



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”h**

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

Rami bar Chama said: This [controversy] of Rav Chisda and Rabbah is the controversy of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua, For Rabbi Eliezer holds, We say, ‘since’, while Rabbi Yehoshua holds, We do not say since’.<sup>1</sup> Said Rav Pappa: Yet perhaps Rabbi Eliezer rules that we say ‘since’, there only, because when they go into the oven, each one is fit for himself; but here that it is fit for visitors only, but it is not fit for himself,<sup>2</sup> perhaps it is indeed [the fact] that we do not say ‘since’? Rav Shisha son of Rav Idi said: Yet perhaps it is not so: Rabbi Yehoshua may rule that we do not say, ‘since’, only there, where there is one [matzah] that is not fit either for himself or for visitors; but here that it is at least fit for visitors, perhaps it is indeed [the fact] that we say ‘since’?

The Rabbis reported this [Rami bar Chama's statement] before Rabbi Yirmiyah and Rabbi Zeira. Rabbi Yirmiyah accepted it, Rabbi Zeira did not accept it. Said Rabbi Yirmiyah to Rabbi Zeira: A matter which has been a continual difficulty to us for many years, [viz.,] wherein do Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua differ, now [that] it has been explained in the name of a great man, shall we then not accept it? Said he to him, How can I accept it? For it was taught, Rabbi Yehoshua

said to him: According to your words, he transgresses on account of you shall not do any manner of work, and he was silent before him. But if this is correct, let him answer him, My reason is on account of ‘since’? — Then on your view, replied he, as to what was taught in a Baraisa, Rabbi Eliezer said to him: According to your words, behold, he violates, ‘it shall not be seen’ and ‘it shall not be found’, and he was silent before him; could he indeed not answer him; surely he answers him in the Mishnah, for we learned: This is not the leaven about which we are warned, it shall not be seen’, and ‘it shall not be found’. But [what we must say is that] he was silent before him in the Baraisa, yet he answered him in our Mishnah. So here too, say that he was silent before him in a teaching, yet he answered him in another collection [of Baraisos]. (48a2 – 48a4)

It was taught, Rebbe said: The halachah is as Rabbi Eliezer; while Rabbi Yitzchak said: The halachah is as the son of Beseirah. And what is the standard of dough?<sup>3</sup> — Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: In the case of wheat, two kavs;<sup>4</sup> in the case of barley, three kavs. Rabbi Nassan said on Rabbi Elozar's authority: The rulings are

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> As far as he is concerned he is definitely baking it for the week, while he has not invited visitors.

<sup>3</sup> Which one can knead on Pesach and keep it from fermenting.

<sup>4</sup> Which is equivalent to forty-eight eggs.

[to be] reversed.<sup>5</sup> But it was taught, Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: In the case of wheat, three kavs, and in the case of barley, four kavs? — There is no difficulty: One refers to inferior [grain]; the other to superior grain.<sup>6</sup> Rav Pappa observed: This proves: Poor wheat is more inferior to good wheat than poor barley is inferior to good barley, for whereas there [there is a difference of] a third, here [there is a difference of] a quarter. (48a4 – 48a5)

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*. (48a5 – 48b1)

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. Rav Yehudah said in

Shmuel's name: The halachah is as Rabbi Eliezer. Said he to him: But it was stated regarding this: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: They taught this only of Babylonian loaves, which bite each other,<sup>7</sup> but not [of] long, narrow loaves? — Surely it was stated regarding this: Rabbi Chanina said: Even long, narrow ones.

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked: What of a board which has no ledges?<sup>8</sup> Do we require the inside of a vessel, which is absent here; or perhaps we require the air space of a vessel, which is present? The question stands.

It was taught: 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 basket). Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel maintains that Babylonian loaves which “bite” one another, are combined.<sup>9</sup> (48b1 – 48b2)

MISHNAH: Rabban Gamliel maintains that three women can knead their dough at one time and bake them in one oven one after the other.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> Rabbi Akiva [agrees with the Chachamim that each dough must be handled constantly because he says] not all

<sup>5</sup> Three in the case of wheat, and two in the case of barley, for barley ferments more quickly.

<sup>6</sup> Two kavs of superior wheat is the equivalent of three kavs of inferior wheat; while three kavs of superior barley is the equivalent of four kavs of inferior barley.

<sup>7</sup> This 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. This is why they are regarded as one.

<sup>8</sup> Does it combine the loaves placed upon it?

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> The Chachamim are concerned that if they all start kneading the dough simultaneously, then one woman'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.

women, not all wood and not all ovens are similar.<sup>12</sup> 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].<sup>13</sup> (48b2 – 48b3)

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: Having kneaded [the dough] she forms it [in shape], while her companion kneads in her place; having formed [the dough] she bakes it, and her companion shapes [the dough] in her place, while the third [woman] kneads. [The first] having baked, she kneads [again], and her companion bakes in her place, while the third shapes [her dough]. And thus the rotation continues. As long as they are engaged [in working] on the dough, it does not come to fermentation. (48b3)

Rabbi Akiva said: not all women etc. It was taught, Rabbi Akiva said: I discussed [the matter] before Rabban Gamliel: Let our Master teach us: Does this refer to energetic women or to women who are not energetic; to damp wood or to dry wood; to a hot oven or to a cool oven? Said he to me, You have nothing else save what the Sages learned: If it rises, let her wet it with cold water. (48b3)

MISHNAH: *Si'ur*<sup>14</sup> must be burned but one who eats it is not liable;<sup>15</sup> *sidduk*<sup>16</sup> must be burned, and one who eats it is liable to kares. What is *si'ur*? [When there are lines on the surface] like locusts' horns; *sidduk* is when the cracks have intermingled with each other; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. But the Sages maintain: Regarding the one and the other, he who eats it is liable to kares.<sup>17</sup> And what is *si'ur*? When its surface is blanched, like [the face of] a man whose hair is standing [on end]. (48b3 – 48b4)

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: What is *si'ur*. Whenever its surface is blanched, like [the face of] a man whose hair is

standing on end; *sidduk* is [when there are lines on the surface] like locusts' horns; these are the words of Rabbi Meir's. But the Sages maintain: What is *si'ur*? [When the lines on its surface are] like locusts' horns; *sidduk* is when the cracks have intermingled with each other; and in both cases, he who eats it is liable to kares. But we learned: *Si'ur* must be burned but one who eats it is not liable; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah? Say according to Rabbi Meir, in both cases, he who eats it incurs kares.<sup>18</sup> Rava said: What is Rabbi Meir's reason? There is not a single crack on the surface for which there are not many cracks below [the surface].<sup>19</sup> (48b4)

#### 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.

<sup>12</sup> So one cannot be certain that the dough will not leaven before an oven is available to bake the dough.

<sup>13</sup> The coldness of the water will prevent the dough from leavening.

<sup>14</sup> *Siur* is dough that has not completely leavened. *Siur* is a case of *chametz nukshah*, defective chametz, and is not biblically prohibited. Since it cannot be eaten, it must be burned.

<sup>15</sup> He will not get *kares*, now will he incur lashes.

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> Even at the earlier stage it is no longer *si'ur*.

<sup>18</sup> Because he regards both as *sidduk*.

<sup>19</sup> Hence even when the cracks on the surface are still separate, they already cross below the surface.