Laws of Chametz and Matzah Summary and Clarification Chapters 1 and 2 - Prohibitions and Removal of Chametz (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Lecture – Laws of Chametz and Matzah, Chapters 1–3

General Introduction: Structure of Laws of Chametz and Matzah

The Rambam's Laws of Chametz and Matzah is structured as follows:

- **Chapters 1–5** – Prohibition of chametz (negative commandments, removal of chametz, searching)

- **Chapter 6** – Commandment to eat matzah

- **Chapter 7** – Recounting the Exodus from Egypt

- **Chapter 8** – The Seder night

The Rambam organizes the mitzvot roughly according to erev Pesach, the seven days, etc., but not exactly.

Chapter 1 – General Definitions of Chametz Prohibitions (Review)

Law 1 – Prohibition of Eating Chametz

The Rambam rules that one who eats a kezayit of chametz on Pesach receives karet (if intentional) and a sin offering (if unintentional).

Explanation: There is no death penalty administered by a human court (unlike Shabbat where there is also stoning), only karet by Heaven, and lashes for the negative commandment.

Law – Prohibition of Deriving Benefit from Chametz

Chametz on Pesach is also forbidden in benefit, from the exposition of "lo ye'achel" – in the manner of permitting eating.

Explanation: The verse "lo ye'achel" is expounded to mean not only eating, but also benefit.

Novel points:

- **Question:** Does one receive karet for deriving benefit from chametz as well, or only for eating? The language "benefit is included in eating" could mean it's literally the same thing (and then karet applies to benefit too), or that it was merely added (and then perhaps there's only a negative commandment without karet).

- In the Acharonim (by the "Beck") there is an opinion that benefit doesn't even have lashes – it's only a prohibition without punishment. The lecture leaves this without a clear resolution.

Law – Prohibition of Chametz Mixture

According to the Rambam, there is an additional negative commandment for eating a chametz mixture. However, the prohibition only applies when one eats a kezayit of the chametz in the mixture.

Explanation: The Rambam holds that a chametz mixture is no longer "chametz itself" – it's a separate negative commandment.

Novel points:

- **All other Rishonim (Ra'avad, Ramban) disagree:** They hold that if one eats a kezayit of chametz in a mixture, this is actual eating of chametz, not a separate prohibition of mixture. According to them, "chametz mixture" would have to mean something else (less than a kezayit, or a taste), and in practice they rule that the prohibition of mixture is not biblical at all, but perhaps rabbinic (a dispute among Tannaim).

Law – Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei

There is a separate prohibition to possess chametz on Pesach – "lo yera'eh" and "lo yimatzei" – two negative commandments. Details of this come in Chapter 4.

Novel points:

- **"Lo yera'eh" as a biblical distancing:** It is discussed whether "lo yera'eh" is a fence that the Torah itself made so that one should not come to eat chametz. The plain meaning commentators certainly learn that "lo yera'eh" is a distancing from eating. The reasoning: You don't need the chametz – it's not like other prohibitions where the object is with you for a permitted purpose. Therefore, the Torah itself made a distancing.

- **"Lo yera'eh and lo yimatzei" doesn't mean "owning" chametz:** As it says in Zevachim – "lo yera'eh and lo yimatzei" means you shouldn't be involved with chametz, it shouldn't be relevant. The novel point: "Don't have chametz" means "don't own chametz" – make it so it's not relevant.

Law – Chametz She'avar Alav HaPesach

The Rabbis prohibited benefit from chametz she'avar alav haPesach – chametz that remained over Pesach in violation – forbidden in benefit forever.

Explanation: It's a penalty.

Novel points:

- **Comparison to Shabbat labor:** It's similar to the law that one may not benefit from labor done on Shabbat.

- The reason is "so that he won't violate bal yera'eh" – so that one shouldn't come to keep chametz over Pesach. It's like a "ticket" – the purpose is that one shouldn't violate.

Law – Prohibition of Eating Chametz on Erev Pesach (From the Sixth Hour Onward)

Biblically (from oral tradition) it is forbidden to eat chametz from midday of erev Pesach, from the verse "lo tochal alav chametz." The prohibition is only eating (not benefit), not mixture, not bal yera'eh and bal yimatzei.

Novel points:

- **Plain meaning of the verse:** "Lo tochal alav chametz" – the simple plain meaning of "alav" doesn't mean "at the time of its slaughter" (as the exposition says). The plain meaning is: when you eat the Pesach offering, you shouldn't eat it with chametz (just as "al matzot u'merorim yochluhu" – "al" means together with, like a sandwich). Rav Sherira Gaon learned this way. This is only the plain meaning, not the law.

- **Rabbinically** they added: eating is forbidden from the end of the fourth hour (two hours before midday), due to concern for "yom hame'unan" (lest one err in the time). However, the Rambam doesn't want to say that they simply added two hours – he says they added one hour, and the other hour is "something else" – a different type of prohibition (not exactly forbidden in benefit, but forbidden for terumah, and the like). There's a distinction between the two added hours.

Chapter 2 – The Commandment of Tashbitu / Removal of Chametz

Laws 2-3 – "What is This Removal Mentioned in the Torah?"

The Rambam asks: "What is this removal mentioned in the Torah?" — and answers that one can fulfill it with nullification in the heart – "that he should resolve in his heart that the chametz is like dust."

Explanation: The Rambam learns that "tashbitu se'or mibateichem" means nullification in the heart – one should nullify the chametz in one's heart. The Gemara (Pesachim 4b) says "biblically, nullification alone is sufficient."

Novel points:

1. "Tashbitu" is a general term, not a specific action

The word "tashbitu" can mean different things – "throw away" (like "lekarev tashlichenu"), or merely "not have" (like "hashbatat hamalchut"). It's not like "teva'arun" or "te'abedun" which clearly indicate an action. The Targum translates "tashbitu" – "tevatilun," which shows it's a minimal term.

2. Comparison to Shabbat – "hashbatah" doesn't mean doing

Just as Shabbat – "shevitah" means not working, not that one must do something – so "tashbitu" regarding chametz means: not having chametz. It's a negative thing, not a positive one. However, the Rambam makes it somewhat positive – that one must actively nullify in the heart.

3. "Tashbitu" as "liten aseh al hadavar"

Often we learn that a positive commandment is only the formulation of the Torah – saying the same thing in a positive way that "lo yera'eh" says in a negative way. The Even Kaspei speaks about this – that the Torah sometimes speaks of negative things in a positive formulation, and this makes a legal difference (positive commandment + negative commandment).

4. The Rambam's great innovation – nullification in the heart is a law in itself

The Rambam learns that "tashbitu" means one can fulfill it through nullification in the heart – "that he should resolve in his heart that the chametz is like dust." This is a tremendous innovation: where in the entire Torah is there such a concept that one says "I don't want to have something" and this changes reality?

5. The Rambam's reasoning – "tashbitu" is not an action, but a "shevitah"

"Tashbitu" is like "shevitah mimelachah, shevitah me'achilah" – shevitah is not an action. What can be not an action? That you nullify it. Just as you don't work, you don't eat – so you "don't have" chametz through nullification in the heart.

6. Dispute between Rambam and Tosafot – what is nullification?

- **Tosafot:** Nullification of chametz is like **hefker** – one gives up ownership. Tashbitu means literally – that there shouldn't be any chametz. Nullification (= hefker) is one of the ways to fulfill tashbitu, but also burning or making it ownerless.

- **Rambam:** Nullification is **not** hefker and not giving up ownership. It has nothing to do with ownership. It has to do with **significance** – one makes the chametz irrelevant, insignificant, "like dust." The person feels that the chametz is worthless to him.

7. The meaning of "not relevant" – disregard

The minimum "irrelevance" is: "I disregard it, I don't care." Not just I won't eat it – it no longer exists from my perspective. Like dust in the house – "lest drops of blood be found and it is in the king's palace" – are there flies in the king's house? It's not relevant, it doesn't exist for you.

8. "Tashbitu" and se'or

"Tashbitu" according to all opinions means the removal of chametz that is fit for eating – not chametz that is "defective chametz" (like se'or that one cannot eat). Se'or's value is not as food, but as a means to make other dough rise. If "tashbitu" is like "shabbaton" (= nullification), one can well understand how this works – one nullifies a half. But if "tashbitu" would have meant "teva'aru" (= physically burn), it would have been different.

9. The Gemara doesn't speak of a commandment of tashbitu

The Gemara itself doesn't say there's a commandment of tashbitu – it only speaks in the context of searching for chametz (that searching is rabbinic, because biblically nullification suffices). However, the Rambam derived from this a system regarding tashbitu.

