

ממי מתניתין? אי רבי יהודה – חמץ
 סתמא קאמר, אפילו דגוי. ואי רבי
 שמעון –

After clarifying the opinions of Rabbi Yehuda, Rabbi Shimon, and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, the Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is the *mishna* taught? If one suggests that it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, this cannot be, as Rabbi Yehuda said leavened bread without stipulation that the leavened bread belong to a Jew, indicating that one may not even benefit from leavened bread of a gentile over which Passover elapsed. Therefore, since this opinion contradicts the statement made in the *mishna* discussed here, Rabbi Yehuda can be ruled out as its author. And if it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon,

Perek II

Daf 29 Amud a

דישראל נמי מישרא קא שרי. ואי
 רבי יוסי הגלילי – אפילו תוך זמנו
 נמי מישרא קא שרי בהנאה!

Rabbi Shimon also permits one to derive benefit from leavened bread after Passover even if it was owned by a Jew. And if the *mishna* follows the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, he would permit one to derive benefit from it even during Passover.

אמר רב אחא בר יעקב: לעולם רבי
 יהודה היא, ויליף שאור דאכילה
 משאור דראייה. מה שאור דראייה –
 שלך אי אתה רואה, אבל אתה רואה
 של אחרים ושל גבוה – אף שאור
 דאכילה, שלך אי אתה אוכל, אבל
 אתה אוכל של אחרים ושל גבוה.

Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said: Actually, it is possible to explain that the *mishna* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and he derives the restrictions pertaining to the eating of leaven from the restrictions relating to seeing leaven. The prohibition against seeing leaven is worded: "It shall not be seen by you." It is understood to mean that you should not see your own or another Jew's leaven. But you may see leaven that belongs to others, i.e., gentiles, and leaven consecrated to God. Similarly, with regard to the prohibition against eating leaven that was owned by a Jew during Passover after Passover, you may not eat your own leavened bread, but you may eat the leavened bread of others or the leaven consecrated to God after Passover.

ובדין הוא דאיבעי ליה למיתנא
 דאפילו באכילה נמי שרי, ואידי
 דתנא דישראל אסור בהנאה –
 תנא נמי דגוי מותר בהנאה. ובדין
 הוא דאיבעי ליה למיתנא דאפילו
 בתוך זמנו מותר בהנאה, ואידי
 דתנא דישראל לאחר זמנו – תנא
 נמי דגוי לאחר זמנו.

And by right it should have taught that even the eating of leavened bread belonging to a gentile is permitted after the conclusion of Passover, but since the *tanna* taught that it is forbidden to derive benefit from leavened bread belonging to a Jew after Passover, he also taught that it is permitted to derive benefit from leavened bread belonging to a gentile. However, one should understand that it is permitted to eat this leavened bread as well. And similarly, by right it should have taught that even during Passover it is permitted to derive benefit from leavened bread that belongs to gentiles. But since the *tanna* taught about the leavened bread belonging to a Jew after Passover, he also taught about the leavened bread belonging to a gentile after Passover. Thus, one should not infer *halakhot* from the exact formulation of these details in the *baraita*, but rather understand that the *mishna* follows Rabbi Yehuda's opinion.

רבא אמר: לעולם רבי שמעון היא,
 ורבי שמעון קנסא קניס הואיל ועבר
 עליה בבל יראה ובל ימצא.

Rava said: This is not so. Actually our *mishna* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon. However, this is difficult, as Rabbi Shimon states that it is permitted for a Jew to derive benefit from leavened bread that had been owned by another Jew during Passover, while our *mishna* explicitly states that this is forbidden. This can be resolved by explaining that Rabbi Shimon argues that it is permitted only according to Torah law. However, one who intentionally commits such a transgression incurs a penalty. Since he transgressedⁿ the prohibition it shall not be seen and the prohibition it shall not be found, the Sages decreed that it is forbidden for him to derive benefit from this leavened bread.^h

NOTES

Since he transgressed – הואיל ועבר עליה: This statement should not be understood as meaning that he actually violated the commandment of seeing leavened bread. Rabbi Shimon fines him even in a case where he might come to commit such a transgression, such as when the leavened bread was in a gentile's possession over Passover (see Ritva). Some claim that, as with other cases of fines, this fine applies only to one who intentionally violated this commandment, and therefore the food would be permitted to one who acted unwittingly or under duress. Similarly, it would be permitted to one who did not violate the commandment. This, however, does not appear to be the case in the Gemara (*Mikhtam*).

