

1 Elul 5773
August 7, 2013



Pesachim Daf 48

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. One cannot bring *nesachim* from wine whose grapes are *tevel*.

It is said: *and one sheep from the flock out of two hundred, from the banquet of Israel*. The words *a sheep* indicates male and female, so this excludes a *bechor*, a firstborn animal, which is only male. The word *one* indicates an offering of an animal that was always by itself and this excludes an animal that was part of a group of ten and was designated as *Maaser*. The words *from the flock* exclude a *palgas*, which is a sheep that is in its thirteenth month, and a *palgas* is not acceptable as an offering. The words *out of two hundred* teaches us that the wine for *nesachim*, libations that are brought with *olah* and *shelamim offerings*, can be used from the leftover of two hundred parts of wine that remain in the vat. This means that one can take some wine for *nesachim* from a vat that has the same amount of prohibited wine, as long as the vat also contains two hundred portions of permitted wine. We learn from this that *orlah* wine is negated when the *orlah* wine is mixed with two hundred parts of wine that is permitted. The words *from the banquet of Israel* teach us that wine used for *nesachim* must be taken from that what is permitted for a Jew to consume, so one cannot bring *nesachim* from wine whose grapes are *tevel* (produce that has not had *terumah* and *Maaser* removed from it. (47b - 48a)

2. The dispute between Rabbah and Rav Chisda regarding the principle of *ho'il* can be linked to

the dispute in our Mishnah between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua.

We learned that there is a dispute between Rabbah and Rav Chisda regarding one who bakes on Yom Tov for the weekday if he receives lashes or not. Rabbah maintained that he is not liable lashes as we say *ho'il*, since visitors may arrive and he can serve them the food on Yom Tov, and Rav Chisda maintains that he will receive lashes as we do not say *ho'il*. The Gemara attempts to link this dispute with the dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua in our Mishnah regarding baking loaves that are tamei on Yom Tov when challah has not yet been separated. Rabbi Eliezer would hold of *ho'il*, because Rabbi Eliezer permits baking the loaves because he can separate *challah* from each loaf separately. One way to separate the challah is by removing a piece from each loaf. Alternatively, one can place all the loaves in a basket and separate one whole loaf as challah. The first manner would certainly allow one to bake the loaves on Yom Tov, because although part of every loaf will be forbidden to eat on Yom Tov, one is still permitted to bake the loaves because of the permitted part of every loaf. If one chooses to designate one loaf as challah, Rabbi Eliezer will permit even the baking of that loaf, because of *ho'il*. Since the person could choose to separate challah from each loaf, he can bake all the loaves even though presently he plans on separating one loaf as challah. Rabbi Yehoshua, however, will, not apply the principle of *ho'il*, and Rabbi Yehoshua will agree with Rav Chisda

that one who bakes on Yom Tov for the weekday will receive lashes. (48a)

3. There is a distinction between different qualities of grain regarding the maximum amount of dough that one can knead on Pesach.

Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says that the maximum amount of dough that one can knead on Pesach without being concerned that it will become chametz is two *kabim*, which is equivalent to forty-eight eggs. Regarding barley flour, which ferments more slowly than wheat, the maximum amount is three *kabim*. Rabbi Nassan said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer that the ruling should be reversed, which means that regarding wheat flour, one can bake up to three *kabim*, whereas regarding barley flour, one can only bake up to two *kabim*. A different Baraisa states that Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says that regarding wheat flour the maximum is three *kabim*, whereas regarding barley flour the maximum is four *kabim*. The Gemara resolves this contradiction by stating that the Baraisa that stated that the maximum amount is forty *kabim* of barley flour refers to inferior grain, whereas the Baraisa that states that the maximum barley flour is three *kabim* refers to superior grain which ferments more quickly than poor grain. We see from this that poor wheat in contrast to good wheat is more inferior than poor barley in contrast to superior barley. Regarding wheat the difference between superior wheat and inferior wheat is one third but regarding barley the difference is a fourth. (48a)

4. Five quarters of a kav and a little bit more are subject to the obligation of *challah*.

Rav said that one *kav* in *Melognah* is the maximum amount regarding kneading dough on Pesach, and the same is true with regard to *challah*, i.e. one is only

obligated to separate *challah* if the dough contains at least one *kav* of flour. However, we have been taught that dough that is obligated in the separation of *challah* is five quarters of a *kav* of flour and a little bit. The Gemara answers that Rav meant that the *kav* of Melognah was actually larger than the conventional *kav*, and it was equal to five quarters of a *kav*. (48a - 48b)

5. Rav Yosef stated that the women in his time would bake a *kepiza* at a time on Pesach.

Rav Yosef said that the women in his time would bake no more than one *kepiza* (three quarters of a *kav*) at a time on Pesach. This was a stringency, as they could have kneaded as much as $1\frac{1}{4}$ *kabim*. Abaye questioned this practice, because it is a stringency that leads to a leniency. When one kneads only one *kepiza* of a dough at a time, there is no obligation to separate *challah*. Rav Yosef answers this objection by stating that these women followed the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer who maintains that when one removes baked loaves from the oven and places them in a basket, the baskets combines them with regard to the law of *challah*. (48b)

6. There is a dispute regarding what combines loaves to reach the required measurement to be subject to the obligation of *challah*.

