

וְאֵלָא מַאי – פְּרוּרָא דְאוֹשְׁפָפִי, אִמַּאי קָרִי לִיהָ הָאֵי קוֹלָן שֶׁל סוֹפְרִים? קוֹלָן שֶׁל רְצַעְנִין מִיבְעֵינָא לִיהָ! אָמַר רַב אוֹשְׁעִיא: לְעוֹלָם פְּרוּרָא דְאוֹשְׁפָפִי, וּמַאי קָרִי לִיהָ קוֹלָן שֶׁל סוֹפְרִים – דְסוֹפְרִים נִמְי מְדַבְּקִין בְּהוּ נִירוֹתֵיהֶן.

”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 – **שְׁהִיעֵנו 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 זַיִת 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.

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

מַאי שֶׁמֶן הַמּוֹר? רַב הוּנָא בְּרַי יְרֵמְיָה אוֹמֵר: סֵטֶקֶת, רַב יְרֵמְיָה בְּרַב אָבָא אָמַר: שֶׁמֶן זַיִת שְׁלֹא הִבִּיא שְׁלִישׁ.

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

”זֶה הַכֶּלֶל כֹּל שֶׁהוּא מִמֵּין דָּגָן”. תַּנְיָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: וְכִי מֵאַחַר שֶׁשָּׁנִינוּ כֹּל שֶׁהוּא מִיֵּן דָּגָן הָרִי זֶה עוֹבֵר בְּפֶסַח – לָמָּה מִנּוּ חֲכָמִים אֶת אֵלוֹ – כִּדִּי שִׁיְהֵא רְגִיל בְּהֵן וּבְשִׁמוֹתֵיהֶן.

כִּי הָא, דְּהוּא בְּרַב מַעֲרַבָא אִיקְלַע לְבָבְלָא, הָוָה בִּישְׂרָא בְּהַדְיָה. אָמַר לְהוּ: קָרִיבֵנו לִי מִתְּבִילְתָּא. שְׁמַע דְּקָאֵמַר: קָרִיבֵנו לִי בּוֹתַח. כִּיֵּן דְּשָׁמַע כּוֹתַח – 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 anpiknin¹ 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

Hardened leaven – חֲמֵץ נִקְשָׁה – This expression refers to inedible leaven or leavened dough that did not rise properly. Neither is considered full-fledged leaven and therefore they are not prohibited to the same degree (Ritva).

For eating leaven in its mixture one is not punished at all – על עירובו בלא כלום – Most authorities agree that this means only that one is not punished for consuming this mixture, not that eating it is actually permitted. The reason is that an olive-bulk of the mixture does not contain an olive-bulk of leaven, and therefore one is not liable for consuming this amount. However, if one eats a larger amount of the mixture, and he eats an olive-bulk of leaven in less than the amount of time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread, he is punished with lashes, even according to the opinion of the Rabbis (Rif, Rosh).

HALAKHA

Leavened bread and leavened bread in a mixture – חֲמֵץ וְתַעֲרוֹבֵת חֲמֵץ – One who eats leaven in its pure, unadulterated form is punishable by *karet*. If one eats an olive-bulk of leaven in a mixture, within the amount of time it takes to consume a half-loaf of bread, he is punishable by lashes. The rationale for this *halakha* is a matter of dispute. Some commentaries claim that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis in this case, as even they agree that one is liable to receive lashes for eating a mixture that contains this proportion of leaven (see Ra'avad and *Maggid Mishne*). Others say that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer (*Kesef Mishne, Lehem Mishne*).

מֵאֵן תִּנָּא דְחֲמֵץ דְּגֵן גְּמֹר עַל יְדֵי תַעֲרוֹבוֹת, וְנִקְשָׁה בְּעֵינֵיהּ בְּלֹא?

The Gemara asks: **Who is the *tanna* who maintains that both full-fledged, leavened grain bread in a mixture, and hardened leaven,^N in its pure, unadulterated form,^H which is not suitable for consumption, are both included in a prohibition?**

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: רַבִּי מֵאִיר הִיא. דְּתַנָּא: שִׂיאֹר יִשְׂרָף, וְנִתְּנָה לְכִלְבֹּי. וְהֶאֱכֹלוּ – בְּאַרְבָּעִים.