HALAKHA

Leavened bread over which Passover has elapsed – חמץ
 שעבר עליו הפסח: One may not derive benefit from leavened
 bread that was under Jewish ownership during Passover due

to a rabbinically instituted fine, in accordance with the opinion
 of Rabbi Shimon, as explained by Rava (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*,
Hilkhot Hametz UMatza 1:4).

בְּשֵׁלֶמָא לְרַבָּא – הֵיִינוּ דְקִתְנִי שְׁל
 יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲסוּר, מְשוּם שְׁנֵאמַר "לֹא
 יֵרָאֶה". אֲלֵא לְרַב אַחָא בְרַי יַעֲקֹב –
 מְשוּם "לֹא יֵאָכֵל חֶמֶץ" מִיַּבְעֵי לֵיהּ!

The Gemara comments: **Granted, according to the opinion of Rava, this explanation is consistent with that which was taught in the mishna: Leavened bread that belonged to a Jew is forbidden because it is stated: "It shall not be seen"** (Exodus 13:7). According to this explanation, the connection between the prohibition against deriving benefit from leavened bread that was owned by a Jew during Passover and the verse prohibiting seeing leaven during Passover is clear. The prohibition against deriving benefit from this leavened bread is a rabbinically instituted fine for transgressing the Torah prohibition of "It shall not be seen." **But according to the opinion of Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov, which states that our mishna follows the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and which renders forbidden by Torah law deriving benefit from leavened bread that was owned by a Jew during Passover, why is this verse cited? The mishna should have said that it is forbidden due to the verse "Leavened bread shall not be eaten"** (Exodus 13:3), as that is the verse from which Rabbi Yehuda derives this prohibition.

מִי סְבֵרַת אֲסִיפָא קֵאִי? אַרִישָׁא קֵאִי,
 וְהִכִּי קֵאמַר: חֶמֶץ שֶׁל גּוֹי שֶׁעָבַר עָלָיו
 הִפְסָח – מוֹתֵר בְּהֵנָּא, מְשוּם שְׁנֵאמַר
 "לֹא יֵרָאֶה לָךְ" – שְׁלֵךְ אֵי אַתְּהָ רוּאָה,
 אֲבָל אַתְּהָ רוּאָה שֶׁל אַחֵרִים וְשֶׁל
 גְּבוּהָ. וְיִלִּיף שְׂאוֹר דְּאֲכִילָה מִשְׂאוֹר
 דְּרֵאִיָּה.

The Gemara answers: **Do you hold that this proof is referring to the latter clause of the mishna, where the prohibition against deriving benefit from leavened bread owned by a Jew is discussed? It is referring to the first clause of the mishna, which discusses permission to derive benefit from leavened bread owned by a gentile, and this is what it is saying: Leavened bread of a gentile, over which Passover has elapsed, i.e., that remains after the conclusion of Passover, it is permissible to derive benefit from it, due to the verse where it is stated: "It shall not be seen by you."** This indicates that **you may not see your own leaven, but you may see leaven that belongs to others and leaven consecrated to God. And he derives the details about the prohibition of eating leaven from the prohibition of seeing leaven.** The verse "It shall not be seen by you" should be understood as an explanation of what is permitted and not as an explanation of what is forbidden.

וְאִדּוּ לְטַעֲמֵיהוּ: דְּאִיתְמַר, הָאוּכֵל
 שְׂאוֹר שֶׁל גּוֹי שֶׁעָבַר עָלָיו הִפְסָח,
 לְדַבְרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, רַבָּא אָמַר: לוֹקָה,
 וְרַב אַחָא בְרַי יַעֲקֹב אָמַר: אֵינוֹ לוֹקָה.

The Gemara comments that Rava and Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov **follow their line of reasoning. For it was stated that they dispute this issue: With regard to one who eats leaven of a gentile over which Passover has elapsed, i.e., that remains after the conclusion of Passover, according to the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, Rava said: He is flogged, as he has violated a Torah prohibition. And Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: He is not flogged.**

רַבָּא אָמַר: לוֹקָה, לָא יִלִּיף רַבִּי יְהוּדָה
 שְׂאוֹר דְּאֲכִילָה מִשְׂאוֹר דְּרֵאִיָּה. וְרַב
 אַחָא בְרַי יַעֲקֹב אָמַר: אֵינוֹ לוֹקָה, יִלִּיף
 שְׂאוֹר דְּאֲכִילָה מִשְׂאוֹר דְּרֵאִיָּה.

