

Perek II

Daf 37 Amud a

HALAKHA

Thick bread – פת עבה: One should not bake matza a handbreadth thick during Passover ab initio (Rabbeinu Yeruham, based on the Gemara here). However, if one did so it is permitted to eat this matza after the fact (Magen Avraham; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 460:5).

A large quantity of bread on a Festival – פת מרובה בפתג: One may bake an ovenful of bread on a Festival, even if he does not need it all on the Festival itself. However, this leniency applies only to small ovens, where the bread was pasted against the inner walls and baked, not to larger ovens. With regard to larger ovens, one may prepare only as much bread as he plans to eat during the Festival itself (Beit Yosef; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 507:6).

NOTES

Shewbread – לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים: The Torah (Leviticus 24:5–9) describes the offering of the twelve loaves of shewbread that were placed on the sacred table in the Sanctuary each Shabbat. The bread of the previous week was divided among the priests and consumed by them. The shewbread was unleavened and placed on the table in two arrangements of six loaves each. Two bowls of frankincense were placed between them, or on top of them, according to some opinions.

A large quantity of bread – פת מרובה: Some commentaries explain that Beit Shammai are concerned that some of the bread will be left over after the Festival, and it will therefore be considered as though one baked bread on a Festival for later use. Conversely, Beit Hillel claim that although one does not need all the bread, it will bake better if the oven is full (Rabbi Yehonatan; Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh; Nimmukei Yosef).

ומאי משמע דהאי אשישה לישנא דחשיבותא – דכתבי: "ויחלק לכל העם לכל המון ישראל למאיש ועד אשה לאיש חלת לחם אחת ואשפר אחד ואשישה אחת וגו'".

The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that *ashisha* is an expression that indicates importance? As it is written with regard to King David's celebration after he brought the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem: "And he dealt among all the people, among the whole multitude of Israel, both to men and women, to every one a cake of bread, and an *eshpar*, and an *ashisha*, and all the people departed, every one to his house" (II Samuel 6:19).

ואמר רב חנן בר אבא: "אשפר" – אחד מששה בפר, "אשישה" – אחד מששה באיפה. ופליגא דשמואל, דאמר שמואל: אשישה – גרבא דחמרא. דכתבי: "ואהבי אשישי ענבים".

And Rav Hanan bar Abba said: The word *eshpar* refers to a portion of meat equivalent to one-sixth of an ox, and the word *ashisha* refers to a cake prepared from one-sixth of an eipha of flour. And this interpretation disputes the opinion of Shmuel, as Shmuel said: *Ashisha* means a jug of wine, as it is written: "And those who love the jug [*ashishei*] of grapes" (Hosea 3:1).

תנו רבנן: אין אופין פת עבה (ביום טוב) בפסח, דברי בית שמאי.

The Sages taught: One may not bake thick bread on the Festival, on Passover, as it might be leavened before it has a chance to bake; this is the statement of Beit Shammai.

ובית הלל מתירין. וכמה פת עבה? אמר רב הונא: טפת, שפן מצינו בלקם הפנים טפת.

And Beit Hillel permit one to bake bread in this manner. The Gemara asks: And how much thickness is required for the *matza* to be considered thick bread? Rav Huna said: This category includes *matza* that is a handbreadth thick. The proof is as we found by the shewbread,ⁿ which could not be leavened and which was a handbreadth thick.

מתקיף לה רב יוסף: אם אמרו בזיוין? אמרו בשאינן זיוין? אם אמרו בפת עמילה? – יאמרו בפת שאינו עמילה?

Rav Yosef strongly objects to this explanation: If the Sages said that it is permitted to bake bread a handbreadth thick for the shewbread, which was prepared by diligent priests who ensured that the dough did not become leavened, will they say the same with regard to other people who are not as diligent? Furthermore, if they said this with regard to well-kneaded bread, will they say the same with regard to bread that is not well kneaded?

אם אמרו בעצים יבשין – יאמרו בעצים לחים? אם אמרו בתנור חם – יאמרו בתנור צונן? אם אמרו בתנור של מתכת – יאמרו בתנור של חרס?

Rav Yosef continues: If they said that bread a handbreadth thick is permitted in a case where the bread was cooked with dry wood, which was brought to the Temple during the dry summer months, as the heat generated from this type of wood would cause the bread to cook quickly before it leavened, will they say the same with regard to ordinary people who cook with moist wood? If they said this with regard to a hot oven in the Temple, will they also say it is permitted with regard to a cool oven? Finally, if they said so with regard to the shewbread, which was baked in a metal oven that could be heated quickly, will they say the same with regard to a clay oven? Clearly, these two cases are different, and no comparison can be drawn between the shewbread and ordinary *matza*.