The Gemara answers that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: **It is the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as it was taught in a *baraita*: Leavening dough, i.e., dough that is at the beginning of the leavening process and is presently hardened leaven, must be burned, or one gives it to his dog. And one who eats it is flogged with forty lashes.**

הָא גּוֹפָא קְשִׁיא! אָמַרְתָּ "שִׂיאֹר יִשְׂרָף" – אֲלֵמָא: אָסוּר בְּהִנְיָהּ. וְהָדָר תֵּנִי: וְנִתְּנָה לְפָנֵי כִלְבֹי – אֲלֵמָא מוֹתֵר בְּהִנְיָהּ!

Before analyzing the contents of the *baraita*, the Gemara addresses an apparent contradiction within the *baraita*. **This *baraita* itself is difficult. You said that leavening dough must be burned; apparently it is prohibited to derive benefit from hardened leaven. And then it teaches: Or one gives it to his dog; apparently, it is permitted to derive benefit from the leaven.**

הָכִי קָאָמַר: שִׂיאֹר יִשְׂרָף – דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר, דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה. וְנִתְּנָה לְפָנֵי כִלְבֹי – דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

The Gemara answers that **this is what the *baraita* is saying: Leavening dough must be burned, i.e., leavening dough as defined by Rabbi Meir must be burned in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who maintains that leavening dough is full-fledged leaven. Alternatively, the *baraita* may be explained as referring to leavening dough as defined by Rabbi Yehuda, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda that it is prohibited to derive benefit from leavening dough. Each *tanna* maintains that it is prohibited to derive benefit from any dough classified as leavening dough by his definition. When the *baraita* says that one gives it to his dog, it means: Leavening dough as defined by Rabbi Meir, is only hardened leaven according to Rabbi Yehuda, and therefore one may feed it to his dog. Rabbi Yehuda maintains that it is permitted to derive benefit from this type of leaven.**

וְהֶאֱכֹלוּ בְּאַרְבָּעִים – אֲתָאֵן לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר.

With regard to the final statement of the *baraita*, that **one who eats leavening dough is flogged with forty lashes, we have once again arrived at the opinion of Rabbi Meir.** Rabbi Meir holds that one who eats this leavening dough, from which it is permitted to derive benefit according to Rabbi Yehuda, is flogged with forty lashes.

שְׂמַעֲיָן לִיה לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר: נִקְשָׁה בְּעֵינֵיהּ – בְּלֹא, וְכָל שֶׁבֶן חֲמֵץ דְּגֵן גְּמֹר עַל יְדֵי תַעֲרוֹבוֹת.

According to this explanation of the *baraita*, **we have learned that Rabbi Meir maintains that hardened leaven in its pure, unadulterated form, is included in a prohibition, and one who eats this leaven is flogged. And all the more so, one who eats full-fledged, leavened grain bread in a mixture is flogged but does not receive *karet*, as he is not eating the leaven in and of itself. Nevertheless, the prohibition against eating leavened bread on Passover applies in that case.**

רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר הִיא. דְּתַנָּא: עַל חֲמֵץ דְּגֵן גְּמֹר – עֲנוּשׁ כְּרַת, עַל עִירוּבוֹ – בְּלֹא, דְּבִרְי רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר. וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים: עַל חֲמֵץ דְּגֵן גְּמֹר – עֲנוּשׁ כְּרַת, עַל עִירוּבוֹ – בְּלֹא כְּלוּם. וְשְׂמַעֲיָן לִיה לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר דְּאָמַר חֲמֵץ דְּגֵן גְּמֹר עַל יְדֵי תַעֲרוֹבוֹת בְּלֹא – וְכָל שֶׁבֶן נִקְשָׁה בְּעֵינֵיהּ.

Rav Nahman said: The mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **For eating full-fledged, leavened grain bread one is punishable by *karet*, whereas for eating a mixture that contains leaven one is punished merely for violating a prohibition. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. And the Rabbis say: For eating full-fledged, leavened grain bread one is punishable by *karet*; however, for eating leaven in its mixture one is not punished at all.^N And we learned according to Rabbi Eliezer, who said that full-fledged, leavened grain bread in a mixture is included in a prohibition, and that is true all the more so with regard to hardened leaven in its pure, unadulterated form.**

וְרַב נַחֲמָן, מֵאִי טַעְמָא לֹא אָמַר כְּרַת יְהוּדָה?

