



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Pesachim, Daf לָהּ – Daf אָמ

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לָהּ-----35-----

MISHNA

- One can fulfill his matzah obligation by eating matzah made of any of the 5 grains (wheat, barley, spelt, rye, and oats).
- One may use matzah of demai, ma'aser rishon whose terumah was taken, or ma'aser sheini or hekdesch that was redeemed. Also, a Kohen may use matzah of Challah or terumah.
- One may not use matzah of tevel, of ma'aser rishon whose terumah was not taken, or of ma'aser sheini or hekdesch which was not redeemed.
- If one made matzah to be used for his own Korbon Todah, or for his own Korbon Nazir, they may not be used to fulfill his obligation on Pesach. If one made matzah to sell to people who need it for their Korbon Todah or their Korbon Nazir, he may use that matzah to fulfill his obligation on Pesach.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says that spelt is in the wheat family, whereas oats and rye are in the barley family (with regard to terumah one must give terumah for produce of the same family).
- **Q:** How do we know that one must use matzah of the 5 grains for the Pesach obligation? Why can't one use rice or "dochan"? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk places the issur of chametz next to the mitzvah of matzah to teach that only something which can become chametz may be used for the matzah obligation.
 - Our Mishna does not follow **R' Yochanan ben Nuri**, because he says in a Braisa that rice and dochan can become chametz.
- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of Reish Lakish** said, one would not be chayuv kares for eating a dough which was kneaded with wine, oil or honey, instead of water.
 - **R' Pappa** explained that the pasuk teaches, one is only chayuv kares for chametz on items that he may use for matzah. Dough kneaded with liquids other than water may not be used for matzah, and therefore would not carry a kares penalty for eating it as chametz.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, a Braisa says that one would be chayuv kares for swallowing dissolved chametz, but would not fulfill his matzah obligation by consuming matzah in this way. We see the above rule does not hold true!? **A: R' Idi bar Avin** said, the reason of **Reish Lakish** is because liquids other than water don't cause dough to rise and become chametz. It has nothing to do with the words in the pasuk.

YOTZEI B'DEMAI U'VIMA'ASER...

- **Q:** Demai is not fit to be eaten, so how can it be used for matzah?! **A:** Since the person can give away all his possessions and become a pauper (who is allowed to eat "demai") it is considered fit for him now as well.

MA'ASER RISHON SHENITLA TERUMASO...

- **Q:** This is obviously fit to be eaten and therefore mutar to be used for matzah?! **A:** We are talking about a case where the Levi took the ma'aser before there was a chiyuv for the owner to give Terumah Gedolah (before it was smoothed into a pile), and therefore, Terumah Gedolah was never given. We would think that is assur and therefore it should not be allowed for matzah. The Mishna is telling us like **R' Avahu**, that in this case the Levi only needs to give his Terumas Ma'aser, not the Terumah Gedola and it is therefore fit to be eaten. However, had the Levi taken the ma'aser after there was already a chiyuv for the owner to give the Teruma Gedola, the Levi would have to separate Teruma Gedola as well as Terumas Ma'aser.

MA'ASER SHEINI V'HEKDESH SHENIFDU...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** This is obviously fit to be eaten and therefore mutar to be used for matzah?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he gave the principle amount of the redemption, but not the additional fifth. The Mishna teaches that the redemption is considered to be complete without the giving of the additional fifth as well.

V'HAKOHANIM B'CHALLAH U'B'TERUMAH...

- **Q:** This is obviously mutar to be eaten by the Kohanim and therefore mutar to be used by them for matzah!? **A:** We would have thought that matzah must be made of grains that are mutar to all (not just Kohanim). The Mishna teaches that the Torah writes the word “matzos” twice to teach that matzah may even be made of grains which are mutar to only some people.

AVAL LO B'TEVEL...

- **Q:** Tevel is obviously not fit to be eaten!? **A:** We are discussing something which is tevel only D'Rabanan (e.g. something grown in a flowerpot without a hole). The Mishna is teaching that even that is considered “not fit to be eaten” to the point that it may not be used for matzah.

V'LO B'MA'ASER RISHON SHELO NITLAH TERUMASO

- **Q:** This is obviously not fit to be eaten!? **A:** We are discussing where the Levi took his ma'aser after the produce was smoothed into a pile but before the owner separated terumah. One would think (based on the psukim) that the Levi should not have to separate the owner's portion of the terumah as well. The Mishna teaches that he does, and until he does it is not to be used for matzah.

V'LO B'MA'ASER SHEINI V'HEKDESH SHELO NIFDU...