The Tanna Kamma maintains that separate doughs combine for the required amount if they “bite” one another, which means that they are so stuck together in the oven that the dough of one loaf would stick to the other loaf when the loaves are pulled apart. Rabbi Eliezer, however, maintains that one who removes baked loaves from an oven and places them in a basket, the basket combines them with regard to the law of *challah*. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel that the Halacha is in accordance with rabbi

Eliezer. The women would place their loaves in basket after baking them, and this would make the loaves obligated in challah. Abaye maintains that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi taught regarding the ruling of Rabbi Eliezer that Rabbi Eliezer only said his ruling regarding Babylonian loaves, which are wide and round and they stick together in the oven to the point that they “bite each other.” This means that when the loaves are pulled apart a piece of one loaf is stuck to the other loaf. Regarding long and narrow loaves, however, which do not “bite” one another, they did not combine by being in the same basket. Rav Yosef disagrees with Abaye and Rav Yosef maintains that quotes Rabbi Chanina who said that Rabbi Eliezer maintains that even loaves that are not stuck together in the oven can be combined by placing the loaves in one basket. Therefore, even though the women only baked one *kepiza* of dough at a time, they could combine the loaves in one basket, thus obligating the loaves in challah separation. A Baraisa states that Rabbi Eliezer maintains that a basket combines loaves for the measure to be obligated in separation of challah. Rabbi Yehoshua maintains that the oven combines the loaves, even if the loaves are not placed in one baskets. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel maintains that Babylonian loaves which “bite” one another, are combined even if the loaves are not placed in one basket. Long narrow laws which do not “bite” each other, however, are not deemed to be a combination. (48b)

7. There is a dispute regarding the procedure that women must adopt when baking matzos on Pesach.

Rabban Gamliel maintains that three women can knead their dough at one time and bake them in one oven one after the other. The women began kneading the dough at the same time, so the doughs are all ready to be baked simultaneously. The oven can only

bake one dough at a time, so when the first dough is being baked, the other two doughs are not going to be kneaded. The last dough that is placed in the oven will have been left out the time it takes to bake the first two doughs. Rabban Gamliel allows this to be done because he is not concerned that the dough will leaven in such a short time period. The Chachamim, however, maintain that three women involved with the dough at the same time must do as follows: when one woman kneads the dough, the second shapes the dough and the third woman bakes her dough. The Chachamim are concerned that if they all start kneading the dough simultaneously, then one women’s dough might leaven while she is waiting to place her dough in the oven. By having one woman knead her dough and then start shaping it, the second woman will then begin to knead her dough, and when the first woman is ready to bake her dough and the second woman finished kneading her dough, the third woman starts kneading the dough. In this manner the dough is constantly being handed until it is baked and it will not become chametz. Rabbi Akiva agrees with the Chachamim that each dough must be handled constantly because not all women, not all wood and not all ovens are similar, so one cannot be certain that the dough will not leaven before an oven is available to bake the dough. The general rule is that if the dough rises, the woman should make her hands wet with cold water and smear water on the dough. The coldness of the water will prevent the dough from leavening. (48b)

8. *Siur* must be burned but one who eats *siur* is not liable kares or lashes.

Siur is dough that has not completely leavened. The Halacha is that *siur* must be burned but one who eats *siur* is not liable *kares* and will not receive lashes. *Siur* is a case of *chametz nuksheh*, defective chametz, and is not biblically prohibited. Since it cannot be eaten, it

must be burned. After the stage of *siur*, there is a stage when the dough leavens and develops cracks or furrows, and this dough must be burned, because furrowed dough is full-fledged chametz. (48b)

9. There is a dispute as to what is considered *siur*.

Rabbi Yehudah maintains that dough that has developed cracks like the antenna of locusts, which is a crack here and a crack here, is considered to be *siur*. When the dough has cracks interwoven one with the other, this is considered furrowed dough. The Chachamim maintain, however, that whether the cracks begin to develop like the antennae of locusts or whether the cracks are interwoven, one who eats such dough is liable *kares*. The Chachamim maintain that *siur* that one is not liable for eating is a dough that its surface pales like a person's face when his hair stands on end out of fear. This stage occurs in eth dough before any cracks develop. Rabbi Yehudah will maintain that dough that has paled is still deemed to be matzah, and one does not have to remove it from his possession and he can even derive benefit from it. (48b)

10. Rabbi Meir maintains that every individual crack above the surface of the dough has many individual cracks below the surface.

A Baraisa states that Rabbi Meir maintains that *siur* is any dough whose surface has paled like a person's face when his hair stands on end out of fear. Furrowed dough is when cracks develop in the dough like the antennae of locusts. The Chachamim maintain that *siur* is when the dough develops cracks like the antennae of locusts, and furrowed dough is when the cracks are interwoven one with the other. According to Rabbi Meir, in either case, one who eats the dough is liable *kares*. The reason Rabbi Meir considered

dough that has cracks like locusts' antenna the same as furrowed dough is because there is no dough that has individual cracks on its surface that will not have many additional cracks below the surface of the dough, so even locusts' antennae above the surface of the dough is a sign that the dough is furrowed beneath the surface. (48b)

DAILY MASHAL

THE PRINCIPLE OF HO'IL

The Gemara discusses the principle of *ho'il*, that since something may occur in the future, we permit an act now. The Medrash states that one should observe the mannerisms of the ant, who gathers wheat in the summer to store for the winter. The ant can subsist on a kernel and a half of wheat, yet it gathers an enormous amount of wheat, barley and lentils. The average lifespan of the ant is only six months. Why does the ant store so much grain if it will not even live for that amount of time? The Medrash answers that the ant hopes that Hashem will grant it more life and it will then be able to benefit from its hard work. The analogy is clear. Man should always anticipate that HaShem may grant him more time to live, and he will then be able to study more Torah and perform more mitzvos so he will be prepared for the World to Come.