

NOTES

Bashel mevushal – בָּשֵׁל מְבוּשָׁל: See *Tosafot*, who discuss this type of formulation. There is an opinion among the *tanna'im* that no *halakhot* can be derived from extraneous language of this kind. This is considered merely the Torah speaking in the language of men, even if the Torah does not usually repeat a word in this manner. Nevertheless, according to the opinion that *halakhot* can indeed be learned from this wording, all possible meanings should be derived, including those that extend beyond the ordinary implication of the term.

וְהָיָה בְּשֵׁל מְבוּשָׁל אֶפְקִיָּה רַבִּי לְצִלִּי קָדָר וְלִשְׂאֵר מִשְׁקִין!

The Gemara asks: **But Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi himself derived from the expression “*bashel mevushal*”ⁿ the prohibition against roasting the meat of the Paschal lamb in a pot, i.e., cooking the meat in a pot without the addition of liquids, and the prohibition against boiling it with other liquids.** How can he derive another *halakha* from this same phrase?

אִם כֵּן לִימָא קָרָא אוֹ “בָּשֵׁל בְּשֵׁל” אוֹ “מְבוּשָׁל מְבוּשָׁל,” מֵאֵי בָּשֵׁל מְבוּשָׁל – שְׂמַעְתָּ מִינָהּ תִּרְתִּי.

The Gemara answers: **If so, i.e., if this verse is referring only to the matter of cooking meat with other liquids or without any liquids, let the verse say either “*bashel bashel*” or “*mevushal mevushal*,”** and one *halakha* would be derived from the extraneous word. **What is derived from the varied wording “*bashel mevushal*”? Learn from this verse two *halakhot*,** one with regard to the manner of the cooking of the Paschal lamb, and the other concerning the time of its cooking.

תֵּנוּ רַבָּנָן: אֶכֶל צִלִּי מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם – חַיִּיב, וְכֹזֵאת נֹא מִשְׁחָשִׁיכָה – חַיִּיב.

The Sages taught: **If one ate from a roasted Paschal lamb when it was still day, he is liable to receive lashes, and likewise if one ate after dark an olive-bulk that was partially roasted, he is liable to receive lashes.**

קָתַנִּי צִלִּי דוּמִיָּא דְנָא, מַה נָּא בְּלֵאוֹ – אֶף צִלִּי בְּלֵאוֹ.

This *baraita* taught that the case of roasted meat is similar to the case of partially roasted meat: **Just as one who consumes partially roasted meat is in violation of a prohibition, so too, one who consumes this roasted meat while it is still day is in violation of a prohibition.**

בְּשֵׁלְמָא נֹא – כִּתִּיב: “אַל תֹּאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ נֹא” אֶלָּא צִלִּי מִנְלָן?

The Gemara asks: **Granted, with regard to partially roasted meat, it is written: “You shall not eat it partially roasted”** (Exodus 12:9). **However, with regard to meat that has been roasted, from where do we derive that one who eats it before the proper time has committed a transgression?**

דְּכִתִּיב: “וְאָכְלוּ אֶת הַבָּשָׂר בַּלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה.” בַּלַּיְלָה – אֵין, בַּיּוֹם – לֹא.

The Gemara answers: **As it is written: “And they shall eat the meat on that night, roasted with fire, and *matzot*; with bitter herbs they shall eat it”** (Exodus 12:8). The Gemara derives from this verse: **At night, yes, the Paschal lamb may be eaten; however, by day, no, it may not be eaten in any manner.**

הָאֵי לֹא הֵבֵא מִכְּלָל עֲשֵׂה הוּא, וְכֹל לֹא הֵבֵא מִכְּלָל עֲשֵׂה – עֲשֵׂה!

The Gemara asks: **This is a prohibition that comes by inference from a positive mitzva, i.e., it is not stated in the Torah in the form of a prohibition.** There is a principle that **every prohibition that comes by inference from a positive mitzva is classified as a positive mitzva.** One who transgresses a mitzva of this kind is considered to have transgressed a positive mitzva, not a prohibition.

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: הָא מִנִּי –

The Gemara answers that Rav Ḥisda said: **In accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*?**

Perek II
Daf 42 Amud a

HALAKHA

תְּמִימִים – Unblemished animals for maintaining the Temple – לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת: One may not consecrate an unblemished animal for its value to be used for maintaining the Temple, as animals of this kind may be consecrated only as offerings. One who consecrates an unblemished animal for maintaining the Temple transgresses a positive mitzva (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramim* 5:6).

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הֵיא, דְּתַנָּא: “שׂוֹר וְשֵׂה שְׂרוּעַ וְקָלוֹט נִדְבָה תַעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ” – אוֹתוֹ אֶתָּה מִתְּפִיס לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת, וְאֵי אֶתָּה מִתְּפִיס תְּמִימִים לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת. מִכָּאֵן אָמְרוּ: כָּל הַמִּתְּפִיס תְּמִימִים לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת – עוֹבֵר בְּעֲשֵׂה.

It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **“Either a bull or a lamb that has anything too long or too short, you may offer it as a free-will offering [to the Temple treasury]; but for a vow [as a sacrifice] it shall not be accepted”** (Leviticus 22:23). From here we learn that it, i.e., a blemished animal, **you may consecrate for maintaining the Temple, but you may not consecrate unblemished animals for maintaining the Temple.** In other words, any animal fit to be sacrificed as an offering may not be consecrated for maintaining the Temple but only as an offering. **From here the Sages stated: Whoever consecrates unblemished animals for maintaining the Temple^h transgresses a positive mitzva.**

No is stated – **לֹא נֹאמַר** – Rabbeinu Hananel and other early commentaries cite a version of the text that reads: *Lo yumar*, it shall not be substituted. In other words, do not exchange, i.e., violate, these matters, and anyone who does so transgresses a prohibition.