- **Q:** This is obviously not fit to be eaten!? **A:** This is discussing where it was redeemed, but not properly. For example, the ma'aser sheini was redeemed onto coins that had no image on them (the pasuk teaches that it must have some image), and the hekdesch was redeemed onto land (the pasuk teaches that hekdesch may not be redeemed onto real property).
- A Braisa says, the pasuk teaches us that grain which is not fully mutar (e.g. even if some ma'aser has been separated, but others have not) may not be used for matzah. The pasuk says “Lo sochal alav chametz” (You shall not eat chametz with it). This teaches that matzah may only be made from grain whose only eating prohibition would be chametz (if it was left to become chametz), but not grain which would be prohibited to eat for some other reason (e.g. tevel).
 - **Q:** Even if the grain is tevel, it would still be assur as chametz if it were left to rise, so it is also assur as chametz!? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa follows **R' Shimon** who says “ein issur chal ahl issur” (a prohibition cannot take effect on top of another issur). Therefore, the issur of chametz could not take effect on top of the issur of tevel (which existed before the issur of chametz). **A2: Ravina** said, the Braisa may even follow the **Rabanan** (who argue with **R' Shimon**). The pasuk teaches that matzah may only be made from something whose **only** issur would be chametz, not any other issur.
 - **Q:** The pasuk doesn't say that it must be the issur of chametz **exclusively**!? **A:** We must fall back to the answer of **R' Sheishes**.

-----Daf 17-----36-----

- A Braisa says, we would have thought that one can fulfill his matzah obligation by eating matzah made of ma'aser sheini in Yerushalayim. **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk refers to matzah as “lechem oni”, which he darshens to mean “bread that can be eaten by an onan (one whose relative has died that day)”. Since ma'aser sheini cannot be eaten by an onan, it cannot be used for matzah. **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk says “matzos” twice, to teach that ma'aser sheini can be used for one's matzah obligation. The words “lechem oni” teach that the dough used for matzah must be kneaded with only water, not wine, oil or honey.
 - **R' Akiva** says, the word “oni” is written with an “ayin”, spelling “ani” (a pauper), to teach that it must be kneaded with water. **R' Yose Haglili** says, the word is read as “oni”, which refers to one whose relative has died that very day. **R' Akiva** says, the reason it is read as “oni” is because the matzah is bread upon which many things are said.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Akiva** allows kneading of matzah dough with wine, oil and honey!? **A:** He holds that for the obligatory mitzvah of eating matzah on the first night of Pesach, such matzah may not be used.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

However, for the optional mitzvah of eating matzah on the remaining days of Pesach, such matzah may be used.

- **Q:** A Braisa said that all agree that matzah dough may not be kneaded with lukewarm water. Why is this different than the case of korbanos where the Mishna says that the non-chametz korban mincha may be kneaded with lukewarm water!? **A:** Kohanim are careful and would make sure the dough would not become chametz, so we allow use of lukewarm water.
 - **Q:** If so, why does **Shmuel** say that the kernels of wheat of the korban may not be soaked in water (even though it would lead to a higher quality flour) because we are afraid they may become chametz!? **A:** The soaking is done outside of the Beis Hamikdash, not necessarily by Kohanim.
 - **Q:** The kneading is not necessarily done by Kohanim either!? **A:** The kneading is done in the Beis Hamikdash complex, whereas the soaking is not.
 - **Q:** Why is soaking allowed by the Korban Omer? **A:** That is a communal korban, which Beis Din would make certain does not become chametz.
- A Braisa says, we would have thought that one can fulfill his matzah obligation by eating matzah made of Bikurim. **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk says “b’chol moshvoseichem tochlu matzos” – matzah may only be made of something that can be eaten everywhere (bikurim must be eaten in Yerushalayim). **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk puts matzah and maror together, to teach that just like maror is not of bikurim (bikurim is only brought from the shivas haminim), so too matzah may not be made of bikurim. And, we can’t say that just as maror cannot be from a species that is subject to bikurim, maybe the same should be with matzah (which would prohibit matzah made from wheat and barley), because the Torah writes the word “matzos” twice, to teach that wheat and barley may be used.
 - **Q:** Maybe the word “matzos” twice teaches that even bikurim may be used!? **A:** **R' Akiva** himself retracts from using the comparison of matzah to maror as the source for not allowing matzah of bikurim. A Braisa says that the source for not allowing matzah of bikurim is the pasuk of “b’chol moshvoseichem tochlu matzos”. The Braisa then says that matzah of ma’aser sheini is allowed because the Torah writes the word “matzos” twice. Now, we have learned previously that **R' Akiva** is the one who says that ma’aser sheini may be used for matzah. Therefore, this Braisa must be following **R' Akiva**, and yet it uses the pasuk as the source for prohibiting bikurim. We see that **R' Akiva** retracted from using his original source.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t **R' Yose Haglili** learn that matzah of bikurim may not be used because it may not be eaten by an onan (the same way he learned regarding ma’aser sheini)!? **A:** He holds like **R' Shimon** who says that bikurim may be eaten by an onan.
 - **The Rabanan**, who argue on **R' Shimon**, say that the pasuk compares bikurim to ma’aser to teach that just like ma’aser may not be eaten by an onan, bikurim may also not be eaten by an onan. **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk refers to bikurim as “terumah”, to teach that it may be eaten by an onan, just like terumah.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that bikurim must be brought with joy. If so, how can **R' Shimon** say it may be eaten by an onan!? **A:** That teaches that it must be brought in a joyous time (i.e. in the harvest season).
- A Braisa says, the words “lechem oni” teach that “chalut” (a fancy bread) and “ashisha” (a large bread) may not be used for matzah. One would think that he must use whole grain (low quality flour) matzah. The Torah therefore wrote the word “matzos” twice to teach that any matzah, no matter how high quality, may be used, except for “chalut” and “ashisha”.