[Digression: Comparison to nullification of idolatry]

Regarding **idolatry of gentiles**, a gentile can nullify it – he says "I no longer believe in this god" and it ceases to be idolatry. But **idolatry of a Jew** cannot be nullified. The distinction: regarding idolatry, nullification means the object becomes "canceled" – it's no longer a god. Regarding chametz, however, one cannot say "it's no longer chametz" – one can only say it's no longer food, it's ownerless/dust.

[Digression: Other nullifications in the heart]

Mi'un – regarding rabbinic betrothal, mi'un (a thought/declaration) helps. But regarding other things (like monetary obligations) one needs an action (a bill of divorce). The principle of nullification in the heart: it only works where the matter is "not having a connection with something" – **lo chashiva** – one considers it nothing.

[Digression: Foreign thoughts]

The **Kotzker Rebbe** is mentioned as saying one can nullify foreign thoughts like "dust of the earth." Nullification of a person (living being) is just like chametz – "tashbitu," one seeks thoughts.

[Digression: Searching for chametz – biblical or rabbinic?]

A position is mentioned (from Sifrei) that the Rambam learns from "abed te'abedun" that in the Land of Israel there is a biblical obligation to destroy, and from this we learn that searching is biblical. The colleague disagrees – he learns that when the Rambam makes everything positive, it's a sugya-style, not that it's actually a biblical commandment to search. Regarding chametz there is no "commandment to pursue it" as with idolatry – chametz is a prohibition, not a commandment to chase after. It's compared to the distinction between the Land of Israel (not chasing) and outside the Land (yes chasing) regarding idolatry, and the Rogatchover is mentioned as bringing an interpretation about "lo yachatz larutz."

Searching for Chametz – Rabbinic

Searching for chametz is rabbinic according to everyone.

Explanation: The Sages went back to the "real Torah" and made a rabbinic enactment that one must indeed search and burn. But the verse "tashbitu" itself means only the minimum – nullification in the heart.

Laws About Who Searches, When, and Where (End of Chapter 2)

Who can be appointed to search?

- **Women, slaves** are trusted regarding searching.

- Even a **gentile** – it's discussed whether he can say he searched (presumption of having been searched).

Upon whom does the obligation of searching fall in rental?

The obligation is upon **whoever had it on the night of the 14th** – whoever is there on the night of the 14th of Nisan.

If one leaves before Pesach or makes a storehouse

- If he leaves **intending to return** – he must **always search** (before leaving).

- If **not intending to return** – if he leaves **before the thirty days** before Pesach, he **doesn't need** to search.

What is the basis of "thirty days"?

Novel points:

- The thirty days before Pesach is when one begins **preparation for the holiday** – one begins learning the laws of Pesach, etc. Essentially, the **rabbinic enactment** of searching for chametz becomes as if **effective from Purim onward** (thirty days before Pesach).

- The **Gemara** asks: "These thirty days, what is the reason?" and answers: **"For Moses stood on the first Pesach and warned Israel about the second Pesach"** – Moses stood on the first Pesach and warned about the second Pesach, which is thirty days later.

- The innovation: The entire **obligation of searching** is a **rabbinic innovation** – one shouldn't rely on nullification alone, but should actually go search. The question is: when does the obligation take effect? One does it on the night of the 14th, but the **inception of the obligation** begins earlier. Therefore, if one leaves **after** the thirty days, it doesn't help – he already has an obligation, and he must search before leaving. **Tosafot** says the obligation takes effect thirty days before Pesach.

Chapter 3 – Searching for Chametz: Places, Doubts, Measures

General Basis of Searching for Chametz

Rabbinically one must actually remove – which means searching and taking away. This is not just nullification in the heart (the biblical minimum), but a physical removal.

Novel points:

- The matter of searching is not just "if I find chametz I should destroy it" – rather **one must actively search**. Why? Because one doesn't want to have any chametz on Pesach, one must make sure one doesn't have any.

- **Places where chametz is brought in** – places where one usually brings in chametz – one must go search. Places where it's not usual, one doesn't go in.

- **The Rambam's position – "lest he come to eat it":** The Rambam does **not** say that one must remove chametz "lest he come to eat it." He holds that searching is one of the **removals** – an act of removal itself. This fits with his position that **bal yera'eh** is a fence for eating – "lest he come to eat it." The entire matter of not having chametz is connected to the prohibition of eating.

Groups of laws in Chapter 3

1. **Places where chametz is brought in** – require searching (the basis).

2. **Doubtful chametz** – for example "he placed ten and found nine" – one knows almost certainly that there is chametz here, one must go search. **Innovation:** All these doubts can be understood as a category of "places where chametz is brought in" – a doubt of chametz makes the place into a place that requires searching.

3. **Clear cases** – where there is certainly chametz (last group of laws in Chapter 3).

Shamei Korah – High and Low

Law: "Shamei korah" – the ceiling (korah = ceiling of the house) must be searched, because chametz falls down from there. But deep in the ground one doesn't need to, because it doesn't come up.

[Digression – hint according to Kabbalah:] If one has an evil inclination in a high place, one must search for it – because it falls down. In a low place one doesn't need to search – because it doesn't come up.

Kipah Shel Or / Se'or Shetach Panav BeTit

The Law

Law: A vessel (kipah) full of se'or that one turned over and covered with mud – "kulo tach ba'aretz" – one doesn't need to search.

Position of the Geonim – "Like mere dust"

Novel points:

- The Rambam brings the language of **the position of the Geonim**: **"And it is like a stone, it is nullified, and it**

goes out from the category of food like mere dust" – it's like a stone, it's nullified, it goes out from the category of food like mere dust. This is a **unique position** – that the object is no longer food.

- **Why this fits with the Rambam's basis:** If everything is connected with **distancing from eating** – the main prohibition is eating, and all other prohibitions (bal yera'eh, bal yimatzei) were added – one can understand why "covered its surface with mud" helps: once it's covered with mud, nothing of the se'or is exposed, it's not relevant to eating, therefore it's as if it's under the ground or like dust.

- **This only fits if "tashbitu" doesn't mean actually in practice:** If "tashbitu" would have meant a physical act of removal, it wouldn't be clear why covering its surface with mud permits. But because "tashbitu" means **to remove chametz from the category of food** – a "defective chametz" – it's understandable that once it's no longer in the category of food, the removal has already happened.

Sidkei HaReichayim – Nullification in Reality

Law: Chametz in the cracks of millstones doesn't need to be searched.

Novel points:

- This is a **nullification in reality** – it became part of the vessel (a "plug"). This is not the same nullification as nullification of chametz in the heart – this is that the object itself is nullified.

- But perhaps nullification of chametz in the heart is also this way – that it becomes "sand," just as that becomes a plug. **All nullification perhaps works this way** – the object becomes something else.

Kezayit BeMakom Echad – Even in the Crack of the Trough

Rambam's position: A kezayit of chametz that is in one place, even when it's hidden in a crack of a trough (sedek ha'arivah), one is obligated to destroy.

Explanation: A kezayit is the measure that one must destroy. Even when it's hard to access, the obligation remains.

Novel points:

- According to Rabbi Shimon, what is the distinction whether it's "stuck" (hidden) or not? According to Rabbi Shimon, the chametz is still useful (one can make other dough from it), so what does it help that it's hard to access? The answer: The distinction of "stuck" is only relevant for less than a kezayit, not for a kezayit.

Less Than a Kezayit – Made to Strengthen vs. Not Made to Strengthen

Rambam's position: Less than a kezayit of chametz that is made to strengthen (to strengthen the vessel) – is exempt and one doesn't need to destroy it. But less than a kezayit that is **not** made to strengthen – one must indeed destroy.

Novel points:

- **Question:** If the measure of destruction is a kezayit, why must one destroy less than a kezayit at all? **Answer:** Because it's not nullified – it lies free and one can gather it with other pieces to a kezayit.

- **Distinction of made to strengthen:** When it's made to strengthen, it's nullified to the vessel – therefore exempt. When it's **not** made to strengthen, it remains a separate reality of chametz that can be gathered.

- **Two half-olives with a string:** If two half-kezayitim are connected with a string, one is obligated to destroy – because through the string they combine to a kezayit.

Half an Olive in the House and Half an Olive in the Upper Story – Law of Combination

Rambam's language: Half an olive in one place in the house and half an olive in another place – if they are not attached to the wall/beams, one must destroy them, because "lest he gather them" (perhaps one will gather them). But if they **are** attached to the wall or beams – one doesn't need to, since they are attached.

Explanation: The rabbinic obligation of searching for small pieces of chametz is based on the concern that one will gather them to a kezayit.