No is stated with regard to the subsequent matters – **לֹא נֹאמַר בְּדִבְרֵים**: See *Tosafot*, who explain that this derivation applies only to a prohibition that stems from a positive mitzva. However, Rabbeinu Hananel apparently maintains that if the first verse of a chapter includes the word: Saying, the violation of any of its positive mitzvot constitutes the transgression of a prohibition.

אִין לִי אֶלְא בְּעֵשָׂה, בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה מִנֵּן – תַּלְמוּד לֹא מֵר: "וַיְדַבֵּר ה' אֶל מֹשֶׁה יֹאמֹר" – לִימַד עַל כָּל הַפְּרָשָׁה כּוּלָּהּ שֶׁיְהֵא בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה, דְּבַרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי לְבַר קַפְרָא: מַאי מְשַׁמְעָ?

אָמַר לוֹ: דְּכַתִּיב "לֹא מֹר" – "לֹא" נֹאמַר בְּדִבְרֵים.

בִּי רַב אָמְרִי: לֹא מֹר – לֹא אָמַר.

"מִי תִשְׁמִישׁוּ שֶׁל נְחֹתוֹם וְכו'". תַּנִּי חֲדָא: שׁוֹפְכֵין בְּמִקּוֹם מְדֻרָן, וְאִין שׁוֹפְכֵין בְּמִקּוֹם הָאִישְׁבוּרָן. וְתַנָּא אִידָךְ: שׁוֹפְכֵין בְּמִקּוֹם הָאִישְׁבוּרָן!

לֹא קִשְׂיָא; הָא – דְּנִפְשֵׁי דְקוּו. הָא – דְּלֹא נִפְשֵׁי, דְּלֹא קוּו.

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: אִשָּׁה לֹא תִלוֹשׁ אֶלְא בְּמֵים שְׁלֵנוּ.

דְּרִשָּׁה רַב מַתְנָה בְּפַפּוּנְיָא. לְמַחֵר אֵייתוּ כּוּלֵי עַלְמָא חֲצִבְיִהוּ וְאָתוּ לְגַבְיָה, וְאָמְרוּ לִיה: הַב לָן מֵיָא! אָמַר לָהּ: אֲנָא בְּמֵיָא דְּבֵיתוֹ אָמְרִי.

From here I have only derived that he violates a positive mitzva; from where do I derive that he also transgresses a prohibition? The verse states at the beginning of that passage: "And the Lord spoke to Moses saying" (Leviticus 22:17). This introductory statement teaches with regard to the entire portion that a prohibition applies to it. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

The *baraita* adds that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to Bar Kappara: From where may it be inferred that this is the case? How does Rabbi Yehuda derive his statement that a prohibition applies to the entire portion from the phrase "And the Lord spoke to Moses saying"?

He said to him: As it is written: "Saying [*leimor*]." Rabbi Yehuda expounds this term as though it read: Say no [*lo emor*]. In other words, the word no, an expression of prohibition, is statedⁿ with regard to the subsequent matters,ⁿ which means that these mitzvot are categorized as prohibitions.

In the school of Rav they say a slightly different explanation: The term: Saying, can be expounded as if it were written *lav emor*, meaning: Say a prohibition. In other words, the verse indicates that Moses was instructed to inform the Jewish people of a prohibition. This teaches that any mitzva introduced by the word *leimor* should be treated as a prohibition. Since the *halakhot* of the Paschal lamb are preceded by the phrase: "And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron in the Land of Egypt saying" (Exodus 12:1), it can be inferred that the subsequent mitzvot are also prohibitions.

We learned in the mishna: Water that has been used by a baker for cooling his hands or washing dishes must be poured out, as it contains a small, undefined quantity of leavened dough. It was taught in one *baraita*: One may pour out this water in a place with an incline, and he may not pour it out in a level place where the water collects. And it was taught in another *baraita*: One may even pour out this water in a level place where the water collects.^h

The Gemara resolves this contradiction: This is not difficult. This *baraita*, which states that it is prohibited to pour out this water in a level place, is referring to a large amount of water that will collect in one place. Since there is a large amount of water, the flour in the water will not be absorbed into the ground but will leaven. Conversely, that *baraita*, which states that it is permitted to pour out the water in a level place, is referring to a situation where there was not a large amount of water, so that it will not collect. Instead, this water will be absorbed into the ground before the dough leavens.

Rav Yehuda said: A woman may knead *matza* dough only with water that rested,^h i.e., water that was left indoors overnight to cool. If water is added to dough immediately after it was drawn, when it is still lukewarm, the dough will leaven at a faster rate.

The Gemara relates: Rav Mattana taught this *halakha* in Paphunya. On the next day, the eve of Passover, everyone brought their jugs to him and said to him: Give us water. They misunderstood his expression *mayim shelanu*, water that rested, as the near homonym *mayim shelanu*, our water, i.e., water that belongs to the Sage, and they therefore came to take water from his house. He said to them: I say and meant: Water that rested [*devitu*] in the house overnight.

HALAKHA

Pouring out water used by a baker – שְׁפִיכֵי מֵי נְחֹתוֹם: With regard to water used by a baker to wash his hands or his vessels, after the time that leaven is forbidden, it should be poured out onto a place with an incline so it will not gather together and become leavened. Although the Gemara cites a *baraita* that permits one to pour this water onto a flat area where it will be collected, it is proper to be stringent in this regard, as the Gemara does not provide the precise parameters of the necessary circumstances for this to be permitted (*Me'iri; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 459:4*).

