

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of ישראל צבי בן זאב גוטליב ז"ל

By the Weiss/Gotlib Families—London, England

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Stringencies applied to holy things

R' Shimi bar Ashi and R' Ashi cited two more examples of stringencies that are applied to holy things.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion regarding the wheat that may be used for making matzos and concludes with halachos that relate to the unleavened loaves of the korbon todah and the wafers of the nazir's korbon.

3) The five grains

A Baraisa teaches that spelt is a species of wheat and oats and rye are species of barley. The Aramaic names of the grains are listed.

Reish Lakish identifies the source in the Torah for the implication of the Mishnah, that teaches that rice and millet may not be used for matzah.

The Mishnah's ruling does not follow the opinion of R' Yochanan ben Nuri who ruled that one may not eat foods with rice and millet because they "are close to leavening."

The Gemara inquires whether R' Yochanan ben Nuri intends to state that rice and millet leaven quickly or perhaps he means that they come close to leavening but never become fully leavened.

A Baraisa is cited that teaches that rice and millet can, in fact, become chometz.

4) Kneading dough with other liquids

Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of Reish Lakish teaches that one who consumes dough kneaded with other liquids is not subject to the punishment of kareis.

R' Idi bar Avin explained: There is no punishment of kareis because other liquids are treated as fruit juice which cannot cause dough to leaven.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the novelty of a number of rulings recorded in the Mishnah.

A Baraisa teaches that one cannot fulfill the mitzvah of matzah with tevel because the mitzvah can only be fulfilled with dough that would only be subject to the prohibition against chometz and not other prohibitions.

The Gemara questions the implication of the Baraisa that if the grain is tevel it would not be subject to the prohibition against chometz.

R' Sheishes explains that the Baraisa reflects the opinion of R' Shimon who said that one prohibition cannot take effect on a pre-existing prohibition. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The mitzvah can be fulfilled with d'mai

דמאי הא לא חזי ליה

The Mishnah ruled that the mitzvah of matzah could be fulfilled using grain from d'mai. The Gemara immediately challenges this halachah, wondering how the mitzvah can be fulfilled using a commodity which is not allowed to be eaten.

Rashi explains the question in two ways. Later, the Gemara (bottom of 35b) teaches that the mitzvah of matzah can only be fulfilled using a product which has a potential to become chometz, if it is mishandled and is allowed to ferment. The verse associates this halachah with the ability to perform the mitzvah of matzah. As the Gemara reports, "A commodity which has upon it the potential to become chometz can be used for matzah. However, if a product has other prohibitions associated with it, this cannot be used for the mitzvah of matzah." The Gemara uses this lesson to conclude that grain that is טבל cannot be used for matzah, because beside the halachah of chometz, it also carries with itself the prohibition not to eat טבל. Therefore, our Gemara also wonders how d'mai can be used, for this grain possesses an additional rule to forbid its consumption other than just the concern about chometz.

Alternatively, Rashi mentions that the Gemara is surprised that d'mai can be used to perform a mitzvah, when this constitutes a מצוה הבאה בעבירה—a mitzvah which entails a sin, and the rule is that such a mitzvah is not valid.

According to this second explanation of Rashi, Gilyon Maharsha notes that Rashi is of the opinion that the fulfillment of a Torah level mitzvah can be in jeopardy when it is done in conjunction with a rabbinic violation. In other words, the concept of מצוה הבאה בעבירה applies even when the violation is of a rabbinic order.

Sfas Emes proposes an inquiry in this regard. A person has no matzah other than that which is tevel on a rabbinic level, and he wants to fulfill the Torah commandment to eat matzah on the first night of Pesach. On the one hand, do we say that eating this matzah which is rabbinically prohibited precludes his fulfillment of the mitzvah, and that he would accomplish nothing by consuming it? Or, do we say that he can fulfill the Torah commandment, but that he has also violated a rabbinic rule not to eat this tevel? Accordingly, if he would have no other matzah, it would still be worthwhile to eat what he has, in order to fulfill the Torah commandment.

He concludes by saying that according to Tosafos (Sukkah 9a, ד"ה הוא) the disqualification of מצוה הבאה בעבירה is only rabbinic in the first place. Therefore, it would be recommended for the person to fulfill the Torah commandment to eat matzah, even though a rabbinic rule would be violated at the same time. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Mixing dough with fruit juice

מי פירות אין מחמיצין (ומאידיך בגמ' בעמוד הבא יש מ"ד) דנילושה במי פירות תשרף, [וכן יש סתירות בזה בעוד סוגיות בש"ס.]