The Gemara asks: **And what is the reason that Rav Nahman did not state his opinion in accordance with the explanation of Rav Yehuda, that the mishna is in accordance with Rabbi Meir's ruling?**

אָמַר לָךְ: דִּילְמָא עַד כְּאֵן לֹא קָאָמַר רַבִּי מֵאִיר הָתָם – אֲלֵא נִקְשָׁה בְּעֵינֵיהּ, אֲבָל חֲמֵץ דְּגֵן גְּמֹר עַל יְדֵי תַעֲרוֹבוֹת – לֹא.

The Gemara answers that Rav Nahman could have said to you that the following distinction applies: **Perhaps Rabbi Meir stated his opinion only there, with regard to hardened leaven in its pure, unadulterated form; however, with regard to full-fledged, leavened grain bread in a mixture, no, one is punished not with mere lashes but with *karet*.**

ורב יהודה, מאי טעמא לא אמר ברב נחמן?

The Gemara asks: **And what is the reason that Rav Yehuda did not state his opinion in accordance with the explanation of Rav Nahman, that the mishna is in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer's ruling?**

אמר לך: עד כאן לא קאמר רבי אליעזר הָתָם - אֶלָּא חֲמִץ דָּגָן גָּמוּר עַל יְדֵי תַעְרוּבָתָא, אֲבָל נֹקְשָׁה בְּעֵינֵיהּ - לֹא אָמַר.

The Gemara answers that Rav Yehuda could have said to you: **Rabbi Eliezer stated his opinion only there**, with regard to **full-fledged, leavened grain bread in a mixture** that it is included in the prohibition. **However**, with regard to **hardened leaven in its pure**, unadulterated form, **he did not state** his ruling and perhaps Rabbi Eliezer maintains that it is permitted to eat hardened leaven.

תניא בנותיה דרב יהודה: "כל מחמצת לא תאכלו" - לרבות פותח הבבלי, ושכר המדי, וחומץ האדומי, וזיתום המצרי. יכול יהא עגוש פרת - תלמוד לומר: "כי כל אכל חמץ ונכרתה" על חמץ דגן גמור - עגוש פרת, ועל עירובו - בלאו.

The Gemara notes that **it was taught** in a *baraita* **in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yehuda**, who said that the *halakha* is in accordance with Rabbi Meir's opinion: **"You shall eat nothing leavened; in all your dwellings you shall eat matzot"** (Exodus 12:20). The Sages taught: This verse comes **to include Babylonian kutah, Median beer, Edomite vinegar, and Egyptian zitom**. I might have thought that one who eats any of these items **will be punishable by karet**. Therefore, **the verse states: "For whoever eats leavened bread... that soul shall be cut off from Israel"** (Exodus 12:15), from which the Sages derived: **For eating full-fledged, leavened grain bread one is punished with karet, but for eating its mixture one is only in violation of a prohibition.**

מאן שמעת ליה דאמר על עירובו בלאו - רבי אליעזר היא, ואילו נוקשה בעיניה - לא קאמר. שמע מינה: נוקשה לרבי אליעזר לית ליה.

The Gemara analyzes the above statement: **Whom did you hear that said that for eating a mixture which contains leaven one is in violation of a prohibition? It is Rabbi Eliezer. However**, the *baraita* **is not stating the halakha of hardened leaven in its pure**, unadulterated form. This *baraita* lists only items that contain leaven in a mixture, but not other substances whose legal status is that of hardened leaven, e.g., broth, worked dough, and glue. **Learn from this that Rabbi Eliezer is not of the opinion that hardened leaven is prohibited.**

ורבי אליעזר, עירובו בלאו מנא ליה? דכתיב: "כל מחמצת לא תאכלו" -

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Eliezer, from where does he derive the halakha that leaven in its mixture is included in a prohibition?** The Gemara answers that he derives it as it is written: **"You shall eat nothing leavened."**

אי הכי - ברת נמי לחייב, דהא כתיב: "כי כל אכל מחמצת ונכרתה".

The Gemara challenges this derivation: **If so**, if the expression: Anything leavened, includes leaven in a mixture, **let one also be liable to receive karet for eating leaven in a mixture. As it is written:** "Seven days no leaven shall be found in your houses; **for whosoever eats anything [kol] leavened**, that soul shall be cut off from the people of Israel, whether he is a sojourner or one born in the land" (Exodus 12:19). Apparently, one is punished with *karet* for eating anything that contains leaven.