Water that rested – מֵים שְׁלֵנוּ: *Matza* for Passover must be pre-

pared with water that was left overnight, whether the water comes from cisterns, springs, or rivers (Rosh). The water should be drawn at twilight. It should be kept overnight in a house if it is warm outdoors, and it should be kept outside if it is cold, although in the latter case it should be brought into the house before sunrise. When the water is carried outside it must be covered. Since the drawing of water is part of the *matza*-baking process, it should be performed by a Jew. The water used for the *matza* that will be eaten on the first night of Passover should be drawn with specially designated vessels (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 455:1*).

HALAKHA

May not knead in the sun – לא תלוש בחמה – It is prohibited to knead the dough for *matza* in a place where the sun shines. On a cloudy day it is prohibited to knead this dough anywhere outdoors, based on the principle that the effect of the sun is widespread on a cloudy day. Likewise, one should not knead the dough for *matza* near a heated oven (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 459:1*).

She may not remove her hand – לא תגביה ידה – Dough that is being used in the preparation of *matza* should not be left idle even momentarily, for as long as it is being worked it will not become leavened (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 459:2*).

Vessels for kneading and mixing – בלים ללישה ולקישוף – A woman kneading dough for *matza* should not mix the dough with the same water she uses to cool her hands. Instead, she must prepare a different vessel for this purpose (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 459:3*).

She transgressed and kneaded dough improperly – עברה – וְלֹא תִלְוֶשׁ בְּחַמָּה – If a woman prepared *matza* dough in the sun or neglected to cool her hands, this *matza* is permitted after the fact, in accordance with the opinion of Mar Zutra, provided that the dough was not actually heated by the sun, as stated by the *Bah, Ḥavvot Ya'ir*, and others (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 459:5*).

NOTES

Water collected [hagerufin] in an urn heated by coals [mulyar] – מים הגרופין מן המולייור – Many early commentaries cite a version of the Gemara that omits the word *mulyar*, an urn heated by coals. They explain that this statement is referring to water that flows in rivers (*Arukh; Rabbeinu Yehonatan; Rif; Nimmukei Yosef*). This interpretation is based on the verse: "The brook Kishon swept them away [*gerafam*]" (*Judges 5:21*). Others suggest that this phrase is referring to water that moves a flour mill (*Maharam Ḥalawa*). According to this explanation, with regard to water from cisterns or wells, there is no need to keep it overnight before it can be used for *matza*, as it does not require cooling.

And she may not remove her hand – וְלֹא תִגְבִּיֵה יָדָהּ – Some commentaries explain that this means she should not stop working with the dough until she has baked everything. Others say that she must constantly work with the dough until it is placed in the oven. Yet others maintain that she must be careful that the oven remains lit until the last *matza* has been baked (*Ritva*).

LANGUAGE

An urn heated by coals [mulyar] – מולייור – From the Greek *μυλιάριον*, *miliarion*, or the Latin *miliarium*, a tall, pointed copper vessel containing pipes that heat the water inside.

דָּרַשׁ רַבָּא: אִשָּׁה לֹא תִלוֹשׁ בְּחַמָּה, וְלֹא בְּחַמֵי חַמָּה, וְלֹא בְּמִים הַגְּרוּפִין מִן הַמּוֹלֵייר, וְלֹא תִגְבִּיֵה יָדָהּ מִן הַתְּנֹור עַד שֶׁתִּגְמֹר אֶת כָּל הַפֶּת. וְצִיָּו שְׁנֵי כְּלִים, אֶחָד שֶׁמְקַטְפֵת בּוֹ וְאֶחָד שֶׁמְצַנְנֵת בּוֹ אֶת יָדָהּ.

אִיבְעִיָא לְהוּ: עֲבָרָה וְלִשָּׁה מֵהוּ? מַר זוּטְרָא אָמַר: מוֹתֵר, רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: אָסוּר.

אָמַר מַר זוּטְרָא: מִנָּא אָמִינָא לָהּ – דְּתִנָּא: אִין לֹתְתִין הַשְּׁעוּרִין בְּפִסְחָ. וְאִם לָתֵת, נִתְבָּקְעוּ – אָסוּרִים, לֹא נִתְבָּקְעוּ – מוֹתֵרִין.

וְרַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: אִטוּ בּוֹלְהוּ חֲדָא מְחִיתָא מְחִיתִינְהוּ? הֵיכָא דְאִיתְמַר – אִיתְמַר, וְהֵיכָא דְלֹא אִיתְמַר – לֹא אִיתְמַר.

הדרן עלך כל שעה

Rava taught: A woman may not knead dough for *matza* in the sun,^H nor with water that has been heated by the sun, nor with water collected [*hagerufin*] in an urn heated by coals [*mulyar*]^{NL} And in addition, she may not remove her hand^{HN} from the oven, i.e., interrupt her baking, until she finishes forming all the loaves from the dough, so that it should not become leavened in the interim. And she requires two vessels, one in which she mixes the water into the dough and one in which she cools her hands so that the heat from her hands does not cause the dough to leaven.^H

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: If she transgressed and kneaded the dough with warm water,^H what is the *halakha*? Mar Zutra said: It is permitted after the fact. Rav Ashi said: It is forbidden.

Mar Zutra said: From where do I say my opinion on this issue? As it was taught in a *baraita*: One may not soak barley on Passover, and if one soaked barley and it split, the barley is forbidden. If it did not split, the barley is permitted. This case indicates that even if one violates the principles established by the Sages with regard to adding water to flour on Passover, the product is forbidden only after the fact if it actually leavened.

And Rav Ashi said in response: Is that to say that all of them are woven in the same act of weaving? In other words, is the *halakha* identical in all cases? Where it was stated that the Sages did not punish the violator by rendering his food prohibited, it was stated; and where it was not stated that they refrained from punishing the violator, it was not stated. It is therefore possible that the Sages rendered dough kneaded with warm water forbidden, to punish the woman who prepared it in this manner.