Novel points – a long dispute between the study partners:

1. **Side A:** The entire law here is rabbinic. Biblically one is already fulfilled with nullification. The Rabbis enacted searching, and the rabbinic obligation of searching is primarily for a kezayit or for what can become a kezayit. Therefore: when pieces lie free in the house, there is a concern that one will gather them – one must destroy. When they are attached to the wall – one will never gather them – one doesn't need to.

2. **Side B:** If the entire reason is "lest he gather" (combination to a kezayit), then when there is only **one** half olive in the entire house, one should also not need to destroy – there's nothing to combine! He held that a half olive itself is already a problem of half a measure forbidden from the Torah.

3. **Response from Side A:** The Rambam does **not** say that half a measure is the reason. He clearly says "lest he gather them" – the reason is the combination to a kezayit, not half a measure in itself. Therefore, one half olive alone in the entire house – one indeed does **not** need to destroy rabbinically.

4. **Question on this:** If "attached to the wall" is only a sign that one won't gather it, why does the Rambam need to add the detail of "attached"? It would have been enough to say "because it's far from each other"! But the Rambam adds that "attached to the wall" is its **own** reason – because it's actually hidden/nullified to the wall, not just because it's far.

5. **Practical difference:** What happens when a half olive is **not** attached to the wall but there are also no other pieces to combine? According to one side – one must indeed destroy (because "not attached" itself is already an obligation). According to the other side – one doesn't need to (because without combination to a kezayit there is no rabbinic obligation).

6. **Unresolved question:** In previous laws it clearly states "kezayit" as the measure of destruction. How does this fit with the implication here that even less than a kezayit (that is not attached) must be destroyed? This remained without a clear resolution.

Searching Holes and Cracks

The Rambam's language: One must search **holes and cracks**.

Explanation: One must search even in small holes and cracks.

Novel points:

- There is a discussion what "holes and cracks" means regarding the measure of chametz one is searching for. One thought that "holes and cracks" shows that one must search even for a small crumb of chametz (less than a kezayit). But the other pointed out that "cracks" can be large cracks that can hold even large pieces of chametz – so the expression "holes and cracks" doesn't necessarily speak of small measures of chametz, but of the **places** where one must search.

- The **Magen Avraham** says a proof that one must search even for less than a kezayit, but it remains uncertain whether this is implied from the Rambam himself, because in other places it implies otherwise.

Full Transcript

Laws of Chametz and Matzah – Chapter 3: Structure of the Prohibitions and the Mitzvah of Tashbitu

Introduction: General Structure of the Laws of Chametz and Matzah

So, we're learning that the Laws of Chametz and Matzah, we're holding at Chapter 3. We see in general, there is indeed chametz and matzah, and there are, as we've learned, the mitzvot, right? There are the prohibitions of not eating chametz, various forms, and then there is the mitzvah of eating matzah, and the mitzvah... In other words, the Rambam organized the mitzvot according to erev Pesach, the seven days, and erev Pesach. Yes, but the laws don't really work exactly that way. It goes roughly like that. That is, but the first category, the first six mitzvot, are all in the first five chapters, let's say. That is, all kinds of matters of the prohibition of chametz, and then Chapter 6 begins the mitzvah of eating matzah, and Chapter 7 is the story of the Exodus from Egypt, and the five types... the Seder night is Chapter 8.

So, it comes out that he shows that the first... It's not really true, that is, not certain. The first four chapters are certainly about the prohibitions of not eating chametz and hashbatat chametz. I think the fifth chapter also has a bit, so I'm not sure. The first five chapters. I had notes somewhere that I found from last year that we made on... Let me see if I find it. That's what I think. It says here that chapters aleph through hei are the prohibition of chametz. Yes, the first five chapters, most of the laws are about the prohibition of chametz. Interesting.

Yes. So, how is the matter of chametz divided? So that's what we need to understand. So the first chapter was, ah, one could say, apparently it should be more general, right? That's how one begins, in a general way.

Review: Chapter 1 – The General Definitions of the Prohibitions of Chametz

The first chapter we learned, I said, in other words, the Rambam always goes and begins with the definition, as it were, of the mitzvah, right? That's essentially what it is. He begins with the definition of the mitzvah. The mitzvah, ah, the prohibition, what is the definition of the prohibition of eating chametz? Yes, what punishments are there? When does one receive the punishments? Such sorts of things.

The Prohibition of Eating Chametz

So we said that there are, ah, three other mitzvot essentially, apparently. There is the prohibition of eating chametz on Pesach itself, the prohibition of eating chametz. There is also another prohibition of mixtures of chametz, an extra prohibition according to the Rambam, which already receives karet. On the first one receives karet, yes, according to the opinion of the Rambam. The other Rishonim, the Ra'avad and the Ramban, they all disagree, but the opinion of the Rambam is that there is one prohibition to eat any food of a kezayit of chametz on Pesach, he receives karet, and a chatat, like a... yes? Yes, yes. Karet and chatat.

There is no punishment, not like Shabbat. Shabbat has for example karet, chatat, and stoning. Here there is no stoning, there is no punishment by human hands. It's interesting. One must know which sins also have this punishment. I mean, karet means one receives lashes apparently, but... Lashes one receives on the prohibition, but not death by human hands, only karet by Heaven if it's intentional, and if unintentional he brings a sin offering. That is eating chametz.

The Prohibition of Benefit – Question: Does One Receive Karet for Benefit?

And that's one thing, and he also writes benefit, he doesn't say what happens if benefit is also karet. I never understood this. Here there is a prohibition of eating and benefit, also benefit. Benefit is forbidden from chametz, there is a derivation, "lo ye'achel," in the manner of eating. But does one receive karet for benefit from Pesach chametz as well? Benefit included in eating means is it the same thing, or that benefit was also forbidden? The language "included in eating" means apparently that it's the same thing, it's one thing. I don't know, I don't know.

So, law 1, law 2, it's not clear. There is... I see in the back that there are those who say that no, even lashes doesn't apply, it's only a prohibition. What does benefit is only a prohibition mean? So he brings, because one should have said apparently that there is a punishment. I don't know, I don't know what the explanation is. In any case, benefit is also not allowed, but he doesn't say what happens.

On this I explain, I don't know, I don't know. In any case, that's one prohibition, a prohibition to eat chametz, okay?

The Prohibition of Mixtures of Chametz – Dispute Between Rambam and Rishonim

Another prohibition there is, prohibition number one, that's the most basic thing, one may not eat chametz on Pesach. Another prohibition there is, to have chametz on Pesach, right? It says "lo yera'eh" and "lo yimatzei." There are distinctions, we'll see details of this in Chapter 4 with God's help. Chapter 4 speaks of details of "lo yera'eh" and "lo yimatzei," but Chapter 1 is only the general definition, one may not have chametz on Pesach, "lo yera'eh" and "lo yimatzei," two prohibitions. And understandably, if one transgresses, that he should receive lashes he must do an action, and therefore this is... okay.

Then, the Rabbis made that chametz she'avar alav haPesach, which was subject to bal yera'eh, it is forbidden in benefit forever. That's already a thing like a general rabbinic matter.

Discussion: Chametz She'avar Alav HaPesach – Is This a Fine?

Chavrusa A: Like one may not have benefit from work done on Shabbat, is this a kind of fine such a thing?

Chavrusa B: It's a fine, and we learn that the reason for the fine is so that one should not transgress bal yera'eh. So one shouldn't come to do bal yera'eh. It's like many fines. It's not simply a fine... What does a fine mean? A fine is like I give you a ticket. You cross a red light, you get a ticket. What's the point of the ticket? That you shouldn't cross the red light. You crossed, and you got through it with some trick, it's not even to say that you shouldn't eat it afterwards.

Chavrusa A: But this is already from the Torah. The distancing from the Torah doesn't say... You're saying a good reasoning. I see that the commentators saw the explanation. When the explanation is a verse, yes, the explanation is a text, one can say it that way. It could be that there's no contradiction. The law will already make from it an extra mitzvah. But just as there is the prohibition of the revelation, there is a distancing from the Torah.

Chavrusa B: No, the Torah also made a distancing from the prohibition, yes. It seems so, yes. And the plain meaning commentators that we saw last night or the night before certainly learn that the seeing is a distancing from eating. And it's not so hard to understand. I mean, you ask why is it different from all other prohibitions? The answer is because it's... I once wrote a whole piece of Torah about this, I don't see it here in my book. But that you shouldn't hold this by the ear, because you don't need the chametz. It's certain that if one learns here simple plain meaning of Scripture, it's certainly so. Yes.