The Gemara explains: **Rava said that according to Rabbi Yehuda, he is flogged, as Rabbi Yehuda does not derive the prohibition against eating leaven from the prohibition against seeing leaven.** Instead, he derives the prohibition from a verse that does not use the words "to you," and therefore leavened bread owned by a gentile over Passover is forbidden in all circumstances. **Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: He is not flogged, as Rabbi Yehuda learns the prohibition against eating leaven from the prohibition against seeing leaven, and thus it is limited to leavened bread owned by a Jew.**

וְהָדֵר בֵּיהּ רַב אַחָא בְרַי יַעֲקֹב מֵהֵיא, וְהָדֵר
 דְּתַנְיָא: הָאוּכֵל חֶמֶץ שֶׁל הַקֹּדֶשׁ
 בְּמוֹעֵד – מְעַל, וְיֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים: לֹא מְעַל.

The Gemara notes: **Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov retracted that position on this matter. As it was taught in a baraita: One who eats consecrated leavened bread during the festival of Passover is guilty of misuse of consecrated items. If one performed this action unintentionally, then he must offer a guilt-offering to atone for using a consecrated item for non-sacred purposes. And some say: He is not guilty of misuse of consecrated items.**

NOTES

מֵאֵן יֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים – referring to whom is the phrase some say referring – Although the Sages generally assume that the term "others" is referring to Rabbi Meir, and the term "some say" is referring to Rabbi Natan, there were cases where it was clear to the Sages of the Talmud that this principle did not apply, and consequently, in this case they asked to whom the phrase "some say" refers (*Tosafot*).

מֵאֵן יֵשׁ אוֹמְרִים? אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: רַבִּי נְחוּנְיָא בֶּן הַקָּנָה הֵיא. דְּתַנְיָא: רַבִּי נְחוּנְיָא בֶּן הַקָּנָה הָיָה עוֹשֶׂה אֶת יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים כְּשַׁבָּת לְתַשְׁלוּמֵין.

The Gemara asks: To whom is the phrase in the *baraita*: **Some say, referring?**^{2N} **Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is Rabbi Neḥunya ben HaKana. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Neḥunya ben HaKana would render the status of Yom Kippur the same as that of Shabbat with regard to payment for damage caused by a person in violation of the prohibitions of that day.**

Is liable to receive the death penalty and exempt – מתחייב – בנפשו ופטור: This is not simply an application of the principle: He receives the greater of the two penalties, that one who committed multiple transgressions is exempt from punishment for the less severe crime. Rather, it is a Torah decree that is derived from the verses themselves, and the various Sages differ as to which verses it is derived from. The decree states that one who is liable to be punished with the death penalty for a specific offense is exempt from paying for damage that he caused through the same action. This exemption applies even when the death penalty is not implemented for lack of witnesses, a warning, or any other reason. So long as the damaging action was simultaneous with a transgression of this nature, he need not pay for damage. This concept serves as the basis for Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana's statement, which is an extension of this principle.

HALAKHA

Redemption of consecrated items – פְּדוּיֵן קִדְּשִׁים – One may not redeem consecrated items that are unfit for human consumption in order to feed them to dogs. Instead, such items should be left untouched and, if necessary, should be buried (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 2:10).

מה שבת, מתחייב בנפשו ופטור
מן התשלומין – אף יום הכפורים
מתחייב בנפשו ופטור מתשלומין.

Just as one who desecrates **Shabbat** by intentionally causing damage to his fellow's property, e.g., by lighting his stack of grain on fire, is **liable** to receive the **death** penalty, since one who intentionally desecrates Shabbat is punished by stoning and is therefore **exemptⁿ from payment**, the basis for this exemption being the principle that after committing multiple transgressions, one is punished only with the most severe punishment; **so too**, one who causes damage by desecrating **Yom Kippur** is **liable** to receive the **death** penalty, as this violation is punished with *karet*, i.e., spiritual death at the hand of Heaven, **and is therefore exempt from payment**. According to this position, one who eats leavened bread during Passover and is deserving of *karet* should also be exempt from other punishments, including the penalty for misuse of consecrated items. In any case, it is clear that both Sages mentioned in the *baraita* agree that leavened bread has monetary value. This must be due to the fact that one is permitted to derive benefit from it after Passover. Therefore, it appears that they both accept Rabbi Shimon's position.

