

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of ישראל צבי בן זאב גוטליב ז"ל

By the Weiss/Gotlib Families—London, England

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying R' Yochanan's opinion (cont.)

R' Ashi explains that R' Akiva did not apply the principle that permitted foods combine with prohibited foods to all prohibitions because nazir and chatas are two pesukim that teach the same principle and therefore cannot be applied to other cases.

The Gemara proceeds to show exactly how R' Akiva and Rabanan approach these drashos.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents instructions for dealing with dough found lodged in the cracks of a kneading bowl as far as chometz and tum'ah are concerned.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel stated that the Mishnah's ruling applies only when the dough is not meant to seal a crack, but if it was, it does not have to be destroyed. This implies that less than a k'zayis does not have to be destroyed under any circumstances.

A second version of this statement is presented which implies that if the dough is the size of a k'zayis it must be destroyed even if it is meant to seal a crack.

A Baraisa in support of each approach is presented.

R' Huna, R' Yosef and Abaye offer different ways to resolve the contradiction between the two Baraisos.

Two versions of R' Nachman's ruling in the name of Rav are presented. According to the first the halachah follows R' Shimon ben Elazar, who rules that it is not required to destroy a block of leaven designated for sitting. According to the second version he ruled that the halachah does not follow R' Shimon ben Elazar.

4) A k'zayis of dough in the cracks of a kneading bowl

R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel issued a ruling concerning two half k'zayis pieces of dough with a thread of dough connecting them.

Ulla clarified a particular point regarding this ruling and posed a series of unanswered questions.

5) Chometz that is inedible

One Baraisa issues a ruling regarding tum'ah for a loaf that became moldy.

A second Baraisa records a dispute concerning the destruction of chometz that is inedible.

6) The Mishnah's ruling concerning tum'ah

The Gemara questions how the Gemara could equate the halachos of destroying chometz with the halachos of tum'ah.

R' Yehudah suggests an explanation but it is refuted by Abaye. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The chometz in the tanner's pan

ת"ר עריבת העבדנין שנתן לתוכה קמח כו' א"ר נתן בד"א שלא נתן לתוכה עורות כו' אינו חייב לבער ואמר רבא הלכה כו' נתן

The implication of the Baraisa is that we have a מחלוקת between Tanna Kamma and Rav Nosson. Tanna Kamma holds that during the first three days the flour in the tanning pan is considered as bona fide chometz. However, Rav Nosson disagrees and states that if the hides were placed into the compound mixture with the flour, the status of the integrity of the chometz in the mixture deteriorates, and it no longer has to be destroyed as Pesach arrives. It is difficult to understand the underlying nature of this disagreement. It seems unreasonable to think that they argue whether placing the putrid hide in the flour blend makes it inedible.

Sfas Emes explains that everyone agrees that placing the hide in the pan makes the flour inedible for man, but it is still edible for a dog. Rav Nosson had just ruled that such an item is still eligible for tum'ah of food. In other words, he holds that if chometz was edible for man, once it has lost this rank, although it is still edible for a dog, it has lost its halacha of being "food."

Rava rules according to the opinion of Rav Nosson. This is consistent with his view earlier (21b) where we discussed the halachah of what to do with a piece of chometz which was scorched before Pesach began. Rashi explains the case is where the taste and appearance of the chometz was nullified before the time chometz became prohibited. This suggests that it was still edible for a dog, but yet the violation of *בל יראה ובל ימצא* no longer apply.

Nevertheless, Tosafos (ibid.) disagree, and they explain that the case of the scorched chometz is a case where the chometz is permitted because it is totally nullified, even from being edible for a dog. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated as a zechus for
A refuah sheleimah for
אברהם ירחמיאל בן זלטה גולדה

HALACHAH Highlight

Chometz in cracks in the wall and ceiling

ר"ש בן אלעזר אומר במה דברים אמורים [שחייב לבער החמץ במקויימת לאכילה, אבל כופת שאור שיחדה לשיבה בטלה].