In any case, okay, already. Then we learned that according to the Rambam there is another prohibition of eating mixtures of chametz, it's an extra prohibition. And in practice the prohibition is also only when one eats a kezayit of the chametz in the mixture. It's a very difficult interesting thing. And all other commentators say no, if you eat a kezayit you've eaten chametz. Not chametz itself, but the Rambam says that the mixture is already not chametz itself. And everyone else understands that no, this is actually chametz, only mixtures should have been a different thing. And what is it then? Then it's a dispute of Tannaim, and one didn't rule at all that it's forbidden, it's only forbidden perhaps rabbinically to something like that.

Okay, that's regarding mixtures of chametz. We spoke about half a measure, forbidden, also has details like the punishment, right? The general things, always the general things include these sorts of things. And very good.

The Prohibition of Eating Chametz on Erev Pesach – From Midday and On

Then we learned that there is, in short, two prohibitions from the Torah, or three you can say: the prohibition of eating chametz, the prohibition of benefit, the prohibition of mixtures of chametz. These are all things from the Torah according to the Rambam. Then there is a fourth prohibition which is also from the Torah not to eat chametz from midday and on. This is only eating, not benefit apparently, and it doesn't say that there are mixtures of chametz, and all other stringencies that we learned, it didn't transgress bal yera'eh and bal yimatzei, all the stringencies that we learned about chametz on Pesach don't exist on this prohibition of erev Pesach from six hours and on.

But from the Torah there is a Torah prohibition from oral tradition that "lo tochal alav chametz" means not to eat chametz at the time... One shouldn't slaughter the Pesach offering when chametz exists. And on this from the Torah there are also rabbinic decrees in time, right? That eating was decreed from six hours. One is one adds an hour, and then one still has fear of a cloudy day. Right, so basically one adds two hours, however exactly it works. Therefore there are distinctions that this is actually added, one may not have benefit also not. It says here one is actually added, and one is something interesting how the Rambam asks it. This is all from the commentators on the Gemara on page 84. Yes, but it shouldn't look like two hours were added. The Rambam doesn't want to say two hours were added. He says one hour was added, but one hour is actually... The one hour is something a matter, it's not actually a prohibition, it's a different kind of prohibition. It's a distinction, it's a distinction in benefit, it was forbidden in terumah, right? There is indeed a distinction.

Discussion: Plain Meaning in the Verse "Lo Tochal Alav Chametz"

In short, that's the point of the first chapter, the principles, the prohibitions of the three prohibitions, you can say: not eating chametz, bal yera'eh, with mixtures of chametz, and not eating chametz on erev Pesach also. Think, by the way, the simple plain meaning of the verse "lo tochal alav chametz" doesn't mean this at all. Simple plain meaning means, "alav" doesn't mean at the time of its slaughter. "Alav" means apparently, like every sacrifice, "al chalot lechem matzot yakriv korbano" it says by todah. Al matzot umarorim yochluhu. "Al" means, when one eats the meat, one eats it on bread. Perhaps literally one ate the meat on bread, like a sandwich, like Hillel. This is what Rav Sherira Gaon thought about the sugya. We mean that the Pesach offering, when one eats it at the Seder, one shouldn't eat it with chametz. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Doesn't mean at the time of slaughter. This is all according to interpretation. According to plain meaning it doesn't mean that. They should say according to tradition, but according to plain meaning... I'm just saying, we always think that sounds reasonable, that there is indeed chametz. I say, it's not the plain meaning in the verse, it's only an interpretation. Okay? Does it make any practical difference? It doesn't help you.

Chavrusa A: We're learning Scripture now, we're not in law.

Chavrusa B: Yes, but we need to know the plain meaning in the verse also. It's one of the things that's good to know. True. And also, that many times, after one finds the plain meaning, one can figure out that perhaps the law does indeed agree with it. It gives clarity in law many times. Okay.

The Mitzvah of Tashbitu – The Fifth Mitzvah

Okay, now, there is a fifth mitzvah. We've already learned four mitzvot, or whatever according to the count. And now there is a fifth mitzvah. This is the mitzvah of hashbatat chametz. There is a mitzvah "tashbitu se'or mibateichem." The general principle first of all of the mitzvah of tashbitu. The Rambam says, "tashbitu" means bitul belev. This is according to... yes, all these many Rishonim who disagree with this, so you shouldn't grab your head, let's say what it says in the Rambam.

Hashbatah means bitul belev, and that's what tashbitu means. It's very funny actually, because the Rishonim argue what bitul should work, whether it's with hefker, whether it's with...

Dispute Between Rambam and Tosafot: What Does Tashbitu Mean?

It's true, on this the Rambam says that tashbitu means bitul, and it's not so simple. It's very not simple, I'll remind you. All other Jews say, I'll remind you, that from the Torah one must indeed, it's not so funny. It's funny that tashbitu should then mean bitul.

Chavrusa A: That bitul is only one form of tashbitu? Or burning, or...

Chavrusa B: No, I mean, tashbitu means one shouldn't have, like a positive commandment of bal yera'eh. The Rambam makes it an extra thing. I'll remind you it's not clear now the dispute. Let's see what he says.

The Gemara says from the Torah bitul alone is sufficient, but searching for chametz is rabbinic. The Gemara never says that the Gemara has a mitzvah of tashbitu. The Gemara only says this on the matter of searching for chametz. It's not so clear. The Rambam understood this from the Gemara, and further. Ah, not simple matters.

Tosafot, for example, according to Tosafot also holds that tashbitu is one of hefker, that bitul is one of hefker. But in practice according to Tosafot it's not the plain meaning that tashbitu means to nullify. Tashbitu means that there is no chametz, literally. There is no chametz. One of the ways is either through burning or through nullifying. No, or through declaring hefker, which then you don't have. Declaring hefker. But it's not that the Rambam learns a completely different thing.

The Fundamental Question: What Does "Tashbitu Se'or" Mean from the Torah?

Speaker 1: That's the meaning, tashbitu means to nullify.

Speaker 2: No, not to nullify.

Speaker 1: The Sages come and changed, it's not changed. They said that one shouldn't rely, one should... It's a bit funny how the Rambam says it, because as if, when actually, what is the form? As if, I'm not starting to give advice, yes? As if, when Moshe Rabbeinu didn't want to give the words of the books, let's say, what does one do on erev Pesach? Nothing, right? No, one nullifies. One says "kol chamira." One must say it, whether it's enough in the heart I don't know. And the other side, I mean that we learn to think usually, as you say only afterwards, that the simple plain meaning is you're told no, the Torah says throw out the chametz. Already, if someone doesn't want... But, one must see.

"Tashbitu" — A General Language, Not a Specific Action

Speaker 1: Both the commentators on the Rambam, also the commentators on Scripture, say that the word "tashbitu" can mean "throw," as it says in other places, "lekarev tashlichenu," or more details what one should need to do. "Tashbitu" is very general, like "hashbatat hamalchut." You shouldn't have chametz. Not have. It doesn't say that you must do some action. Not have. Not have means the minimum. What is the minimum not to have? The minimum not to have, he must nullify. He should remove the ownership. If the simple plain meaning would have been that the minimum is any kind of way of removing from possession, so one could perhaps say. The most minimum is bitul belev.

Speaker 2: But one can say even less, righteous one. One can say that minimum means "tashbitu" from the power of chametz or from making chametz.

Speaker 1: No, you shouldn't have. You simply shouldn't have, literally. You shouldn't have chametz on Pesach. You whatever, it doesn't matter. It's not a positive commandment, it's a negative thing, not a positive thing. The Rambam does make it a bit of a positive thing. True, there's nothing to do, it's only like a bitul belev, but he makes it such an extra thing.

Comparison to Shabbat — "Hashbatah" Means Not Doing, Not an Active Action

Speaker 1: A tashbitu is not yet like Shabbat, right? Shabbat has a positive and negative commandment. You shouldn't do work, and you should rest. What does one do in order to rest? One nullifies the work in the heart? No, one does nothing, one doesn't do work. I would have said that one can say Pesach, there is a negative commandment, "lo yera'eh lecha chametz," and a positive commandment, "tashbitu chametz." Both mean the same exact thing, it's only strange... "Tashbitu" is not chametz. The Torah doesn't say "tashbitu." It could be that's what the Rambam says.

I'll tell you the most simple. After when the Sages added that one should indeed make an extra hashbatah. I'm telling you that what the Rambam says is not the most simple. The most simple is nothing. That the Torah says nothing. You shouldn't have chametz. It's your issue, it's not my issue.

Discussion: What Is the Minimum of "Tashbitu"?

Speaker 1: So about this the Rambam says, you'll know the most basic hashbatah, the easiest, the minimum, the minimum hashbatah that you nullify in the heart.

Speaker 2: No, no, that's not correct, but that's a great novelty, righteous one, again. Because the other option is that you must actually remove it.