-----Daf י"ז-----37-----

- A Braisa says: **B”S** say one may not bake thick loaves on Pesach (it takes longer to bake and may become chametz before it gets baked). **B”H** allow it.
 - **Q:** How thick of a loaf would **B”H** allow to be baked? **A:** **R' Huna** said, a tefach thick, as we find the Lechem Hapanim was a tefach thick even though it was not allowed to become chametz.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Yosef** asked, maybe we allowed the Lechem Hapanim to be that thick because it was: made by Kohanim (who are more careful); made of very well worked-out dough; baked with very dry wood; baked in a very hot oven; and baked in a metal oven. However, regular Pesach breads that are not made in this way would not be allowed to be made a tefach thick!? **A: Rav** (according to another version it was **Rabbeinu Hakadosh**) said, when the Braisa says “thick loaves” it means “many loaves”, more than are needed to be eaten on that Yom Tov. The Braisa calls it “thick” either because the kneading process for all the loaves creates a large, thick dough, or because in the place of that Tanna they would call “many loaves” by the words “pas avah”.
 - **Q: Why do B”S** say it is assur? If the reason it because he is baking more than he needs, why does the Braisa seem to say it is only a problem on Pesach? It is the same problem on any Yom Tov!? **A: B”S** would say this regarding all Yomim Tovim. The Braisa was taught regarding Pesach, which is why Pesach is mentioned.
- A Braisa says: One can fulfill his matzah obligation with matzah made of high quality flour, low quality flour, or matzah etched with designs, even though the **Rabanan** said that it is assur to make designs on the matzah (for fear it will cause delays and make it chametz). **R' Yehuda** said, Baisos ben Zonin asked the **Rabanan** why a design can't be made using a pre-made mold, which is very quick and will not delay the baking of the matzah. They answered that doing so would not be problematic on its face, but would lead to people thinking that all design making is mutar. Therefore we can't allow that method either. **R' Elazar bar Tzadok** said that his father said that only design making by professional bakers is problematic (because they are perfectionists and will delay the baking). Another version says that his father said, only design making of non-professionals is a problem. **R' Yose** says one may make designs on very thin matzahs, but not on thick ones.
- A Mishna says, sponge-like bread, bread fried in honey, very thin bread, bread made in a pan on top of a fire, and bread made of chullin mixed with terumah, all are patur from challah.
 - **Reish Lakish** said, the first 4 breads are patur because they are all made in a pan on the fire, rather than in an oven (and thus not considered as full-fledged bread). **R' Yochanan** said, bread made in such a way would be chayuv in challah. The reason these are patur is because they are baked by the heat of the sun.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says, sponge-like bread, honey bread, and very thin bread, if made in a pan are chayuv in challah, but if baked in the sun are patur from challah!? **A: Ulla** said, **Reish Lakish** would say this Braisa is discussing where at first the pan was heated up and then the dough was placed in. That case would be considered true bread. But, if the dough is first placed in and then the pan is heated, it would be patur from challah.
 - **Q: If so, why does the Braisa** need to contrast bread made in a pan with bread baked in the sun? If it wants to show a contrast, it can do so by contrasting where the pan is heated before the dough is placed in it, to where the pan is heated after the dough is placed in it!? **A: The Braisa** is missing words, and in fact it does contrast between the two cases of the pan.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says that one may fulfill his matzah obligation with matzah made in a pan. We see it is considered bread!? **A: The Braisa** is discussing where the pan was first heated and the dough was then placed inside.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says: with regard to “me'isa” (made with flour that was poured over boiling water), **B”S** say it is patur from challah and **B”H** say it is chayuv. With regard to “chalitah” (made with flour that had boiling water poured over it), **B”S** say it is chayuv in challah and **B”H** say it is patur. [The Gemara says that there should be no reason why they should reverse their shita in these two instances, so it must be that the one who stated the machlokes about “me'isa” is not the same one who stated the machlokes about “chalitah”]. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said that his father said both are patur from challah. **Another version** is that he said both are chayuv. **The Chachomim** say, both of these, if made in a pan, they are patur from challah, and if made in an oven, they are chayuv in challah. This shita of the **Chachomim** is problematic according to **R' Yochanan**!? **A: R' Yochanan** would say that there is a Tanna that holds like him as well. A Braisa says that “me'isa” and “chalutah” are not chayuv in challah based on the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