ההוא מיבעי ליה לכדתניא: (מחמצת) - אין לי אלא שנתחמץ מאליו, מחמת דבר אחר מניין - תלמוד לומר: "כל מחמצת ונכרתה".

The Gemara answers that Rabbi Eliezer **needs that phrase**: Anything leavened, in order to derive **for that which was taught** in a *baraita*: From the phrase: Anything leavened, I have derived **only** that an item **that became leavened on its own** is prohibited. However, **from where** do I derive that one is punished with *karet* for eating an item that became leavened **due to a different factor? The verse states:** "Whosoever eats anything [kol] leavened... shall be cut off," indicating that food that became leavened due to a different factor is considered leavened bread.

אי הכי - דלאו נמי להכי הוא דאתא.

The Gemara asks: **If so**, if the phrase: Anything leavened, is referring to food that became leavened by means of something else, then when this same phrase appears with regard to the **prohibition**, I should explain that it **comes for that purpose as well**. Consequently, there should be no violation for eating a mixture that contains leaven, as apparently, the phrase: Anything leavened, does not refer to that case at all.

אלא טעמא דרבי אליעזר מ"כל"

Rather, the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer is that he derives this halakha from the term anything [kol]. He does not derive his opinion from the term leavened; he bases his ruling on the inclusive term anything.

The Torah rendered a man equal to a woman – הַשָּׂוֹה – הַקְּטוּב אִישׁ לְאִשָּׁה: This comparison is referring to those places where the Torah formulates the mitzva in the masculine form. In those cases, the Torah prohibition is incumbent upon all the Jewish people, including women. However, this derivation is unnecessary in cases where the verse speaks in the plural form, which applies equally to males and females. Furthermore, this principle does not apply if the verse specifically uses the term man (*Tosafot*).

NOTES

A time-bound, positive mitzva – מִצְוַת עֲשֵׂה שְׂהוּמָן גְּרָמָא – This refers to a positive mitzva that can be performed only at a certain time of day, or during the day rather than at night, or on certain days of the year. Generally, women and slaves are exempt from mitzvot of this kind, although there are some time-bound mitzvot that women are required to perform, e.g., *kiddush* on Shabbat and prayer. Women and slaves are required to perform only mitzvot that are not restricted to a particular time for their performance, e.g., contributing to charity, affixing a *mezuzah*, etc. However, there are certain exceptions, such as Torah study, from which women and slaves are exempt.

HALAKHA

Women are obligated to eat *matza* – נְשִׁים חַיִּיבוֹת בְּמִצְוַת – Women are obligated by Torah law to eat *matza* just as men are, as stated in the Gemara. The same rule applies to all other mitzvot on the first night of Passover (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Hametz UMatza* 6:10; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 472:14).

הָתָם נָמוּ, הַכְּתוּב "כֹּל". הַהוּא מִיַּבְעֵי לִיָּה לְרִבּוֹת אֶת הַנְּשִׁים.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **There, too**, in the verse that mentions the punishment of *karet*, **isn't it written**: "For **whosoever** [*kol*] eats anything leavened, that soul shall be cut off"? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Eliezer **requires that term to include women** who are also punishable by *karet* for eating leavened bread.

נְשִׁים, מְדַרְבֵּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב נִפְקָא דְאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב, וְכֵן תִּנָּא דְבִי רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל, אָמַר קָרָא: "אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה כִּי יַעֲשׂוּ מִכָּל חַטָּאת הָאָדָם – הַשָּׂוֹה הַכְּתוּב אִישׁ לְאִשָּׁה לְכֹל עוֹנְשֵׁי שְׁבִיתוֹרָה!

The Gemara asks: Is this source necessary to derive this *halakha*? The fact that **women** may not eat leavened bread is **derived from** the statement that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said. **As Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, and similarly**, the Sage in the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: **The verse said**: "Speak to the children of Israel: **A man or woman, when they commit any of the sins of men, to commit a trespass against the Lord, and that soul shall be guilty**" (Numbers 5:6). **The Torah rendered a man equal to a woman^N for all punishments of the Torah**. Since the punishment of *karet* for eating leavened bread on Passover is included in this general principle, there is no need for a separate source to include women.

אִיצְטְרִיךְ.