Speaker 1: I'm saying, this is the minimum, because this is not hefker, lo yera'eh. Because according to you, "tashbitu" means nothing at all. Right? Minimum you can interpret in two ways. Minimum that you mean is... No, I'm saying that it could be that the Rambam holds like you, that "tashbitu" means nothing. And the Rambam just wants to tell you, what is the minimum nothing? What is the minimum nothing? The maximum nothing is what Chazal added, that you should burn it. The minimum nothing... It could be, it could not be that this is what the Rambam means. **"Mahi hashbatah zo ha'amurah baTorah?"** What is the hashbatah that is stated? Such a weak expression doesn't appear in the Torah. It means the minimum. What is the minimum how you should fulfill "lo yera'eh"?

Speaker 2: I understand, but you are using the word "minimum" differently than me. For me, the word "minimum" means how many chidushim are stated in this verse. According to what I'm arguing, the simple peshat, and I'm sure there are other Rishonim who learn this way, nothing is stated. It's "liten aseh al hadavar", as it were.

"Tashbitu" — A Positive Formulation of a Negative Thing

Speaker 2: In other words, many times we learn, a mitzvas aseh can simply be the formulation of the Torah. You can say the same thing in a positive way and in a negative way. Here it's stated in a positive way, as it were. It's a formulation. I saw that the Even Kaspi even talks about this, it fits with Aristotle, but you can talk this way. The Torah, sometimes, speaks of

negative things in a positive way. This is a sugya in the Torah, as it were. It makes a difference lehalacha, that it's a mitzvas aseh, and so on. Give me one second.

The Great Chidush of the Rambam — Bitul Belev is a Din in Itself

Speaker 2: But the Rambam adds a great chidush, that what? That "tashbitu" doesn't just mean that, that "tashbitu" means that one can, as it were, one fulfills it with a bitul belev. Where in the Torah is there such a thing that I should say "I don't want to have something"? It means to say, make yourself as if you don't have it. It's a huge chidush, no?

Speaker 1: It's not make yourself, if it works like... ah, wait, it's a chidush. You understand? It's not clear where this is stated at all.

Speaker 2: Yes, the Rambam learned this in the word "tashbitu". That "tashbitu" is not an action, "tashbitu" is a shevitah mimelachah, shevitah me'achilah. Shevitah is not an action. So what can not be an action? That you are mevatel it. Just as you don't work, you don't eat, you don't have, you don't have through belev. I make myself as if I don't have it.

Speaker 1: I understand, but it's still, as it were, I hear, there must be a sevara for this, because seemingly it's strange.

"Lo Totiru" and the Concept of Hefker

Speaker 1: "Lo totiru" is as it were here a clear thing of hefker. The Torah just says you shouldn't have. If "lo totiru" is peshat, it's not such a great chidush, because the Torah says you shouldn't have. If you're not mine, it doesn't belong to you. So it's a general thing that hefker works, you understand? But the Rambam says a new kind of thing, that it's a "liyosem belibo she'afar", I don't know, the whole Torah is a davar peleh seemingly. In other words, where does this kind of idea even come from? Do you understand my question? I want to ask this. Do you understand what I mean?

Digression: Bedikas Chametz — D'oraisa or Derabanan?

Speaker 2: When he says "tashbitu", I want to ask this. I see here, I'm learning now in Sifrei, I see he cites the halacha in the Rambam that we learned, **"aved te'abedun"**, he means that in Eretz Yisrael, **"mitzvah le'abdan beyad ad sheyeabed osam min ha'olam"**, he cites. But when the Rambam learns "aved te'abedun", he means that there you're obligated to be meva'er, not that you have to go actively searching. And he suggests that the Rambam learns that bedikah of chametz is d'oraisa, min haTorah le'abdan. If so, that we learn that a tevilah must be without a chatzitzah, one must do the action to get there.

Speaker 1: So, I don't agree with this, because I always learn that when the Rambam makes all things positive for you, it's also a matter of sugya, and he doesn't really hold that it's a mitzvah to be bodek. I'm not sure it's correct. It's so it shouldn't be. It's understood, one must do the action practically, but I'm not convinced that this is actually the peshat in what we're explaining.

Speaker 2: No, but here it says yes "mitzvah lirdof acharehah", one must search for it. Chametz is not a mitzvah lirdof acharehah, that's an issur.

Speaker 1: No, no, I mean it's less. I mean, with the Rabbinic ones must yes lirdof acharehem.

Speaker 2: It's interesting, just as we learned that in Eretz Yisrael and chutz la'aretz, so we learned.

Speaker 1: Yes, that's a thing. In Eretz Yisrael one doesn't have to chase after, in chutz la'aretz one does have to chase after, whatever the details of that are. It comes out that chametz is like the issur in Eretz Yisrael, and the Rabbinic ones, that is, "lo yechatz larutz", there's a Rashba about this. The Rogatchover brings it.

Speaker 2: I hear. I don't know, I don't know. In any case, you understand the point, it's an interesting thing.

Back to the Language "Hashbatah" — What Does It Mean?

Speaker 2: What can it have to do with the language "hashbatah"? Because for example the Targum translates "hashbatah" - "tevatlun". That "hashbatah" is a very minimal word, because "hashbatah" means not eating, not working. But "hashbatah" means not having, it doesn't mean being me'abed, it doesn't mean like "teva'arun", "te'abedun". It's still a language of not having.

Therefore Chazal sought how can one not have and not have to do major work? Rather one should be mevatel in one's heart, hefker, or whatever way it works. Without doing that. Or giving up ownership of it. Instead of you being busy with the chametz, you can do something with yourself, a small thing, a word that you speak out that has changed the reality.

And only then did Chazal go back to the actual Torah, and yes said that one must actually, they made miderabanan that one must yes search. But to interpret the word "tashbitu" they did only the minimum, that you shouldn't have. Just like the shevitah from melachah, the shevitah of a kehillah, just as you say "shevisas asor".

Speaker 1: But not having can mean that one must yes be meva'er, that's what I'm telling you. Here states another chidush that one doesn't even have to...

Speaker 2: No, but if so there doesn't stand in the Torah a positive language of go be me'abed, just as it could say "teva'arun".

Speaker 1: But it's like someone would say that on Shabbos one stops melachah, it still doesn't have to be mechashev. What kind of thing is this?

Speaker 2: No, no, no. When you are mevatel for Shabbos, you've given up ba'alus on it.

Speaker 1: No, I haven't given up ba'alus, what are you holding?

Speaker 2: That's not such a thing. That's Tosafos's peshat. That's... right, okay.

Dispute: Whether Bitul is Hefker (Tosafos) or Something Else (Rambam)

Speaker 1: What does according to the Rambam "yachshov belibo" mean? What does "mistalek" mean according to the Rambam? What did the Rambam think? How does it work? It's such a strange thing? You make yourself as if you don't have it?

Speaker 2: No, you don't have it.

Speaker 1: You don't have it?

Speaker 2: No. What is peshat according to the Rambam? According to the Rambam it's not completely hefker, but it's also something. Something such a kind of thing that the person doesn't feel the chametz is worth to him, or something. There must be something there. It has nothing to do with

ba'alus. It certainly has nothing to do with ba'alus. It has, you can say, to do with chashivus.

Speaker 1: What does it mean according to the Rambam? How does it elevate?

Speaker 2: Chashivus. I told you yesterday, just like... just like we learn... It makes sense, one can make it make sense. I'm just saying that it's a chidush, it's not the minimum.

Speaker 1: You come and you say that it's a chidush.

Speaker 2: It makes sense, one can make it make sense.

The Explanation of "Not Relevant" — Hesech Hadaas

Speaker 2: That one says for example, just as they said yesterday, that it says in the Torah "don't have chametz". What does "don't have chametz" mean? "Don't have chametz" means "own" not chametz. Okay, that's a chidush, because what's the problem of "owning"? Just as in Zevachim it says "lo yera'eh velo yimatzei", you shouldn't be involved with chametz.

Now, when I have, as you say, he asks you, "Do you have a piece of dust?" "I have." Yes, it's not relevant. The question is whether it's relevant. Make it so the chametz should be not relevant. How does one do that? It could even be that to do this with the Rabbinic ones must yes bitul chametz. That the Rabbinic ones, bedikas chametz with the Rabbinic ones, is yes even more strongly made that it's not relevant.

But essentially, as it were the minimum not being relevant is, I'm mesi'ach daas. Lo ichpas li. I'm not going to... not only I'm not going to eat it, it doesn't exist anymore from my perspective. That is, how can you say it doesn't exist from my perspective? Yes, you can say, why not? Just as you have dust in your house. "Shema yimatzei tipos dam vehi beheichal melech". In the king's house are there mosquitoes? You know? No, there aren't. It's not relevant.

