



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

Our Rabbis taught: [With regard to] the trough of tanners¹ into which he put flour, [if] within three days [before Pesach], he is bound to remove it;² [if] before three days, he is not bound to remove it.³ Said Rabbi Nassan: When is this said? If he did not put hides into it; but if he put hides into it, even [if it is] within three days, he is not bound to remove [the flour].⁴ Rava said: The halachah is as Rabbi Nassan, even [if it is] one day, and even one hour [before Pesach]. (45b4)

And it is likewise in respect to tumah: if he objects to it, it interposes; but if he desires its preservation, it is like the kneading-trough. But are they comparable? There the matter is dependent on the quantity [of the dough], [whereas] here the matter is dependent on [his] objecting [to it]? Said Rav Yehudah, Say: But in respect to tumah it is not so. Said Abaye to him, But he states, and it is likewise in respect to tumah? Rather, said Abaye, He means as follows: And it is likewise in respect to combining for tumah on Pesach, whereas during the rest of the year there is a distinction. How is that? E.g., if there are eatables less than an egg in quantity,⁵ and they were in contact with this dough; on Pesach, when its prohibition renders the dough important, it combines.⁶ [But] during the rest of the year, when the matter is dependent on [his]

objecting, ‘if he objects to it,’ it combines; [while] ‘if he desires its preservation, it is like the kneading-trough.’ To this Rava demurred: Does he then teach, it combines; surely he teaches, it interposes! Rather, said Rava: [The meaning is], and it is likewise in respect to bringing taharah to the kneading-trough. How is that? E.g., if this kneading-trough became tamei, and he wishes to immerse it. On Pesach, when its interdict [renders it] important, it interposes, and the immersion is not efficacious for it. But during the rest of the year the matter is dependent on his objecting: If he objects to it, it interposes, while if he desires its preservation, it is like the kneading-trough. To this Rav Pappa demurred: Does he teach, And it is likewise in respect to taharah? Surely he teaches, and it is likewise in respect to tumah! Rather, said Rav Pappa: [The meaning is], and it is likewise in respect to causing tumah to descend upon the kneading-trough. How so? E.g., if a sheretz touched this dough: on Pesach, when its interdict [renders it] important, it interposes, and tumah does not descend upon it;⁷ [but] during the rest of the year, when the matter is dependent on [his] objecting, if he objects to it, it interposes; while if he desires its

¹ Into which they put hides for tanning.

² Because it is still regarded as flour, and of course it is chametz.

³ Because by Pesach it will be so spoiled through the odor of the trough, even if there are no hides in it, that it will not be regarded as flour.

⁴ Because the hides utterly spoil it.

⁵ This being the minimum standard which can render tamei.

⁶ With the eatables. I.e., the dough, if an olive in quantity, is important in so far as its prohibition necessitates its removal, and owing to this it combines with the eatables to the standard of an egg, whereby if tamei they can together render other foods tamei.

⁷ The trough does not become tamei, for we do not regard the sheretz, as having touched it.

preservation, it is like [i.e., identical with] the kneading-trough.⁸ (45b4 – 46a2)

Dough that is left without being worked/kneaded for eighteen minutes becomes chametz.

The Mishna states that dough that is deaf; i.e., it is unclear whether or not it has become chametz,⁹ is considered chametz, if dough in a similar situation clearly became chametz. (46a2)

The Gemora asks: What if there is no comparable dough? How would we know if it became chametz? Rabbi Avahu answers in the name of Rish Lakish: [The period for fermentation is] as long as it takes a man to walk from Migdal Nunaya to Tiberias, which is a mil.¹⁰ Then let him say a mil? — He informs us this, [viz.,] that the standard of a mil is as that from Migdal Nunaya to Tiberias.

Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: For kneading, for prayer, and for washing the hands, [the standard is] four mils.¹¹ Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: Aivu stated this, and he stated four [laws] about it, and one of them is tanning. For we learned: And all these, if he tanned them or trod on them to the extent of tanning, are

⁸ So that the trough becomes tamei through the contact of the sheretz with the dough.

⁹ I.e., dough whose surface has gone hard and smooth and contains no splits, which are the usual signs of fermentation, and thus there is doubt.

¹⁰ Two thousand cubits. This is generally regarded as an eighteen minutes' walk. If it is eighteen minutes since the dough was kneaded (before being set in the oven), it is chametz.

¹¹ A paid kneader must go four mils to immerse the kneading vessels, if they are tamei. A man on a journey, when he wishes to stop for the night, must go on another four mils if there is a synagogue within that distance, to pray there. Similarly, he must go on four mils ahead to procure water for washing his hands prior to eating; but if no synagogue or water is available within that distance, he is not bound to undertake a longer journey.