אמר רב ירמיה בר אבא: שאילית את רבי ביחוד, ומנו – רב. איכא דאמרי: רב ירמיה בר אבא אמר רב: שאילית את רבי ביחוד, ומנו – רבינו הקדוש. מאי פת עבה? פת מרובה. ואמאי קרו ליה פת עבה? משום דנפישא בלישה. ואי בעית אימא: באתריה דהאי תנא לפת מרובה פת עבה קרו ליה.

Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba said: I asked my special Rabbi, and who is this? Rav. Some say that Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba said that Rav said: I asked my special Rabbi, and who is this? Our holy Rabbi, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: What is the meaning of the expression: *Pat ava*? He explained that it means: A large quantity of bread,^{HN} a large batch of dough prepared in one session. And why did they call it: *Pat ava*, thick bread? It is referred to by this name due to the fact that it requires a large amount of kneading. And if you wish, say instead that in the place where this *tanna* lived, a large quantity of bread was simply called *pat ava*, thick bread.

סריקין המצויירין – Matza shaped in figures – One may not prepare *matza* shaped in figures on Passover. This *halakha* applies whether the shapes are formed by a mold or prepared by bakers, as we do not rely on the leniencies stated in the Gemara, in accordance with the statement of the Sages. The custom is to poke small holes in the *matzot*, which are not added to create a form, but rather to prevent the *matza* from becoming leavened. After the fact, if one shaped *matza* into a figure and it was not leavened in the process, it may even be used to fulfill one's obligation to eat *matza* (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 460:4).

LANGUAGE

Baitos ben Zonin – בַּיְתוֹס בֶּן זִוְנִין: Baitos is the Greek name Βοηθός, Boëthus, meaning helper or aide, and may be a translation of the Hebrew name Ezra. Zonin is the Greek name Ζήνων, Zeno.

Spiced cakes [eskeritin] – אֵסְקֵרִיטִין: Apparently from the Greek ἐσχάριτης, *escharitēs*, a type of bread baked over the fire.

מאי טעמא? אי משום דקא טרח טירחא דלא צריך – מאי איריא בפסח? אפילו ביום טוב נמי!

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason for this prohibition against preparing a large batch? If the reason is due to the unnecessary exertion that is required to knead a large amount of dough, which is an improper activity on a Festival, why discuss particularly the application of this halakha to Passover? The same halakha should apply also to other Festivals.**

אין הכי נמי, והאי תנא ביום טוב של פסח קאי. תניא נמי הכי, בית שמאי אומר: אין אופין פת עבה ביום טוב, ובית הלל מתירין.

The Gemara answers: **Yes, it is indeed so; it is prohibited to prepare a large quantity of dough during any Festival. And while this tanna was referring to the festival of Passover, he incidentally mentioned a halakha that actually applies to other Festivals as well. The Gemara comments: That opinion was also taught in a baraita, which states that Beit Shammai say: One may not bake pat ava on a Festival, and Beit Hillel permit baking bread in this manner on a Festival.**

תנו רבנן: יוצאין בפת נקיה ובהדראה, ובסריקין המצויירין בפסח, אף על פי שאמרו: אין עושין סריקין המצויירין בפסח. אומר רב יהודה: דבר זה שאל בייתוס בן זונין לחכמים: מפני מה אמרו אין עושין סריקין המצויירין בפסח? אמרו לו: מפני שהאשה שוהה עליה, ומחמצתה.

The Sages taught: **One fulfills the obligation to eat matza on Passover with fine bread, with coarse bread, and after the fact with matza shaped in figures, although they said that one should not bake matza shaped in figures^h on Passover ab initio. Rav Yehuda said that Baitos ben Zonin^l asked the Sages about this matter: Why did the Sages say that one may not prepare matza shaped in figures on Passover ab initio? They said to him: The reason is because a woman will tarry over it as she prepares the bread, so that she can form the figure before it is baked, and she will thereby cause it to become leavened.**

אמר להם: אפשר יעשנה בדפוס, ויקבענה ביזן! אמרו לו: לאמרו כל הסריקין – אסורין, וסריקי בייתוס – מותרין.