מתני' ואלו עוברין בפסח: בפתח הבבלי ושכר המדי וחומץ האדומי וזיתים המצרי וזמן של צבעים ועמילן של טבחים וקולן של סופרים.

רבי אליעזר אומר: אף תבשטי נשים.

זה הכלל: כל שהוא ממין דגן – הרי זה עובר בפסח. הרי אלו באזהרה, ואין בהן משום פת.

גמ' תנו רבנן, שלשה דברים נאמרים בפסח הבבלי: מטמא את הלב, ומסמא את העינים, ומכחיש את הגוף.

מטמא את הלב – משום נסיוני דחלבא, ומסמא את העינים – משום מילחא, ומכחיש את הגוף – משום קומנתא דאומא.

תנו רבנן: שלשה דברים מרבין הזבל, וכופפין את הקומה ונוטלין אהד מחמש מאות ממאור עיניו של אדם. אלו הן: פת קיבר, ושכר חדש, וירק חי.

תנו רבנן: שלשה דברים ממעטין את הזבל וזוקפין את הקומה, ומאירין את העינים. אלו הן: פת נקייה, בשר שמן, ויין ישן. פת נקייה –

MISHNA And for possessing these^N one transgresses [*overin*]^{NH} the prohibitions of: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found, on Passover, although not all of them are considered food: Babylonian *kutah*,^N a dip with a sharp flavor that contains flour; Median beer; Edomite vinegar; Egyptian *zitom*,^L a type of beer; dyers' broth [*zoman*];^L bakers' well-worked dough; and bookmakers' [*shel soferim*] glue [*kolan*].^L

Rabbi Eliezer says: The same prohibition also applies to women's adornments, i.e., cosmetics, that contain leaven.

This is the principle: If one possesses any substance that is derived from a type of grain that became leavened, although it is not actually bread, one transgresses the prohibitions of: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found, on Passover. These substances are included in the warning,^H i.e., the biblical prohibition of possessing leaven, but there is no element of *karet* if one eats them.

GEMARA Since the mishna mentions *kutah*, the Gemara cites a *baraita* where *kutah* is discussed. The Sages taught that three things were said with regard to *kutah*: It blocks the heart, it blinds the eyes, and it weakens the body.

The Gemara explains each statement: It blocks the heart due to the whey. Whey was added to *kutah* and was considered to be an inferior type of food. It blinds the eyes due to the salt in it, which can be dangerous if it enters the eyes. And it weakens the body due to the mold in the bread, as one of the ingredients of *kutah* was crumbs from dough that had become leavened to the point that they were nearly spoiled.

After mentioning this *baraita*, the Gemara continues to discuss the nutritional effects of other foods. The Sages taught: Three things increase one's waste, lower one's stature, and take one five-hundredth of a person's vision if he eats them regularly. And they are: Bread from coarse flour, new beer, and raw vegetables.

Similarly, the Sages taught in another *baraita*: Three things decrease one's waste, straighten one's stature, and improve one's vision, and they are: Bread from fine flour, fatty meat, and aged wine. The Gemara explains: Fine bread

NOTES

And for possessing these – אלו: A different version of the Gemara does not include the connecting prefix *vav*, meaning: And. This omission indicates that there is no connection between this mishna and the previous one; conversely, those who accept the version with a *vav* maintain that there is a connection between the two *mishnayot*. The previous mishna explains that the water used by a baker may not be kept in one's possession on Passover, although it is not actually leavened bread. Similarly, this mishna discusses other items that are not in themselves leavened bread but contain only a small amount of leavened matter (*Melekheth Shlomo*).

Transgresses [*overin*] – עוברין: There are different opinions with regard to the meaning of the word *overin*. Some explain that it is referring to the transgression of the prohibitions: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found (Rashi; *ge'onim*; Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh; and others). Others maintain, based on the alternative translation of *over* as *pass*, that the word means that the items listed must be removed from the table since they contain leaven, and it is prohibited to eat them (Rabbeinu Hananel; *Me'iri*; Ritva). Yet others interpret this word to mean that these items must be removed from one's possession before Passover (Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi; Rabbeinu Gershom; Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

Kutah – כותח: *Kutah* was a typical Babylonian dip made from whey, salt, and bread that fermented to the point of moldiness. This dip was so sharp that it could be eaten only by the Babylonians, who were accustomed to eating it. In the Mishna, it is referred to as Babylonian *kutah*.

HALAKHA

For possessing these one transgresses – אלו עוברין: If on Passover one possesses an item containing leaven mixed with other ingredients that is fit for consumption, he has transgressed the commandments of: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found. Any such items must be removed from one's possession before Passover (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 442:1*).

These are included in the warning – הרי אלו באזהרה: One who eats food containing a mixture of leaven on Passover is not liable to be punished with *karet*. If one eats an olive-bulk of the mixture in the time it takes to eat half a loaf of bread, then he is liable to receive lashes, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Hametz UMatza 1:6*).

LANGUAGE

Zitom – זיתום: From the Greek ζυθος, *zuthos*, or Latin *zythum*, meaning beer made from barley, especially in Egypt.

Broth [*zoman*] – זוקן: From the Greek ζωμός, *zomos*, meaning broth that contains bran.

Glue [*kolan*] – קולן: From the Greek κόλλα, *kolla*, meaning glue, especially the glue used to bind books.

NOTES

A goat that has not yet given birth – צפורתא דלא אפתח: Others explain that this phrase may also refer to young birds that have not yet laid eggs (Rabbeinu Hananel; *Arukh*).

דסמידא, בשר שמן – דצפורתא דלא אפתח, וין ישן – עתיק עתיקי.

is made from refined flour; fatty meat refers to meat from a goat that has not yet given birth;^N and aged wine refers to wine that has been aged significantly, for at least three years.