requirement that the bread be “lechem”. **R’ Yehuda** argues and says that only bread baked in an oven is chayuv in challah. It must be that the **T”K** says that even bread made on a pan in chayuv, like **R’ Yochanan** said.

- **Q:** It could be that even the **T”K** would say that bread made in a pan is not chayuv in challah. The machlokes may be whether, if after frying in a pan he bakes it in an oven, that would make it be considered bread – the **T”K** says it would and **R’ Yehuda** says that it would not.
- **Rabbah** told **R’ Zeirah** to ask **Ulla** what the halacha is when he places the dough in the pan and heats the pan from the outside. **R’ Zeirah** said, that is not even a question, because that is the classic case of making bread in a pan (which is the subject of the machlokes mentioned above). **R’ Yosef** then told **R’ Zeirah** to ask **Ulla** what the halacha would be if the flame was placed opposite the dough (it was broiled). **R’ Zeirah** said, that is also not even a question, because most poor people do that (to conserve wood) and it is therefore a normal way of making bread in the pan, which would be subject to the machlokes mentioned above.

-----Daf פל 38-----

- **R’ Assi** said, according to **R’ Meir**, who says that ma’aser sheini is considered to belong to Hashem, dough made of ma’aser sheini would be patur from challah, matzah of ma’aser sheini cannot be used to fulfill one’s matzah obligation on Pesach, and an esrog of ma’aser sheini cannot be used to fulfill one’s obligation on Succos. According to the **Rabanan**, who say that ma’aser sheini is considered to belong to the person, dough of ma’aser sheini would be chayuv in challah, matzah of ma’aser sheini may be used, and an esrog of ma’aser sheini may be used.
 - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked, it is understandable why the dough would be patur according to **R’ Meir**, because the pasuk regarding challah says “*arisoseichem*” – *your* dough. The din regarding an esrog makes sense as well, because the pasuk says “*lachem*” – *yours*. However, why can’t matzah of ma’aser be used!? **A: Rava** said, there is a gezeirah shava from matzah to challah, which teaches that it must be “yours”.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, may a Kohen fulfill his matzah obligation with matzah made of challah of ma’aser sheini in Yerushalayim?
 - According to **R’ Yose Haglili**, who says even regular ma’aser sheini may not be used, this surely cannot be used. However, according to **R’ Akiva** who allows it, maybe he only allows regular ma’aser sheini, since if it becomes tamei it may be redeemed and eaten anywhere, but challah which must be burned if it becomes tamei maybe cannot be used for matzah. Or maybe, we say that since if it wasn’t made into challah it would be mutar, it is mutar now as well.
 - **Another version** says, **R’ Akiva** would surely allow it in this case for the reason given. The question is where challah was purchased with the money of ma’aser sheini, according to **R’ Yehuda** who does not allow the redemption of such ma’aser sheini, do we say “since” 2 times (since if it would not have been purchased but would have been regular ma’aser sheini, and since if it would not be challah and would become tamei it could be redeemed and eaten anywhere) and therefore allow its use for matzah, or maybe we only allow using “since” one time, not two!? To that **Rava** said, it would make sense to say that we would allow its use for matzah.

CHALLOS TODAH U’RIKIKEI NAZIR...