He said to them: **It is possible for a woman to prepare this matza with a mold, and she could set it immediately, without delaying the baking process. They said to him: People would fail to understand the distinction, and they would say that all shaped matza is prohibited, and yet Baitos' shaped matzaⁿ is permitted. Consequently, the Sages rejected this distinction, and prohibited all forms of matza shaped in figures on Passover.**

אמר רבי אלעזר בר צדוק: פעם אחת נכנסתי אחר אבא לבית רבן גמליאל, והביאו לפניו סריקין המצויירין בפסח. אמרתי: אבא, לא כך אמרו חכמים "אין עושין סריקין המצויירין בפסח"? אמר לי: בני, לא של כל אדם אמרו, אלא של נחתומין אמרו.

Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok said: **Once I followed my father, Rabbi Tzadok, into Rabban Gamliel's home, and they brought before him matza shaped in figures on Passover. I said: Father, didn't the Sages say that one may not prepare matza shaped in figures on Passover? He said to me: My son, they did not say this prohibition for the matza of all ordinary people; rather, they said so in regard to the matza of bakers, who are under pressure to enhance the appearance of their products to in order to increase sales. The dough could leaven, since bakers might take too much time to ensure that the shape of their matza is exactly right.**

איכא דאמרי, הכי קאמר ליה: לא של נחתומין אמרו, אלא של כל אדם. אמר רבי יוסי: עושין סריקין במין רקיקין, ואין עושין סריקין במין גלוסקאות.

Some say that **this is what Rabbi Tzadok said to his son: The Sages did not say that this practice is prohibited with regard to the matza of bakers, who are expert and efficient in their work and will do it quickly, but rather this prohibition applies to the matza of all ordinary people. According to both version of this exchange, it is permitted to eat this matza after the fact. Rabbi Yosei said: One may prepare matzot shaped as thin wafers, but one may not prepare matzot shaped as thick loaves, as the latter is more likely to be leavened.**

תנו רבנן: הסופגנין, והדובשנין, ואסקריטין, וחלת המסרת, והמדומע – פטורים מן החלה. מאי חלת המסרת? אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: זה חלוט של בעלי בתים.

The Sages taught: **Sponge-like cakes, honey cakes, spiced cakes [eskeritin],^l pan-fried bread [hallat hamasret],ⁿ and bread prepared from a mixture of permitted grain and teruma,ⁿ their owners are all exempt from halla. The Gemara clarifies these obscure terms. What is pan-fried bread? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: This is boiled bread baked by ordinary homeowners in a deep frying pan.**

NOTES

Baitos' shaped matza – סריקי בייתוס: This *halakha* is based on the well-known principle that the Sages did not distinguish between particular cases in the application of their decrees. The Sages regularly included in their decrees activities that could be reasonably viewed as exceptions, in order to maintain the overall effectiveness of the decree.

a *sin*. *Masret* with the letter *sin* means a frying pan, as in II Samuel 13:9. Consequently, *hallat masret* means bread prepared in a frying pan (*Mikhtam*). However, others claim that this bread was prepared by being boiled before it was baked (*Arukh*).

required to separate *halla* from this mixture, as they are permitted to eat *halla*. Consequently, some commentaries explain that this phrase refers to a case where an Israelite unwittingly ate most of this mixture of *teruma*, or a case where a small quantity of *teruma* fell into the dough and was nullified by the far larger amount of non-consecrated dough. Yet others suggest that the dough actually belongs to a priest and claim that priests are also required to separate *halla*, despite the fact that they may eat it afterward. This is similar to the *halakha* that even a priest may not eat untithed produce until he has separated its *teruma* and tithes (*Me'ir*).

Pan-fried bread [hallat hamasret] – חלת המסרת: Some commentaries associate *masret*, which is written with the letter *samekh*, with the term *masret*, which is written with

Mixture of permitted grain and teruma – המדומע: According to most commentaries, this refers to dough prepared from non-sacred grain into which *teruma* fell. However, it is unclear who is eating this bread. It is presumably prohibited for an Israelite to eat it, due to the *teruma* it contains, while priests would not be

Pot-boiled stew [*ilpas*] – אֵילֶפֶס: From the Greek *λοπάς*, *lopas*, referring to a large vessel used for cooking, eating, and drinking.



Greek *lopas*

אָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: הֲלָלוּ מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילֶפֶס הֵן. וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילֶפֶס חַיִּיבִין, וְהֲלָלוּ שְׁעֵשָׂאן בַּחֲמָה.

