



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Pesachim, Daf מ"ב – Daf מ"ג

This week's Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H

### -----Daf מ"ב---42-----

#### MEI TASHMISHO SHEL NACHTOM...

- **Q:** One Braisa says the water must be spilled onto a sloped place (so that it will go away) and not onto an area with cracks in the ground (where the water will collect), but another Braisa says that it may be poured onto an area with cracks in the ground!? **A:** The first Braisa discusses where there is a lot of water, where there is risk that it will collect and remain stagnant. The second Braisa discusses where there is less water, and therefore does not pose that same risk.
- **R' Yehuda** says, matzah dough should only be kneaded with water that was drawn and then left overnight (to allow the water to cool overnight so that the dough is not kneaded with warm water).
  - **Rava** said, matzah dough should not be kneaded in the sun, nor with water heated in the sun, nor water from the bottom of the keili used to heat water. Also, the dough should continue to be worked on until it is placed into the oven. The baker should also have two keilim of water – one to be used for the dough and one to be used to cool off the baker's hands.
  - **Q:** What is the halacha if warm water was used to knead the dough? **A: Mar Zutra** says it is mutar (just like soaked barley is mutar even though it is not allowed to be done in the first place), and **R' Ashi** says it is assur (the **Rabanan** did not specifically allow it here, so we cannot say that it is mutar based on the case of soaked barley).

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL SHA'AH!!!

### PEREK EILU OVRIN -- PEREK SHLISHI

#### MISHNA

- If one has any of the following items on Pesach, he is "oiver" the lavim of "bal yeira'eh" and "bal yimatzei": "kutach" of Bavel (a dip containing bread), beer of Madai, vinegar of Edom, "zeisom" of Egypt, "zoman" of dyers, "ameilan" of chefs, and "kolan" of scribes. **R' Eliezer** says, "tachshitim" of women should be included in the list as well.
- The general rule is, if something is made from one of the 5 grains, one is oiver for possessing it on Pesach.
- Eating anything in the above list, would make one be oiver a lav, but would not make him be chayuv kares.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, there are 3 things said about "kutach" of Bavel: it clogs the heart (because of the milk byproduct it contains), blinds the eyes (because of the salt), and weakens the body (because of the moldy bread).
  - A Braisa says, 3 things increase a person's waste, make him stoop over, and take away 1/500 of his eyesight: whole grain bread, fresh beer, and raw vegetables.
  - A Braisa says, 3 things decrease a person's waste, make him stand straighter, and are healthy for the eyes: white bread (from fine flour), fatty meat (from a female goat that had never given birth), and old wine (2 years old).
    - Anything that is good for one part of the body is harmful for another part, and visa-versa, except for the following, which are good for everything: fresh ginger, long peppers, white bread, fatty meats, and old wine.

#### SHEICHAR HAMADAI

- In Madai the beer is made with barley, and is therefore chametz.

#### V'CHOMETZ HA'ADOMI

- The vinegar in Edom is made by putting barley into the wine, and is therefore chametz.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Nachman** said, in the times of the Beis Hamikdash, the wine of the Yehuda region would not sour into vinegar (it was very high quality) unless barley was put into it. After the Churban, this blessing of such high quality wine was taken away from the Yehuda region and given to Edom.
  - A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, originally, one would not have to give ma'aser from vinegar that was purchased from an ahm ha'aretz in the Yehuda region, because it is known to have come from "temed" (inferior wine made by allowing the left over grape particles to soak in water, thereby having the water acquire its taste), which is considered "water" and therefore not chayuv in ma'aser. However, after the Churban, one would have to give ma'aser from vinegar that was purchased from an ahm ha'aretz in the Yehuda region, because it is known to have come from wine.
    - **Q:** We see from a Braisa that **R' Yehuda** says that "temed" is chayuv in ma'aser!? **A:** In the first Braisa, he meant that we can assume that the ahm ha'aretz gave ma'aser, because there is no significant cost in doing so. **A2:** Temed made from grape pulp is chayuv, but temed made from grape seeds is not chayuv.

### V'ZEISOM HAMITZRI...

- **R' Yosef** says this is a mixture made of 1/3 barley, 1/3 "kurtimi", and 1/3 salt. **R' Pappa** said that wheat was used instead of barley.
  - This mixture would be soaked, toasted and ground, and one would then drink this between Pesach and Shavuot. It healed constipation and also healed a loose stomach as well. However, it was dangerous for a sick person and a pregnant woman.

### V'ZOMAN SHEL TZABA'IM...

- This is water in which grain was soaked, used in the dyeing process.