- **Q:** From where do we learn this din? **A: Rabbah** said, the pasuk teaches that the matzos must be guarded for the sake of the mitzvah of matzah. The matzos made for these korbanos were not. **R’ Yosef** said, the pasuk teaches that matzah must be made with the potential for them to be eaten for seven days (“shivas yamim matzos tocheilu”). The matzos of the korbanos can only be eaten for a day and a night.
 - **Q:** Why can’t they both learn this din from the words “lechem oni” which teach that the matzah must be able to be eaten by one who has lost a relative that very day and therefore can’t have been made for a korban (which is assur to be eaten by an onan)!? **A:** They hold like **R’ Akiva** who uses those words to teach that it must be like an “ani” (a poor man’s bread).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why don't they learn this din from the fact that the matzos of a korbon are mixed with oil and are therefore "matzah ashira" (not a poor man's bread) and therefore no good for Pesach!? **A: Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said, the amount of oil per matzah of the korbon is minute, and therefore would not prevent its use on Pesach.
- **Q:** Why don't they learn this din that these matzos are passul because they can only be eaten in Yerushalayim!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, we learn from here that the matzos of these korbanos were allowed to be eaten in Nov and Givon, because these korbanos were brought on the "bamos" in Nov and Givon.
- A Braisa says, **R' Illai** said that he asked **R' Eliezer** what the halacha would be with using matzos made for these korbanos and he didn't know. He then asked **R' Yehoshua**, and he said the **Rabanan** say it is allowed if they were made to sell to someone else, but are passul if made for his own korbanos.
 - **Rabbah** explained, when he makes them for sale he knows that he may change his mind and decide to use them for Pesach. Therefore, they are considered to be made and guarded for Pesach from the very beginning.

-----Daf טז-----39-----

MISHNA

- One may fulfill his maror obligation using: chazeres, tamcha, charchavina, ulshin, or maror. They may be used whether moist or dry, but may not be used when soaked in vinegar, overcooked, or even cooked regular. All the species may be combined to reach the required kezayis. The stalks may be used for the maror obligation as well. They may be used even if they are demai, or ma'aser rishon whose terumah has been taken, or ma'aser sheini or hekdesch that have been redeemed.

GEMARA

- The Gemara quotes a number of Braisos that list vegetables that may be used as maror. After doing so, **R' Huna** says that we pasken like the **Acheirem** of a Braisa that any vegetable that has sap and is light green in color is allowed to be used as maror, because any such vegetable is bitter.
 - **Ravina** saw that **R' Acha the son of Rava** was searching for "merirsa" to use as maror. **Ravina** said, since "chazeres" is listed first in our Mishna and in the various Braisos, it would seem that it is the preferred species to use. In fact, **R' Oshaya** clearly stated that it is preferred. In addition, **Rava** said that "chazeres" is "chasa" (lettuce), which should be used because Hashem was "chas" (had pity) on the Yidden and saved them from Mitzrayim. Also, **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason** said, the Egyptians are compared to maror, because at first they were soft and then turned hard (like lettuce). If so, why are you (**R' Acha**) looking to use a different species!? **R' Acha** said, I take back what I have done and will only use "chasa".
- **Q: R' Rechumei** asked **Abaye**, how do we know that maror must be a vegetable? Maybe it is the bitter part of a fish!? **A:** The pasuk compares maror to matzah, to teach that it comes from the ground.
 - **Q:** Maybe it is a bitter tree? **A:** Just like matzah comes from herbage (not trees), maror must come from herbage as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe maror is "harzifu" (a plant that is poisonous to animals)? **A:** Just like matzah is made from something that can be bought with ma'aser sheini money, maror must be as well. "Harzifu" may not be bought with ma'aser money (because it is generally not something that is eaten).
 - **Q: Rabbah bar R' Chanin** asked **Abaye**, maybe the word "maror" teaches that only one species is kosher. How do we know that there are many? **A:** The pasuk says "merorim", which is plural.
 - **Q:** Maybe the plural allows for two, but no more!? **A:** Just like matzah may be from a number of grains, so too maror may be taken from a number of species.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, the vegetables that the **Chachomim** said may be used for maror, may all be planted in one vegetable patch.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How can we say there is no kilayim problem? We find that these species are subject to kilayim with each other!? **A: Rav** meant that they must be planted in one patch in a way that will not lead to kilayim problems.
 - **Q:** A Mishna has already taught that different species must be planted with proper spacing in a patch!? **A:** We would have thought that Mishna only applies to seeds (grain and beans), but vegetables could not be planted in one patch even with such spacing.
 - **Q:** We see from a Mishna that vegetables have a smaller proximity of nourishment than seeds, which would mean that they can surely be planted in one patch!? **A:** We would have thought that the different species of maror are considered “seeds”. **Rav** teaches that they are considered to be vegetables.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna and the Braisos that were quoted all clearly label maror as vegetables!? **A: Rav** stated his halacha only in regard to “chazeres”. Since it hardens, we would think it needs to be planted with more spacing.