רב יוסף אומר: בפודין את הקדשים
להאכילן לכלבים קמיפלגי.

Rav Yosef said: The dispute mentioned in this *baraita* should be understood differently. Both *tanna'im* in the *baraita* accept the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, which states that one may derive benefit from leavened bread during Passover, and thus, in principle, one should be permitted to derive benefit from this consecrated leavened bread. Yet, unlike non-sacred leavened bread, which one may sell to gentiles or feed to dogs, it is prohibited to use consecrated leavened bread in this way. Therefore, the question whether this leavened bread has any monetary value depends on the question whether **one may redeem consecrated items in order to feed them to dogs,**ⁿ and it is about this point that the *tanna'im* disagree.

מאן דאמר מעל, קסבר: פודין את
הקדשים להאכילן לכלבים. ומאן
דאמר לא מעל – קסבר: אין פודין.

The one who said that he **misused** consecrated items by using this leavened bread during Passover **holds** that **one may redeem consecrated items in order to feed them to dogs**. Because the food may be redeemed for this purpose, the consecrated leavened bread does have some monetary value, and therefore using it is considered misuse of consecrated items. **And the one who said that he did not misuse** consecrated items **holds** that consecrated property may **not be redeemed** for this purpose, but only in order to provide food for a Jewish person. In this case, since it is forbidden to eat this leavened bread during Passover, the consecrated leavened bread has no value at all at this time. Therefore one who eats such leavened bread is not guilty of misuse of consecrated items.

רב אחא בר רבא תנא לה

The Gemara comments: Rav Aḥa bar Rava taught

Perek II

Daf 29 Amud b

להא שמעתא משמיה דרב יוסף
בהא לישנא: דכולי עלמא אין פודין
את הקדשים להאכילן לכלבים,
והכא בהא קמיפלגי: בדבר הגורם
למזון, כמזון דמי.

this *halakha* in the name of Rav Yosef with the following formulation: **Everyone agrees that one may not redeem consecrated items in order to feed them to dogs. And here, they disagree** with regard to the question of whether **an item that can cause a financial loss is considered to be of monetary value**. The Sages disagree about the status of an object that does not have any present value but if lost or destroyed will cause the owner financial loss. In other words, they disagree as to whether such an item is considered to have inherent value. This dispute can be applied to our discussion of the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who states that one is permitted to eat leavened bread after Passover even if it was owned by a Jew.

דָּבַר הַגּוֹרֵם – An item that can cause a financial loss – **לְמִמּוֹן**: An item that will lead to a financial loss if destroyed, such as a promissory note, or something that will have value in the future, is treated as though it has monetary value. Therefore, if a person damages or destroys such an item he is obligated to reimburse its owner for its loss (*Shulhan Arukh, Hoshen Mishpat* 386:1).

A prohibited mixture – תַּעֲרוּבַת אִיסוּר: Most items prohibited by the Torah, with certain notable exceptions, are nullified once they fall into a mixture, as long as they do not give flavor to it, which in practice is assessed as one part in sixty. This applies both when the mixture is the same type as the prohibited item and when it is of a different type, as the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan and Reish Lakish when they disagree with Rav and Shmuel (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 98:1).

NOTES

A mixture with a forbidden food – תַּעֲרוּבַת אִיסוּר: The many issues that arise when a portion of a prohibited food is mixed together with permitted foods are discussed at great length in tractates *Avoda Zara* and *Zevachim*. Numerous distinctions exist, based on the status of the prohibited food that fell in, the mixture into which it fell, and the severity of the prohibition attached to the prohibited food. However, the general principle behind these laws is that the prohibited item is nullified when it is mixed with a majority of permitted food to the extent that one considers it as though it were no longer present. However, there are several exceptions to this rule when considering an important object, such as a piece of meat fit to serve guests, a whole creature, etc. Similarly, a food might not be able to be nullified because its prohibited status can be changed to a permitted one via other means, such as a change in time or place, or a relevant action.