BACKGROUND

Moist ginger – ינגבילא רטיבא: Ginger is obtained from the root of *Zingiber officinale*. Extracts of ginger are used in foods, condiments, baked confections, candies, beverages, cosmetics and perfumes. Overall, ginger products vary considerably in taste, pungency and smell, while the root varies in consistency, depending on the country of origin and the variety of the crop. Traditionally, the warming and aromatic properties of ginger have led to its use for numerous indications, including as an expectorant or to treat colds, often in teas or soups.



Ginger plant



Fresh ginger roots

NOTES

This is called Edomite vinegar – קורין אותו חומץ האדומי – As indicated in the blessings given to Jacob by Isaac (Genesis 27:40), the fact that these blessings are granted to the Jewish people, rather than the descendants of Esau, is dependent upon the merits of the Jews. While the Temple stood, the libations that were poured on the altar served as a source of blessing for the wine of Jews, assuring that it would not spoil. After the destruction of the Temple and the cessation of the libations, that blessing was transferred to the Edomites, who are descendants of Esau, as stated in tractate *Megilla* 6a (Maharsha).

HALAKHA

One who produces *temed* – המתמד: If one adds water to wine dregs and filters it, and he finds that there are four parts of liquid for every three parts with which he started, then he must assume that the additional portion is wine, and he is obligated to separate tithes from this mixture for the additional portion. If he finds less than four parts for every three parts he added, and certainly if he finds the same amount that he initially added, then he is not required to tithe the mixture. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis who dispute Rabbi Yehuda's position, as Rabbi Yehuda is an individual Sage in dispute with many Sages, and the *halakha* accords with the majority opinion (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Ma'aserot* 2:7).

כל מילי דמעלי להאי – קשה להאי, ודקשה להאי – מעלי להאי, בר מונגבילא רטיבא, ופילפלי אריכתא, ופת נקיייה, ובשר שמן, ויין ישן – דמעלי לכולי גופיה.

”שכר המדי” – דרמו ביה מי שערי.

”וחומץ האדומי” דשדו ביה שערי.

אמר רב נחמן (בר יצחק): בתחלה, כשהיו מביאין נסכים מיהודה – לא היה יינם של יהודה מחמיץ עד שנותנין לתוכן שעורין, והיו קורין אותו חומץ קתם. --

ועכשיו אין יינם של אדומיים מחמיץ עד שנותנין לתוכן שעורין, וקורין אותו חומץ האדומי, לקיים מה שנאמר: “אמלאה החרבה” אם מלאה זו – חרבה זו, ואם מלאה זו – חרבה זו. רב נחמן בר יצחק אמר, מהכא: “ולאם מלאם יאמץ.”

תניא, אמר רבי יהודה: ביהודה, בראשונה, הלוקח חומץ מעם הארץ – אינו צריך לעשר, מפני שחוקה אינו בא אלא מן התמד. ועכשיו, הלוקח חומץ מעם הארץ – צריך לעשר, שחוקתו אינו בא אלא מן היין.

וסבר רבי יהודה תמד לאו בר עשורי הוא? והא (תנן): המתמד ונתן מים במדה, ומצא כדי מדתו – פטור, ורבי יהודה מחייב!

The Gemara states a general principle: **Any food or medical treatment that is effective in healing this sickness or this limb is deleterious for that one. And any food or treatment that is deleterious for this one is effective in healing that one, except for moist ginger,⁸ long peppers, and bread made of refined flour, and fatty meat, and aged wine, which are effective to heal all limbs of the body.**

The Gemara returns to its discussion of the details mentioned in the mishna. Why is **Median beer** prohibited during Passover? It is because the Medians **place barley water into it.**

And Edomite vinegar is prohibited because the Edomites **place barley into it.**

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: **Initially**, when the Temple stood and they would bring wine libations from Judea, the wine would be blessed and would be preserved without any additives. **The wine of Judea would not turn to vinegar unless they placed barley into it to achieve this effect. And they would call this vinegar to which barley had been added ordinary vinegar**, since wine would not become vinegar without this additive.

And now, after the destruction of the Temple, **Edomite wine does not turn to vinegar unless one places barley into it. This is called Edomite vinegar,ⁿ to fulfill that which is stated with regard to Tyre, and the same applies to other enemies of the Jewish people:** “Because Tyre has said against Jerusalem: Aha, she is broken that was the gate of the peoples; she is turned unto me; I shall be filled with her that is laid waste” (Ezekiel 26:2). The Sages expound: **If this one, Jerusalem, is full, then that one, her enemy, is laid waste; and if this enemy is full, then she, Jerusalem, is laid waste.** Therefore, when the Jewish people fall, their enemies can achieve the success that was once attained by the Jews. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: This notion can be derived from here, where the verse states regarding Esau and Jacob: “**The one people shall be stronger than the other people**” (Genesis 25:23), meaning that when one nation gains power, the other is weakened, because they cannot both be strong at the same time.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda said: **In Judea, initially, one who would purchase vinegar from an *am ha'aretz*, i.e., one who is not scrupulous in matters of ritual purity and tithes and is therefore suspect of not having tithed his fruit properly, would not need to tithe it due to the fact that it can be assumed that ordinary vinegar was made only from *temed*, a liquid produced from grape remnants. After filtering the wine from the stems, seeds, and skins, water was poured over these remnants. The liquid was then drained off and allowed to ferment until it became vinegar. This liquid was called *temed*, and it is not necessary to tithe it. Vinegar was produced in this way because the wine of that time was so strong that it did not turn to vinegar on its own. But now, one who purchases vinegar from an *am ha'aretz* must tithe it, as the wine nowadays turns to vinegar quickly, and the presumption is that vinegar comes only from wine.**

The Gemara asks: **But does Rabbi Yehuda hold that *temed* is not subject to tithing? Wasn't it taught in a mishna: With regard to one who produces *temed*^h and adds a measured amount of water and afterward finds a corresponding amount of liquid to that which he measured, he is exempt from tithing this *temed* because it is clear that the grape produce added only flavor and did not add to the volume of the *temed*. And Rabbi Yehuda obligates one to tithe the *temed* even in that case. If this is so, how can Rabbi Yehuda permit a person to purchase *temed* from an *am ha'aretz*? According to his opinion in this *baraita*, *temed* must be tithed.**

Bran water [*maya dehviri*] – מֵיֵא דְחֵיֵרִי: In the present version of the Gemara, this phrase reads *maya dehviri*, which Rashi interprets to mean bran water. However, most early commentaries had a different version of the Gemara, which read *maya dehvira*, meaning water that is extracted from different types of plants. It seems that flour was added to this liquid to enhance the dye.