The Gemara answers: Nonetheless, it is **necessary** to cite a source that men and women are equal specifically with regard to the punishment of *karet* for eating leavened bread,

Perek III

Daf 43 Amud b

סְלִקָא דְעֵתְךָ אֲמִינָא: הוּאִיל וְכַתִּיב "לֹא תֹאכַל עִלְיוֹ חֶמֶץ שְׁבַעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל עִלְיוֹ מִצּוֹת" כֹּל שֵׁיטְנֵנוּ בְּקוּם אֲכוּל מִצָּה – יִשְׁנֵנוּ בְּבַל תֹּאכַל חֶמֶץ, וְהֵינּוּ נְשִׂי הוּאִיל וְלִיתְנָהוּ בְּקוּם אֲכוּל מִצָּה, דְּהוּאִי לִיָּה מִצְוַת עֲשֵׂה שְׂהוּמָן גְּרָמָא (הִיא) – אִימָא בְּבַל תֹּאכַל חֶמֶץ נְמוּ לִיתְנָהוּ, קָא מְשַׁמְעֵ לָן.

as it could enter your mind to say that since it is written: "You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days you shall eat with it *matzot*" (Deuteronomy 16:3), one might have thought that **anyone included in the obligation to eat *matza* is also included in the prohibition against eating leavened bread. And these women, since they are excluded from the obligation to eat *matza*, as it is a time-bound, positive mitzva^N from which they are exempt as a rule, I might say they are also excluded from the prohibition against eating leavened bread. Therefore, the verse teaches us that women are also prohibited from eating leavened bread.**

וְהַשְׁתָּא דְאִתְרַבּוּ לְהוּ בְּבַל תֹּאכַל חֶמֶץ – אִיתְרַבּוּ נְמוּ לְאֲכִילַת מִצָּה, כְּרַבִּי (אִלְיָעֶזֶר). דְּאָמַר רַבִּי אִלְיָעֶזֶר: נְשִׁים חַיִּיבוֹת בְּאֲכִילַת מִצָּה דְבַר תּוֹרָה, שְׁנֵאמַר: "לֹא תֹאכַל עִלְיוֹ חֶמֶץ וְגו'" כֹּל שֵׁיטְנֵנוּ בְּבַל תֹּאכַל חֶמֶץ – יִשְׁנֵנוּ בְּאֲכִילַת מִצָּה. וְהֵינּוּ נְשִׂי נְמוּ, הוּאִיל וְיִשְׁנֵנוּ בְּבַל תֹּאכַל חֶמֶץ – יִשְׁנֵנוּ בְּקוּם אֲכוּל מִצָּה.

The Gemara comments: **And now that women have been included in the prohibition against eating leavened bread, they should also be included in the obligation to eat *matza*, even though it is a time-bound, positive mitzva, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. As Rabbi Eliezer said: Women are obligated to eat *matza* by Torah law, as it is stated**: "You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days you shall eat with it *matzot*" (Deuteronomy 16:3). These two commandments are juxtaposed to teach that **anyone included in the prohibition against eating leavened bread is also included in the obligation to eat *matza*. And these women too, since they are included in the prohibition against eating leavened bread, they are also included in the obligation to eat *matza*.**^H

וּמֵאִי חֲזִית דְּהָאִי "כֹּל" לְרַבּוּי נְשִׁים וּמִפְקָתָ עִירוּבוֹ, אִימָא לְרַבּוּי עִירוּבוֹ!

The Gemara questions this derivation: **What did you see that led you to understand that the term anything [*kol*] comes to include women and to exclude leaven in its mixture?** On the contrary, say that it comes to **include** in the punishment of *karet* one who eats its mixture.

מִסְתַּבְּרָא, קָאִי בְּאוּכְלִין – מְרַבָּה אוּכְלִין, קָאִי בְּאוּכְלִין מְרַבָּה נְאֻכְלִין!

The Gemara answers: **It is reasonable** to explain that the verse comes to include women since the verse is **dealing with those who are obligated in the mitzva not to eat leavened bread, it includes those who eat**, as the verse says: "For anyone who eats leavened bread... shall be cut off." It stands to reason that the expression: Anyone [*kol*] includes additional people who are punishable by *karet*, not additional types of leaven. Would a verse that is **dealing with those who may not eat leaven** come to **include** additional types of foods that may not be eaten?