The principles governing mixtures are also related to the principles governing cases of uncertainty, as it is not known exactly which objects in the mixture are prohibited. However, the principle of nullification is effective to a greater extent than the principles governing cases of uncertainty, such that once an object is nullified in a mixture it is considered as though it has entirely disappeared within the majority of permitted objects, and there is no longer cause for concern with regard to its presence.

מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר מֵעַל – קָסְבֵּר: דָּבַר הַגּוֹרֵם לְמִמּוֹן – בְּמִמּוֹן דְּמִי. וּמֵאֵן דְּאָמַר לֹא מֵעַל – קָסְבֵּר: דָּבַר הַגּוֹרֵם לְמִמּוֹן – לֹא בְּמִמּוֹן דְּמִי.

רַב אַחָא בְּרַי יַעֲקֹב אָמַר: דְּכוּלֵי עֲלֵמָא דְּבַר הַגּוֹרֵם לְמִמּוֹן – בְּמִמּוֹן דְּמִי. וְהִכָּא בְּפִלּוּגְתָא דְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן קָמִיפְלִגִי. מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר לֹא מֵעַל – כְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה, וּמֵאֵן דְּאָמַר מֵעַל – כְּרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן.

וְהָא רַב אַחָא בְּרַי יַעֲקֹב הוּא דְּאָמַר דְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה יִלְיָף שְׂאוֹר דְּאִכִּילָהּ מִשְׂאוֹר דְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה! אֵלָּא: הֲדַר בֵּיהּ רַב אַחָא בְּרַי יַעֲקֹב מֵהֵיאָא.

רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: דְּכוּלֵי עֲלֵמָא אֵין פּוֹדִין, וְדָבַר הַגּוֹרֵם לְמִמּוֹן לֹא בְּמִמּוֹן דְּמִי, וְהִכָּא בְּפִלּוּגְתָא דְּרַבֵּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי וְרַבֵּי קָמִיפְלִגִי. מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר מֵעַל – כְּרַבֵּי יוֹסֵי, וּמֵאֵן דְּאָמַר לֹא מֵעַל – כְּרַבֵּינָן.

אָמַר רַב: הִמְצָא בְּזַמְנוֹ, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – אִסוּר. שְׂלֵא בְּזַמְנוֹ, בְּמִינוֹ – אִסוּר, שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – מוּתָר.

The Gemara explains: **The one who said that he misused** consecrated property by using consecrated leavened bread during Passover **holds that an item that can cause a financial loss^h is considered to be of monetary value.** Although the leavened bread is currently worthless, it can be eaten after Passover and will have some value at that time. It is therefore considered to have monetary value now, such that one who uses it is guilty of misuse of consecrated items. **And the one who said that he did not misuse** consecrated property **holds that an item that can cause a financial loss is not considered to be of monetary value.** Therefore, since the leavened bread is currently worthless, one who uses it would not be guilty of misuse of consecrated property.

Rav Aha bar Ya'akov explains the issue as follows: **Everyone agrees that an item that can cause a financial loss is considered to be of monetary value, and here they disagree with regard to the same point of dispute as Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon.** The opinion of the one who said that he did not misuse consecrated items is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that one may not derive benefit from leavened bread that was owned by a Jew during Passover. Thus, the consecrated leavened bread is worthless, since it will remain prohibited after Passover as well. **And the one who said that he misused** consecrated items is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who maintains that one may derive benefit from leavened bread after the conclusion of Passover even if it was owned by a Jew during Passover. Therefore, the consecrated leavened bread is considered to be of monetary value, and one who uses it is guilty of misuse of consecrated items.

The Gemara raises a challenge: **But isn't it Rav Aha bar Ya'akov who said that Rabbi Yehuda derives the details of the prohibition against eating leaven from the details of the prohibition against seeing leaven?** Just as it is permitted to see the leavened bread of a gentile or of God, so too, it is permitted to eat this type of leavened bread after Passover. Therefore, consecrated leavened bread would be permitted after Passover even according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. **Rather, it should be understood that Rav Aha bar Ya'akov retracted that explanation of Rabbi Yehuda's opinion, and agrees with Rava, who explains that Rabbi Yehuda maintains that any leavened bread in existence during Passover is forbidden afterward.**

