

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The Todah and Shte HaLechem

A Baraisa presents a dispute whether one may leaven the dough of the Todah and Shte HaLechem with apples.

R' Kahana had a version of the Baraisa with a different name.

A Mishnah is cited that seems to follow the opinion of R' Chanina ben Gamliel who maintains that one may leaven the dough with apples.

The Gemara reconciles the Mishnah with the opinion of Rabanan.

2) Minchah

R' Illa states that the hardest kemitza to take was from the sinner's mincha since it was dry but R' Yitzchok bar Avdimi maintains that it may be mixed with water.

An explanation of the dispute is suggested but rejected.

3) Assessing volume

Another Mishnah is cited that discusses how to calculate the volume of meat that swelled or shrank.

Two sets of Amoraim disagree about how to read the Mishnah.

The position that maintains that the meat is measured as it was initially is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another Baraisa proves that we assess the volume as it exists now.

In light of this Baraisa Rabbah explains the point of dispute between the two sets of Amoraim.

The assertion that a group of Amoraim maintain that the principle of rejection applies to regular mitzvos is suc-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What makes taking the kemitza of the sinner's mincha difficult?
.....
2. What is the point of dispute concerning the reading of the Mishnah in Uktzin?
.....
3. How does Rabbah explain the dispute between the two sets of Amoraim?
.....
4. What is תרומת מעשר?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

The difficulty in collecting the kemitzah

אין לך הקשה לקמיצה יותר ממנחת חוטא

The Torah (Vayikra 5:1-13) describes a series of sins whose consequence is similar. They are if one swears falsely to deny knowledge of testimony, if one becomes tamei and his condition eludes him and he enters the Mikdash, or if one swears regarding an act he will either do or not do, and he violates his oath. In any of these cases the Torah mandates that he bring an offering. If he can afford it, he brings a sheep as an asham or a goat as a chattas. If this is too expensive, he shall bring a pair of birds, and if even this is too much of a financial strain, he shall bring an issaron of flour as what is termed a minchas choteh, the meal offering of a sinner. In this final arrangement, no oil or frankincense is added to the flour.

In our Gemara, R' Illa states that among the various types of menachos, the procedure of the kohen taking a kemitzah, a fistful, of flour from the issaron was most difficult. Rashi explains that it was not the removal of the flour from the minchah that was challenging, but rather it was the scraping from the top of the fistful, by the thumb on top and the small finger on the bottom, that was difficult. The problem was that the flour was dry and powdery, thus causing too much to fall as it was being scraped. The remaining volume of flour in the kemitzah was difficult to preserve so that it would not be deficient.

Tosafos notes that R' Illa's statement would have been more appropriate to appear in reference to the Gemara earlier (11a) which stated that among the most difficult procedures in the Mikdash was taking a kemitzah from the minchah of marcheses and machavas which are baked before their kemitzah is removed.

The Gri"z points out that the earlier Baraisa was referring to the act of taking the kemitzah, which was more difficult to do when being collected from a baked item than it was when being collected from flour. That is why the Baraisa did not mention the difficulty of collected flour for the kemitzah of the minchah of a sinner. In our Gemara R' Illa was noting that although collecting the kemitzah from a sinner's minchah was relatively easy, keeping it intact so that it not be deficient was more challenging.

In Yoma (49a), Tosafos explains the Baraisa on 11a which says that taking the kemitzah was among the most difficult services of the Mikdash, together with melikah and chafinah. This refers to the kohen's physical difficulty in

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Determining the volume of a food that swells

וכל היכא דמעיקרא לא הוה ביה והשתא הוה ביה מדרבנן

Anytime a food did not initially have the required volume and then it swelled and now has the required volume it is Rabbinically tamei

The Gemara presents a disagreement between Amoraim regarding a prohibited food that had the volume of an olive and then shrunk to less than the volume of an olive and then swelled back to the volume of an olive. One group of Amoraim maintains that the food is assessed according to its current state and one who eats it is liable to punishment. The fact that there was a period of time that it contained less than the volume of an olive is inconsequential. The second group maintains that the food is assessed according to its shrunken state. If at that time it contained less than the volume of an olive, one is not liable for eating the prohibited food after it swells (although it is still prohibited because it contains "half the volume - חצי שיעור.") The Gemara also teaches that if one eats a prohibited food after it shrinks to less than the volume of an olive one is not liable to punishment. Additionally, we are taught that one who eats a food that did not have the volume of an olive but then swelled to the volume of an olive has violated only a Rabbinic injunction. It is clear from the Gemara's discussion that the swelling of a food does not add to its volume and it is prohibited only Rabbinically because the food appears to have the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

performing the act. It was painful for a kohen to scrape off the excess pieces of baked minchah, to pierce the neck of the bird and to carry the spoon of incense into the kodesh kodoshim while holding it by his teeth and balancing the pan of coals so as not to get burned. Our Gemara says that taking a kemitzah from dry flour is difficult to do properly. Some dry flour might fall away leaving the kemitzah deficient. ■

olive's volume. This leads Poskim into a discussion about measuring the volume of olive of bread for the purpose of determining whether a person is obligated to recite Birkas HaMazon.

Teshuvos Zera Emes¹ discusses the case of a type of bread that swells but the air is not easily discernable. If a person eats the volume of an olive is he obligated to recite the beracha afterwards or perhaps the food should be pressed down before determining whether it contains an olive's volume. He cites our Gemara that teaches that foods that do not contain an olive's volume and then swell to the volume of an olive are not considered to contain the volume of an olive. Although the Gemara discusses prohibited foods it seems that the same principle should be true for determining whether one must recite a beracha acharonah as well. This position is cited by Mishnah Berurah² approvingly in the name of later authorities. ■

1. שו"ת זרע אמת ח"א סי' כ"ט.

2. מ"ב סי' ר"י סק"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

An Admixture

"נוקשה מיהא הוי"

Today's daf discusses chometz nokshah.

A certain person was required to take medication every day. When Pesach came around, he discovered that there was flour mixed in with his medicine, much to his chagrin. He wasn't certain what to do. There was no kosher for Pesach substitute available. Refraining from the medicine could be detrimental to his health but not dangerous. He decided to ask Rav Nissim Karelitz, shlit"a, whether he could take the medicine or

not.

Rav Karelitz replied that the answer was somewhat complex. "The Chazon Ish explicitly discusses tablets which have flour mixed in. If they have no water added to them, even if they do contain fruit juice, it is permitted to take them on Pesach. If they have water mixed, they are chometz nokshah which is prohibited even if it is only fitting to be eaten by a sick person, as we find in Orach Chaim. Now if the medicine is so dry that it is not fitting to be eaten at all, it is permitted. But if the mixture includes both water and fruit juice which we hold becomes chometz very quickly, it is very difficult to determine the exact shiur when they are permitted or not."

He concluded, "In the final analysis, if the medicine is mixed with very harsh elements and is definitely inedible for humans, it is permitted, since the flour cannot be separated from the remedy and the person taking it only wants the medicine, not the binding agent which is chometz."¹ ■

1. חז"א, אר"ח, קט"ז, ס"ק ג', ד"ה לר"י

(Overview...continued from page 1)

cessfully challenged.

Rabbah's earlier assertion that all opinions agree that things are assessed according to their current volume is challenged.

In order to reach the challenge the Gemara challenges and revises the Baraisa. ■