YOTZIN BAHEN BEIN LACHIN BEIN YEVEISHIN...

- **R' Chisda** said, the stalks of these species may be used moist or dry. However, the leaves may only be used when moist.
 - **Q:** In a Braisa **R' Meir** seems to say that even leaves may be used when dry!? **A:** He is referring to the stalks, which may be used when dry.
- A Braisa says that one may not use maror that has withered. **R' Eliezer the son of R' Tzadok** said withered maror may be used.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, may one fulfill his obligation with maror of ma'aser sheini in Yerushalayim? According to **R' Akiva**, who allows matzah (which is D'Oraisa) of ma'aser sheini to be used, he would clearly allow maror (which is only D'Rabanan when there is no Korbon Pesach) of ma'aser sheini to be used. The question is according to **R' Yose Haglili** who does not allow such matzah to be used, would he allow such maror to be used? **A: Rava** said, it would make sense that since matzah is compared to maror, one would not be allowed to use maror of ma'aser sheini either.

MISHNA

- One may not soak chicken feed (from grain) in water on Pesach, but he may pour boiling water on it (that does not make it become chametz).
- A woman may not soak the grain she uses as soap, but she may rub the dry grain on her skin (even though her skin is still somewhat wet).
- A person may not chew grain and then place it on his wound (as a method of healing), because it causes the grain to become chametz.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, things that are baked, cooked or had boiling water poured on them, cannot become chametz.
 - **Q:** The cooked thing could become chametz before the water boils!? **R' Pappa** says, the Braisa is referring to a baked item that was then cooked.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, flour which has water dripping onto it (even for a long time) will not become chametz as long as the drip is constant.
 - **R' Pappa** said, this is only if there is constant and rapid dripping.
- **Q:** The Yeshiva of **R' Shila** said that “vatika” (a food made with flour) is mutar on Pesach, however, a Braisa says that it is assur!? **A:** When made with oil and salt it is mutar. When made with water and salt it is assur.
- **Mar Zutra** said, one should not thicken a pot with flour of grain that was dried in an oven (which is somewhat “baked”), because we are concerned that it is not fully baked and may become chametz.
- **R' Yosef** said, one should not pour boiling water over two kernels at once, because it may prevent the water from touching all sides of the kernel, which will therefore not have the effect of preventing it from becoming chametz.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** said, one should not burn two stalks of grain together, because moisture may come out of one (during the process) and go onto the other one (leading it to become chametz).
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we should be similarly concerned that moisture of one part of a single stalk will exit and enter another part of the same stalk!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the reason the moisture is not an issue (whether dealing with 2 stalks or 1) is because it is “fruit juice”, which can’t make something chametz.
 - **Abaye** also changed his view and said it would not be an issue, because a flow of water (i.e. moving water) can’t cause something to become chametz.

