



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Cooking on Yom Tov for weekday use (cont.)

Abaye concludes his unsuccessful challenge of Rabbah's position.

Rami bar Chama suggests that the dispute between R' Chisda and Rabbah is related to the dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua in the Mishnah. In other words, R' Eliezer and Rabbah subscribe to the principle of **להואיל** whereas R' Yehoshua and R' Chisda do not.

R' Pappa and R' Shisha the son of R' Idi dispute this assertion.

The Gemara records an exchange between R' Yirmiyah and R' Zeira regarding Rami bar Chama's assertion.

A Baraisa records a dispute whether the halachah follows R' Eliezer or Ben Beseira.

### 2) The maximum amount of dough one may knead on Pesach

Two seemingly contradictory Baraisos are quoted regarding the maximum amount of dough one may knead on Pesach.

The Gemara resolves the contradiction by distinguishing between inferior and superior quality grain.

Rav rules that the maximum amount of grain one may knead is a "melognah kav" which is the same amount of dough necessary to obligate one to separate challah.

R' Yosef endorsed the practice of women to bake no more than three quarters of a kav at a time. Abaye, however, did not endorse the practice because it lead to an exemption from the obligation to separate challah.

The issue of combining loaves in a utensil to obligate one to separate challah is discussed.

**3) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah records a dispute regarding the correct procedure for three women to prepare dough for baking on Pesach.

### 4) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Baraisa is cited that further clarifies the opinion of Chachamim.

A second Baraisa is cited that records the debate between R' Gamliel and R' Akiva.

**5) MISHNAH:** The halacha of "si'ur" is presented and there is a dispute regarding the stage of leavening which qualifies a dough as "si'ur".

### 6) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Baraisa is cited that parallels our Mishnah. One discrepancy is that the Baraisa rules that one who eats "si'ur" is subject to kares whereas the Mishnah ruled that he is not liable to kares.

The discrepancy is resolved.

Rava explains R' Meir's rationale. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Less of the better quality, or more of the poor*

אמר רב פפא שמע מינה גרעינין חיטי חסיכתא מחיטי מעלייתא טפי ומדגרעינין שערי חסיכתא משערי מעלייתא

Two measures of better quality wheat is equal in value to three measures of poor quality wheat. This is a drop in value of 33% for the larger, poorer product. In the case of barley, the degree of drop is only 25% from the large amount (4 of the inferior product is equal to 3 of the good). Rav Pappa reports that we see that wheat suffers a greater drop in quality from good to poor quality, more than was found in barley. This statement only seems to repeat what the Gemara already had said. This sets the stage for a discussion among the commentators to explain Rav Pappa.

Rashi explains that Rav Pappa is teaching a rule about buying and selling. Rabbi Shlomo Kluger, זט"ל, in his **חכמת שלמה** (Choshen Mishpat 233) writes that if the seller promises to provide "good" wheat, and the seller gives "poor wheat," the seller must provide an extra half of the original volume to compensate for the lesser quality, and an extra third of the original volume if the sale is for barley.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why was R' Yirmiyah so inclined to accept Rami bar Chama's explanation?
2. Does silence by a Tanna in a Mishnah or Baraisa indicate that he has been refuted?
3. What is the easiest method to stop dough from leavening?
4. What is the rationale underlying R' Meir's opinion?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Joey Stern  
in loving memory of their mother  
מרת חיי בת ר' יוסף ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
Mr. & Mrs. S.Y. Meystel  
in memory of her father  
Mr. Jules Behren  
ר' יהודה בן ר' אליעזר ע"ה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## How to take off 'challah'

ר"א אומר הרודה ונותל לסל הסל מצרפן לחלה. וא"ר יהודה אמר שמואל הלכה כר"א

R. Elazar said: One who puts his bread into a basket, the basket itself combines the breads to obligate the removal of challah. R. Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel that the law follows R. Elazar's opinion.