Rav Natan, father of Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan – רב נתן – אביו: Some versions of the text read only: Rav Natan, father of Rav Huna. However, it is likely that the version cited here is correct. The Gemara first identifies Rav Natan by means of his son Rav Huna. As this Rav Huna is not the Rav Huna whose opinions are typically cited, the Gemara indicates that this is another Rav Huna by repeating his father's name.

Include foods that are eaten – מרבה נאכלין: Apparently, Rabbi Eliezer derives the prohibition against eating additional foods from a verse that mentions those who may eat. The reason is that he interprets the verses: “For anyone who eats leaven” and “For anyone who eats fat” in a similar manner to the verse: “All forgive iniquity” (Hosea 14:3). This verse is interpreted as though the words were reversed: God will forgive all iniquity. Here too, the verse can be read: “As one who eats any type of fat” (Rashash).

The Rabbis...do not interpret the term: Anything [kol], to include other matters – רבנן...כל לא דרשי: Although a derivation of this kind is common and logical, it is possible that the Gemara means that the Rabbis, unlike Rabbi Eliezer, do not interpret the term: Anything, to include matters beyond the clear meaning of the verse (See *Tosafot*; Maharam Halawa).

From where is it derived that it is prohibited to sacrifice leaven in a mixture – עירובו מניין: Some commentaries accept Rashi's explanation that this *halakha* applies to half an olive-bulk of leaven in a mixture. However, others maintain that this prohibition applies even when there is any amount of leaven present; as long as the leaven contributes taste to the mixture, it may not be burned on the altar (Maharam Halawa).

Rabbi Eliezer derives halakhot from the term kol – רבי אליעזר: This statement is surprising, as there is no evidence that Rabbi Eliezer derives *halakhot* from other instances of the word *kol*, e.g., “Any [*kol*] blood” (Leviticus 7:26); “Any [*kol*] fish that does not have fins and scales” (Deuteronomy 14:10); et al. Apparently Rabbi Eliezer derives *halakhot* from the word *kol* only with regard to prohibitions in which there are not many different categories, as in those prohibitions *kol* merely refers to the existing categories and does not come to include anything beyond them (see the Ra'avad's critique of the commentary of *Ba'al HaMaor*).

HALAKHA

Burning leaven in a mixture – הקטרת תערובת שאור: One who offers leaven on the altar is punished with lashes, even if the leaven is only part of a mixture (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 5:1).

מתקייף לה רב נתן אביו דרב הונא (בריה דרב נתן): וכל היכא דקאי באוכלין לא מרבה נאכלין? והא תנא: “כי כל אכל חלב מן הבהמה אשר יקריב”, אין לי אלא חלב תמימין שראוי לקרב, חלב בעלי מומין מניין – תלמוד לומר: “מן הבהמה”. חלב חולין מניין – תלמוד לומר: “כי כל”. והא הכא דקאי באוכלין וקא מרבה נאכלין!

התם דליכא אוכלין – מרבה נאכלין. הךא דאיכא אוכלין – לא שביק להו לאוכלין ומרבה נאכלין.

ורבנן דלית להו עירוב – “כל” לא דרשי. אלא נשים מנא להו?

“כל” – לא דרשי, “כי כל” דרשי.

ורבי אליעזר, אימא: “כל” – לרבות את הנשים, “כי כל” – לרבות את עירובו!

וכי תימא: “כי כל” – רבי אליעזר לא דרשי – והתנא: “שאר כל תקטירו” אין לי אלא בולא, מקצתו מניין – תלמוד לומר: “כל”. עירובו מניין – תלמוד לומר: “כי כל”. מאן שמעת ליה דדרשי “כל” – רבי אליעזר, וקא דרשי “כי כל”.

Rav Natan, father of Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan,^N strongly objects to this: And anywhere that a verse is dealing with those who eat, does it necessarily not come to include additional types of food in the prohibition? Wasn't it taught in a *baraita*: “For anyone who eats the fat of the domesticated animal, of which men present an offering of fire to God, the soul that eats it shall be cut off from its people” (Leviticus 7:25)? The Sages interpreted this verse: I have derived from this verse that the prohibition applies only to the fats of unblemished animals that are fit to be sacrificed. From where is it derived that it is also prohibited to eat the fats of blemished animals, which may not be offered as sacrifices? The verse states: “Of the domesticated animal.” From where is it derived that it is prohibited to eat the fats of non-sacred animals? The verse states: “For anyone who eats the fat.” Rav Natan explains his objection: Here, isn't the verse dealing with those who eat fats, and nevertheless, its superfluous phrases come to include types of foods that may not be eaten.