-----Daf 70-----40-----

- A Braisa says, one may not soak barley on Pesach. If one did so, if the grains split from the water, they are assur. If they did not split, they are mutar. **R’ Yose** says, if the water has caused the barley to begin expanding, he can soak them in vinegar, which will cause a reversal of the effects of the water and will prevent them from becoming chametz.
 - **Shmuel** said, we do not pasken like **R’ Yose**.
 - **R’ Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva** said, when the Braisa says “split”, it doesn’t mean that they need to actually split to be assur. It means, that if has been effected by the water enough so that if it were now placed on a wine bottle it would split from the fumes of the wine, it is assur. **Shmuel** says, when the Braisa says “split”, it means the barley has actually split.
 - **Rabbah** said, a pious person should not soak barley on Pesach.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says that no one may do so!? **A: Rabbah** meant that a pious person should not even soak wheat, which is harder than barley (and therefore more difficult to make chametz by soaking).
 - **R’ Nachman** said that one may soak wheat on Pesach (which then creates a higher grade flour which can be used for the matzah), because we find that **R’ Huna** and **Rava bar Avin** would soak wheat on Pesach.
 - **Rava** said one may not soak wheat on Pesach.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says one may not soak barley, which is mashma that wheat may be soaked!? **A:** The Braisa is teaching that not only may one not soak wheat, which has ridges which can trap water and thus lead to it becoming chametz, rather one may not even soak barley, which is smooth.
 - **Rava** retracted his view and held that one may soak wheat on Pesach, based on a Braisa. The Braisa says that one may use “white” matzah on Pesach. Now, white matzah can only be made by soaking the wheat. We see that it must be mutar.
 - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says that the “kemach” (regular flour) and “solles” (fine flour) of the village people are not subject to tumah. Presumably this is because the wheat and flour have not touched water. We see that fine flour can be made without soaking!? **A:** The halacha of the Braisa is only referring to the regular flour.
 - **Q:** After **Rava** left, **R’ Pappa** said, I should have asked him from the fact that **Shmuel** said that the grains used for a Korbon Mincha may not be soaked, and yet the Torah refers to the flour as “solles”!?
 - **Rava** later said that it is actually a mitzvah to soak the grains used for the matzah. The pasuk says “Ushmartem es hamatzos”. If they are not soaked, at what point must they be watched and guarded from becoming chametz? It must be that it is a mitzvah for them to be soaked.
 - It can’t be that the mitzvah is that it should be guarded from after the kneading, because **R’ Huna** said, dough of a goy may be eaten on Pesach, but one must eat a kezayis of matzah that was made for the sake of the mitzvah in addition to that of the goy. Presumably, the problem with the goy’s dough is that although it was guarded throughout the baking process, it was not guarded during a soaking process. We therefore see that soaking is part of the mitzvah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Gemara says, it could be that soaking is not a mitzvah. The problem with the goy's dough is that it was not watched from the time that water hit the flour!?
 - **Rava** did not change his view, and therefore would even tell the field workers to handle the grain with intent that it is being done for the mitzvah of matzah.
- A ship carrying wheat sunk before Pesach, and **Rava** allowed any salvaged wheat to be sold to goyim (out of concern that it may be chametz). **Rabbah bar Leivai** asked, we should be concerned that the goy will sell it to a Yid who doesn't know that the wheat was in water (the same way we don't allow clothing of unnoticeable kilayim to be sold to a goy)!? **Rava** then said, it may be sold one kav at a time to Yidden, so that we know it will get used before Pesach.
- A Braisa says, one may not add flour to a pot cooking on the fire on Pesach. If one wants to, he should put in the flour and immediately after, he should put in vinegar (which quickens the cooking process and makes sure the flour is fully cooked before it can become chametz). **Others** say he may even put in the vinegar and then afterwards pour in the flour.
 - The "others" is **R' Yehuda**, who says that one may not put spices into a hot dish containing vinegar on Shabbos, because that causes the spices to get cooked (even though the vinegar was there before the spices were put in).
 - **Ulla** said, no matter what the order, it may not be done. We want to stay far away from the possibility of chametz.
 - **R' Pappa** allowed the bakers of the Reish Galusa to put flour of grain dried in an oven into a cooking pot. **Rava** said we can't allow this when being done by slaves who are not concerned for chametz! **Others** say that **Rava** himself would add such flour to a pot.

MISHNA

- One may not add flour to a dip containing vinegar, or to mustard. If one did so, he should eat it immediately. **R' Meir** says it is assur to eat.
- One may not cook the Korbon Pesach in any liquids, including fruit juices. However, one may smear the meat with them, and one may dip the meat into it when he is eating it.
- The water used by a baker to cool his hands (and therefore always has some dough in it) must be poured out because it becomes chametz.