Rav Ashi said that everyone agrees that one does not redeem consecrated property in order to feed it to dogs, and similarly, everyone agrees that **an item that can cause a financial loss is not considered to be of monetary value.** **And here, in this baraita, they disagree with regard to the same point of dispute as do Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and the Rabbis.** The opinion of the one who said that he misused consecrated items by eating the consecrated leavened bread is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, who maintains that one may derive benefit from leavened bread that belongs to a Jew even during the seven days of Passover. Therefore, since the leavened bread has some value, one is guilty of misuse of consecrated items by using it. **And the opinion of the one who said that he did not misuse** consecrated items is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who maintain that one may not derive benefit from leavened bread during Passover, thus rendering the consecrated leavened bread worthless. Although it may have some value after Passover, an item that can cause a financial loss is not considered to be of monetary value, and therefore it is presently considered to be worthless.

Rav said: With regard to leavened bread that becomes mixed with permitted food, the following distinction applies. **During its time of prohibition, i.e., during the seven days of Passover, leavened bread is forbidden whether it is mixed with its own type,** for example, when leavened flour is mixed with *matza* flour or when unleavened *matza* is mixed with leavened *matza*, **or it is mixed with another type of substance. Not during its time of prohibition, but rather after Passover, if it is mixed with its own type of substance, then it is prohibited.** However, if it is mixed with another type of substance, then it is permitted.^{HN}

Gives flavor – **נותן טעם**: Usually, when forbidden food is mixed with permitted food, and the flavor of the forbidden food can no longer be detected, the mixture is permitted. A mixture of this kind may be given to a non-Jewish cook to determine whether or not the flavor of the non-kosher ingredients is noticeable. If this is not possible, the mixture is presumed to be kosher if it contains at least sixty times as much permitted as forbidden food, as the Sages assessed that no substance can give flavor at this ratio.

Leavened bread that gives flavor – **חמץ בנותן טעם**: The early commentaries ask why it is necessary for Rabbi Yohanan to state that a small amount of leavened bread makes the mixture forbidden, given the principle that an item that can be permitted by other means can never be nullified. As the *halakha*, which is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, is that leavened bread is permitted after the conclusion of Passover, it is considered an item that can be permitted by other means, and therefore any amount of leavened bread will cause the mixture to become forbidden. They answer that apparently Rabbi Yohanan does not render leavened bread permitted after Passover, and therefore this principle does not apply in this case (Ramban; *Milhemet Hashem*).

Any amount of leavened bread – **חמץ במשהו**: Several different explanations are offered as the rationale behind this stringency. Some say that because the leavened bread will be permitted after Passover it is considered to be a forbidden item that can be permitted via other means, with regard to which the *halakha* is more stringent. Others say that since one is permitted to eat leavened bread during the rest of the year, it is logical that one is especially strict about it during Passover in order to prevent himself from accidentally eating it. Still others suggest that this stringency is directly connected to the punishment of *karet* and the prohibition against seeing leavened bread, neither of which applies to most other forbidden items (*Me'iri*).

במאי עסקינן? אילימא בנותן טעם, שלא בזמנו שלא במינו מותר? הא יהיב טעמא!

The Gemara asks: **With what are we dealing? If you say that there is enough leavened bread such that it gives flavor^N to the mixture, i.e., at least one part in sixty, then if it is not during its time and mixed with another type of substance, why is it permitted? Doesn't it give flavor to the mixture, and, as one who eats this mixture will distinguish the forbidden flavor, the entire mixture is forbidden?**^N

אלא במשהו. חמץ בזמנו בין במינו בין שלא במינו אסור, רב לטעמיה. דרב ושמואל דאמרי תרוניהו: כל איסורין שבתורה, במינו – במשהו, שלא במינו – בנותן טעם.

Rather, this case is dealing with any amount, a minimal quantity of leavened bread^N that has been mixed with a large quantity of matza. The *halakha* in this case is that **leavened bread during its time of prohibition is forbidden, whether it is mixed with its own type of substance or with another type of substance**. This statement of Rav conforms to his line of reasoning as follows: **As it is Rav and Shmuel who both say:** With regard to any foods forbidden by the Torah that become mixed with permitted foods, if the permitted food is of its own type, such that it is impossible to distinguish one from another, then even any amount of the prohibited substance renders the entire mixture prohibited. However, if the forbidden food was mixed with another type of substance, then the mixture becomes prohibited only when there is enough of the forbidden item to give flavor to the mixture.

רב גזר חמץ בזמנו שלא במינו אטו מינו, ושלא בזמנו במינו אסור, כרבי יהודה.