The Gemara answers: There, in the verse concerning prohibited fats, where there are no additional people who eat of it to include, as the prohibition already applies to everyone, the superfluous expression comes to include additional foods. Here, in the verse that deals with leavened bread, where there are people who eat of it who can be included, namely women, the verse does not exclude people who eat and include foods that are eaten.^N Generally, there should be a connection between the content of a verse and that which is derived from it. Only when no other derivation is possible is a less related matter derived.

The Gemara explains: And the Rabbis, who are not of the opinion that leaven in a mixture is included in the prohibition, do not interpret that the term: Anything [*kol*], comes to include other matters;^N neither with regard to leaven in a mixture nor with regard to *karet*. The Gemara asks: However, in that case, from where do they derive that it is prohibited for women to eat leavened bread?

The Gemara answers: Although they do not derive a *halakha* from the term: Anything, they derive a *halakha* from the expression: For anyone [*ki kol*], in the verse: “For anyone who eats leaven.”

The Gemara asks: And if indeed the phrase: For anyone, is a more inclusive expression than the simple word anything, then according to Rabbi Eliezer, another *halakha* could also be derived from here. Say that the phrase: Anyone who eats leaven, comes to include the women, and the phrase: For anyone who eats, comes to include leaven in its mixture. According to Rabbi Eliezer, then, one would be punishable by *karet* for eating leaven in a mixture.

And lest you say that Rabbi Eliezer does not derive a *halakha* from the phrase: For anyone [*ki kol*], as he does not consider this an inclusive expression, the result would be another contradiction. Wasn't it taught in another *baraita*: “For no [*ki kol*] leaven nor any honey shall be offered as a burnt-offering before God” (Leviticus 2:11)? Had the verse stated only: You shall not offer leaven, I would have derived nothing other than the *halakha* that it is prohibited to sacrifice an entire piece of leaven. From where is it derived that it is also prohibited to sacrifice part of it? The verse states: “No [*kol*] leaven,” indicating that it is prohibited to sacrifice even part of it. From where is it derived that it is prohibited to sacrifice leaven in a mixture?^{NH} The verse states: “For no [*ki kol*] leaven.” The Gemara analyzes this statement: Whom did you hear who derives *halakhot* from the term: *Kol*? It is Rabbi Eliezer,^N and nevertheless, he derives additional details from the expression: *Ki kol*.

קשיא.

The Gemara concludes: This matter remains difficult, as no satisfactory explanation has been found for why Rabbi Eliezer does not derive from the expression *ki kol* that leaven in a mixture is also prohibited.

אָמַר רַבִּי אַבְהוּ אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: כָּל
אִיסוּרֵי שְׁבִיתוֹרָה אֵין הֵיטֵר מִצְטַרְף
לְאִיסוּר, חוּץ מֵאִיסוּרֵי נְזִיר, שֶׁהֲרִי
אָמְרָה תוֹרָה "מִשְׁרֵת".

After discussing leaven in a mixture, the Gemara states a more general principle. **Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to all prohibitions of the Torah, a permitted substance does not join together with a prohibited substance.** If one eats a permitted food with a prohibited food, and together they constitute the minimum prohibited measure, he is exempt from punishment for this act of consumption. This principle applies to all *halakhot* except for the prohibitions of a nazirite, who is liable for eating a mixture of that kind, as the Torah said with regard to a nazirite: "He shall abstain from wine and strong drink; he shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, nor shall he drink anything soaked in grapes" (Numbers 6:3). This verse indicates that a nazirite is prohibited from consuming not only wine and vinegar, but also any food that was soaked in these liquids.

וְזַעֲרֵי אָמַר: אִף שָׂאוֹר בֵּל תִּקְטִירוּ.

And Ze'eiri said: Permitted and prohibited substances also combine with regard to the prohibition against offering leaven on the altar, as it states: "For no [kol] leaven and no [kol] honey shall be offered as a burnt-offering before the Lord" (Leviticus 2:11). This indicates that one is also liable for sacrificing leaven in a mixture (*Tosafot*) in addition to the liability for sacrificing pure leaven.

כַּמָּאן – כְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, דְּדְרִישׁ "כָּל".