GEMARA

- **R' Kahana** said, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Meir** is only regarding the case where the flour was placed into mustard. However, when placed into the vinegar dip, all agree that it must be burned and not eaten. A Braisa says like this as well.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehuda in the name of R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, the halacha follows the **T"K**.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchok** asked **R' Huna the son of R' Yehuda**, did **Shmuel** say that only regarding mustard or even regarding the vinegar dip (i.e. does he say there is no machlokes regarding the vinegar dip like **R' Kahana** said)? **R' Huna** said, I do not agree with **R' Kahana's** statement.
 - **R' Ashi** said, it would seem that we should pasken like **R' Kahana**, because **Shmuel** said we don't pasken like **R' Yose** who said that vinegar reverses the chametz process. It must mean that **Shmuel** says that vinegar quickens the process!
 - The Gemara says, this is not a proof. It could be that **Shmuel** says that vinegar does not reverse or quicken the process (so he may disagree with **R' Kahana**).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says the Korbon Pesach may not be cooked “in water”. One would think it may only not be cooked in water, but may be cooked in other liquids. A kal v’chomer teaches us that this is not so. If it can’t be cooked in water, which doesn’t add flavor to the meat, surely it can’t be cooked in other liquids, which would add flavor to the meat. **Rebbi** says, we know that the Korbon Pesach may not be cooked in other liquids because the pasuk says “u’vashel mevushal” – a double use of the word “cooking” – to teach that it is assur to be cooked in any liquid.
 - The difference between these opinions is whether one may cook a Korbon Pesach in its own juices. According to the **T”K**, it doesn’t affect its taste and therefore may be done. According to **Rebbi**, no cooking whatsoever is allowed.
 - **Q:** What does the **T”K** learn from the double use of the word “cooking” in the pasuk? **A:** It is necessary to teach that according to **Ulla**, according to **R’ Meir**, one would be chayuv for cooking the Korbon Pesach even if it was first roasted.
- A Braisa says, one would think that one would be chayuv for burning (“over roasting”) the Korbon Pesach. The pasuk therefore says that one “may not eat from it partially roasted or cooked in water”. However, eating from it when over-done, would not make him chayuv.
- A Braisa says, one would think that one would be chayuv for eating a kezayis of the Korbon Pesach raw. The pasuk therefore says that one “may not eat from it partially roasted”. However, eating from it when raw would not make him chayuv. One would think that it is therefore mutar to eat from it raw. The Torah therefore says that it may be eaten “only roasted over fire”.
- **R’ Chisda** says, one who cooks with the hot springs of Teverya on Shabbos is patur. One who cooks a Korbon Pesach in the hot springs is chayuv.
 - **Q:** Why is it not “cooking” for Shabbos, but is for Korbon Pesach? **A:** **Rava** said, when **R’ Chisda** said he “is chayuv”, he did not mean that he is chayuv for cooking, he meant that he is chayuv for eating it in a way other than “roasted over fire”.
- **Rava** says, if one ate from a Korbon Pesach: partially roasted *or* cooked, he gets 2 sets of malkus (one for the general lav of “only roasted over fire”, and one for the specific lav against eating it partially roasted or cooked). If one eats a piece that is only partially roasted, *and* a piece that is cooked, he is chayuv 3 sets of malkus. **Abaye** says one does not get malkus for the lav of “only roasted over fire”, because it is a “general lav”.
 - **Some say** that **Abaye** says that he never gets malkus for the general lav (even when that is the only lav being violated). **Others** says that **Abaye** says that he gets malkus for that lav if it is the only lav being violated.
 - A similar machlokes is stated with regard to a nazir eating a grape peel or grape seed.
- A Braisa says, if one eats a kezayis of partially roasted Korbon Pesach on Erev Pesach, he is patur. If he did so after nightfall, he is chayuv. If one ate a kezayis of roasted Korbon Pesach on Erev Pesach, he may still join his Korbon Pesach group that night. If he ate a kezayis on Pesach night, he may no longer join his group (a person must eat his Korbon Pesach in one place only).
 - A Braisa says:
 - One would think that if he eats a kezayis of partially roasted Korbon Pesach on Erev Pesach he should be chayuv, because if he is chayuv for eating it at a time when there is a mitzvah to eat the korbon when properly roasted, surely he should be chayuv for eating it at a time when there is no mitzvah to eat it even if properly roasted. Or, maybe we should say, that one should only be chayuv for eating a partially raw piece when there is no mitzvah to eat a proper Korbon Pesach (by day), but not at night. Just like it becomes mutar to eat a proper Korbon Pesach at night, maybe a person who eats a partially roasted one at night is no longer chayuv. To avoid this confusion, the pasuk says, “one shall not eat from it partially roasted...only roasted over fire”. This teaches that one is only chayuv for eating partially roasted when there is a mitzvah to eat a proper Korbon Pesach.
 - **Rebbi** says, why does the pasuk say a double use of the word “cooking” (u’vashel mivushal)? We would think that the issur of cooking the korbon only applies at night. The double wording teaches that the issur applies on Erev Pesach as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rabbi** used this double wording to teach something else!? **A:** The Torah could have used the same word twice, but instead it uses 2 different variations of the word “cooking”. Therefore, we can learn 2 lessons from this verbiage.
- A Braisa says, if one eats a piece of properly roasted Korbos Pesach on Erev Pesach, he is chayuv. If one eats a piece of partially roasted Korbos Pesach after nightfall, he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** The Braisa seems to compare both cases, saying that both are chayuv with a lav. What is the lav in the first case? **A:** The pasuk says “the meat should be eaten that night” – which is mashma that it may not be eaten before night.
 - **Q:** This is a lav that is learned from an “asei”, which has the status of an “asei”, not a lav!? **A: R’ Chisda** said, this follows **R’ Yehuda**, who says that an issur which is in a parsha that begins with “Vayidaber Hashem...leimor” is considered a lav. The parsha of Korbos Pesach begins with such a pasuk.
 - **Bar Kappara** explains, “leimor” is interpreted as saying “Lo Emor” – “No” was said in regard to this issur. The Yeshiva of **Rav** said, it is interpreted as saying “Lav emor” – a lav is said with regard to this issur.