### V'AMEILAN SHEL TABACHIM...

- This is bread of grain which had not yet grown to a third of its potential growth. This was used as a pot cover to absorb the foam from what was being cooked.

### V'KOILAN SHEL SOFRIM...

- This is the glue used by a shoemaker. **R' Simi from Chuna'ah** says it is the cream (which contained flour) used by wealthy girls to remove hair. **R' Oshaya** says it is the shoemaker's glue, and the reason it is called "of the scribes" is because scribes also use it for their paper.

### R' ELIEZER OMER AHF TACHSHITEI NASHIM...

- **Q:** What is chametz about a woman's cosmetics? **A:** He is referring to the cream used to remove hair. We find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that this cream was made of fine flour.

## -----Daf 43-----

### ZEH HAKLAL KOL SHEHU MIMIN DAGAN

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehoshua** said, the reason the **Chachomim** singled out the ones listed in the Mishna was so that people should become familiar with them and their names.
  - We find an instance where being familiar with the name and ingredients of "kutach" prevented someone from eating it with meat.

### HAREI EILU B'AZHARA

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna of our Mishna, who holds that chametz in a mixture, and chametz (which is not in a mixture) that is in a state that is generally not eaten, are assur D'Oraisa? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, it is **R' Meir**, who says in a Braisa that one gets malkus for eating "se'or" (which is generally not eaten). And, if he says one gets malkus for that, he would surely say that he gets malkus for eating regular chametz in a mixture. **A2:** **R' Nachman** said, it is **R' Eliezer**, who says in a Braisa that one commits a lav by eating chametz which is in a mixture. And, if he says one commits a lav for that, he would surely say that he commits a lav for eating chametz not in a mixture, although it is of the type generally not eaten.
  - **R' Nachman** doesn't say like **R' Yehuda**, because he says that **R' Meir's** statement may be limited to chametz not in a mixture, which is generally not eaten. **R' Yehuda** does not say like **R'**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Nachman**, because he says that **R' Eliezer's** statement may be limited to truly edible chametz in a mixture.

- There is a Braisa which supports **R' Yehuda**. The Braisa gives examples of chametz in a mixture and says that they are assur with a lav (which is what **R' Eliezer** said). The Braisa does not say that chametz not in a mixture, of the type that is generally not eaten, is also assur with a lav. This is exactly how **R' Yehuda** understood **R' Eliezer**.
- **Q:** From where does **R' Eliezer** learn that there is a lav for chametz in a mixture? **A:** He learns it from the pasuk “kol machmetzes lo socheilu”. The word “machmetzes” includes even chametz of a mixture.
  - **Q:** If so, why does he not get kares for this as well? The pasuk of kares also says “ki kol ochel machmetzes”!? **A:** The “machmetzes” of kares is needed to teach that one is chayuv kares for eating chametz even if it only became chametz through the help of a catalyst (e.g. yeast).
    - **Q:** Maybe the “machmetzes” of the lav is also needed to teach that!? **A:** **R' Eliezer** learns his din from the word “kol”.
    - **Q:** The kares pasuk also says the word “kol”!? **A:** That is needed to include women in the kares penalty of chametz.
      - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** already taught that women are chayuv like men with regard to all punishments in the Torah!? **A:** The pasuk compares the issur of chametz to the mitzvah of matzah. We would think that since women are not chayuv in matzah (it is a time-bound mitzvah), they are likewise not chayuv for eating chametz. Therefore we need the word “kol” in the pasuk of kares.
        - Once we know women are chayuv for chametz, **R' Eliezer** learns that the comparison to the mitzvah of matzah teaches that women are also chayuv in the mitzvah of matzah.
      - **Q:** Why do we assume that the word “kol” comes to include women in the kares penalty, maybe it comes to include chametz of a mixture in the kares penalty!? **A:** The pasuk is talking about the eaters of chametz, not the food that is eaten. It therefore makes sense to say that it is an additional eater that is being included, not an additional food.
        - **Q: R' Nossan**, the father of **R' Huna**, asked, we find a Braisa that says the “kol” of the pasuk that prohibits eating cheilev from a korbon, although talking about the eaters of the cheilev, comes to include eating cheilev of chullin animals!? **A:** Regarding cheilev there are no other eaters to include, so it must be including other items.
    - **Q:** The **Rabanan**, who say a chametz mixture is not assur D'Oraisa, obviously do not darshen the word “kol”. If so, how do they know that women are included in the kares penalty? **A:** They don't darshen “kol”, but they do darshen the words “ki kol”, to include women in the kares punishment.
      - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Eliezer** use “kol” to include women, and “ki kol” to include chametz mixtures? We find elsewhere that he darshens “kol” and “ki kol”!? **A:** This remains a **KASHYEH**.

