

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Processed foods (cont.)

Abaye and Rava discuss another case that involves a possible concern of chometz.

2) Soaking barley

A Baraisa presents a discussion regarding soaking barley.

Shmuel rules that vinegar does not have the capacity to inhibit the leavening process.

A dispute is recorded regarding the definition of the word "split" used in the Baraisa to indicate that soaked barley has become prohibited.

3) Soaking wheat

Rabbah ruled that a conscientious person should not soak wheat, whereas R' Nachman permitted the practice.

Rava initially prohibited the practice, but subsequently reversed his position since white matzah cannot be made without first soaking the grain.

Rava changed his position a second time and asserts that it is a mitzvah to soak the grain before use, i.e. from the moment the grain is harvested.

Two incidents are recorded that relate to the requirement
(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Abaye and Rava concerning roasting grain in a vessel?
2. According to Rava, what do we learn from the phrase ושמרתם את המצות?
3. Why did Rabbah bar Livai object to selling the soaked grain to non-Jews?
4. According to R' Kahana, which is stronger; mustard or charoses?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Eric Rothner
In loving memory of their mother
Mrs. Shirley Rothner, ז"ל

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Baruch and Dorothy Starr Aplebaum
In memory of her father
ר' אברהם אריה בן ר' שמואל ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

To infuse the matzah with the intent of לשמה

בצקות של נכרים אדם ממלא כרסו מהן

Rashi explains that a Jew can only eat from the loaf of a gentile if he first inspects it carefully to see that it has not developed any signs of leavening (listed later, 48b). If the loaf is not chometz, the Jew can eat from it.

Ramban wonders about the comment of Rashi, because although the loaf itself might not have any signs of chometz, the utensils of the gentile might not have been free of all chometz. How can the Jew rely upon this loaf simply by looking at it? Rather, Ramban prefers the comment of Rabeinu Chananel, who explains that the Jew can only eat from the loaf made by the gentile if the Jew stood over the gentile as it was being prepared and baked. If he can ascertain that every aspect of the preparation was kosher, including all utensils, mixing bowls, and, of course, the baking, then the Jew can eat it.

The Rishonim discuss whether the Jew can even use this loaf for the mitzvah to eat matzah the first night of Pesach. Here, we require not only that the matzah not be chometz, but also that it be made לשמה—for the sake of the mitzvah. Can the Jew infuse this matzah with the requisite mitzvah intent necessary while standing next to the gentile, or does לשמה depend upon the one who is actually making the matzah?

Rav Hai Gaon (brought in כ"ו ש"ס) holds that the intent of the Jew is adequate for the matzah to be considered לשמה.

Ramban, however, writes that the element of לשמה is a function of the person who is working with the dough with his own hands. Therefore, it is inadequate when a Jew stands next to a gentile and merely supervises the work while declaring that the matzah is being formed לשמה.

Chasam Sofer points out that it is certainly acceptable for the Jew to serve in a supervisory position during the "guarding" necessary from the time of harvest until the moment the water is mixed with the flour and the kneading of the dough begins. This stage of the process is simply a time to ensure that the grain is not chometz. What is critical is from the moment of the kneading until after the baking. It is this part of the process where the intent of לשמה is part of the very making of the matzah (עשייה). This is where we find some Rishonim who say that we cannot consider the matzah as being made לשמה simply by having the Jew standing nearby as the matzah is prepared by the gentile. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Dr. & Mrs. Phillip Zaret
in memory of their father
Mr. Seymour Socol
ר' זיסל בן ר' אברהם אבא ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

The "Guarding" of the matzah

ושמרתם את המצות וכו' דשימור דלישה הוי שימור ואפיה לא כדר ביה רבא וכו' קסבר שיוור מעיקרא מתחלתו ועד סופו בעינן

"And guard the matzos, etc." Watching the dough during the kneading is considered guarding, but not during the baking. Rava changed his opinion...originally he held that one needs guarding for the entire process.

The Rishonim¹ discuss whether Rava meant that "shimur" (guarding) is required from the moment of grinding of the flour or even earlier, from the harvesting. The Ran writes² that the aforementioned discussion applies only to performing the mitzvah in its most ideal form. However, to fulfill one's obligation, all that is required is that the intent of לשמה must be done for the sake of the mitzvah from the point of kneading. Based on this, the Shulchan Aruch³ writes that ideally one should make sure that the wheat which he intends to use for his matzos (to fulfill the mitzvah on Seder night) should be kept free of water from harvesting or at least from the point of its being ground up.