מִיתִיבִי: הַסּוּפָגָנִין וְהַדּוּבִשָּׁנִין וְהָאֵיֶסְקְרִיטִין, עֲשָׂאן בְּאֵילֶפֶס – חַיִּיבִין, בַּחֲמָה – פִּטּוּרִין. תְּיֻבַּתְיָה דְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לֶקִישׁ! אָמַר עוּלָא, אָמַר לְךָ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לֶקִישׁ: הֲכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינַן – שְׁהֲרַתִּיחַ וּלְבַסּוֹף הַדְּבִיק –

אָבַל הַדְּבִיק וּלְבַסּוֹף הַרְתִּיחַ מַאי – הֲכִי נִמְי דְּפִטּוּרִין, אֲדַתְמִי סִיפָא “עֲשָׂאן בַּחֲמָה פִּטּוּרִין” לִיפְלוֹג וְלִיתְנִי בְּדִידָה: בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אָמֹרִים – כְּגוֹן שְׁהֲרַתִּיחַ וּלְבַסּוֹף הַדְּבִיק, אָבַל הַדְּבִיק וּלְבַסּוֹף הַרְתִּיחַ – פִּטּוּרִין!

חֲסוּרֵי מַחֲסָרָא וְהֲכִי קִתְנֵי: בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אָמֹרִים – שְׁהֲרַתִּיחַ וּלְבַסּוֹף הַדְּבִיק, אָבַל הַדְּבִיק וּלְבַסּוֹף הַרְתִּיחַ – נַעֲשֵׂה כְּמִי שְׁעֵשָׂאן בַּחֲמָה וּפִטּוּרִין.

תָּא שְׁמַע: יוֹצֵאִין בְּמַצָּה הֵינָא וּבְמַצָּה הָעֲשׂוּיָה בְּאֵילֶפֶס! הֲכָא נִמְי: שְׁהֲרַתִּיחַ וּלְבַסּוֹף הַדְּבִיק.

מַאי מַצָּה הֵינָא? אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: כֹּל שְׁפוּרְסָה וְאִין חוּטִין נִמְשְׁכִין הֵימְנָה. אָמַר רַבָּא: וְכֵן לְחַמֵּי תוֹדָה. פְּשִׁיטָא, הֲכָא “לֶחֶם” כְּתִיב, וְהֲכָא “לֶחֶם” כְּתִיב!

מַהוּ דְּתִימָא: הוּאֵיל וְכַתְּיב: “וְהִקְרִיב מִמֶּנּוּ”

Reish Lakish said: These dishes are pot-boiled stew [*ilpas*],^l not bread. Since this food is prepared in a pot and not in an oven, it has been boiled rather than baked, and its owner is therefore exempt from *halla*. And Rabbi Yohanan said: Even the owner of bread prepared like a pot-boiled stew^h is obligated in *halla*, but the owners of these pan-fried breads and the other baked goods listed are exempt, as these breads were baked in the sun. Since they were not baked over a fire, they are not classified as bread with regard to the mitzva of *halla*.

The Gemara raises an objection to the statement of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish statement from a *baraita*: With regard to sponge-cakes, honey cakes, or spiced cakes, if one prepared them in a pot, he is obligated to separate *halla*. However, if he prepared them in the sun, he is exempt from this mitzva. This is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish. Ulla said: Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish could have said to you: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where one heated the pot over the fire and afterward pasted the dough to the sides of the hot pot. This is considered like baking in an oven, and one is therefore obligated to separate *halla* from the dough.

The Gemara asks: However, if one pasted the dough to the sides of the pot and afterward heated it, what is the *halakha*? So too, you will say that he is exempt from the mitzva of *halla*? If so, rather than teach in the latter clause of that *baraita* that the owner of the bread is exempt if it was baked in the sun, let the *tanna* distinguish and teach this *halakha* within the presentation of this case itself: In what case is this statement, that one who prepares this bread in a pot is obligated to separate *halla*, said? For example, when one heated the pot and afterward pasted the bread to its sides; but if he placed the bread in the pot and then boiled it, he is exempt. Why didn't the *baraita* formulate the *halakha* in this manner?

The Gemara answers: The text of the *baraita* is incomplete and is teaching the following: In what case is this statement said? In a case where one heated the pot and afterward pasted the bread to its sides. However, if one placed the bread inside the pot and afterward boiled it, it is considered as though it had been cooked in the sun, and he is exempt from separating *halla*.

