

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Fulfilling the mitzvah of matzah with tevel (cont.)

Ravina offers an alternative explanation to the Baraisa but the Gemara demonstrates that the explanation offered by R' Sheishes is clearer.

### 2) Matzah made from ma'aser sheni grain

A Baraisa is cited that records different sources that do not permit the use of ma'aser sheni grain for the mitzvah of matzah.

An apparent contradiction is noted regarding R' Akiva's position concerning matzah that was kneaded with liquids other than water.

The Gemara resolves the contradiction by distinguishing between the first day of Pesach and the remaining days of Pesach.

### 3) Kneading dough in lukewarm water

The Gemara questions why the previous Baraisa does not permit the use of lukewarm water to make matzah whereas regarding a Korbon Mincha, kohanim are permitted to use lukewarm water.

The Gemara distinguishes between kohanim who are diligit and common people who are not.

Issues and details related to diligitance are discussed.

### 4) Matzah made from bikkurim

A Baraisa is cited that records a dispute between R' Yosi HaGalili and R' Akiva concerning the source that disqualifies the use of matzah made from Bikkurim grain.

It is, however, demonstrated that R' Akiva changed his position and agreed with R' Yosi HaGalili's source.

As part of the explanation for R' Yosi HaGalili's position, the Gemara digresses to discuss the dispute between Rabanan and R' Shimon whether an onen may eat Bikkurim.

### 5) לחם עוני

A Baraisa disqualifies certain methods of preparing matzah because they do not fulfill the Torah's requirement of לחם עוני.

The Gemara analyzes the meaning of the word אשישה. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben

In memory of their parents  
ר' אברהם וואלף בן ר' בערל ז"ל  
ר' חיים שלום בן ר' בנדיט מאיר ז"ל

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
ל"נ ר' יצחק אייזיק בן ר' משה ז"ל  
Rabbi Yitzchak Hauben ז"ל

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Matzah cannot be made from Bikkurim

אוציא חטין ושעורין שיש במינן ביקורים

The Gemara brings a Baraisa which teaches that matzah cannot be made from fruits which are brought to Yerushalayim as Bikkurim. Rabbi Yosi HaGalili learns this from the verse which describes matzah as something that is eaten "בכל מושבותיכם—in all your communities," which excludes Bikkurim fruits which can only be eaten in Yerushalayim. Rabbi Akiva also determines that the mitzvah of matzah cannot be fulfilled from Bikkurim, and he learns this from the association between matzah and marror (in the verse Bemidbar 9:11). We know that a person cannot fulfill his obligation to eat marror with Bikkurim. So too, claims Rabbi Akiva, matzah cannot be performed with Bikkurim.

The Gemara then clarifies the analysis of Rabbi Akiva. Perhaps we should associate marror and matzah and say that just as marror is a type which is not at all eligible for Bikkurim, so too, matzah should not be made from any species which is used for Bikkurim – thus excluding wheat and barley, which are among the seven species with which Eretz Yisroel is praised (Devarim 8:8). The Gemara responds to this challenge by citing a verse which includes wheat and barley (מצות מצות).

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

- Under what condition is it permitted to knead dough with milk?
- When is it assumed that a non-kohen performed kneading with diligitance?
- What is the logic to include ma'aser sheni and exclude bikkurim for use for matzah?
- Why does R' Shimon permit an onen to consume bikkurim?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by By Mr. and Mrs. Michael Schultz  
In memory of their father  
ר' יונה בן ר' מנשה לייב הכהן ע"ה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Dough kneaded with milk

והתניא אין לשין את העיסה בחלב ואם לש כל הפת אסורה מפני הרגל עבירה וכו', אמר רבנא כעין תורה שרי

And it was taught in a Baraisa: One should not knead the dough with milk, and if he did, the entire mixture is forbidden so as not to wind up being in violation of a sin. Ravina said, if it is "K'ein Tura" it is permissible.

Rashi explains that "K'ein Tura" means that it is permissible to knead dough with milk only in small quantities, just as an ox eats everything at one time (being תורה the Aramaic word for ox). However, one may not leave over such dough for it may lead to transgression (for the bread may end up being eaten with meat). The Rif<sup>1</sup> and the Rambam, however explain, that "k'ein tura" means that the shape of the bread is changed in a noticeable way as a reminder not to eat it with meat. The Shulchan Aruch<sup>2</sup> rules in accordance with all of the opinions, and writes that whether one made small quantities of bread<sup>3</sup> (like Rashi) or whether one changed the shape (like Rif/Rambam) the bread is permitted. The later authorities<sup>4</sup> add that one must change the shape before baking, because once the bread is baked without a change (and thereby becomes forbidden) one cannot undo his error by subsequently changing it.

Note:<sup>5</sup> the above only applies to something where there is a chance that the bread will be eaten with meat, for example bread or borekas. However, desserts baked with dough which are generally not eaten together in the same bite with meat, but are eaten after a meal, can be kneaded with milk. ■

(Insight...Continued from page 1)

Tosafos notes that when the Gemara entertained the possibility that as we exclude wheat and barley from being used for matzah, we must wonder if the other three grains (spelt, oats, rye) should also be excluded. This is because the Gemara already reported that spelt is a type of wheat, and that oats and rye are in the family of barley. By excluding the main two grains, the other three might also be removed from eligibility. Tosafos answers that this cannot be so, however, because matzah is a form of bread, and the Torah cannot be excluding all types of grain from eligibility when we must have a matzah which is "bread."

Pnei Yehoshua explains that the question of Tosafos could not have been to actually consider that the association to Bikkurim would result in the exclusion of all grains. Tosafos only meant to point out that only wheat and barley are obligated in Bikkurim in the first place. The fact that the other three grains are in the respective families of the main two grains is only to show that they ferment and true bread can be made from them. But, oats, rye and spelt are not mentioned in the verse which highlights the praises of Eretz Yisroel (Devarim 8:8), and they are not brought as Bikkurim. They are not so important as the main two grains of wheat and barley. ■

1. הרי"ף בפרקין, והרמב"ם במאכ"א פט"ו

2. בשו"ע יור"ד צ"ז ס"א

3. בפת"ש שם ס"ק ג' בשם החו"ד ופמ"ג, וכן דייק הגליון

מהרש"א שם מלשון השו"ע, וכ"כ עוד פוסקים

4. בפת"ש שם בשם מהרי"ט. וכן עי' בחכמ"א כלל נ' ס"ד,

וכ"כ בבה"ש שם ס"ק ב'. וע"ע בדרכי תשובה ס"ק י"ד ■

## Gemara GEM

### The matzah which speaks volumes

לחם עוני—לחם שעונין עליו דברים הרבה

Rabbe Yehoshua from Galanta, ז"ל, points out that in the Derashos of the Chasam Sofer (1:274b), this statement of our sages is understood to mean that the matzah itself speaks,

and it appeals to the tzaddik and asks the matzah? that he eat it.

This comment is not found anywhere in Shas, nor is it in the Midrash. It is, however, found in the holy writings of the Ba'al Shem Tov, but it is clear that the Chasam Sofer did not have access to these sefarim, as he never cites them or quotes from them. From where, then, did the Chasam Sofer learn this insight about

It must be, though, that the situation described in this Derasha actually occurred to the Chasam Sofer himself. He personally must have sat at his seder and sensed that the matzah called out to him and answered many things to him, among them being a request that the tzaddik partake of the matzah. ■