Speaker 1: Anyway, okay.

Digression: Comparison to Avodah Zarah Bitul

Speaker 1: If so, it helps, you can't be mevatel just with the heart.

Speaker 2: What?

Speaker 1: Avodah zarah one can't be mevatel just in the heart. I don't know what other things. But avodah zarah is... one can be mevatel in the heart. Avodah zarah of goyim, if the goy says it's no longer avodah zarah, he gives it a swipe with his... whatever, yes, but...

Comparison to Bitul Avodah Zarah

Speaker 1: What does it mean, how can you say it doesn't exist from his perspective? Yes, you can say, why not? Just like dust in your house. **"Semamis beyadayim titpas vehi beheichal melech"**. In the king's house are there spiders, you know? No, there aren't. It's not relevant.

Anyway, okay.

If avodah zarah helps, one can't be mevatel just in the heart.

Speaker 2: What?

Speaker 1: But avodah zarah one can't be mevatel just in the heart.

Speaker 2: If the avodah zarah one can yes be mevatel in the heart, if the avodah zarah of goyim, if the goy says that it's no longer avodah zarah and he gives it a swipe with his whatever.

Speaker 1: But the goyim?

Speaker 2: Yes, but an avodah zarah of a Yisrael, one must understand that the matter of bitul avodah zarah means yes, I mean to say, it's assur behana'ah and so on, but if the goy stops serving, it's not anymore that it becomes nullified. I mean, the goy says, "I no longer believe in this god", it's no longer a god. Finished god, statue, we worship it.

One can't say it's finished chametz. One can only say it's finished something, finished eating in general, it's hefker.

Speaker 1: Right. But you can say it's similar. Bitul chametz, bitul belev. What other things can one be mevatel in the heart?

Speaker 2: Me'un.

Speaker 1: Who?

Speaker 2: Me'un. On a kiddushin derabanan me'un helps. But on other things one can't say, "No, I don't want to be obligated in this money." One must make a sefer kerisus. Right.

Speaker 1: Okay. On kiddushei derabanan, lekiddushin, okay.

Speaker 2: Okay, in any case, no, it's not relevant. In any case, no, one must find another thing where the matter is not having something, not having a connection with something, and that means simply that you don't hold anything. Something like that. Lo chashiva.

Foreign thoughts one must deal with this way.

Speaker 1: Yes. Okay.

Speaker 2: But with Rabbinic ones must burn them.

Why? One must say **"esh tukad ad avedon"**, **"yachid talmidei"**. Yes.

With the Reish one can do like the Butchatcher Rav said, and say that all foreign thoughts are mevatel.

Ke'afra de'ara.

In any case, also bitul of a person is only hefker ba'alei chayim, this is exactly like with chametz. It's tashbitu, one searches for thoughts. **"Minafshi achaprah al kol teha"**.

Transition to Chapter 3 — The D'oraisa and Derabanan of Mitzvas Tashbitu

Speaker 1: Okay. Let's begin chapter 3. No, I mean one must finish the chapter because it's good. Levels. Let's learn as we learn, that this is the d'oraisa and the derabanan of mitzvas tashbitu. Just like for example miderabanan one may not eat chametz even less than a shi'ur, that this is miderabanan. Eh, miderabanan one may not eat even chametz erev Pesach? You should know, miderabanan one must actually be mashbis. What does actually be mashbis mean? Is to search and remove. Yes? And therefore there are details of this. There are details that the Chachamim make things, they make with their whole schedule, you understand? The d'oraisa goes, no, there's also a schedule. In short, they make their whole schedule. One must do the leil 13th, leil 14th, yes? And one must, there are halachos how one must be bodek. What is the peshat of the halachos how one must be bodek according to the halachos?

In other words, the Rabanan say that you must search for the chametz, and two things: search to have and they should be meva'er. You should search, what does search mean? Search places, make sure that your places that are a bit prepared even that one brings in chametz, you should go search and be meva'er. Very good. And after that...

I mean here is the question when the obligation begins, the thing of thirty days. But before that there are all the doubts and... right? The doubts and whatever, I don't know exactly. Let's skip that for now, yasher koach. And if there is chametz erev Pesach, I know, one day in the middle they'll be very board, you'll learn that. Yes. You'll learn the sugya, because they're difficult gemaras. The Rambam tries his best, but the gemara is difficult. Yes.

In any case, there are here a bunch of cases of doubts. There's also the din of how chametz becomes batel betzedakah hareiseh, or when one made it for a bagel in cabinet the week. Now there's a din of... one minute, there's here... let's just try to understand. The Rabanan say you must search places... let's say the first point. You must search. The second point we'll learn be'ezras Hashem in chapter 3 more. You must search places where there can be chametz. That is, don't say... that's another thing, right? This is not davka davka bitul belev. This is davka... you must search. Just as we learned by avodah zarah, that if I'll find chametz, I should be meva'er it. No, the peshat is you must search. Why must you search? Because you're not supposed to have any chametz on Pesach, so make sure you don't have. In other words usually, right? The question is perhaps what the usually is. We said usually, that means here places where one brings in chametz, places where it's not usual we don't go in. But places where usually there is chametz, that you're obligated to make sure it's not there, one can ask by all mitzvos hateluyos if one is obligated mid'oraisa to search, you understand? I know.

The Rambam's Approach — Hashbatah and "Lo Yavo Le'ochlo"

Speaker 1: The Rambam doesn't say that one must remove it because perhaps "shema yavo le'ochlo". He doesn't hold this way, or it's not important to him because he doesn't say any reasons. No, he holds that it's one of the hashbatos, one should yes do. I added that the hashbatos, the basic kind of hashbatah is the minimum bitul, but hashbatah can also mean an act that one must do with bedikah, with bi'ur.

Speaker 2: Exactly, it could be that the whole hashbatah, that one says the whole "bal yera'eh" is "lo yavo le'ochlo". The gemara says this a bit once, but he doesn't bring this. It seems that it's more, exactly, that this is the hashbatah miderabanan, but miderabanan one must yes make hashbatah in this manner, in a manner actually physically being busy. So it's a bit implied. And yes, it could actually be about this, because the Rambam understands that the whole matter of not having is as a geder of achilah, "lo yavo le'ochlo". Exactly, completely plain like that. It's not simply so, you understand what I'm saying? Yes, wonderful.

So in my opinion. Right, and therefore, obviously places, there are certainly halachos. That is, the places, and therefore from something there are concerns, how should one place the chametz. Uh, sorry, what is... soon we'll talk about how one should place it. There is, what is if one sees later that there is too little chametz or too much chametz, it's obvious that it became again. It's very interesting by the way, not just a makom shehichnisu bo, it became again a place where you know almost certainly that there is chametz. If for example **"hiniyach eser u'matza tesha"**, you know that there is chametz there, you need to go search for it, right? A child you don't need to, but you know that it's actual crumbs, crumbs, crumbs. And what is if you know that it's not, you don't know? In other words, these are questions about places where you know for certain that there is chametz, right? It's a bit different, because earlier, you understand what I'm saying, from the laws of doubts and also the rest of the halachos from the Sukkah, avodah zarah matters, we spoke about the question of bedikah. Right? Here is... a place that is obligated in bedikah, for example, we're not concerned that perhaps there's a distinction, that all places are makomos shemachnisin bahem chametz according to the Rambam's interpretation. But afterwards there is a question, what if I know for certain that there is chametz? How do I know for certain? Because almost certain, from doubt. I have a doubt, perhaps there is chametz. Understand? About this it makes a bit of sense what we learned according to the Rambam's interpretation, that all these doubts speak about bedikas chametz. Because that is indeed the meaning of bedikas chametz. The meaning of bedikas chametz, a place where perhaps there is chametz, one must go search for it, right? Always it's perhaps. So in other words, you'll see, all these doubts you can say makes it in the category of makomos shemachnisin bahem chametz, understand?

And therefore, makomos shemachnisin bahem chametz need to be checked, correct? Therefore there is established, if there is actually a majority, one doesn't need to, perhaps there are places where there is a whole... there are two halachos that one must... there are several halachos that one must yes, several things that one doesn't need to. There is a way that one doesn't need to, which is not established, or it's dependent, there is even a way that one uses dependent sometimes not, I don't know clearly. But in any case, places where there is doubtful chametz, a normal doubt, need to be checked. Very good, I understand.

Clear Halachos — Shemei Korah, Sidkei HaReichayim

Speaker 1: Okay, afterwards we learned even clearer halachos, not even a doubt, right? The last group of halachos in chapter 3 was the places where it's not even a doubt, it's clear that there is chametz there. For example, in the ceiling one must search. "Shemei korah", not in the heavens, which says shamayim. Did you know that the korah is a piece of heaven? The ceiling of your house is the korah. And in short, one must check because it falls down. But deep in the earth one doesn't need to, because it doesn't come up.