The depilatory paste of the daughters of the wealthy – טִיפּוֹלָן שֶׁל בָּנוֹת עֲשִׂירִים: According to the Ra'avad, the correct version of the Gemara should be: The sons of the wealthy would leave over these products for the sons of the poor. Otherwise, the mishna should have used the feminine form *soferot*, rather than the masculine form *soferim*. See *Tosafot*, who point out that according to Rav Shimi's explanation, it is difficult to understand Rabbi Eliezer's statement at the end of the mishna, as the latter adds nothing novel.

Some explain that in fact Rabbi Eliezer agrees with the first *tanna*, and he is merely adding that all types of cosmetics contain hardened leaven (*Ra'avad*). Others state that the first *tanna* prohibited cosmetics used by poor young women because their cosmetics contained a majority of flour and only a minority of other substances, while those of the wealthier women contained mostly other ingredients and only a small portion of flour (see *Ba'al HaMaor*).

Some say that the first *tanna* prohibits only hardened leaven itself, or a mixture containing true leaven, while Rabbi Eliezer prohibits a mixture containing hardened leaven as well (see *Ba'al HaMaor*; Rabbeinu Gershon). Others explain that according to Rav Shimi, the paste referred to here is specifically that which was left over for the poor young women, which became leavened in the meantime, whereas the wealthy women used their paste immediately, before it became leavened (*Maharam Halawa*).

Four items used by the ordinary people of the state – אַרְבַּעַה מִיַּי מְדִינָה: Some explain Rabbi Hiyya's statement to mean simply that each of the first four items on the list is associated with a *medina*, a state, as its country of origin is contained in its name: Babylonian *kutah*, Median beer, Edomite vinegar, and Egyptian *zitom*. The other three items are associated with a specific artisan, namely dyers' broth, bakers' well-worked dough, and bookmakers' glue (*Me'ir*).

Three items of artisans – שְׁלֹשָׁה מִיַּי אוּמָנוֹת: Rabbeinu Hananel's version of the Gemara reads: Three items of the state and four items of artisans. In his opinion, Egyptian *zitom* belongs in the latter category, as it was used primarily for medicinal purposes, and doctors are considered artisans.

הָכִי קָאָמַר: לֹא נִחְשְׁדוּ עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ עַל הַתְּמֵד. אִי בְּעֵית אֵימָא: נִחְשְׁדוּ. וְלֹא קִשְׂיָא: הָא – בְּדִרוּקָא, הָא – בְּדִפּוּרְצֵי.

The Gemara answers: **This is what Rabbi Yehuda is saying:** One is required to tithe *temed*; however, *amei ha'aretz* are not suspected of failing to tithe *temed*. Because *temed* is so inexpensive, the assumption is that *amei ha'aretz* are not sparing with it and are willing to tithe it. **If you wish, say** instead that even if *amei ha'aretz* are suspected of failing to tithe *temed*, and this is not difficult for the following reason: **This mishna is referring to a case where the *temed* was produced with dregs that contain some amount of wine, and therefore Rabbi Yehuda says that a person is required to tithe it. That *baraita* is referring to a case where the *temed* was produced with grape pits; because it is assumed that no wine is mixed into the *temed*, Rabbi Yehuda states that one is exempt from tithing it.**

״וְזֵיתוֹם הַמְּצָרִי וכו״. מֵאֵי זֵיתוֹם הַמְּצָרִי?

It is stated in the mishna that Egyptian *zitom* is considered leavened food. The Gemara asks: **What is Egyptian *zitom*?**

תָּנָא רַב יוֹסֵף: תְּלָתָא שְׁעֵרִי, תְּלָתָא קוּרְטְמוֹ, וְתְלָתָא מְלָחָא.

Rav Yosef taught from a *baraita*: It is one-third barley, one-third safflower, and one-third salt.

רַב פַּפָּא מְפִיק שְׁעֵרִי וּמְעַיִל חֵיטִי, וְסִימְנִיךְ סִינִי.

Rav Pappa removes barley from the list of ingredients and includes wheat; he maintains that Egyptian *zitom* was made with wheat rather than barley. The Gemara comments: **Your mnemonic to remember which Sage expressed which version is the word *sisanei*, meaning a twig basket. *Sisanei* contains the letter *samekh* twice, which can help one remember that Rav Yosef, whose name contains a *samekh*, says that Egyptian *zitom* is made from *se'orim*, barley, a word that contains the letter *sin*, which makes the same sound as *samekh*.**

תָּרוּ לָהּ, וְקָלוּ לָהּ, וְטָחְנָהּ לָהּ, וְשָׂתוּ לָהּ. מְדִיבְחָא וְעַד עֲצָרְתָא. דְּקָמִיט – מְרַפֵּי לִיָּהּ, וּדְרַפֵּי – מְקָמִיט לִיָּהּ. לְחֹלָה וְלֹא שָׂה עוֹבְרָה – סַכְנָתָא.