Rav rendered an additional decree prohibiting leavened bread during its time of prohibition, when that leavened bread is mixed with another type of food even when only a small bit of it is mixed in, due to the prohibition against consuming a comparable mixture with its own type of substance. Owing to the severity of the prohibition against consuming leavened bread during Passover, Rav thought it necessary to render this additional decree. Rav's statement that leavened bread is forbidden not during its time, when it is mixed with its own type of substance, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who says that according to the Torah, leavened bread is forbidden even after Passover, and thus even a mixture of it is prohibited.

ושלא במינו – מותר. דשלא בזמנו ושלא במינו אטו מינו – בולי האי לא גזרינן.

But if it is mixed with another type of substance it is permitted, because there is no need to go so far as to render a decree with regard to a mixture with another type of substance not during its time, due to the prohibition of a mixture with the same type of substance. Rav maintains that when any prohibited item falls into a mixture of a different type of substance, it is nullified, unless it gives flavor to the new mixture. Therefore, the same principle should apply to leavened bread after Passover, and a small amount should be nullified once the more serious prohibition no longer applies to it.

שמואל אמר: חמץ בזמנו, במינו – אסור, שלא במינו – מותר. שלא בזמנו, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – מותר. חמץ בזמנו במינו אסור, שמואל לטעמיה, דרב ושמואל דאמרי תרוניהו: כל איסורין שבתורה, במינו – אסורין במשהו, שלא במינו – בנותן טעם.

In contrast, Shmuel said that if leavened bread becomes mixed with permitted food during its time of prohibition, then the following distinction applies: If it becomes mixed with its own type of food it is forbidden, but if it becomes mixed with another type of food it is permitted. If it becomes mixed together not during its time of prohibition, but after Passover, then regardless of whether it becomes mixed with its own type or with another type of substance, it is permitted. With regard to the statement that leavened bread mixed with the same type of substance during its time of prohibition is forbidden, Shmuel conforms to his line of reasoning below: **As it is Rav and Shmuel who both say:** With regard to any foods prohibited by the Torah that become mixed with permitted foods, if the permitted food is of its own type, such that it is impossible to distinguish one from another, then even any amount of the prohibited substance renders the entire mixture prohibited. However, if the prohibited food is mixed with another type of substance, then the mixture becomes prohibited only when there is enough of the forbidden item to give flavor to the mixture.

שלא במינו אטו מינו – לא גזר. שלא בזמנו, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – מותרין, כרבי שמעון.

And Shmuel did not render a decree prohibiting a mixture with another type of substance, due to the prohibition against consuming a mixture with its same type. However, not during its time, but rather after Passover, the mixture is permitted, regardless of whether it was mixed with its own type or with another type. And this statement is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who states that after Passover one may derive benefit from leavened bread that was owned by a Jew during Passover.

ורבי יוחנן אמר: חמץ בזמנו, בין במינו ובין שלא במינו – אסור בנותן טעם. שלא בזמנו, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – מותר.

And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to leavened bread that falls into a mixture **during its time** of prohibition, **whether** it is mixed **with its own type** of substance **or another type** of substance, it becomes prohibited **only when** there is enough of the forbidden item to give flavor to the mixture. However, **not during its time** of prohibition, but rather after Passover, it is always permitted, regardless of **whether** it falls into a mixture of **its own type** of substance or whether it falls into a mixture of **another type** of substance.

חמץ בזמנו בין במינו בין שלא במינו בנותן טעם – רבי יוחנן לטעמיה, דרבי יוחנן וריש לקיש דאמרי תרויהו: כל איסורין שבתורה, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – בנותן טעם. שלא בזמנו, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – מותרין – מותרין – כרבי שמעון.

The Gemara explains this position: With regard to the statement that leavened bread that falls into a mixture **during its time** of prohibition, **whether with its own type** of food or **with another type** of food, then it is prohibited **only when it gives flavor** to the mixture, Rabbi Yoḥanan conforms to his line of reasoning below. As it is Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish who both say: With regard to any foods forbidden by the Torah that fall into a mixture, **whether of its own type** of food or **another type** of food, the mixture is **prohibited when** there is enough of the forbidden item to give flavor to the mixture. If less than this amount falls into the mixture, it is nullified by the large majority of permitted food. Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement that **not during its time** of prohibition, but rather after Passover, it is **permitted**, regardless of **whether** it falls into a mixture of **its own type** of food or into a mixture of **another type** of food, is **in accordance with** the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who maintains that leavened bread owned by a Jew during Passover is not prohibited afterward.