Come and hear a difficulty from a *baraita*: One can fulfill the obligation to eat *matza* with half-baked *matza*^h and pot-boiled *matza*.^h Apparently, dough baked in a pot is classified as bread. The Gemara answers: Here too, the *baraita* is referring to a case where one heated the pot like an oven, and afterward he pasted the dough to the sides of the pot.

The Gemara asks: What is half-baked *matza*? Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: This refers to any *matza* that is sufficiently baked so that when it is broken no strands of dough emerge from its sides. Rava said: And likewise the loaves of the thanks-offering may be used if they have been baked to this extent. The Gemara asks: It is obvious that this is the case, as here, with regard to *matza*, “bread” is written, and there, with regard to the loaves of the thanks-offering, “bread” is also written (Leviticus 7:13). Since both loaves are called bread, it is obvious that the same criteria should apply to both cases.

The Gemara rejects this assertion: This statement is necessary, lest you say the following: Since it is written with regard to a thanks-offering: “And he shall present from it

HALAKHA

Halla from pot-boiled bread – מַעֲשֵׂי אֵילֶפֶס בַּחֲמָה: Dough baked in a pot is subject to the obligation of *halla*, even though the bread has not been prepared in an oven (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 329:8).

Half-baked *matza* – מַצָּה הֵינָא: One can fulfill his obligation to

eat *matza* with *matza* that has been baked to the extent that no strands of dough emerge from it when it is broken, as stated in the *baraita* and explained by the Gemara (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 461:3).

Pot-boiled *matza* – מַצָּה הָעֲשׂוּיָה בְּאֵילֶפֶס: One can fulfill the

obligation to eat *matza* with *matza* that was prepared by heating a pot and pasting dough to its sides. Some authorities say it is forbidden to use this *matza* if one first pasted the dough and afterward heated the pot (Rav Amram Gaon). One should therefore avoid preparing *matza* in this manner *ab initio* (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 461:2).

אֶחָד מִכָּל קֶרֶבֶן, "אֶחָד" – שְׁלֹא יִטוּל פְּרוֹס, וְהָכָא כְּמֵאן דְּפָרִיסָא דְּמֵאָא. קָא מִשְׁמַע לָן.

מִיִּתְיָבִי: הַמְעִיסָה, בֵּית שְׁמַאי פּוֹטְרִין, וּבֵית הֵלֵל מְחַיִּבִין. הַחֲלִיטָה, בֵּית שְׁמַאי מְחַיִּבִין, וּבֵית הֵלֵל פּוֹטְרִין. אֵיזְהוּ הַמְעִיסָה וְאֵיזְהוּ הַחֲלִיטָה? הַמְעִיסָה – קִמַּח שְׂעֵל גְּבִי מוּגְלָשִׁין, הַחֲלִיטָה – מוּגְלָשִׁין שְׂעֵל גְּבִי קִמַּח.

רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר מִשּׁוּם אָבִיו: זֶה זֶה לְפָטוּר, וְאִמְרֵי לָהּ: זֶה וְזֶה לְחַיִּיב, וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים: אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה, עֲשֵׂאֵן בְּאֵילָפֶס – פְּטוּר, בְּתַנּוּר – חַיִּיב.

וְתַנָּא קִמָּא, מֵאֵי שְׁנָא הַמְעִיסָה וּמֵאֵי שְׁנָא חֲלִיטָה? אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל וְכֵן אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְאֵיתִמָּא רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֹוִי: כְּמַחְלֹקֶת בְּזוּ כָךְ מַחְלֹקֶת בְּזוּ. וְתַבְרָא, מִי שְׂשֻׁנָה זֶה לֹא שְׂשֻׁנָה זֶה.

קָתְנִי מִיָּהֵת: וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה, שְׂעֵאֵן בְּאֵילָפֶס – פְּטוּר, בְּתַנּוּר – חַיִּיב. תִּיּוֹבְתָא דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן! אָמַר לָךְ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: תַּנָּאֵי הֵיא. דְּתַנָּא: יְכוּל יְהֵא מְעִיסָה וְחֲלִיטָה חַיִּיבִין בְּחֻלָּה – תַּלְמוּד לומר: "לחם",

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: אֵין לָחֶם אֱלָא הָאֶפּוֹי בְּתַנּוּר. רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הֵינִי תַנָּא קִמָּא! אֱלָא לָאוּ – מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילָפֶס אֵיכָא בִּינֵיהוּ. תַּנָּא קִמָּא סְבַר: מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילָפֶס חַיִּיבִין, וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סְבַר: מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילָפֶס פְּטוּרִין,

one out of each offering for a gift to the Lord; it shall belong to the priest who sprinkles the blood of the peace-offerings" (Leviticus 7:14), and the word "one" indicates that it must be a whole loaf, i.e., that one should not take a broken piece,^h and here the bread has not been properly baked, it might therefore have been thought that it is considered as though it were broken. Consequently, the *baraita* teaches us that this is nevertheless classified as bread.