The Gemara describes how Egyptian *zitom* is prepared: Those who prepare it **soak the ingredients together, and then they roast them and grind them together. They drink the mixture from Passover to Shavuot.** This drink relaxes the bowels of one who is constipated, and it constipates one whose bowel movements are loose. However, **it is dangerous for a sick person or a pregnant woman to drink this mixture.**

״זוֹמֵן שֶׁל צְבָעִים וכו״. הֲכָא תְרַגְמוּ מֵאֵי דְחֵיֵרִי דְצָבְעֵי בְּהוּ לְבָא.

It was taught in the mishna that dyers' broth is considered leavened. The Gemara explains: **Here, in Babylonia, they interpreted that this is bran water** [*maya dehviri*]^N that people use to dye leather.

״וְעַמִּילָן שֶׁל טְבָחִים וכו״ – פֶּת תְּבוּאָה שְׁלֵיא הַבִּינְיָה שְׁלִישׁ, שְׁמִיחָה עַל פִּי קְדִירָה וְשׂוֹאֶבֶת הַזֵּוּהָמָא.

It was further stated in the mishna that bakers' well-worked dough is also considered leavened. The Gemara explains the nature of this substance: It is **bread made from grain that was harvested before it was one-third ripe and then made into a loaf.** This loaf was placed on top of a pot to draw out the filth from the broth.

״וְקוֹלָן שֶׁל סוֹפְרִים וכו״ הֲכָא תְרַגְמוּ: פִּירוּרָא דְאוּשְׁפָפִי.

It was further taught in the mishna that the *kolan* of *soferim*, bookmakers' glue, is considered leavened. The Gemara explains: **Here, in Babylonia, they interpreted that this expression is referring to shoemakers' glue that is made from flour.**

רַב שִׁמִּי מִחֻזְנָאָה אָמַר: זֶה טִיפּוֹלָן שֶׁל בָּנוֹת עֲשִׂירִים שְׁמִשְׁיִירוֹת אוֹתוֹ לְבָנוֹת עֲנִיִּים.

Rav Shimi from Hozna'a said: **This is the depilatory paste of the daughters of the wealthy,^N of which they would leave a remnant for the daughters of the poor.** It was the common practice for women to remove hair from different parts of their bodies by applying various pastes, some of which contained flour. The *kolan* of *soferim* mentioned in the mishna was such a substance. It was given this name because wealthy young women would give the paste [*kolan*] to poor young women whose fathers were schoolteachers [*soferim*], so that the poor women could utilize it as well.

אֵינִי! וְהָא תָּנָא רַבִּי חֵיָא: אַרְבַּעַה מִיַּי מְדִינָה, וְשְׁלֹשָׁה מִיַּי אוּמָנוֹת. וְאֵי אֲמַרְתָּ טִיפּוֹלָן שֶׁל בָּנוֹת עֲשִׂירִים – מֵאֵי מִיַּי אוּמָנוֹת אֵיכָא?

The Gemara asks: **Is that so? But didn't Rabbi Hiyya teach a mnemonic by noting that the mishna lists four items that are used by the ordinary people of the state,^N i.e., *kutah*, beer, vinegar, and *zitom*, and three items of artisans,^N i.e., dyers' broth, bookmakers' glue, and bakers' well-worked dough? And if you say that bookmakers' glue is the depilatory paste of the daughters of the wealthy, then what artisanship is there in that?** According to this interpretation, that substance does not belong on the list of artisans' items.

וְאֵלָא מַאי – פְּרוּרָא דְאוּשְׁכַפִּי, אִמַּאי קָרִי לִיהּ הָאֵי קוֹלָן שֶׁל סוֹפְרִים? קוֹלָן שֶׁל רִצְעָנִין מִיבְעֵיָא לִיהּ! אָמַר רַב אוּשְׁעִיא: לְעוֹלָם פְּרוּרָא דְאוּשְׁכַפִּי, וּמַאי קָרִי לִיהּ קוֹלָן שֶׁל סוֹפְרִים – דְסוֹפְרִים נְמִי מְדַבְּקִין בְּהוּ נִירוּתֵיהֶן.

”רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר אִף תְּכַשִּׁיטֵי נָשִׁים וְכוּ”.

תְּכַשִּׁיטֵי נָשִׁים סְלָקָא דְעֵתְךָ? אֵלָא אִימָא: אִף טִיפוּלֵי נָשִׁים, דְאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל

The Gemara answers with another question: **Rather what**, will you say that this is referring to **shoemakers’ glue**? If so, **why did** the authors of the mishna call it **bookmakers’ glue** [*kolan shel soferim*]? It should have been called **shoemakers’ glue** [*kolan shel ratzanin*]. Rav Oshaya said: **Actually**, one should explain that *kolan* is referring to **shoemakers’ glue**; and why is it called **bookmakers’ glue**? The reason is that **bookmakers also use it to attach their pages**. During the time of the mishna, this paste was referred to as **bookmakers’ glue**.

It is stated in the mishna: **Rabbi Eliezer says that women’s adornments are also prohibited as leavened food**. The Gemara asks: **Could it enter your mind** to say that **adornments** made from silver, gold, or woven materials contain leaven? **Rather, say** instead that this means: **Even women’s cosmetics** or other items used by women to enhance their skin are prohibited if they contain leavened ingredients. **As Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The Jewish women**

Perek III
Daf 43 Amud a

NOTES

Who reached physical maturity but had not reached the age of majority – **שְׁהִיגוּ לְפָרְקוֹן וְלֹא הִגִּיעוּ לְשָׁנִים** – Some commentaries explain that this is referring to girls who have reached the age of majority but whose bodies do not yet show the signs of physical maturity. To expedite puberty, they would spread ointments on their skin to accelerate the growth of body hair (*Arukh*).