¹² A number of animals are enumerated in Gemara Chullin whose skins are the same as their flesh in respect of tumah, as

tahor,¹² excepting a man's skin. And how much is 'the extent of tanning'? — Said Rabbi Aivu in Rabbi Yannai's name: The extent of walking four mils. Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina said: They learned this only [about going on] ahead, but [as for going] back, he need not return even a mil. Said Rav Acha: And from this [we deduce]: it is only a mil that he need not go back, but less than a mil he must go back.¹³ (46a2 – 46a3)

The Mishna asks: How do we separate *challah* on the festival (of Pesach) from dough which is in a state of *tumah*? [*Challah which is tamei may not be eaten by the Kohen. Now this challah may not be baked, since it cannot be eaten, and only the preparation of food is permitted on a Festival; it cannot be kept until evening, as it may turn chametz; nor may it be burned or given to dogs, for sacred food must not be destroyed on a Festival. The actual Festival days are meant, i.e., the first and the last days (outside Eretz Yisroel, the first two and the last two), but not the Intermediate Days, which possess only a semi sanctity.*] Rabbi Eliezer said: It must not be designated with the name (of *challah*) until it is baked. [*The dough must first be baked, and then all the unleavened matzos are put in a basket, and one matzah or so is declared challah for all of it. Usually challah must be separated from*

they are likewise accounted as eatables (several animals unfit for food are included in the list). But if he tanned them, etc., they are tahor, i.e., they lose the status of flesh and thus become tahor.

¹³ After the Gemora mentioned that dough left unworked becomes chametz after eighteen minutes, it mentioned four things that are dependent on seventy-two minutes. Two of them are the amount of time one must keep traveling forward (towards the location he is travelling to) in order to obtain either a minyan for davening or water for washing his hands before eating bread. However, he is only required to backtrack (go backwards on his journey) less than eighteen minutes in order to achieve these spiritual goals. [If he would need to go more than seventy-two minutes forward or eighteen or more minutes backward, he is allowed to eat the bread without touching it with his hands (by using a napkin or utensil, see Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim 163:1).]

the dough, but when this is impossible, or if it was not done, it is separated from the baked bread.] The son of Beseirah said: Let the dough be placed into cold water (until evening, for the chill of the water will prevent it from becoming chametz). Rabbi Yehoshua said: Now this is not the chametz concerning which we are warned with the injunctions, 'it shall not be seen,' and 'it shall not be found (for the challah which is chametz does not belong to him; rather, it belongs to the Kohanim), but he separates it and leaves it until the evening, and if it leavens, it leavens. (46a3 – 46b1)

The Gemora asks: Shall we say that they differ in respect of the benefit of gratitude (in the challah; i.e., the fact that he can give it to any Kohen he wishes): Rabbi Eliezer holds that the benefit of gratitude is considered money, while Rabbi Yehoshua holds that the benefit of gratitude is not money (and therefore there would be no prohibition for retaining it over Pesach)?¹⁴

The Gemora answers: No; all hold that the benefit of gratitude is not money, but here they differ in respect to (the principle of) 'since'. For Rabbi Eliezer holds: We say, 'since' if he desires, he can have it (the designation of challah) annulled (by a Sage),¹⁵ it is his property (even now); while Rabbi Yehoshua holds: We do not say, 'since.'¹⁶ (46b1)

¹⁴ Goodwill benefit is a man's right to dispose of property to whomever he desires, though he may not keep it, and it is disputed whether such a right is accounted as of monetary worth. Naturally, even if it is, its value is small. Thus an Israelite must separate challah, but he can give it to any Kohen he desires, and a friend of a particular Kohen might pay him a trifle to give it to that Kohen. Now, it has been stated that the interdict against leaven being seen or found in the house applies only to one's own leaven. Now if goodwill benefit ranks as money, the challah is accounted the Israelite's property, and therefore it is subject to this interdict: hence Rabbi Eliezer holds that the dough must first be baked. But if goodwill benefit does not rank as money, the challah is not accounted the Israelite's property, and therefore it is separated from the dough, and it does not matter if it turns leaven.

There is an argument whether or not someone who bakes on Yom Tov for the purpose of using the food during the week receives lashes.