Fruit juices do not cause something to become chometz. [On the other hand, the Gemara on the following amud brings an opinion] that something which is kneaded with fruit juice must be burnt. [There are other such contradictions found in shas.¹]

The Rishonim argue how to understand this. Rashi² explains that our Gemarah views such a mixture as chometz nuksha (inedible³ or incomplete chometz) and not bona-fide chometz. Tosafos⁴, on the other hand, explains that something mixed with fruit juices (without water) may even be eaten on Pesach. And that which the Gemara says, "it must be burnt" refers to a mixture of water which will more readily turn into chometz.

The Shulchan Aruch⁵ rules according to Tosafos. The Rema⁶ however adds that the custom is not to mix dough with fruit juices, except in extenuating circumstances. Based on this Rama, the Mishna Berura⁷ says that even a mixture of fruit juice which was already baked should be left until after Pesach and not eaten on Pesach itself. The aforementioned law applies only to the Ashkenazim (who generally follow the Rema). Many Sefardim⁸, however, are customarily lenient with mixtures of fruit juices (based on the decision of the Shulchan Aruch above). The practical difference between these opinions emerges in the question of using 'egg matzos'⁹. With regards to baked matzos which are subsequently fried in eggs, see the footnote below. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the five grains that may be used for matzah?
2. What is the halachah for dough kneaded with wine, oil or honey?
3. Why does one fulfill one's obligation to eat matzah with demai?
4. Explain: אין איסור חל על איסור.

1. עי' בתוד"ה ומי, ובשאר ראשונים כאן
2. רש"י להלן ל"ו א'
3. במשנה ברורה סימן תמ"ב ס"ק ב' שכ"ה בראשונים
4. משא"כ לרש"י חולק על התוס'. שפירש שמש"כ שאין מחמיצין [דהיינו שאין בו כרת לשיטתו] איירי כשאין בו מים כמפורש בדברין בסוף ל"ה א' בד"ה ביין ובשמן, וכ"ה בר"ן. ודו"ק. ודע עוד שהרי"ף ורמב"ם פסקו כר"ע שמוותר לאכול בפסח את הנילוש במי פירות ואפילו כשיש בו גם מים
5. באו"ח תס"ב ס"א וב'
6. שם בסעיף ד'
7. שם ס"ק י"ח
8. בכה"ח שם סס"ק מ"א שהביא חילוקי מנהגים בזה לספרדים. ועי"ש שימחר בעשיתו
9. שג"ז דינו כמי פירות כמפורש בשו"ע שם ס"ד. וכ"ז כשנלוש כך מתחלתו משא"כ במצה אפויה במים כדינו, שאח"כ מטגנו לכר"ע מותר. ולדעת הגר"ז אפילו למחמירין בשרויה במים, מ"מ בשריה במי פירות אין להחמיר ויש שהחמירו גם בזה עי' פס"ת הג"ח ו' ■

Gemara GEM

Matzah—only if it had the potential to be chometz

וכן תנא דבי רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אמר קרא לא תאכל עליו חמץ שבעת ימים תאכל עליו מצות—דברים הבאים לידי חימוץ אתה יוצא ידי חובתו במצה

The prohibition of having any use of chometz is declared to start at the beginning of the time the Pesach offering is to be brought (Shemos 23:18 and 15:19,20). The prohibition of chometz

is placed in close connection with the command to eat matzah (Devarim 16:3). The halachah of the positive command to eat matzah is even dependent on the negative command of chometz in that the only grains which may be used for matzah are those which have the potential to become chometz.

Rabbi S. R. Hirsch elaborates upon this concept. The eating of matzah is an absolute duty on the first evening of Pesach, and it is to be a positive expression of the historical fact of our lack of independence at the time of redemp-

tion, as well as of our everlasting permanent lack of independence towards God. This matzah must therefore be made from material which was able to become chometz, symbolically to represent acknowledgement of these facts. What must be matzah must have been able to be chometz. Lack of the ability for independence was not the cause of our slavery in Egypt, nor is it the cause of our servitude to God at all times. Forcible suppression was our עבודת ה', free-willed submission is our פרעה. Matzah itself is, literally, suppressed leavening. ■