The Poskim write⁴ that "Shmura Matzos" are guarded from harvesting. And, although the wheat is sometimes wet when being cut, when it dries⁵ and whitens to its full capacity it is considered "cut." If rain falls⁶ on it after that point, it will become chometz. (See note below, that wheat should not be harvested while still green, nor when it has become fully whitened, but rather while white with a tinge of green.) ■

1. להרי"ף י"ב א' משעת קצירה. ולרא"ש בסימן כ"ו משעת טחינה. וברש"י כאן כתב מתחלת קציר, ומאידך ברש"י בחולין דף ז' ע"א בד"ה דבמצוה, כתב מתחילת טחינה
2. הר"ן כאן בד"ה ומיבע"י
3. באר"ח סימן תנ"ג ס"ד ומש"כ שם [כגאון אחד שבר"ן] שבשעת

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

to guard grain from becoming chometz.

4) Adding flour to a cooking pot on Pesach

A Baraisa discusses the permissibility of adding flour to a cooking pot on Pesach.

After the Gemara identifies the author of the second opinion in the Baraisa, Ulla rules that one should, under all circumstances, avoid adding flour to the pot.

A related incident is recorded.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the use of flour on Pesach and improper methods of preparing the Korbon Pesach for consumption. The Mishnah concludes with a ruling related to chometz in water.

6) Clarifying the dispute in the Mishnah

R' Kahana said that the dispute concerning eating the mixture containing flour applies only in the case of mustard, but in the case of charoses all opinions would agree that it must be burned immediately.

A Baraisa is cited that supports this understanding. ■

הדחק מותר ליקח קמח מן השוק. המ"ב (שם ס"ק כ"ד) כתב שעכשיו אפילו בשעת הדחק אין ליקח קמח מהשוק שמכבסים אותם במים.

4. חיי אדם כלל קכ"ח ס"ב. והובא במ"ב תס"ז ס"ק י"ז וכן בתנ"ג ס"ק כ"ב

5. שם. וכ"ה בשו"ע תס"ז ס"ה עפ"י רשב"א והח"א הנ"ל כתב בזה"ל שלא יעמדו השבלים במחבר עד שיתיבשו וילבינו "כל צרכן" וכ' ונכון לקצור החטים בעוד שיש בהם עוד מעט מראה ירקות. עכ"ל ומעין זה בלשון הקשו"ע ק"ח א'. ונראה שגם העה"ש תס"ז י', ר"ל כן שכתב וז"ל נהגו לקצור שמורה בעוד שלא נגמר עדיין "כל הגידול אך אותם הקוצרין ירוקים ממש נ"ל דלא יהפ"ם עושים. עכ"ל. וא"כ ירוקים ממש לכו"ע לא. ושיתיבשו וליבינו "כל צרכן". ג"כ לא. אלא שיהיו לבנים "בעוד שיש בהם עוד מעט מראה ירקות". ודו"ק

6. מ"ב תס"ז ס"ק י"ח ■

Gemara GEM

Not to mock the dead

בגד שאבד בו כלאים הרי זה לא ימכרנו לנכרי... אבל עושין אותו תכריכין למת

Maharal expounds upon one of the essential differences between a positive commandment and a negative commandment. When a person fulfills a positive command, even if it is one which was not obligatory for him, he has performed an action which has accomplished a concrete goal. If he fails to perform a mitzvah, the gain which might have been advanced re-

mains deficient and lacking. However, a negative command does not entail this type of accomplishment, for it simply requires that one abstain and avoid violating a sin. This mode of being passive is not one of positive accomplishment.

In fact, if a person abstains from an activity, and feels that he wishes to be in compliance with a negative commandment which has not been commanded to him, Maharal explains that the person is acting improperly. It is inappropriate to avoid partaking in actions which are not prohibited by the Torah.

A proof for this is seen in the contrast between two comments in the Gemara.

On the one hand, we find (Berachos 18a) that it is improper for a person to walk in a graveyard and have his tzitzis drag upon the graves. This is considered mocking the dead. Yet, the Gemara in Pesachim (40b) tells us that the dead may be clothed in kilayim as shrouds. This is not considered a disgrace for the dead. The reason is as we have stated. A positive command represents an opportunity to gain and accomplish, and confronting the dead with their inability to do the mitzvah of tzitzis is mocking them. On the other hand, the dead are no longer obligated in mitzvos, and wearing kilayim, a negative commandment, does not serve to mock them. ■