The Gemora quotes an argument between Rabbah and Rav Chisda regarding one who bakes from Yom Tov for weekday use. Rav Chisda says that he incurs lashes, while Rabbah says that he does not incur lashes. Rav Chisda says that he incurs lashes: We do not say, Since if guests visited him it would be fit for him [on the Festival itself]. Rabbah said: He incurs lashes: We say, 'since.'¹⁷ Said Rabbah to Rav Chisda: According to you who maintain, We do not say, 'since', how may we bake on a Festival for the Shabbos? — On account of the eiruv tavshilin, he answered him. And on account of an eiruv tavshilin we permit a Biblical prohibition! — Said he to him, By Biblical law the requirements of the Shabbos may be prepared on a Festival, and it was only the Rabbis who forbade it, lest it be said, You may bake on a Festival even for weekdays;¹⁸ but since the Rabbis necessitated an eiruv tavshilin, he has a distinguishing feature.¹⁹ [Rav Chisda says that while it is prohibited according to Torah law to prepare on a day of Yom Tov for a weekday, it is only Rabbinically prohibited to prepare on Yom Tov for Shabbos. The root of the Rabbinic prohibition in preparing on Yom Tov for Shabbos is because one might come to prepare on Yom Tov for

¹⁵ When a man declares anything sacred, as challah, it is really the equivalent of a vow that this shall be sacred, and therefore he can be absolved of it, whereby his declaration is annulled, just as in the case of other vows.

¹⁶ We disregard this possibility, since in fact he has not revoked it. Hence it is not his property.

¹⁷ Rabbah maintains: 'Since' it is possible that guests might come to his house and he would now be able to feed them food, he does not clearly transgress preparing for a weekday on Yom Tov (as he still might use the food today).

¹⁸ Which is definitely forbidden.

¹⁹ Which makes it clear to him that cooking on Festivals is not permitted indiscriminately, but only for the Festival or the Shabbos.

during the week. Therefore, Chazal only made this decree when one does not make an “eiruv tavshilin”. This is because the eiruv tavshilin makes it noticeable that one is only able to prepare on Yom Tov for Shabbos, not for a weekday. This takes away the reason why Chazal would otherwise prohibit preparing on a Yom Tov for Shabbos.] (46b2)

The Gemora asks a question on Rav Chisda from a braisa. The braisa states: If someone has a dangerously ill animal (that he thinks might die if he waits to slaughter it after Yom Tov), he may slaughter it as long as he has time to eat an olive sized piece of its roasted meat on Yom Tov. The Gemora asks: [Thus, it states when] he is able to eat [of it], [that is] even if he does not wish to eat. Now according to me, who maintains that we say, ‘since’, it is well, since if he desires to eat, he is able to eat, for that reason he may slaughter. But according to you who maintains, we do not say, ‘since’, why may he slaughter?²⁰ Rav Chisda answers that it is on account of the loss of his money.²¹ And on account of the loss of his money we permit a Biblical prohibition! Yes, he replied: on account of the loss of his money he determined in his heart to eat as much as an olive, and as much as an olive of flesh is impossible [to obtain] without slaughtering.²² (46b3)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

An Eiruv Tavshilin is when one takes a piece of bread and a cooked dish on the eve of a Yom Tov that falls out on Friday (if it is a two-day Yom Tov before Shabbos he would take this on Wednesday afternoon), and he recites a blessing on the mitzvah of Eiruv Tavshilin. He then states that with this Eiruv Tavshilin it will be permitted for him to

²⁰ According to Rav Chisda, one should be required to actually eat the meat, not merely be able to eat the meat!

²¹ Indeed, in this case the person will certainly eat the meat, as he wants to be able to save what would otherwise be a large financial loss.

do the melachos that he must perform before Shabbos for Shabbos (despite the fact that he will be doing this preparation on Yom Tov).

Some Rishonim (the Ba’al ha’Maor and many others) understand that Eiruv Tavshilin works as explained above (4.). They rule like Rav Chisda’s position in our Gemora.

However, there are some (Maharshal and others) who rule like Rabah, stating that the logic that guests may come means that preparing on Yom Tov for Shabbos is only a Rabbinic prohibition. Chazal instituted Eiruv Tavshilin in order to totally permit this preparation.

Their leniency, according to this opinion, did not have to do with contrasting cooking for a weekday and for Shabbos. Rather, they realized that it would be difficult for people to properly have Shabbos without permitting them to prepare on the day beforehand.

According to these opinions, one must ensure that when preparing food for Shabbos on Yom Tov, the food should be edible for guests who might arrive on Yom Tov day. This means, for example, that one should not put a cholent on the fire right before Shabbos, as it will clearly not be ready on Yom Tov day in any way shape or form.

The Mishnah Berurah (527:3) indeed rules that one should try to ascertain that the food he is preparing for Shabbos (when he has made an Eiruv Tavshilin) is ready to eat (at least to some extent) on Yom Tov day, in order to abide by these opinions as well (see also Biur Halachah DH “v’al yedei eiruv”).

²² It should be noted that it is only clear he can do melachos for the entire cow because he has to slaughter the entire cow in order to eat an olive sized piece of meat. This is therefore not a proof that one can cook a lot of food in order to only eat some of it on Yom Tov (as he should instead only prepare what he needs).