From this one can learn a hint according to Kabbalah, understand? If someone has a yetzer hara in a very high place, then he must search for it, because it only makes you fall down. In a low place one doesn't need to search, because it doesn't come up. Okay, afterwards there is, already one doesn't need to search. Afterwards there is a matter of the sidkei hareichayim, which is perhaps a matter of bitul, right? Very interesting. The sidkei hareichayim is bitul like we learned, bitul like bitul chametz? No, it's a different kind of bitul, that it's batel b'metzius, it became a clod. Well, very good, perhaps that's also the bitul, all bitul works that way. That it becomes sand, just as that one becomes a clod, it becomes sand. Interesting. Okay, in any case, what is the principle? Can you tell me the principle of this? Because I don't know it.

Speaker 2: No. What is the klal hadevarim? When there are things that are... when are there things that are... when must one, in other words, let's preface the question for a second. What is a kipah shel or, by the way? What is the meaning? A

bench that was made from... I don't know what kipah means. Yes, a bench? No, kipah, he says he means a vessel. Ah, kipah. It means a thing full of se'or, one turned it over, one finished with the se'or, one turned it over, not just se'or alone, this is a clod of se'or that was turned over, one covers its face, one covered it with clay, that the se'or is kulo tach ba'aretz. Okay, so that's one thing. It means that there is a way, let's understand one thing. According to the way they learned that everything is a distancing from eating, one can understand you a bit. Once one has tach panav b'tit, it's already like under the ground, it's already like earth. If that's not so, what does it matter to me? It's covered with clay, I have a piece of se'or in my house. But if everything is connected to do with eating, one can understand it more easily. Again, yechidah hi shitah, that's what he's talking about here. I'm saying, but if the point is that everything is distancing from eating, the main prohibition is eating, and all other things were added, one can understand. Once tach panav b'tit, nothing of the se'or is exposed, it's not relevant to eat, therefore it's as if it's in a pit, or it's as if... he brings the language in shitas hage'onim, **"v'harei hu k'gon even, she'hu batel, v'nafka lei mitoras ochel k'afra b'alma."** Yechidah hi shitah, he shows that a person can... that the dough is not food, this is a stone made from se'or, but there you go.

And it also only fits with the fact that "tashbisu" doesn't mean actually in practice. Because if "tashbisu" would mean actually in practice, it's not clear that one would be able to permit this. No, "tashbisu" means food, means not... "tashbisu" means... I can understand how this works. But if one would say so, it would mean actually like mixtures. But it seems not, because another way, it seems that... again, according to all opinions bitul means, hashbasah means to eliminate chametz, which is food not chametz, which is defective chametz. So far, right?

Halachah: K'zayis in One Place – Obligation of Removal Even in a Crack of the Trough

Speaker 1: The se'or doesn't need to be a taste that one could eat, the se'or is that one should be able to make from it another dough. If the point is "tashbisu" like "shabbason", and therefore batel a half, one can very well understand how this works. But if one would say "tashbisu" means actually like "teva'aru", but it seems not, because another... it seems that... again, according to all opinions "tashbisu" means the elimination of chametz, which is food, not chametz which is defective chametz.

So, alright. Let me see, okay. Interesting going? Yes. Let me see a moment, I'll go... I'll go take my daughter... take the... okay, no, the women's thing I'll use. Do you want to try it? Do you want to try it and they'll ask if you can the women?

Speaker 2: Ah, I'm not going there.

Speaker 1: Okay, I'll take you later to women. Hello, Mendel tzaddik. Okay, continue. Very good. It's good to the matter.

So, the next thing was, after the matter of kipas se'or and mazon hametzora when it becomes batel to the clod, is the question of when is the obligation of bedikah? Ah, we have here the thing of chesaron bedikah, chesaron inui bedikah. One minute, so, that doesn't mean the principle. So, the principle is thus, the principle is thus: **a k'zayis in one place, even when it's stuck in a crack of the trough, is obligated to remove.** Why? Because seemingly according to Rabbi Shimon one can even use it, it's useful even, the problem is that it's stuck. It's stuck, what's the difference? If it's not a k'zayis, is to strengthen, it's different, to strengthen, and then it will enter into their dispute. There are many expressions in the Gemara, I see that it's a whole sugya.

Halachah: Less Than a K'zayis – Asui L'chazek vs. Lo Asui L'chazek

There are three other sorts of main points. There is one point which is if it's to strengthen or to seal, and not... it's stuck there, there is a concern that it will smooth the clod, the plate, the trough. In this situation, even in this situation, if it's a k'zayis, it's not batel, because one will take it back and one will make from it bread.

Speaker 2: Yes, different from kipas se'or, because there one doesn't see any plan from that it goes.

Speaker 1: Yes, one can also make that.

Speaker 2: Yes, here we're talking about mixtures.

Speaker 1: But if it's less than a k'zayis and it's asui l'chazek is exempt, and don't stand. But less than a k'zayis, when it's not to strengthen, generally less than a k'zayis, what is found not to strengthen less than a k'zayis, then if there is a thread that can connect, he is obligated. Why? Again, because it's a k'zayis.

Discussion: What is the Measure of a K'zayis?

Speaker 2: What is the measure of a k'zayis? Only a k'zayis must one remove, that's the point? Less than that is outside the measure? But here we see that less than a k'zayis one must also remove. Why here less than a k'zayis doesn't one need to remove? Because it's batel.

Speaker 1: No, it's asui l'chazek.

Speaker 2: Yes, we're only talking about a case where it's asui l'chazek. Well, and then is the question whether it should become forbidden as a k'zayis. It's not asui l'chazek, obligated to remove even less than a k'zayis.

Speaker 1: Yes.

Speaker 2: Well, why does one need the whole halachah of two half-olives in two places? We just learned that lo asui l'chazek one must remove even in one place.

Speaker 1: No, if it's two half-olives we're talking about a case when it is yes to strengthen, she'ra'o hara'ui lo, there isn't from the beginning. Ah, that's what he's talking about here.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: It's that, and such a case when it's less than a k'zayis is okay. The question is what means less than a k'zayis. About this one says, because one can say that the clod strengthens it, it becomes one, yes, for example by challah one says that the clod joins them all. I could say that in the whole clod there is a k'zayis, and one is obligated to take a piece that should be joined. Here, here. It's in short, one must have all things, one must have both less than a k'zayis, and less than a k'zayis means even not what one can connect it back with one piece, and both, let's see what goes to seal with the next halachah.

Halachah: Half an Olive in the House and Half an Olive in the Upper Story – Law of Joining and Stuck to the Wall

The next halachah says, in the house, in the house one must even without a... that there lie small pieces of chametz that together it's a k'zayis, in the house but one must even without a thread one must remove even less than a k'zayis, but in the

house and in the upper story and the like one doesn't need to, since they are stuck to the walls they are not obligated. So here we see yes that there is a way that it became batel in the house here, batel in the house here, batel in the house here, I understand that one must. Ah, so it's essentially lo yera'eh one must even less than a k'zayis, that's chatzi shiur is forbidden from the Torah. And the problem is only that when one joins them it becomes a k'zayis. If it's stuck to the wall, something for some reason it's a bit easier. Usually, if you see a half-olive in your house, you must remove it. Next to a half-olive you must remove it. Why? Because it's chatzi shiur. Yes?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: So it comes out. A half-olive you must remove. Why must you remove it? Because it's chatzi shiur forbidden from the Torah. Not so. But if it's stuck to the wall, then one doesn't need to, because so far you can't rely on the bitul.

Discussion: The Rambam's Language "Shema Yekabetz Osam"

But the Rambam says, the Rambam says in the language "shema yekabetz osam". It seems that chatzi shiur wasn't yet any problem. The problem is that when they come together. That's when it's stuck in the house. He says, that's one needs. Why is one needs? No, again, we're talking here about rabbinic. Everything is even after eight, perhaps he'll gather them. What's missing here from the words "shema yekabetz osam"? Why doesn't he say because it's a chatzi shiur? He says clearly in the next piece why. Come here, but that it's far, there is a way that he won't gather it, right? Then what? Then one may yes. If one has nullified it one may. But one may not without a bitul. Ah, so all these things are apparently halachos from the Rabbis. It has to do with the rabbinic obligation of bedikah. Indeed with the Torah obligation you already fulfilled with bitul. So now there is the problem of the rabbinic concern, and about this is the distinction, whether you can gather it together or not.