-----Daf 72-----44-----

- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, in all halachos of the Torah, when prohibited items are mixed with permitted items, and one does an act that is prohibited to do with those prohibited items (e.g. he eats a mixture of kosher and non-kosher meat), the permitted item of the mixture does not combine to reach the requisite amount needed for him to be chayuv for the issur (e.g. a kezayis), *except* for the case of a nazir, who if he eats grapes and bread in the amount of a combined kezayis, will be chayuv, because regarding nazir the pasuk says “mishras”. **Zeiri** says, another exception is one who burns chametz on the Mizbe'ach (all korbonos are not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

allowed to be chametz). Therefore, if one burns a half kezayis of chametz and a half kezayis of matzah on the Mizbe'ach, it will combine to make him chayuv.

- **Q:** Presumably, **Zeiri** is following **R' Eliezer**, who darshens the word “kol” and said that the word “kol” in the pasuk about burning chametz on the Mizbe'ach teaches that if less than the amount needed to be chayuv is chametz, it combines with the chametz to make him chayuv. If so, regarding chametz on Pesach, which the pasuk also says “kol”, one should be chayuv for eating a kezayis of a mixture that contains chametz and matzah (even though there is less than a kezayis of chametz), and that should be another exception!? **A:** Chametz on Pesach actually is another exception. The reason **Zeiri** didn't mention it is because his purpose was not to mention exceptions to **R' Yochanan's** halacha, it was to dispute **Abaye's** view. **Abaye** said that one is chayuv for burning even less than a kezayis of chametz on the Mizbe'ach. **Zeiri** argues and says that a kezayis is needed, but that kezayis can be made up of a combination of chametz and matzah.
- **Q:** **Abaye** asked **R' Dimi**, we find that **Rabbah bar bar Channa**, when explaining a Mishna, says that a non-Kohen would be chayuv for eating a kezayis of a mixture of terumah and chullin even though he ate less than a kezayis of terumah. We see that the prohibited and permitted items do combine to reach the required amount!? **A:** He meant that the non-Kohen is chayuv if he ate enough of the mixture to have eaten a full kezayis of the terumah in the time that it takes to eat a “pras” (“k'dei achilas pras”). If he did, he will be chayuv D'Oraisa and will get malkus.
  - **Q:** If the concept of “k'dei achilas pras” is D'Oraisa, why do the **Rabanan** say that he is not chayuv if eats kutach on Pesach? There too, if he ate enough of the kutach to have eaten a kezayis of chametz “k'dei achilas pras”, he should be chayuv!? **A:** Kutach is meant to be eaten as a dip. If he uses it as a dip, he will never eat a kezayis of chametz “k'dei achilas pras”. If he eats it straight, that is not considered “normal” and will not be considered “eating”.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there are 2 pots – one containing terumah and one containing chullin, and in front of them are 2 spice crushers with spices – one of terumah and one of chullin, and the spices of one crusher fell into one pot, and the spices of the other into the other pot, we may assume that the terumah fell into the terumah and the chullin into the chullin. Now, if the concept of “k'dei achilas pras” is D'Oraisa, how can we be lenient and assume that? **A:** Terumah of spices is only D'Rabanan. That is why we can be lenient. However, the concept of “k'dei achilas pras” may be D'Oraisa.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there are 2 boxes of grain – one of terumah and one of chullin, and 2 smaller containers of grain in front of them – one of terumah and one of chullin, and the contents of each container fall into a box, we can assume that the terumah fell into the terumah and the chullin into the chullin. Now, if the concept of “k'dei achilas pras” is D'Oraisa, how can we be lenient and assume that? **A:** Terumah in today's times is only D'Rabanan.
