

*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) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Baraisa explains why the Mishnah gave examples in addition to presenting the general principle of these halachos.

The Gemara asks: Who is the author of the Mishnah who holds that chometz in a mixture (תערובות) and defective chometz (נוקשה) are Biblically prohibited?

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav asserts that the Mishnah reflects R' Meir's opinion.

R' Nachman states that the Mishnah reflects the opinion of R' Eliezer.

The Gemara explains why R' Yehudah and R' Nachman reject the other's suggestion, and a Baraisa is cited in support of R' Yehudah's opinion.

### 2) Clarifying R' Eliezer's opinion

The Gemara clarifies R' Eliezer's position that chometz in a mixture is Biblically prohibited but not punishable with kareis.

After the Gemara explains the position of Rabanan, who disagree with R' Eliezer, it turns back to R' Eliezer to account for the additional words introduced to the discussion by Rabanan, and R' Eliezer is unable to explain these words.

### 3) Combining permitted substances with prohibited substances

R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan states that, in general, permitted substances do not combine with prohibited substances except for the forbidden substances of the nazir.

Zeiri adds, as an exception, the prohibition of placing leaven on the mizbeach. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is it important for a person to be familiar with the names of different items?  
.....
2. What is the source that women are included in the prohibition against chometz?  
.....
3. What is the source that women are obligated in the mitzvah of matzah?  
.....
4. Explain: היתר מצטרף לאיסור.  
.....

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Clarifying the rules of permitted and prohibited mixtures*

אמר רבי אבהו אמר רבי יוחנן כל איסורים שבתורה אין היתר מצטרף לאיסור

The Rishonim offer varying explanations and circumstances of the rule that "the permitted joins with the prohibited" to be measured together.

Rashi (ד"ה אין, אף) understands that this rule applies when the two substances, that which is permitted and that which is prohibited, are not mixed together. Rather, it is where each is recognizable as distinct, but they are eaten together. Chidushei Rabeinu Dovid and Chidushei Hari"m each explain that if the two items would be mixed together, and the person would consume a k'zayis of the blend, this would be prohibited due to טעם כעיקר. The rule here of צירוף, therefore, must be speaking about where the items are not mixed, but are rather only eaten together.

Others explain that not only do we use this concept of היתר when the items are separate but eaten together, but we also use it when the two items are combined ר"ש—טבול. Still others (ר"ש משאנ"ץ) point out that it is only when the items are separate that we use this rule, but when they are combined and the prohibited item is not recognizable, we do not say that the permitted substance joins with that which is prohibited.

Tosafos (ד"ה כמאן) says that it is only when the items are blended together that we say היתר מצטרף לאיסור. Tosafos brings a proof to his opinion from the Baraisa cited on 45a about meat which comes into contact with the flesh of a chattas offering. The halachah is that once any meat touches a chattas, and it absorbs some of the chattas into itself, the meat that comes into contact must be consumed within the shortened time framework of the chattas itself. We see, claims Tosafos, that it is when the two items are combined that the rule of צירוף is a factor. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in loving memory of*  
משה יחזקאל בן יהושע ז"ל

*by his children Dr. and Mrs. Aaron Friedman*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in loving memory of the yahrzeit*  
*of our brother*

משה דוב בן שמואל ז"ל —  
*by Mr. and Mrs. Alan Gerber*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in memory of*  
*לעילוי נשמת אילה ע"ה בת אהרון —*  
*by Madeline & Justin Schwartz, Monsey, NY*

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Medications which contain chometz on Pesach

הגמ' מבארת שמה שאמר ר"א שעובר אף על תכשיטי נשים ר"ל כדאר"י א"ר בנות ישראל שהגיעו לפרקן ולא הגיעו לשנים וכו' טופלות אותן סולת

The Gemara explains Rav Elazar's words said about women's cosmetics...young women who have not yet reached the age of maturity but have begun to show signs of maturity (through the growth of hairs)...can remove the hair with lime...

In our days, there are many forms of creams and medications which may include chometz. R. Shlomo Zalman Aurbach, zt"l, writes<sup>1</sup>, even if a medicine tastes a bit bitter, nonetheless this may not qualify as "not edible for a dog," for our standards of taste are quite discriminate. And if a food is technically edible by a human it is forbidden to have it in one's possession. Therefore, barring life-and-death situations, how could one use such medicines (even if it does taste bitter)?