Perek II
Daf 30 Amud a

HALAKHA

A mixture of leavened bread – תערובת חמץ: During Passover, even a small bit of leavened bread that falls into a mixture renders it forbidden, whether it is mixed into the same type of substance or into a different type of substance, in accordance with Rava's ruling (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 447:1*).

Leavened bread after Passover – חמץ שלא בזמנו: The *halakha* with regard to a mixture containing leavened bread at a time that is not Passover, either before or after the Festival, is that the leavened bread is subject to nullification in the mixture regardless of whether it falls into the same type of substance or into a different type of substance, so long as it is less than one-sixtieth of the mixture (*Tur*). Most authorities rule that when the leavened bread fell into a mixture after Passover, the leavened bread can be nullified in a mixture so long as the permitted substance constitutes a majority of the mixture (*Be'er Heitev, Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 447:11*).

NOTES

But a mixture, no – אָבֵל עַל יְדֵי תְעוּבַת לֹא – It is insufficient for a mixture to have a one-to-one ratio of leavened bread to permitted food in order to be permitted. Rather, the leavened bread must be nullified by the majority of the permitted food, even if it still is of sufficient quantity to impart a noticeable taste (*Ritva*). This principle applies only when the leavened bread fell into the mixture unintentionally. However, if one intentionally created such a mixture, Rabbi Shimon would impose a penalty, and the mixture would be forbidden (*Ra'ah*).

Leavened bread from the gentiles – חֲמֵצָא דְבִגְיֵי חֵילָא – Some explain that Rav Naḥman only instructed them to buy leaven, i.e., yeast, so that they could make their own bread, but he did not give them permission to purchase leavened bread itself. This distinction could be based on the stringency of the prohibition against leavened bread, or because Rav Naḥman himself is of the opinion that throughout the year one may not eat bread baked by gentiles (*Maharam Ḥalawa*).

אמר רבא: הלכתא, חמץ בזמנו, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – אסור במשהו, כרב. שלא בזמנו, בין במינו בין שלא במינו – מותר, כרבי שמעון.

Rava said: The *halakha* is that with regard to the prohibition against eating a mixture of leavened bread **during its time** of prohibition, i.e., during Passover, regardless of whether it is mixed **with its own type or with another type**, it is **forbidden**,^h even if **any amount** becomes mixed in, **in accordance with** the opinion of Rav. **Not during its time** of prohibition, but rather after the conclusion of Passover, regardless of whether the leavened bread was mixed **with its own type or with another type**, it is **permitted**, even when it gives flavor to the mixture. This is **in accordance with** the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who states that leavened bread owned by a Jew during Passover is permitted after Passover.^h

ומי אמר רבא הכי? והאמר רבא: רבי שמעון קנסא קניס, הואיל ועבר עליי ב"ב ליראה ובל ימצא!

The Gemara asks: **Did Rava actually say this**, that according to Rabbi Shimon, leavened bread owned by a Jew on Passover is permitted after Passover? **But didn't Rava himself say that Rabbi Shimon imposed a penalty** forbidding one from deriving benefit from leavened bread owned by a Jew during Passover, **since he transgressed the prohibition it shall not be seen and the prohibition it shall not be found?**

הני מילי – בעינייה, אביל על ידי תערובת – לא. ואודא רבא לטעמיה, דאמר רבא: כי הוין בי רב נחמן, כי הו נפקי שבעה יומי דפסחא, אמר לן: פוקו וזבינו חמירא דבגי חילא.

The Gemara resolves this challenge: This penalty applies only to leavened bread that is **in its pure** unadulterated form, **but** with regard to a **mixture, no**,ⁿ one does not impose a penalty, even though the leavened bread is still extant. The Gemara adds: **And Rava follows his line of reasoning**, stated elsewhere, that indicates that he rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as Rava said: **While we were studying in Rav Naḥman's house, on the evening when the seven days of Passover had passed, he said to us: Go and buy leavened bread from the gentiles**ⁿ who baked it on that day, the last day of Passover. Based on this story, it is clear that he maintained that one may eat leavened bread that was owned by a gentile during Passover.