- **Q:** How could **R' Yochanan** say that “mishras” teaches that nazir is an exception? A Braisa says that “mishras” teaches that the flavor of the wine is just as assur as the actual wine (if grapes are soaked in water and give the water their taste, and a nazir drinks that water, he would get malkus), and from nazir we then learn this concept to all other issurin of the Torah!? **A:** This Braisa follows the **Rabanan**. **R' Yochanan** follows **R' Akiva** who does not learn the principle of “flavor equals substance” from “mishras”, and therefore uses “mishras” is available to teach that the prohibited and permitted items combine to reach the required amount.
  - **Q:** From where does **R' Akiva** learn that “flavor equals substance”? **A:** He learns it from the issur of milk and meat – although there is only the taste of the milk in the meat (we don't see any milk), it is assur.
    - **The Rabanan** don't learn the concept from milk and meat, because the issur of milk and meat is a novelty (if the meat is left to soak in milk all day, it would not be assur, but if it is cooked in it, it becomes assur) and therefore cannot serve as the basis for teaching anything in a different context.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How could **R' Akiva** learn it from milk and meat, given that it is a novelty!? **A: R' Akiva** learns the din from the issur of using keilim from a goy that they used for non-Kosher. The keilim only have absorbed taste, and yet it is assur.
  - **The Rabanan** say that this case is also a novelty (even though the absorbed flavor is somewhat spoiled it is still assur) and therefore cannot be the basis of a teaching for another context.
  - **R' Akiva** says that the taste in the keilim is only assur within 24 hours of it being absorbed, during which time it is not a spoiled taste, and therefore not a novelty.
    - **The Rabanan** say that absorbed flavor gets somewhat spoiled immediately.
- **Q: R' Acha the son of R' Avya** asked, just as the **Rabanan** use “mishras” to learn that “taste equals substance” throughout the entire Torah, **R' Akiva** should use “mishras” to teach that the prohibited and permitted items in a mixture combine to reach the required amount, throughout the entire Torah!? **A: R' Ashi** answered, the Torah teaches this principle regarding nazir and regarding a Korbon Chatas. If the Torah meant for this principle to be taught to all other places, there was no need to teach it twice. The fact that it was, teaches that it is only to be applied to those two places.
  - The **Rabanan** say that nazir teaches the principle of “flavor equals substance” and chatas teaches the principle of mixtures. Therefore, they are teaching different things and nazir can be the source for the rest of the Torah. However, chatas cannot be the source regarding mixtures for the rest of the Torah, because we cannot learn out chullin from kodashim.
- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, a Braisa says that the pasuk by nazir teaches that the different parts of the grape combine with each other to reach the required kezayis. If, as **R' Akiva** says, they combine with permitted items, surely they combine with prohibited items, so why must the pasuk teach this to us!? **A: R' Kahana** said, for the permitted and prohibited items to combine, they must be eaten simultaneously. Prohibited and prohibited items combine even when they are eaten one after another.