The Poskim<sup>1</sup> write that a basket does not have the same "merging effects" as are found in a single dough from the outset. When a single dough has the requisite amount to obligate challah removal from the outset<sup>2</sup>, Chazal allow several leniencies outside of Eretz Yisroel. For example, one is permitted to bake the dough, and eat the bread, leaving over the necessary challah at the end. This would not be the case with smaller amounts of dough which combined in a basket<sup>3</sup>. In such a case, one would be obligated to remove the challah before eating. Another practical difference would be that dough which had an obligation from the outset<sup>4</sup> would be considered "combined," such that if one were to break the dough apart and place it in separate areas of a house, one would be able to remove challah from one part of the overall dough and have it fulfill the obligation from all the other parts. Meaning, since they were all part of one original batch, being together in the house<sup>5</sup> itself can merge them so they are looked upon as "all together." Also, when such dough (i.e. which had the requisite amount from the outset) is sitting in utensils (bowls, etc.), one would be allowed to take challah from one bowl<sup>6</sup> to satisfy the obligation of challah in another bowl, provided that the utensils are open on top and are near one another. This is in contrast to dough which did not have the required amount from the outset, which would need<sup>7</sup> to be placed into one basket<sup>8</sup> (utensil) and ideally<sup>9</sup> to even be touching each other in the basket. There are those<sup>10</sup> who say that if one combined many vessels which on their own do not contain the required amount to obligate challah removal, and subsequently placed

(Insight...Continued from page 1)

Based upon this, we must understand the ruling in Shulchan Aruch (ibid.) that if one sells "good" wheat and supplies "poor" wheat instead, the sale is invalid. This must mean that it is only invalid if the seller refuses to make up the difference with an appropriate increase in volume. If the buyer insisted on "these good kernels," then the seller must specifically supply good quality wheat, and it cannot be exchanged for more of the poorer quality commodity. Rav Pappa would be referring to a case where the deal was not specifically for "these" good kernels, but rather where the buyer spoke in a general manner, asking for "good" wheat (סתם).

Alternatively, even where the buyer asks for סתם wheat, he could nullify the sale if supplied with poor grain. Yet, Rav Pappa is teaching a law where the buyer asked for \$10 worth of wheat. Here, the seller must provide either a smaller amount of better grain, or a larger amount of inferior product. ■

them in one large vessel, for example bundles of matzah which contain individually wrapped matzah (each in its own plastic), they would have a status of "touching." ■

1. תרומת הדשן סימן קפ"ט והובא בד"מ יר"ד שכ"ה
2. כדאיתא בבבא ט' ע"א ובשו"ע יור"ד שכ"ג
3. במ"ב תנ"ז ס"ק ו'
4. שו"ע יר"ד שכ"ה ס"ב. וכתב שם ס"ק ו', וז"ל בש"ך ב' עיסות אחת יש בה כשיעור ואחת אין בה כשיעור דינן כב' עיסות שיש בכ"א מהן כשיעור, וכז' ומפריש מן העיסה שיש בה כשיעור שיעור חלה וכו' עכ"ל
5. מ"ב תנ"ז ס"ק ז'
6. במ"ב שם
7. שם
8. כן פסק המ"ב תנ"ז בריש ס"ק ז'. [ובעה"ש סתירה בזה בין דבריו שם ס"ד, וי"ב, לדבריו ביר"ד שכ"ה ס"ג. כדהעיר במנח"ע דלהלן.]
9. בשעה"צ ס"ק ט'. ומנח"י דלהלן
10. כן דייק בשו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ח סימן ק"ט בד"ה אבל. מלשון המ"ב ועי"ש שנחלקו בזה האחרונים, וע"ע בזה בפס"ת תנ"ז ה' ו'. וע"ש שהגר"י קנייבסקי זצ"ל נהג להחמיר שהמצות עצמם יגעו. ושכן מחמיר הגר"ש וואזנאר זצ"ל ■

## Gemara GEM

### How much wheat or barley?

בחיטין קבין ובשעורין שלשת קבין ר"נ אומר כו' חילוף הדברים

Rashi explains that Rav Nosson holds that barley will ferment quicker than wheat, so a woman is only allowed to handle 2 measures of barley, as opposed to being allowed to handle 3

measures of wheat. Rabbi Yishmael disagrees and holds the opposite, and that wheat ferments quicker than barley.

Sfas Emes claims that it is difficult to say that these Tannaim argue about an issue which can be readily observed and measured.

Rather, Sfas Emes cites Rabeinu Chananel who explains that Rabbi Yishmael holds that two kav of wheat makes more dough than three kav of barley.

Therefore, the amount of effort to keep wheat from becoming chometz is greater than for 3 measures of barley. Rav Nosson disagrees and says that although the wheat is greater in volume, it is a stronger and fatter grain, which slows the chometz process. He holds that a woman can therefore be allowed to work with more wheat. They argue about which factor is more critical. This interpretation may even be understood in Rashi. ■