

NOTES

Two verses that come as one – שני כתובין הבאין – באחד: This is one of the principles limiting the application of an analogy. Ordinarily, an analogy may be derived from a *halakha* stated with regard to one case in the Torah. However, if that *halakha* appears in connection with two or more cases, these cases constitute the principle of: Two verses that come for the same purpose. In this situation, the principle governing these cases is: Two verses that come for the same purpose do not teach, i.e., an analogy may not be derived from two similar cases. This is due to the fact that a *halakha* that needed to be mentioned in two different places cannot be a general principle, but must instead be an exceptional case. However, certain Sages maintain that it is impossible to derive an analogy only when a *halakha* appears in three places, i.e., the principle is: Three verses that come for the same purpose do not teach.

A permitted substance that joins together with a prohibited substance in the case of a sin-offering – חטאת להיתר מצטרף לאיסור: The early commentaries question this derivation, as the case of a sin-offering is an example of the principle that the legal status of taste is like that of substance, not the principle that permitted material joins prohibited material (see *Tosafot*). Some explain that in this case, the meat that touched the sin-offering absorbed such a large quantity of the sin-offering that it is as though part of the sin-offering itself, not only its taste, has been absorbed into the meat. Consequently, this case does in fact involve the principle that permitted substances join together with prohibited substances (see *Tosafot* in tractate *Nazir, Me'iri*).

Both of these cases are necessary – מיצריך צריכי: The reason that one cannot derive a principle from two verses that come as one is that since the principle could have been derived from one source, there was no need for the Torah to mention the *halakha* twice. However, that is true only if the *halakha* in question could have been derived from one case and applied to the other. If it can be demonstrated that it is impossible to apply the *halakhot* of each case to the other case, they can no longer be viewed as two verses that come as one. In that case, a principle may indeed be derived from them.

HALAKHA

That which touches a sin-offering – הנוגע בחטאת: Food or a vessel that touches a sin-offering and absorbs its taste assumes the legal status of the sin-offering itself. This means that the restrictions that apply to a sin-offering with regard to when and where it may be eaten apply to this food or vessel as well. If the sin-offering is disqualified, these objects are disqualified as well (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 8:15–16).

משום דהוה נזיר וחטאת שני כתובין
הבאין באחד, ואין מלמדין.

נזיר – הא דאמרן, חטאת מאי היא?
דתנא: "כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש
וגו'" – יכול אפילו לא בלעה, תלמוד
לומר: "בבשרה" – (ויקדש) – עד שיבלע
בבשר.

"ויקדש" – להיות כמזה, שאם פסולה
היא – הניפסל, ואם בשרה היא – תאכל
בחמור שבה.

ורבנן נמי, ניהו נזיר וחטאת שני כתובין
הבאין באחד, ואין מלמדין!

אמרי: הנהו מיצריך צריכי.

ורבי עקיבא: מאי צריכי? בשלמא אי
כתב רחמנא בחטאת – לא גמר נזיר
מינה, דחולין מקדשים לא גמרינן.
אלא לכתוב רחמנא בנזיר, ותיתי
חטאת ותגמור מיניה, דהא כל איסורין
שבתורה קא גמר מנזיר.

ורבנן אמרי לך: מיצריך צריכי, חטאת –
להיתר מצטרף לאיסור, וחולין מקדשים
לא גמר. ומשרת – ליתן טעם בעיקר,
ומכאן אתה דן לכל התורה כולה.

due to the fact that the *halakhot* of a nazirite and those of a sin-offering are two verses that come as one,^N i.e., to teach the same principle, and two verses that teach the same principle do not teach that principle by analogy.

The Gemara elaborates: The derivation that a permitted substance joins together with a prohibited substance in the case of a nazirite is that which we stated above. With regard to a sin-offering, what is the derivation that permitted material combines with prohibited material? As it was taught in a *baraita* with regard to the verse: "Anything that touches in its flesh shall become consecrated" (Leviticus 6:20). I might have thought that non-sacred meat that touched any part of a sin-offering is rendered prohibited even if it did not absorb the taste of the sin-offering it touched. Therefore, the verse states: In its flesh shall become consecrated, to teach that this meat is not consecrated until the taste of the sin-offering is absorbed within its flesh.^H

The *baraita* continues: Shall become consecrated means that its legal status becomes like that of the sin-offering itself; that is, if the sin-offering is disqualified, this meat will also be disqualified. And if the sin-offering is valid, the meat that touched it may be eaten in accordance with the more stringent standards of a sin-offering as far as when and where it may be eaten. The principle that a permitted substance joins together with a prohibited substance applies in the case of a sin-offering^N as well. Therefore, the principle cannot be extended to the entire Torah, as a *halakha* stated in two cases is not applied elsewhere.

The Gemara asks: And according to the Rabbis as well, let the cases of a nazirite and a sin-offering be considered two verses that come as one and they do not teach the principle that the legal status of taste is like that of the substance with regard to the entire Torah.

