

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) An employee's right to eat (cont.)

Ravina concludes his proof that expositions are not needed to teach that humans may eat from their employers' detached produce or that animals may eat attached produce.

A Baraisa presents the exposition that teaches that a worker may only eat from food that grows from the ground.

The necessity for this exposition is explained.

Another Baraisa teaches that a worker may only eat from food that is at the completion of work.

The necessity of this exposition is explained.

A third Baraisa teaches that the worker may only eat from food that is not completed as far as ma'aser is concerned.

A contradictory Baraisa is presented.

R' Pappa resolves the contradiction.

A fourth Baraisa teaches that a worker may only eat from food that is not yet obligated in challah.

The Gemara notes that the exposition regarding challah seems to contradict the Baraisa that discusses ma'aser.

On the third attempt the Gemara resolves the contradiction.

2) Toasting the produce

The Gemara inquires whether a worker is permitted to toast the produce on a fire.

After a number of unsuccessful attempts the Gemara leaves the matter unresolved.

3) Salting the produce

Two contradictory Baraisos are cited related to whether a worker may salt the food he eats.

Abaye suggests a resolution for the contradiction.

Rava rejects that resolution and offers his own, alternative resolution.

The source that one must tithe produce that is salted and eaten two at a time is cited. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What halachos are derived from the word דיש?
2. At what point in history was there an obligation in challah but not in ma'aser?
3. Is it permitted for a worker to take time away from his job to prepare food to eat?
4. Does dipping produce in salt generate a ma'aser obligation?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Roasting stalks of grain

פועל מהו שיהבהב באור ויאכל וכו'

The Torah declares (Devarim 23:25,26) that a worker is allowed to eat from the produce with which he is working. The worker is not allowed, however, to add spices or other additives to the fruit or grain to make it easier to eat more than if the produce would be eaten by itself. This is learned from the verse which permits eating "ענבים – grapes," from which the Gemara learns "ולא ענבים ודבר אחר—he may not eat grapes with something else."

Our Gemara presents an inquiry whether the worker may roast the stalks. Rashi explains that roasting the stalks makes them sweet, and easier to eat. In other words, the stalks and the grain on them are already edible as is, but heating them in a flame makes them tastier and easier to eat, and the worker would be able to eat more of them. The question of the Gemara is whether the rule of "not to eat grapes with something else" is due to something being added, which is not the case when the stalks are simply being heated up, or is the rule of adding something to the grapes due to the natural product being tampered with, which is also the case when stalks are heated in fire.

In the name of Rabeinu Tam, Tosafos, however, learns that if the stalks were edible as is, it would certainly be allowed to heat them before eating them. The question of the Gemara is regarding stalks that are barely edible as is, and they need to be roasted to make them readily palatable.

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. Richard Tresley
 In loving memory of his father
 ר' יעקב בן ר' זאב, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Rabbi & Mrs. Avrum Reifer
 in memory of his father
 ר' צבי בן ר' שלמה דוד רייפער ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לעילוי נשמת מרת נחמה בת ר' יוסף לייב ע"ה
 Mrs. Emma Meystel
 by her family

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of our mother's yahrzeit
 שבע שולה בת משה דב הלוי oleho hasholom.
 by her children Alan Jay and Helene Gerber

HALACHAH Highlight

Determining when the challah obligation begins

יצא הלש וכו' שנגמרה מלאכתו לחלה דאין פועל אוכל בו

Excluding one who kneads etc. whose work is completed for challah

The Gemara derives from the word **דיש** that a worker may only eat from food that is not yet subject to the challah obligation. Therefore, for example, once food is kneaded thus subjecting it to the challah obligation, it may not be eaten by a worker. Rashi¹ explains that once water is put onto the flour and is mixed, it becomes obligated in challah even if additional kneading is required. In other words, the worker who is kneading the dough may not eat from the dough once he begins kneading. Sefer Toras Chaim² explains that Rashi holds that a worker is permitted to eat while he is performing the task that will make the dough obligated in challah. It is only once that task is completed and the challah obligation is in place that the worker may no longer eat. That was the reason Rashi was forced to explain that the dough is considered completed and subject to the challah obligation as soon as water is put onto the flour.

Avnei Nezer³ writes that it would seem that Tosafos⁴ disagrees with Rashi about this point and maintains that a worker may not eat the food as he is performing the task that will make the flour obligated in challah. Tosafos writes that when the Tanna teaches that a baker may not eat his employer's food while he is baking, he is teaching that if the dough is baked without kneading which would have obligated the dough in challah, he is not permitted to eat while baking which is the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

אבן האזל (to Hilchos S'chirus 12:10) notes that one of the rules of a worker eating from the produce of the employer is that he may not partake of fruit which is set for ma'aser. This means that once the produce has been processed enough that it is eligible to have ma'aser taken from it, a worker may no longer eat from it. Yet, once grain has been heated and prepared for consumption, ma'aser must be taken. What, then, is the question of our Gemara to consider that a worker may eat from this?

The answer is based upon the view of Rashba. While it is true that a worker may not take food that is ready for ma'aser, here the worker is taking the stalks before they are roasted, before they are eligible for ma'aser. It is only his actions which advance the processing so that the stalks now become eligible for ma'aser. This is similar to the adding of salt to the stalks, where the worker takes the stalks early, and his actions advance the process to where the stalks become obligated in ma'aser. This is not a violation of the rule that the worker may only take produce that is not yet ready for ma'aser. ■

final task to make the dough obligated in challah. Since Tosafos explains that while baking the baker is not permitted to eat the dough even though that is the final task to obligate the separation of challah it is evident that Tosafos holds that a worker is not permitted to eat while performing the final task that triggers the challah obligation. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה הלש.
2. ספר תורת חיים ד"ה ולהכי.
3. שו"ת אבני נזר יו"ד סי' תכ"ד סק"ד.
4. תוס' ד"ה יצא הלש. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Final wishes

"ותרתי דקבעה ספיתא מני"ל..."

A certain man's wife contracted a terrible sickness. When she was in the final stages of her illness and it was clear that she did not have much time, she begged her husband to gather people together in their home every day until her first yahrtzeit. She insisted that he learn with them every day for the betterment of her soul. To ensure that he would really carry out her instructions to the letter, she insisted that he vow to fulfill her wishes.

When the time came, the man was heartbroken but he was also very discon-

certed by his vow. He had clearly been pushed into it since he was quite thrifty and really did not want to suffer the expense of bringing people to his house. But a vow is a serious matter, so he consulted with the Shvus Yaakov, ז"ל, if this vow might be invalid since everyone who knew him could testify that he had been forced to make the vow by his late wife. In addition, if his vow was actually binding, he wondered how many people he was obligated to bring to his home to learn for her.

The Shvus Yaakov quickly disillusioned the disappointed man. "I see no way out of this vow. Although we sometimes find that one who is forced into a vow by a sick person is considered to be coerced, this has no relevance here since

you vowed to do a mitzvah, and you must fulfill your vow. With regards to how many people you are obligated to bring, although it is certainly fitting to hire nine people so you can say kaddish for the soul of the departed after learning together, you are not obligated to bring more than two other people since this is also included in the language of a **קיבוץ**, a gathering.

"We learn this from Bava Metzia 89. There we find that Rav Manah learns from the verse that a **קיבוץ** is not less than two. Although one can claim that in most people's lexicon a **קיבוץ** means more, we need not worry about this without clear proof since **תפשת מועט תפשת**—The established minimum holds."¹ ■

1. שו"ת שבות יעקב, חלק ב', סי' פ"א