There are two leniencies in this matter. R. Moshe Feinstein<sup>2</sup>, zt"l, permits the usage of medicines provided they were no longer classified as "food" before Pesach. Also, one could<sup>3</sup> use creams which are not edible for humans, provided they are not used for the sole purpose of pleasure (but to smooth skin or some other function). R. Shlomo Zalman Aurbach<sup>4</sup>, zt"l, only permits the use of medicines for ill people. Also, the medicine is only permitted if it is not chewa-

ble and is only fit for swallowing. Since this method of consumption is not considered the normal way of eating, it is indeed permissible for one who is sick (even if the illness is not life-threatening). Nonetheless<sup>5</sup>, the common custom is to sell such medicines to the non-Jew and use only Kosher for Pesach medicines. ■

1. בשו"ת מנחת שלמה ח"א סימן י"ז אות ב'
2. בשו"ת אג"מ באו"ח ח"ב בריש סימן צ"ב. ועי"ש שכתב וז"ל ואחשביה לא שייך בדבר שלוקח לרפואה דאף דברים מרים ומאוסים נוטלין לרפואה עכ"ל. ומאידך בשו"ת מנח"ש הנ"ל באות א', ז"ל הבלוע מחשיב מאד את החמץ מפני שע"ז הוא יכול לבלוע התרופה וכו' עכ"ל
3. בשו"ת אג"מ או"ח ח"ג סימן ס"ב נוהנה חמץ שנתקלקל עד שנפסל לכלב יש ב' ציורים שמותר לקיימוץ או שנתקלקל וכן קודם שהחמיץ, או אפילו שם נתקלקל כל רק אחרי שהחמיץ אבל קודם זמן איסורו. (תמ"ב ס"ק ט' וי"ב) ואם נתקלקל רק עד אינו ראוי לאכילת אדם כלל אבל ראוי לכלב אסור לקיימו אא"כ שנתערב בהיתיר קודם זמן איסורו, שאז מותר לקיימו ולהנות ממנו. [נשו"ע שם ס"ד וכן בס"א וכדפירש בר המ"ב שם בס"ק ה' י"ח י"א וכ"ב] ולדעת הרמ"א בלח שנתערב קודם פסח מותר אפילו לאכלו (הרמ"א בתמ"ז ס"ד. ומה שהרמ"א סתר א"ע שסתם הרמ"א בתמ"ב ס"ד להקל, והאחרונים תמהו עליו. י"ל דמדינא ס"ל דמ"מ אין חוזר וניעור אלא שמ"מ אסור מפני מנהיגא. ביבש ביבש.) וכ"ז בחמץ הראוי לאכילה עד שנתערב. משא"כ בנוקשה שנתערב כתב המ"ב (תמ"ב ס"ק י"ט) שדעת הרבה אחרונים שמותר לאכלו, ואפילו כשנתערב בפסח
4. במנח"ש שם בד"ה אך, והנה לגרשז"א זצ"ל בתרופה שצריך למצוץ או ללעוס אסור. ודע עוד שבסוף ספר מאור השבת ח"ב במכתבי הגרשז"א זצ"ל מכתב ל' אות ו' ז"ל בזמנינו יש ודאי דברים חריפים שפוסל מאכילת כלב ובענין סיכה כשתיה בבה"ל סוף סימן שכ"ז כתב שנוהגים להקל. ושי"ש יחמיר. (וק"ו לפסח)
5. עי' בפסק"ת שמ"ב ב' ה'. ועע"ש תס"ו א' ■

## Gemara GEM

### Women's obligation to eat matzah

כל שישנו בבל תאכל חמץ ישנו באכילת מצה, אכול מצה

In this verse, the prohibition not to eat chometz and the mitzvah to eat matzah are associated with each other. This comes to teach us that just as women are warned not to eat chometz, so too, they are obligated to eat matzah.

Tosafos (Megilla 4a) notes that women are obligated to drink the four cups of wine at the seder based upon a concept of אף הן היו באותו הנס—even

women were included in the miracle of the exodus from Egypt. Why do we not apply this rule regarding matzah as well, and say that women are required to partake in this mitzvah due to their having been part of the miracle which the matzah commemorates?

Tosafos answers that the rule of אף הן היו is only used to include women in mitzvos which are rabbinic, such as the four cups at the seder, reading Megilla and lighting Chanukah candles. We do not apply it to mitzvos of the Torah, where the Torah itself sets its own guidelines for women and their level of participation.

Tosafos also provides a different answer, as well. We know that women

are exempt from residing in a sukkah on Sukkos. We also know that there is a גזירה שוה which links the eating of matzah and the mitzvah to dwell in a sukkah. Although we might have included women in the mitzvah of matzah due to the rule of אף הן היו וכו', on the other hand we might have exempted them from the mitzvah of matzah due to the connection we have with the mitzvah of living in a sukkah. Because these lessons each lead us in opposite directions, we would not know what to conclude. This, then, is why we need the association between matzah and chometz to teach that women are, indeed, obligated to eat matzah. ■