R. Shimon ben Elazar says; In which case is does this apply (the obligation to remove chometz)? When it is still edible. However, if there is a block of leaven which has been set aside to function as a chair, it is considered null (and can be kept in one's possession on Pesach).

One opinion in the Gemara understands that the law is according to R. Shimon ben Elazar even without smearing the nullified chometz with lime, but another opinion requires an added condition to smear the leaven with lime. The Shulchan Aruch¹ decides in favor of the second opinion. The Bach² writes that according to this opinion which necessitates one to smear the leaven with lime, there would also be a similar obligation to remove the dough which sticks to the ceilings of a home (even though such dough is inedible). This is also the opinion of the Yerushalmi³. Based on this, the Tur⁴ and the Shulchan Aruch say there is a stringency to scrape walls and chairs which touched chometz, and a crack in which one can not reach the chometz should be smeared with lime.

The Mishna Brura⁵ writes that if the chometz is slightly dirty and is less than the shiur of a k'zayis, one would not be obligated to remove it whatsoever. According to this, if one sprays something which will cause the chometz to become somewhat repulsive (e.g. soap, etc.) between cracks in chairs (which may have crumbs in them), it would obviate the necessity to then remove such "chometz." This would indeed be the view according to all opinions. There are those who write⁶ that in the spirit of the custom (to remove chometz) one

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to Rabanan, why does the Torah need the cases of nazir and chatas to teach the same halachah?
2. When is a piece of dough not considered an interposition?
3. Why is there a difference, according to Ulla, between pieces of dough in a bowl and pieces of dough found in a home?
4. Why, according to the Gemara's question, are the laws of chometz and tum'ah fundamentally different from one another?

should add a more potent agent to such cracks (so the chometz will not even be edible by a dog). ■

1. באו"ח סימן תמ"ב ס"ט
2. שם ס"ו בב"ח בד"ה ומה שכתב ההוא
3. בירושלמי פסחים פ"ב ה"ב
4. שם ס"ו
5. שם ס"ק ל"ג
6. בספר שבות יצחק בהלכות פסח פ"א דף ו' בד"ה והנה, בשם הגר"י אלשיב זצ"ל וצ"ע דעי' בזבחים כ"ב ע"א שטיט הנרוק שייך שיהיה ראוי למאכל בהמה, וא"כ מנין "שהמעט טיט" (שכתוב בשו"ע הנ"ל) פירושו כ"כ הרבה טיט שיפסל לכלב, כדי שעפי"ז להצריך ליתן חומר שפוגם מכלב. וצ"ע [וגם בספר שבות יצחק גופא בדף י"ח כתב בשם הגר"י ש אלשיב זצ"ל שא"צ לחוש לפירושים ■

Gemara GEM

Clarifying the opinion of Rambam

קודם שלשה ימים אינו חייב לבער

If chometz had been placed in the pan of the tanner at least three days before Pesach, it no longer has to be destroyed as the holiday commences, because it has become ruined. Rambam rules that chometz that has lost its appeal for human consumption may be retained during Pesach, even if it is still edible for a dog. He writes (Hilchos Chometz 4:8,9): "Flour in the pan of the tanner in which

the hides have been placed may be kept during Pesach." He continues (ibid., Halacha 10): "A salve or medical preparation in which chometz has been added may also be kept over Pesach, for the form of the chometz has been altered."

Yet, in Halachah 11, Rambam only allows spoiled bread to be kept if it is nullified from being edible by humans as well as by a dog. Why is this different from a mixture of chometz which may be kept once it is ruined from human consumption, even if it is still desirable for a dog?

Rabeinu Chaim HaLevi explains that mixtures are more lenient, because, as

Rambam himself writes, "the form of the chometz has been altered." Mixtures only need to be cancelled from being human food. However, a piece of chometz which is intact still has its shape and appearance. This is only allowed to be kept if it is ruined from both human and dog edibility.

Alternatively, Rambam holds that mixtures are viewed as prohibited due to the rule of טעם כעיקר. The taste of the chometz in the blend creates its presence, and this prohibits the mixture. This is a function of the chometz being viewed as "food." Once it is inedible for man, it is no longer "food." ■

