there shall not be found', how much the more does it require burning! Said they to him: Every argument that you argue [which] in the first place is stringent yet in the end leads to leniency is not a [valid] argument: [for] if he did not find wood for burning, shall he sit and do nothing, whereas the Torah ordered: You shall put

<sup>12</sup> Directly opposite the bread through the oven mouth.

<sup>13</sup> I.e., when do they prohibit benefit from forbidden fuel?

<sup>14</sup> Made of forbidden wood. One must not sit upon it, because he thereby benefits from the wood while it is yet fully in existence.

<sup>15</sup> Sc. where it is heated with orlah or kil'ayim.

<sup>16</sup> If orlah is accidentally mixed with two hundred times its own quantity of permitted produce and cannot be removed, it is annulled, and the whole is permitted. But hekdesch in similar circumstances is never annulled: thus its interdict is obviously more stringent.

<sup>17</sup> When one misappropriates hekdesch for secular use, he commits me'ilah and is liable to an offering for having withdrawn it from sacred ownership. Thus by this very act he converts it into chullin, and therefore the bread should be regarded as having been baked with ordinary fuel, hence permitted. This principle holds good of all hekdesch

save animals dedicated for sacrifices and the service utensils in the Temple.

<sup>18</sup> I.e., wood dedicated for shelamim offerings, which means that it is to be sold and shelamim offerings bought with the money, shelamim offerings belong to the category of 'sacrifices of lower sanctity', and do not involve a me'ilah-offering; nevertheless they are forbidden for secular use.

<sup>19</sup> Sacrifices were brought only for unwitting transgressions.

<sup>20</sup> Viz., chametz on Pesach, terumah which became tamei, orlah and kil'ayim of the vineyard.

<sup>21</sup> Only then are the ashes of hekdesch for ever forbidden.

<sup>22</sup> Viz., the shovelful of ashes hidden at the base of the altar. Only these are forever forbidden.

away chametz out of your houses, [which means] with anything that you can put it away? Rabbi Yehudah argued again [with] another argument.<sup>23</sup> Nossar is forbidden for eating and chametz is forbidden for eating: just as nossar [is disposed of] by burning, so is chametz [destroyed] by burning. Said they to him: Let neveilah prove [it] for it is forbidden for eating yet does not require burning. Said he to them: There is a difference: nossar is forbidden for eating and for [all] use, and chametz is forbidden for eating and for [all] use: just as nossar requires burning, so does chametz require burning. Let the ox that is stoned prove it, they replied: it is forbidden for eating and for [all] use, yet it does not require burning. Said he to them: There is a difference: Nossar is forbidden for eating and for [all] use, and he [who eats it] is punished with kares, and chametz is forbidden for eating and for [all] use, and he is punished with kares: just as nossar [must be destroyed] by burning, so is chametz [destroyed] by burning. Said they to him: Let the cheilev of the ox that is stoned prove it, which is forbidden for eating, for [all] use, and involves the penalty of kares, yet it does not require burning. Rabbi Yehudah argued again [with] another argument: Nossar is subject to ‘you shall let nothing of it remain,’ and chametz is subject to ‘you shall let nothing of it remain’:<sup>24</sup> just as nossar [is disposed of] by burning, so is chametz [disposed of] by burning. Said they to him: Let the asham of suspense<sup>25</sup> and the chatas of a bird which is brought for a doubt,<sup>26</sup> on your view,<sup>27</sup> prove it: for they are subject to ‘you shall let nothing of it remain,’ and we maintain that they

<sup>23</sup> Not on the basis of an a kal vachomer argument, but a gezeirah shavah, the conclusion of which is accepted irrespective of the result.

<sup>24</sup> Since chametz must not be seen or found in the house after midday on the fourteenth of Nisan, it may obviously not remain there until then.

<sup>25</sup> I.e., doubt. When a man is in doubt whether he has committed a transgression for which, if certain, a chatas is due, he brings an asham taluy.

require burning, while you say [it is disposed of] by burial.<sup>28</sup> [Thereupon] Rabbi Yehudah was silent. Said Rav Yosef: Thus people say: The ladle which the artisan hollowed out, in it [his tongue] shall be burnt with mustard. Abaye said: When the shackle-maker sits in his own shackles, he is paid through his own hand handiwork. Rava said: When the arrow maker is slain by his own arrows, he is paid through his own hand handiwork. (27b3 – 28a1)

## 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.

<sup>26</sup> E.g., when a woman miscarries, and it is not known whether the fetus was viable or not.

<sup>27</sup> The Rabbis hold that this chatas bird must be burnt, while Rabbi Yehudah maintains that it is cast into a water canal which carries it off.

<sup>28</sup> This refers to the asham taluy.