The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose opinion did Ze'eiri issue his ruling?** It is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Eliezer, who derives** from the term *kol* that any mixture that contains any amount of a prohibited substance is not nullified.

אי הכי – The Gemara raises a difficulty: **If so,**

Perek III

Daf 44 Amud a

לְעֵנֵן חֵמֵץ בַּפֶּסַח נִמְי.

with regard to the matter of leavened bread on Passover one should also be liable^N for eating a prohibited substance joined together with a permitted substance.

אֵין הֵכִי נִמְי, וְלֹא פֻקֵי מִדְּאֲבֵי, דְּאָמַר:
יֵשׁ הִקְטָרָה לְפָחוֹת מִכֹּזָיִת, קִמְשָׁמַע לָן:
דְּהִקְטָרָה לֹא לְפָחוֹת מִכֹּזָיִת.

The Gemara answers: **Yes, indeed it is so, and the prohibition mentioned by Ze'eiri against sacrificing leaven in offerings was only to exclude the statement of Abaye, who said: There is significance to offering less than an olive-bulk of leaven on the altar,^H and one is flogged for sacrificing an offering of that kind.** By noting that one is liable because permitted substances combine with prohibited substances, the *baraita* teaches us that an offering of less than an olive-bulk is not considered an offering, and therefore sacrificing it is not punishable by lashes.

יְהִיב רַב דִּימִי וְקָאָמַר לָהּ לְהָא שְׁמַעְתָּ:
אָמַר לִי אֲבִי לְרַב דִּימִי: וְכָל אִיסוּרֵי
שְׁבִיתוֹרָה אֵין הֵיטֵר מִצְטַרְף לְאִיסוּר?

Rav Dimi sat and stated this halakha that a permitted substance does not join together with a prohibited substance to constitute the requisite measure, except in the case of a nazirite. **Abaye said to Rav Dimi: And is it true that with regard to all other prohibitions in the Torah, a permitted substance does not join together with a prohibited substance?**

וְהִתְנַן: הַמִּקְפָּה שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה, וְהַשּׁוּם
וְהַשְּׁמֵן שֶׁל חוּלִין, וְנִגְעָ טְבוּל יוֹם
בְּמִקְצָתָן – פָּסֵל אֶת כּוֹלָן. הַמִּקְפָּה שֶׁל
חוּלִין וְהַשּׁוּם וְהַשְּׁמֵן שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה וְנִגְעָ
טְבוּל יוֹם בְּמִקְצָתָן – לֹא פָּסֵל אֶלָּא
מִקוּם מִגְעוֹ בְּלִבָּד.

But didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to thick soup^N prepared with *teruma*^H produce whose garlic and oil are of non-sacred produce, and one who immersed himself during that day touched some of the ingredients, he disqualified all the contents of the pot, as they are subsumed within the *teruma* soup. However, if the thick soup was prepared with non-sacred produce^H and the garlic and the oil were of *teruma*, and one who immersed himself during that day touched some of them, he disqualifies only the ingredients in the place that he touched.

NOTES

For eating leavened bread on Passover one should also be liable – חֵמֵץ בַּפֶּסַח נִמְי: Some commentaries interpret this statement as referring to all prohibited items in the Torah, not just leaven; however, as the Gemara was discussing Passover and leaven it cited this example (Maharam Ḥalawa).

Thick soup – מִקְפָּה: Elsewhere Rashi explains that this soup was prepared from a mixture of wine, spices, and pounded wheat or barley.

HALAKHA

The measure of leaven that it is prohibited to offer – שִׁיעוֹר: It is prohibited to offer any amount of leaven on the altar, and one who offers an olive-bulk is flogged. The punishment is administered only for this quantity because less than an olive-bulk is not considered an actual offering. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rava, as the *halakha* is ruled in accordance with his opinion in disputes with Abaye (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 5:2).

Thick soup with *teruma* – מִקְפָּה וְתוּמָה: If one who immersed himself during that day touches a mixture of thick soup made with *teruma* produce and non-sacred garlic and oil, the entire mixture is disqualified (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 8:12).

Thick soup with non-sacred produce – מִקְפָּת חוּלִין: If one who immersed himself during that day touches a thick soup of non-sacred produce and *teruma* garlic and oil, he disqualifies only that portion of the soup with which he came into contact (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 8:13).