It seems that the rabbinic prohibition is yes, the Rabbis didn't also say that it must have a chatzi shiur. Rather the rabbinic prohibition is mainly on a k'zayis, or on what can become a k'zayis. So about this they say that a bitul is not enough, rather one must also have bedikah. It's not correct. According to the Rambam it says here clearly, I mean it doesn't say here clearly, but it's implied here, that if there is a k'zayis not stuck to the wall, a half-olive that's just on the table, you must remove it rabbinically. Even if it's only a half-olive. He doesn't say. He only says how a half-olive in one place, and with other places is more. Again, he says why the half-olive stuck one doesn't need to remove, if and if the half-olives are stuck to the wall or to the beams...

Speaker 2: No, but... no, no, he doesn't say here more than one half-olive. When there is only one half-olive in the whole house, one can rabbinically also not make bedikah on that.

Speaker 1: Tzaddik, he doesn't say clearly, he doesn't say clearly, but why does he say that one must? That there are other halves where there one said that they are joined, and the whole house you have yes a k'zayis, that would be the rabbinic obligation of bedikah. That's one thing. Therefore when it's far one from the other, one won't join them. And therefore it's not the same with it, one must add another thing.

Speaker 2: Right, according to you one could stop here. One can say, if it's far, one doesn't need to check.

Speaker 1: He doesn't say that, he says, since it's stuck... no, not it's far, he says "because of joining", one doesn't need to mean a practical eating. He says, since one joins, one looks at it as if in your whole house there is a k'zayis. Again, "mah she'ein ken devukim b'kosel o b'koros", finish the rest of the halachah. Read the whole thing.

What's interesting, because he adds the "devukim", what happens when it's half an olive in the house and half an olive in the upper story and it's not stuck? It just lies. There he says that one must yes. That's what I've been talking about with you for ten minutes, tzaddik. But what happens when there is only one half-olive and it's not stuck? One doesn't need to either!

Speaker 2: One must yes! We see that one must yes.

Speaker 1: I mean that not. He only says that half-olives would be a problem that you should look at it as one whole - he says that it's not, because it's stuck to the wall, therefore it will never become one whole. It seems if there is in the whole house everything together only one half-olive, one indeed doesn't need to!

Speaker 2: Why isn't it joined? Because it's far one from the other! That's the reason! "Half in the house and half in the upper story", one always joins things from the wall. The whole thing is that a wall one must even when it's in the wall, one takes it together. What's not so when it's far, one doesn't take it together. One has already solved the problem of gathering, and still everything remains something left over why one must add that one doesn't need only because it's stuck.

Speaker 1: What happens when one has only one half-olive in the house? Certainly one doesn't need to check rabbinically. It doesn't say here, tzaddik. I know you're not just a scholar, but it doesn't say so here, and the halachah is not so what it says here. You see as if the words are "because he gathers them together", that's the reason for the prohibition, no?

Speaker 2: No, that's the reason for prohibition when it's stuck to the wall, "since they're stuck to the wall", and it's not gathered, therefore one may. Therefore if one of the things is missing, it's not stuck to the wall, is even without gathering one shouldn't, so it comes out here. I don't understand what you're saying at all.

Speaker 1: So what does being stuck to the wall do? Does it make it harder to remove, or does it make it nullified to the wall, and therefore there would be a permission? The thing is that it's possibly one of these two things. It's not so clear to me. I think that "meshavev imo umekabetz osam" (gathering it together) is not really a practical problem, so it will become a k'zayis (olive-sized portion). What's the difference? I don't understand what the practical difference is in this. The fact is that the Rambam needs to add something, that when there isn't the problem of gathering, and it's a half-zayis, the reason why you're not required to remove it is because it's stuck. That's what he says. According to you, it doesn't come into this, it doesn't matter. Whether it's stuck or not stuck, it's less than a k'zayis anyway, so good Purim.

Speaker 2: No, less than a k'zayis, but when it's stuck there's a permission, if not you need to remove it. That's what it says here.

Speaker 1: And it's a problem, because in most earlier laws it says "k'zayis in a beam." What is this less than a k'zayis? I don't know. You can find other places where it says that only a k'zayis needs to be removed, I don't know. If you hold that one

must remove it, "meshavev imo umekabetz osam," will it then be stuck to the wall or will it become a k'zayis? It will become a k'zayis, right? I don't know, I'm not understanding something, I don't know what you want to say.

Speaker 2: What's the problem with "meshavev imo umekabetz osam"? So what will happen then? It will become a k'zayis, right?

Speaker 1: Yes, and then the Sages say you must remove it. What happened with the half k'zayis? This is a half k'zayis, this is exempt from... On a half k'zayis, when it's stuck to the wall, he holds you don't need to. And when it's not stuck to the wall? It's implied that you do need to. We're talking about him. He explains bedikah (searching). That's what's implied, I can't help you. Please, he already, the Charan HaShadchan says right away that one must even for small ones. Charan HaShadchan means a small crumb of chametz. He knows that. But he's not, he introduces a large chametz. A large chametz?

Speaker 2: Yes, we're not talking about a tiny hole, it's a large hole. Even a k'zayis is quite small, you're confused.

Speaker 1: Right, okay. A k'zayis is as big as an egg. Like half a matzah. Okay. In short, I don't know, I'm not sure.

Discussion on the Rambam's Language: "Chorin V'Sedakin"

Speaker 1: It's implied that you do need to, we're talking about him. It explains bedikah.

Speaker 2: No.

Speaker 1: That's what's implied, I can't help it. Please, he says **"chorin v'sedakin"** (holes and cracks), he says right away that one must even for small ones. **"Chorin v'sedakin"** means a small crumb of chametz. I know that. **"Chorin v'sedakin"** introduces large chametz.

Speaker 2: Cracks? Yes, we're not talking about a tiny hole, it's a large hole. Even a k'zayis is quite small, you're confused.

Speaker 1: Right, okay. A k'zayis is as big as an egg. Like half a matzah. Okay.

Speaker 1: In short, I don't know, I'm not sure. The Magen Avraham says this inference, but that's what's implied here, and in other places it's implied differently. So I don't know.

Summary of the Laws Studied

Speaker 1: Okay, now, let's continue. Let's finish at least, and say this. Okay, all of this.

After that there was the question, two questions.

Question A: Who Must Appoint a Searcher?

One question is, who must... no, one question is, who must appoint someone to be a searcher? Okay, it's a halachic question in the house, I don't know exactly. One question is, that chezkas bedikah (presumption of searching), chezkas baduk (presumption of having been searched). And another question, and even a slave or a non-Jew can say. He says yes, women and slaves.

Question B: Who Is Obligated to Search in a Rental?

After that there's a question, who is obligated to search in a rental? The answer is, whoever had it on the night of the 14th.

Question C: One Who Goes on a Journey or Makes a Storehouse

And after that is the answer, another question what happens if someone goes away before Pesach or he makes a storehouse, it's like this:

- If it's **with intention to return** he must search always

- If it's **not with intention to return**, if it's before thirty days he doesn't need to

Thus far the laws.

Explanation of the Matter of Thirty Days

Speaker 2: What's the meaning of the thirty days?

Speaker 1: It's like the custom, within thirty days it appears that preparation for the holiday begins. One begins to learn, certainly.

Speaker 2: Yes. As if the enactment of the Sages to search actually takes effect on Purim.

Speaker 1: Ah, about this the Gemara says, **"Hani shloshim yom mai ta'ama?"** (These thirty days, what's the reason?) The Gemara says, **"She'ra'ah Moshe omed b'Pesach rishon u'mazhir es Yisrael al Pesach sheni"** (That we saw Moshe standing at the first Pesach and warning Israel about the second Pesach).

Speaker 2: Right, but it's as if, here we're talking about the Rabbis, it's there by the Rabbis.

Innovation: When Does the Obligation of Searching Take Effect?

Speaker 1: The question is like, the point is like this, the whole matter, the whole obligation of bedikah is like an innovation from the Rabbis, they say you shouldn't rely on the nullification, you should go and search. Now, when do they say one should do it? The night of the 14th. But when does it take effect, when essentially does the obligation become? If someone has the obligation, it doesn't help that he goes away, right? He goes away before midday, yes? So the question becomes, when does the obligation become? The Tosafos, it becomes thirty days before, something like that.

Moving to Chapter 3

Speaker 1: Okay, now let's learn more topics about removal of chametz and the order, okay? Chapter 3, already.

Speaker 2: Was all of this a review of chapters 1 and 2?

Speaker 1: No, this can't be in chapter 3. Where, it was a long time the obligation. I don't remember, we didn't learn chapter 2 very well. The Torah always speaks, but no one learns such a thing well.

Um, let me make a stop and I'll make another recording.