-----Daf דף 45-----

### MISHNA

- Regarding dough that is stuck in the crack of a kneading bowl: if there is a kezayis of dough in one place, one must get rid of it. If there is not a kezayis in one place, it becomes batul to the bowl and need not be removed.
  - The same is regarding tumah: if he is particular about the dough being there, it is considered a chatzitza. If he wants it to remain in the crack in the bowl, it is considered to be a part of the bowl and will not be a chatzitza.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, when the Mishna says that if the dough is the size of a kezayis it must be removed and destroyed, that is only if the crack being filled by the dough is in a place in the bowl that does not hold water. If it is in such a place, it need not be removed (because he intends for it to remain there permanently and it is considered as part of the bowl). It would seem from this, that even in a place that does not hold water, if it is less than a kezayis, it need not be removed.
  - **Others say**, that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, a piece *less* than a kezayis need not be removed if the crack is in a place of the bowl that holds water. If the crack is in a place that does not hold water, even *less* than a kezayis of dough would have to be removed. It would seem that even in a place that holds water, a piece larger than a kezayis would have to be removed.
  - **Q:** There is a Braisa that says like the first version, and another Braisa that says like the second version. These Braisos contradict each other!? **A: R' Huna** said, remove the lenient Braisa (that follows the first

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

version), because it must be incorrect. **A2: R' Yosef** said, we can say the Braisos follow different Tanna'im, who argue this point. A Braisa says, moldy bread must be destroyed. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, if it is no longer being kept as food (e.g. a block of yeast is being used as a chair), it need not be destroyed. The **T"K** must hold that a kezayis of chametz never becomes batul, and therefore would say that it must be removed from the bowl even in a place where it holds water. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** holds that it would become batul and need not be removed.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, this does not answer the contradiction of the Braisos regarding a piece of dough *less* than the size of a kezayis!? **A: Abaye** said, both Braisos follow **R' Shimon ben Elazar**. The Braisa that says the piece need not be removed refers to the place in the bowl that does not hold water, but is used in the kneading process (therefore the dough less than a kezayis is intended to be left there). The Braisa that says that it must be removed refers to the part of the bowl above that, that is not used for anything.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rav** said, we pasken like **R' Shimon ben Elazar**.
  - **Q:** We find that **R' Yitzchak bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said that a block of yeast used as a chair need not be destroyed only if it is smeared with plaster. If it is not, it would have to be destroyed!? **A:** These 2 statements of **Rav** cannot be reconciled and only one of them can be correct.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, with regard to 2 half-zayis sized pieces of dough in a kneading bowl that are attached by a thin strand of dough, if they can be carried by lifting the thin strand, they are considered connected and must be destroyed. If not, they need not be destroyed.
  - **Ulla** said, this is only the halacha for a kneading bowl. If this situation existed with 2 pieces of dough in a house, they must be destroyed even if not connected, because it is possible that they will be brought together when one cleans the house.
    - **Q: Ulla** said, they asked in Eretz Yisrael, what if one piece is on the ground floor and the other is in the attic? What if one is in the house and the other is on the porch? What if there are 2 houses, one within the other, and a piece is in each of these houses? **A: TEIKU.**
- A Braisa says, if bread became moldy and is no longer fit for human consumption, but is fit for dogs, it is still subject to food tumah if it is the size of an egg, and if it is tahor terumah, it may be burned with tamei food on Erev Pesach. **R' Nosson** says it is not subject to food tumah.
- A Braisa says, if one put flour into the bowl used by tanners (used in the process of tanning hides) within 3 days of Pesach, it must be destroyed (the flour is still considered edible). If the flour was put in more than 3 days before Pesach, it need not be destroyed (it is rendered inedible). **R' Nosson** said, that is only if hides weren't put into the bowl along with the flour. If hides were put in, the flour is rendered immediately inedible.
  - **Rava** said, the halacha follows **R' Nosson**.

### -----Daf 17-----46-----

V'CHEIN L'INYAN TUMAH...

- **Q:** How can the Mishna say that the same din applies to tumah? Chametz depends on the size of the piece of dough and tumah depends on whether he is particular about it!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the Mishna should say that tumah is *unlike* chametz. **A2: Abaye** said, the Mishna is saying that on Pesach, because the issur of chametz is so significant, these pieces of dough combine with other foods to reach the minimum required size of an egg for tumah. However, during the rest of the year it only combines with other foods if he is particular about it being there. **A3: Rava** said, the Mishna is saying, if the bowl is tamei and one wants to toivel it, on Pesach when the chametz is considered significant, it is automatically considered to be a chatzitza. During the rest of the year, it is only a chatzitza if he is particular about it. **A4: R' Pappa** said, the Mishna is saying, if a sheretz touches the pieces of dough on Pesach, since the dough is considered significant (because of its issur), it is considered as a chatzitza and prevents the bowl from becoming tamei. During the rest of the year, if he is particular about it, it acts as a chatzitza and prevents the bowl from becoming tamei. If he is not, it is considered as part of the bowl and the entire bowl becomes tamei.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

- If we are unsure whether a particular dough is chametz (we have reason to believe that it is, but it does not have the characteristics typically associated with chametz), if we find another dough that was kneaded at the same time as this one, and that other dough has become chametz, then this first dough is assur as chametz as well.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** If another dough cannot be found, what is the halacha of the first dough? **A: R' Avahu in the name of Reish Lakish** said, if the dough was left alone for the time it takes to walk a "mil", it is assur as chametz.
  - **R' Avahu in the name of Reish Lakish** says, regarding one who was hired to knead for a person and found all the person's keilim to be tamei, and regarding one who is travelling and wants to stop for the night, but doesn't have a minyan to daven with, and regarding one who wants to eat bread but doesn't have water to wash his hands: the halacha is that these people must walk up to 4 mil if he will find a mikvah to toivel the keilim, find a minyan, or find water.
    - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it was **Eivo**, not **R' Avahu**, who said this statement, and he also said a fourth situation with the "4 mil" halacha. He said that hides which were walked upon for the time it takes to walk 4 mil are removed from the category of food (and don't become tamei as food).
    - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, in all these cases, one must only walk 4 mil if it is in the direction he is travelling. If it is in another direction, he does not even have to walk a mil.
      - **R' Acha** said, we see that he does not have to walk a mil in the wrong direction, but he would have to walk less than a mil.