Olive oil from an olive that has not reached a third of its growth – **שֶׁמֶן זֵית שְׁלֹא הִבִּיא שְׁלִישׁ** – Some commentaries explain that myrrh was added to the olive oil, and that it was this combination that was called myrrh oil (Rambam’s Commentary on the Torah).

It removes [*mashir*] the hair – **מִשִּׁיר אֶת הַשֵּׁיעַר** – Some commentaries cite an alternative version of the text: It blackens [*mashhir*] the hair. According to this explanation, it was designed to beautify rather than to serve as a depilatory (*Arukh*).

Karet – **כַּרֶּת**: A divine punishment for serious transgressions. The precise definition of the term is a matter of debate among the commentaries, with opinions including premature or sudden death, barrenness and the death of the sinner’s children, and excision of the soul from the World-to-Come. Tractate *Keritot* mentions thirty-six transgressions punishable by *karet*, all of which are violations of prohibitions, with two exceptions: Neglecting to sacrifice the Paschal lamb and failure to perform circumcision. *Karet* applies only to a person who intentionally commits a transgression. In certain instances, if the transgression was committed in the presence of witnesses, the transgressor is subject to execution by an earthly court or to the penalty of lashes. Anyone who inadvertently transgresses one of the prohibitions punishable by *karet* must bring a sin-offering as atonement.

LANGUAGE

Setaket – **סֵטֶקֶת**: From the Greek *στακτή*, *staktè*, meaning oil of myrrh.

Anpiknin – **אַנְפִּיקְנִין**: From the Greek *ὀμφάκιον*, *omfakiyon*, meaning oil prepared from unripe olives.

שְׁהִיגוּ לְפָרְקוֹן וְלֹא הִגִּיעוּ לְשָׁנִים, בְּנוֹת עֲנִיִּים טוֹפְלוֹת אוֹתָן בְּסִיד, בְּנוֹת עֲשִׂירִים טוֹפְלוֹת אוֹתָן בְּסוּלָת, בְּנוֹת מְלָכִים בְּשֶׁמֶן הַמּוֹר, שְׁנֵאָמַר: ”שִׁשָּׁה חֳדָשִׁים בְּשֶׁמֶן הַמּוֹר”.

מַאי שֶׁמֶן הַמּוֹר? רַב הוּנָא בְּרִי יְרֵמְיָה אוֹמֵר: סֵטֶקֶת, רַב יְרֵמְיָה בְּרִי אֲבָא אָמַר: שֶׁמֶן זֵית שְׁלֹא הִבִּיא שְׁלִישׁ.

תַּנְיָא, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: אֲנִפִּיקְנִין – שֶׁמֶן זֵית שְׁלֹא הִבִּיא שְׁלִישׁ. וְלָמָּה סִכִּין אוֹתוֹ – מִפְּנֵי שֶׁמִּשִּׁיר אֶת הַשֵּׁיעַר וּמַעֲדֵן אֶת הַבָּשָׂר.

”זֶה הַכֶּלֶל כֹּל שֶׁהוּא מִמִּין דְגָן”. תַּנְיָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: וְכִי מֵאַחַר שֶׁשָּׁנִינוּ כֹּל שֶׁהוּא מִין דְגָן הָרִי זֶה עוֹבֵר בַּפֶּסַח – לָמָּה מִנוּ חֻקִּים אֶת אֵלוֹ – כִּדִּי שִׂיחָא רְגִיל בְּהֵן וּבְשִׁמוֹתֵיהֶן.

כִּי הָא, דְהָהוּא בְּרִי מַעֲרָבָא אִיקְלַע לְבָבְלָא, הָוָה בִּישְׂרָא בְּהַדְיָה. אָמַר לְהוּ: קָרִיבֵי לִי מִתְכִּילְתָּא. שְׁמַע דְקָאֲמַרִּי: קָרִיבֵי לִי כּוֹתָח. כִּיֵּן דְשָׁמַע כּוֹתָח – פִּירֵשׁ.

who reached physical maturity, but had not yet reached the age of majority,^N and women who sought to remove hair for cosmetic purposes. **They would smear daughters of the poor with lime; they would smear daughters of the wealthy with fine flour; they would smear daughters of kings with shemen hamor, as it was stated: “For so were the days of their anointing filled, six months with shemen hamor”** (Esther 2:12).

The Gemara asks: **What is shemen hamor?** Rav Huna bar Hiyya said: *Setaket*.¹ Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said: It is olive oil extracted from an olive that has not yet reached a third of its growth,^N the acidic oil is effective as a depilatory.

It was taught in a *baraita*: **Rabbi Yehuda says that *anpiknin*¹ is olive oil from an olive that has not reached a third of its growth. And why is it spread on the body? It is due to the fact that it removes [*mashir*] the hair^N and pampers the skin.**

The mishna states: **This is the principle: One violates these prohibitions on Passover with anything that is prepared from a type of grain. It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehoshua said: Now that we learned that by possessing anything that is a type of grain one violates the prohibition against leaven during Passover, why did the Sages list these items individually?** They could have simply stated the principle. The *baraita* explains that the Sages provided a list of prohibited foods so that one would become familiar with these items and with their names, so that it would become widely known that these foods contain a small quantity of grain.

The Gemara cites an incident that underscores the significance of familiarity with the names of foods: **As in this case of that man from the West, Eretz Yisrael, who visited Babylonia, and had meat with him, he said to his hosts: Bring me a dip with which to eat my bread. He heard them saying: Bring him *kutah*. Since he heard the word *kutah*, he stopped eating, as he knew that *kutah* contains milk and may not be eaten with meat. This incident underscores that it is advantageous for one to familiarize himself with the names and ingredients of different foods, so that he will be aware of the nature of the food even if he does not recognize it.**

”הָרִי אֵלוֹ בְּאוֹהָרָה”

It is stated in the mishna: **These substances are included in the prohibition but are not punishable by *karet*.**^N