The Gemara raises an objection: With regard to *me'isa*, dough that was boiled in water, Beit Shammai exempt one from separating *halla*, and Beit Hillel obligate one to do so. As for dough that has undergone the process of *halita*, Beit Shammai obligate one to separate *halla* from it, and Beit Hillel exempt. The Gemara asks: What is *me'isa* and what is *halita*?ⁿ The Gemara explains: *Me'isa* is dough prepared by pouring flour on boiling water [*muglashin*],ⁿ whereas *halita* is formed by pouring boiling water on flour.^h

Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yosei, said in the name of his father: From both this, *me'isa*, and that, *halita*, one is exempt from separating *halla*. And some say that he said: With regard to both this and that, one is obligated to separate *halla*. And the Rabbis say: With regard to both this and that, if one prepared them in a pot, he is exempt from the mitzva of *halla*; however, if he prepared the bread in an oven, he is obligated to separate *halla*.

The Gemara asks: And according to the first *tanna*, who taught that Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel disagree with regard to these two cases, what is different about *me'isa* and what is different about *halita*? Why do Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel reverse their opinions with regard to these types of bread? Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said, and likewise Rabbi Yehuda said, and some say it was Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi who said: As is the dispute with regard to this type of bread, so is the dispute with regard to that one; i.e., Beit Hillel are either lenient or stringent in both cases. And the variation in the *baraita* is due to a breakⁿ in its text, which is actually a combination of two sources, because he who taught this *baraita* did not teach that one, as the two statements were taught by different Sages.

In any event, the *baraita* is teaching that the Rabbis say: With regard to both this and that, *me'isa* and *halita*, if one prepared them in a pot he is exempt from the mitzva of *halla*, but if he prepared them in an oven he is obligated to separate *halla*. This is apparently a conclusive refutation of Rabbi Yohanan, who claims that one is obligated to separate *halla* from bread cooked in a pot. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yohanan could have said to you: It is a dispute between *tanna'im*, as it was taught in a *baraita*: I might have thought that one is obligated to separate *halla* from *me'isa* and *haluta*; therefore the verse states "bread" to inform us that this is not the case.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Bread is nothing other than that which is baked in an oven. The Gemara asks: The opinion of Rabbi Yehuda is the same as that of the first *tanna*. Rather, is it not the case that the practical difference between them is in the case of bread prepared as pot-boiled stew? The first *tanna* maintains that one is obligated to separate *halla* from bread prepared as pot-boiled stew, unlike bread prepared by *me'isa* and *halita*. And Rabbi Yehuda maintains: Similar to *me'isa* and *halita*, one is exempt from separating *halla* from bread prepared as pot-boiled stew, as it was not baked in an oven.

HALAKHA

Loaves of a thanks-offering to a priest – לֶחֶם תּוֹדָה לִכֹּהֵן – A thanks-offering includes forty loaves, ten loaves of four different types. Since the priests take a tenth of each type, each receives a full loaf without breaking the loaves. However, if one brought only four loaves, one of each type, the priest's portion must be separated before the bread is baked, while it is still dough, as one may not break apart a portion of a loaf (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 9:22).

Boiled dough – עִיסָה חֲלִיטָה – One must separate *halla* from dough whether the flour was poured on the water or the water was poured on the flour. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan and with the second version of Rabbi Yosei's opinion cited in the *baraita* (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 329:8).

NOTES

Me'isa and *halita* – מְעִיסָה וְחֲלִיטָה – See *Tosafot*. Other commentaries note that one might have thought there is a difference between flour poured on water, in which case the water is in a primary vessel straight from the pot on the fire, and between hot water poured on flour, as this water is no longer in a primary vessel but has begun to cool (*Tosefot Rid*).

Boiling water [*muglashin*] – מוּגְלָשִׁין – The *Arukh* cites a version of the text that reads: *Mei gelashim*, i.e., *gelashim* water. *Gelashim* means boiling, presumably so called because it bubbles over [*golesh*] the edge of the pot. Other commentaries suggest that *muglashin* is derived from the Aramaic root *gelosh*, meaning bald, as scalding water will cause hair to fall off the skin. A proof for this interpretation is the Aramaic translation of the word *gibbe'ah*, bald, in the Torah (Leviticus 13:41) as *gelosh* (*Ra'avad*).