## MISHNA

- How does one separate challah from tamei dough on Pesach (he can't bake the dough that he separates, because it is not fit to be eaten and therefore cannot be baked on Yom Tov, and he cannot leave it without baking, because the dough will become chametz)? **R' Eliezer** says, all the dough should be baked and challah should be separated after it is already baked and therefore prevented from becoming chametz. **Ben Beseirah** says, the dough should be separated and placed into cold water. **R' Yehoshua** says, since challah belongs to the Kohen, the person can separate it and will not be oiver on bal yeira'eh or bal yimatzei for having it in his possession. After Yom Tov, the dough can be burned. If it becomes chametz in the meantime, so be it.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes in the Mishna (whether the challah is considered his and must be prevented from becoming chametz, or is considered the Kohen's and may be left to become chametz) is based on whether we say that the fact that he can choose which Kohen to give it to (and may even accept money to influence that decision) gives him ownership status in the challah. **R' Eliezer** would say that it does, and **R' Yehoshua** would say that it does not? **A:** All agree that it does not give him ownership status. **R' Eliezer** says, since he can go to a chachom to annul the challah status (like a promise), at which time it would clearly be his, we consider it to be his now as well. **R' Yehoshua** says that we don't say the concept of "since".
  - **R' Chisda** said, one who bakes on Yom Tov for after Yom Tov is chayuv malkus, because we don't say "since". **Rabbah** says he does not get malkus, because we say "since" guests may come, he may need the food that he baked and therefore baked it for Yom Tov use.
    - **Q: Rabbah** asked, if you don't say "since", how may one bake on Yom Tov for Shabbos!? **A: R' Chisda** said, he may do so because he makes an "eiruv tavshilin" (instituted by the **Rabanan**).
      - **Q: Rabbah** asked, can a Rabbinic institution remove an issur D'Oraisa!? **A: R' Chisda** said, D'Oraisa one may bake on Yom Tov for Shabbos. The **Rabanan** said it is assur so that people don't think one may bake on Yom Tov for weekday. The **Rabanan** said, if an eiruv tavshilin is made one may bake on Yom Tov for Shabbos, because establishing the eiruv will make people realize that baking on Yom Tov is only allowed for Shabbos, not for regular weekdays.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, a Braisa says, one may not shecht an animal that it is danger of dying on Yom Tov (he wants to shecht it before it dies so that the meat would not be assur as neveilah), unless there is enough time for him to eat a kezayis of its meat that was prepared via roasting (after the shechita) on Yom Tov. The Braisa seems to say that as long as he could have eaten it, it is mutar to shecht the animal even if he doesn't eat the meat on Yom Tov. If you don't believe in the concept of "since", how does the Braisa allow one to shecht this animal!? **A: R' Chisda** said, he is allowed to shecht the animal because of the impending financial loss.
  - **Q:** We allow him to do an issur on Yom Tov because of a financial loss!? **A:** He knows that if he doesn't eat a kezayis on Yom Tov, he may not shecht the animal, which will lead to the animal's death, causing a financial loss. Therefore, he will force himself to eat a kezayis of its meat on Yom Tov, to allow the shechita. [However, with regard to baking on Yom Tov for after Yom Tov, there is no impetus for him to eat from the baked items, and therefore it is considered baked for after Yom Tov, which therefore makes it assur to be done.]