Break – תַּבְרָא – This word indicates that the quoted *baraita* is not a single unit. Instead it should be divided, as it contains statements taught by different Sages. Rabbeinu Hananel explains that this is an expression of an oath, and it serves to emphasize that the two statements are unrelated.

NOTES

If one pasted bread inside a pot and lit a torch opposite it – הדְּבִיק מִבְּפָנִים וְאִבּוּקָה כְּנֶגְדּוֹ – Some commentaries explain that this question is referring to a pot (see *Tosafot*). The statement that this is performed by most poor people does not mean that paupers bake bread in a pot in this fashion, but rather that they heat ovens in this manner, and therefore the same *halakha* should apply if one heats a pot in this way (*Tosefot Rid*).

HALAKHA

Halla from dough of second-tithe produce – חֲלָה – מעִיסַת מַעֲשֵׂר: One is obligated to separate *halla* from dough of the second tithe in Jerusalem (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Bikkurim* 6:4).

לֹא, דְּכּוּלֵי עֲלָמָא – מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילָפִס פְּטוּרִין, וְהָכָא – כְּגוֹן שְׁחוֹר וְאֶפְאוּ בְּתַנּוּר קָא מִיפְלָגִי. דְּתַנְא קְמָא סְבִיר: כִּיּוֹן שְׁחוֹר וְאֶפְאוּ בְּתַנּוּר – לְחֵם קְרִינֵן בֵּיהּ, וְרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה סְבִיר: אֵין לְחֵם אֵלָא הָאֶפּוּ בְּתַנּוּר מְעִיקְרָא, וְכִיּוֹן דְּמְעִיקְרָא לֹא בְּתַנּוּר אֶפְיִיה – לָא לְחֵם הוּא.

אָמַר רַבָּא: מַאי טַעְמָא דְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה – דְּכַתִּיב: “וְאֶפּוּ עֶשֶׂר נָשִׁים לְחֶמֶךְ בְּתַנּוּר אֶחָד” לְחֵם הָאֶפּוּ בְּתַנּוּר אֶחָד – קְרוּי לְחֵם, וְשְׂאִין אֶפּוּ בְּתַנּוּר אֶחָד – אֵין קְרוּי לְחֵם,

יְתִיב רַבָּה וְרַב יוֹסֵף אַחֲרֵיהּ דְּרַבֵּי יוֹרָא, וְיְתִיב רַבֵּי יוֹרָא קְמִיהּ דְּעוּלָא. אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבָּה לְרַבֵּי יוֹרָא: בְּעֵי מוּנְיָה מְעוּלָא: הַדְּבִיק מִבְּפָנִים וְהִרְתִּיעִית מִבַּחוּץ מַהוּ? אָמַר לֵיהּ: מַאי אֵימָא לֵיהּ? דָּאֵי אֵימָנָא לֵיהּ, אָמַר לֵי: הֵי נִיהוּ מַעֲשֵׂה אֵילָפִס?

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַב יוֹסֵף לְרַבֵּי יוֹרָא: בְּעוּ מוּנְיָה מְעוּלָא. הַדְּבִיק מִבְּפָנִים וְאִבּוּקָה כְּנֶגְדּוֹ מַהוּ. אָמַר לֵיהּ: מַאי אֵימָא לֵיהּ? דָּאֵי אֵימָנָא לֵיהּ, אָמַר לֵי: רוּב עַנְיִים עוֹשִׂין כֵּן.

אָמַר רַב אֲסִי: עֵיסָה שְׁל מַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנֵי, לְדַבְרֵי רַבֵּי מֵאִיר – פְּטוּרָה מִן הַחֲלָה, לְדַבְרֵי חֲכָמַיִם – תְּשִׁיבַת בַּחֲלָה.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, it is possible to say that everyone agrees that the owner of bread prepared as pot-boiled stew is exempt from *halla*, and here they disagree with regard to a case where one subsequently baked it in the oven. The first *tanna* maintains that since one subsequently baked it in the oven, it is called bread, and one must separate *halla* from it. And Rabbi Yehuda maintains that bread is nothing other than that which is initially baked in an oven, and since this food was not initially baked in an oven, it is not classified as bread.

Rava said: What is the reason of Rabbi Yehuda? As it is written: “And ten women shall bake your bread in one oven” (Leviticus 26:26). Rava learns from this verse that bread baked in one oven is called bread, and that which is not baked in one oven, but rather in several different vessels, is not called bread.

Rabba and Rav Yosef sat behind Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Zeira sat before Ulla to hear him teach Torah. Rabba said to Rabbi Zeira: Raise the following dilemma of Ulla: If one pasted bread inside a pot and heated it from the outside, what is the *halakha*? Is one obligated to separate *halla* from this bread? He said to him: Why should I say this question to Ulla? For if I say this to him, he will say to me: What is the *halakha* with regard to bread prepared as pot-boiled stew? In other words, he will reply that my question is effectively the same as that well-known case.

Rav Yosef further said to Rabbi Zeira: Raise the following dilemma of Ulla: If one pasted bread inside a pot and lit a torch opposite it,ⁿ what is the *halakha*? He again said to him: Why should I say this question to Ulla? As if I say this to him, he will say to me: The majority of poor people do this when they use a pot for cooking, and therefore this too should be considered the same as bread prepared like pot-boiled stew.

Rav Asi said: With regard to dough of second-tithe produce, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Meir, one is exempt from separating *halla* from it. The reason is that Rabbi Meir considers second tithe to be consecrated property, which means that although its owner is entitled to use this produce, it does not in fact belong to him. By contrast, in accordance with the statement of the Rabbis, who maintain that second-tithe produce is the property of its owner, one is obligated to separate *halla* from it.^h

Perek II Daf 38 Amud a

HALAKHA

מצות של מעשר – מצות של מעשר – שני: One can fulfill his obligation to eat *matza* on the first night of Passover with second-tithe produce if he is in Jerusalem, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Hametz UMatza* 6:8).

אתרוג של מעשר – אתרוג של מעשר – שני: One should avoid using a second-tithe citron to fulfill his obligation to take the four species *ab initio*, as he may render it susceptible to ritual impurity. However, one who did so has fulfilled his obligation after the fact, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shofar VeSukka VeLulav* 8:2).

מצות של מעשר שני, לְדַבְרֵי רַבֵּי מֵאִיר – אֵין אָדָם יוֹצֵא בָהּ יְדֵי חוּבְתוֹ בְּפֶסַח, לְדַבְרֵי חֲכָמַיִם – יוֹצֵא בָהּ יְדֵי חוּבְתוֹ בְּפֶסַח.

אתרוג של מעשר שני, לְדַבְרֵי רַבֵּי מֵאִיר – אֵין יוֹצֵא בּוֹ יְדֵי חוּבְתוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב, לְדַבְרֵי חֲכָמַיִם – אָדָם יוֹצֵא בּוֹ יְדֵי חוּבְתוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

With regard to *matzot* of second-tithe produce:^h In accordance with the statement of Rabbi Meir, a person cannot fulfill his obligation to eat *matza* on the first night of Passover with this *matza*. Rabbi Meir considers it consecrated property, and one must eat *matza* that belongs to him, not consecrated property. In accordance with the statement of the Rabbis, one can fulfill his obligation with this type of *matza* on the first night of Passover.

The same dispute applies to a citron of second-tithe produce:^h In accordance with the statement of Rabbi Meir,ⁿ one cannot fulfill his obligation to take the four species on the first day of the festival of *Sukkot* with this citron. In accordance with the statement of the Rabbis, a person can use this citron to fulfill his obligation on the first day of the festival of *Sukkot*.

NOTES

Second-tithe produce, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Meir – מעִיסַת שְׁנֵי לְדַבְרֵי רַבֵּי מֵאִיר: Both the Rabbis and Rabbi Meir agree that one is required to bring second-tithe produce to Jerusalem, or if this is difficult, he should redeem it for money and take this money to Jerusalem. After reaching Jerusalem, the owner must eat the second-tithe produce

or food purchased with the second-tithe money. Nevertheless, the Rabbis and Rabbi Meir disagree as to whether this second-tithe produce is considered the property of its owner. According to the Rabbis, despite the fact that the Torah imposed certain limitations with regard to the place where it may be eaten, second-tithe produce is in the legal possession

of its owner. Conversely, Rabbi Meir maintains that the status of second-tithe produce is that of consecrated property, and the Torah permits the owner to consume this offering only in Jerusalem. This dispute is the basis for the different opinions with regard to using second tithe for purposes other than ordinary consumption.