### -----Daf 17--47-----

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, how can **R' Chisda** say that D'Oraisa one may bake on Yom Tov for Shabbos? A Mishna says that the Lechem Hapanim (which were typically baked on Friday and eaten on the Shabbos a week later) were not allowed to be baked on Yom Tov, even though they would be eaten on a Shabbos!? Rabbinic issurim were not followed in the Beis Hamikdash. Therefore, if D'Oraisa this may be done, it should have been allowed for the Lechem Hapanim!? **A: R' Chisda** said, the **Rabbanan** did not institute their issurim in the Beis Hamikdash only if the Rabbinic issur would interfere with an immediate need of the Avodah. However, regarding the Lechem Hapanim, they would not be eaten for over a week, and therefore the issur D'Rabanan of baking on Yom Tov for Shabbos did apply.
  - **Q: R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Shimon ben Ha'sgan** said that one does bake the Lechem Hapanim on Yom Tov. We see that there is no Rabbinic issur instituted even in this case!? **A:** This is exactly the point of machlokes between **R' Shimon** and the **T"K**. The **T"K** says that they may not be baked on Yom Tov, because there is a Rabbinic issur in this case, even in the Beis Hamikdash. **R' Shimon** says there is no Rabbinic issur in this case, because Rabbinic issurim do not apply in the Mikdash.
- **Q: R' Mari** asked, the Mishna says that the Shte Halechem (brought on Shavuot) may not be baked on Shabbos or Yom Tov. If we may not even bake on Yom Tov for something needed on Yom Tov, how can **R' Chisda** suggest that one may bake on Yom Tov for Shabbos!? **A:** The pasuk that permits baking on Yom Tov says "lachem" – the permit is for **you**. The Shte Halechem is a korbon, and is therefore not considered to be "for you". That is why it may not be baked on Yom Tov.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Shimon ben Ha'sgan**, who says that it may be baked on Yom Tov, how does he learn the word "lachem"? **A:** He will use it like **Abba Shaul**, who says that the pasuk teaches "lachem" – for you and not for goyim. The permit to bake on Yom Tov in only to prepare for Yidden.
- **Q: R' Chisda** asked, how can **Rabbah** says that we use the concept of "since"? A Mishna says, it is possible for a person to plow one row and be chayuv 8 lavim. One of the lavim listed in the Mishna is for plowing on Yom Tov. According to **Rabbah**, one should not be chayuv for plowing on Yom Tov, because we should say that "since" he may need the loose earth (that he is plowing) to use for the mitzvah of covering the blood of a bird or chaya, he is not chayuv for the plowing!? **A: R' Pappa bar Shmuel** said, the Mishna is discussing where he is plowing a field of rocks, which may not be used for the mitzvah of covering the blood.
  - **Q:** He can crush the stones and they would then be fit to use to cover the blood!? **A:** It is not mutar to crush stones on Yom Tov (it is considered grinding).
    - **Q:** He can crush them in an unusual way (which would not be assur on Yom Tov)!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing rocky ground, which cannot be crushed.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** It can't be discussing rocky ground, because the Mishna says that he is planting in it, and such ground cannot be planted!? **A:** He is planting in the soft earth underneath the rocky layer, but he is chayuv for the plowing of the rocky ground on top.
- **Q:** He should not be chayuv for the plowing, because it has uncovered soft dirt, which may be used to cover the blood!? **A: Mar bar R' Ashi** said, the Mishna is dealing with moist mud, which can be planted in, but which may not be used for covering the blood. That's why he is chayuv.
- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, one who cooks the gid hanasheh, in milk, on Yom Tov, and then eats it, will get 5 sets of malkus, one of which is for lighting a fire on Yom Tov. According to **Rabbah**, we should say that "since" the fire could be used for permitted cooking, he should not be chayuv for having lit a fire for a prohibited cooking!? **A: Rabbah** said, we must amend the Braisa to say that the 5<sup>th</sup> set of malkus is not for lighting a fire, it is for eating the gid hanasheh when it is of a neveilah.
  - **Q: R' Chiya** taught, of the 5 sets of malkus, 2 of them are for eating (eating the gid hanasheh and eating meat in milk). According to the **Rabbah's** change, there are now 3 sets that are for eating!? **A:** Amend the Braisa to say that the 5<sup>th</sup> set of malkus is for using wood of muktzeh.
    - **Q:** Is muktzeh assur D'Oraisa!? **A: Rabbah** answered, it is. The pasuk says "v'heichinu" – one must prepare what he needs before Shabbos and Yom Tov.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, you **Rabbah** seem to say elsewhere that muktzeh is only assur D'Rabanan!? **Q2:** Also, you say that one who is oiver multiple lavim with one action on Yom Tov is only chayuv one set of malkus, so placing the wood into the fire and cooking (which are one act) should only get one set of malkus (not 2 sets as you are now suggesting)!? **A: Rabbah** said, we must amend the Braisa to say that the 5<sup>th</sup> set of malkus is for using the wood of an "asheirah" tree (used for avodah zarah).
        - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked, one is chayuv 2 sets of malkus for using asheirah wood. If so, he should be chayuv 6 sets of malkus!? **A:** We must amend the Braisa to say that the 5<sup>th</sup> set of malkus is for using wood of hekdesch.

### -----Daf ןל---48-----

- **Rami bar Chama** said, the machlokes between **R' Chisda** and **Rabbah** (whether we say "since") is the machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua** in our Mishna. **R' Eliezer** allows him to bake all the dough, because we say "since" he may separate a piece from each matzah baked, he may bake it all. **R' Yehoshua** does not say "since", and therefore does not allow the challah to be baked.
  - **R' Pappa** said, it could be that **R' Eliezer** only allows "since" in the case of the Mishna, because he himself may end up eating any of the matzos. However, when baking on Yom Tov when he has no intention to eat any of it, and the "since" is dependent on the possibility of guests, it may be that he would not say "since".
  - **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, it could be that **R' Yehoshua** only doesn't say "since" in the Mishna, because the piece separated as challah is not fit to be eaten by himself or by guests. However, when baking on Yom Tov, "since" it may be needed for guests, he may agree that we do say "since".
  - **R' Zeira** said, **Rami bar Chama** cannot be correct, because in a Braisa **R' Yehoshua** said to **R' Eliezer**, by baking the challah he is doing melacha on Yom Tov! **R' Eliezer** was quiet. According to **Rami bar Chama**, he should have said, "I hold of 'since', so it is permitted!" **R' Yirmiya** said to **R' Zeira**, in a Braisa **R' Eliezer** said to **R' Yehoshua**, by leaving the dough as is, he will be oiver for bal yeira'eh and bal yimatzei! **R' Yehoshua** remained silent in the Braisa, but we know he answered in our Mishna. Similarly, it is quite possible that **R' Eliezer** answered **R' Yehoshua** in another Braisa as well.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** paskens like **R' Eliezer**, and **R' Yitzchak** paskens like **Ben Beseira**. The Braisa then asks, how large of a dough may one person knead on Pesach? **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Brokah** says, a wheat dough may be made of 2 kavim of wheat, and a barley dough may be made of 3 kavim of barley. **R' Nosson in the name of R' Eliezer** says the reverse.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yishmael** says a wheat dough may be made of 3 kavim and a barley dough may be made of 4 kavim!? **A:** This Braisa is discussing lower quality grain, which takes longer to become chametz.
- **Rav** said, one Melugna'ah Kav is the amount one may knead on Pesach, and the amount that is chayuv in challah.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that slightly more than 5 quarters of a kav is chayuv in challah!? **A:** A Melugna'ah Kav is equal to slightly more than 5 quarters of a kav.
- **R' Yosef** said, the women of his locale would knead  $\frac{3}{4}$  of kav at a time on Pesach. **Abaye** asked, that brings to a leniency regarding challah, because that is not enough to be chayuv in challah!? **R' Yosef** said, we hold like **R' Eliezer** who says that even if a small amount is kneaded, but after the bread is removed from the oven it is placed together with other bread in a basket, the basket combines them all and can make them chayuv in challah at that point.
  - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** asked, will the same din of combining the breads apply if they are placed on a board (with no rim) together (is it the inside of the keili that combines them, or the airspace of the keili)? **A:** **TEIKU**.
  - A Braisa says: **R' Eliezer** says a basket combines the breads. **R' Yehoshua** says even the oven combines the breads. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, breads that become attached in the oven are considered combined.

### MISHNA

- **R' Gamliel** says, 3 women may knead dough simultaneously on Pesach, even if the size of the oven will require them to bake the dough one after another. The **Chachomim** say, if 3 women want to bake somewhat together (and the oven is only big enough to bake the dough of one woman at a time), they must be at different stages of the process (one should be kneading, one should be shaping, and one should be baking) so that when one woman's dough is put in the oven, the other women's dough are still being worked on and not yet ready to go into the oven. **R' Akiva** says, this must be looked at on a case-by-case basis. Factors such as the skill of the women, the type of wood used, and the heat of the oven, all play into a determination.
- The general rule is, if the dough begins to rise, she should wet her hands with cold water and smear it on the dough, to prevent it from rising.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa explains, that when one woman is putting her dough into the oven, the second woman should be at the shaping stage, and the third should be at the kneading stage. After she is done with the oven, everyone moves to the next stage, and the first woman can begin another batch of dough.

### R' AKIVA OMER LO KOL HANASHIM...

- A Braisa says, **R' Akiva** asked **R' Gamliel**, did you say this halacha for skilled women or even unskilled? For dry wood or even wet wood? For a hot oven or even a cold oven? **R' Gamliel** said, no difference is made. The only thing they must do is to watch for signs of rising, and smear with cold water to prevent that rising.

### MISHNA

- “Siur” (dough which is “partially chametz”) must be burned, but one who eats it is not chayuv. “Siduk” (already has cracks and is more chametz than siur) must be burned and one who eats it is chayuv.
  - **R' Yehuda** says: Siur is dough that has cracks like a grasshopper's antennas. Siduk is dough with intermingling cracks. The **Chachomim** say, both of these would make its eater chayuv kares. Rather, siur (for which an eater is not chayuv) is dough that has become white, but which has not yet begun to show cracks.

### GEMARA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says: **R' Meir** says, siur is dough that has become white, and siduk is dough with cracks like the antennas of a grasshopper. The **Chachomim** say, siur is dough with cracks like the antennas of a grasshopper, and siduk is dough with intermingling cracks. In either case, the one who eats it is chayuv kares.
  - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Yehuda** said that one who eats siur is not chayuv!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that according to **R' Meir**, if one eats the siur or the siduk as explained by the **Chachomim**, he will be chayuv kares.
  - **Rava** said, the reason that **R' Meir** says that dough with cracks like the antennas of a grasshopper is considered to be completely chametz is because such cracks on the face of the dough is a sign that there are many more cracks on the inside of the dough as well, which is a clear sign of chametz.