The Gemara answers that the Rabbis say: Both of these cases are necessary^N as they could not have been derived from each other. Therefore, they are not two verses that come as one and it is possible to derive a principle from these two *halakhot*.

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Akiva, who does not derive a general principle from these verses, would respond by asking: In what way are they necessary? Granted, if the Merciful One had written this principle only with regard to a sin-offering, one would not derive the *halakha* of a nazirite from it, as we do not derive *halakhot* of non-sacred objects from those of consecrated objects. Certain stringencies and strictures apply only to consecrated property. However, let the Merciful One write this principle with regard to a nazirite, and you could bring the case of the sin-offering and derive it from the case of a nazirite, just as the application of this principle to all prohibitions in the Torah is derived from the *halakha* of a nazirite. Since this principle is stated in both cases unnecessarily, these are two verses that come as one, and one cannot derive a principle from them.

The Gemara asks: And the Rabbis, as they maintain that the principle that the legal status of the taste of a prohibited substance is like that of the substance itself is not limited to these two cases, they would say to you that both sources are necessary. The case of the sin-offering is necessary to derive the principle that a permitted substance joins together with a prohibited substance, as one cannot derive the *halakhot* of non-sacred food from consecrated property. And the term soaked, which appears in the context of the *halakhot* of a nazirite, teaches the principle that the legal status of taste is like that of the substance. Since both examples are necessary, they are not considered two verses that come as one, and it is therefore possible to derive a principle from them. And consequently, from here you derive the *halakha* with regard to all of the Torah in its entirety.

צרוף – The joining together of items prohibited to a nazirite – **איסורי נזיר**: The foods that are prohibited to a nazirite join together. This means that if a nazirite eats an olive-bulk of a mixture of grapes, grape seeds, grape skins and unripe grapes, he is flogged. Similarly, he is punished for eating a measure of an olive-bulk of these items one after another, if he does so within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nezirut* 5:3).

בצק – Dough that is in the cracks of a kneading bowl – **שֶׁבִּסְדֵּקֵי עֲרִיבָה**: If an olive-bulk of dough is stuck in one area of a kneading bowl, one is obligated to remove it. However, it is nullified if it serves to reinforce the bowl, provided there is not an olive-bulk in one place, in accordance with the second version of Rav Yehuda's statement (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 442:7).

ורבי עקיבא – תרוייהו להיתר מצטרף לאיסור, והווי להו שני כתובין הבאין באחד, וכל שני כתובין הבאין באחד אין מלמדין.

The Gemara asks: **And** how could Rabbi Akiva respond to this claim? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva would say that **both** cases teach the principle that **a permitted substance joins together with a prohibited substance, and they are indeed two verses that come as one**, to teach about the same issue. **And** the rule is that **any two verses that come as one do not teach** overarching principles.

אמר ליה רב אשי לרב כהנא: אלא הא דתנא: "מכל אשר יעשה מגפן היין מחרצנים ועד זג" – לימד על איסורי נזיר שמצטרפים זה עם זה. השתא לרבי עקיבא איסור והיתר מצטרפין, איסור ואיסור מיבעיא!?

Rav Ashi said to Rav Kahana: **But** with regard to that which is taught in a *baraita*: The verse: "He shall eat **nothing that is made of the grapevine, from the grape skins to the grape seed**" (Numbers 6:4), **taught with regard to prohibitions of a nazirite that these substances join together.**^H If the nazirite ate only a small amount of each substance that when joined together constitute the measure that determines liability, he is liable. **Now** the following question arises: **According to Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that prohibited and permitted substances join together, is it necessary to teach that one prohibited substance joins together with another prohibited substance?**^N Apparently, according to Rabbi Akiva's opinion, this derivation is unnecessary.

אמר ליה: איסור והיתר – בבית אחת, איסור ואיסור – בזה אחר זה.

Rav Kahana said to him that this derivation is necessary because the two cases are not identical: Whereas **prohibited and permitted substances combine only when they are eaten simultaneously, prohibited and other prohibited substances join together even when eaten one after the other.** In other words, if a nazirite eats half an olive-bulk of grape skins and then eats half an olive-bulk of grape seeds, he is liable according to Rabbi Akiva.

מתני' בצק שבסדקי עריבה, אם יש כזית במקום אחד – חייב לבער, ואם (לא) – ביטל במיעוטו.

MISHNA With regard to **dough that is in the cracks of a kneading bowl,**^H if there is an olive-bulk of dough in one place, one is obligated to remove it. **And** if the dough does not add up to this amount, it is nullified due to its insignificance.

וכן לענין הטומאה, אם מקפיד עליו – חוצץ, ואם רוצה בקיימו – הרי הוא בעריבה.

And similarly, with regard to the *halakhot* of immersion to purify the bowl from **ritual impurity, if one is particular about the dough**^N that is stuck in the cracks and he plans to remove it and use it, it is a foreign substance that **interposes** between the kneading bowl and the water of the ritual bath, and invalidates the immersion of the bowl, leaving it ritually impure. **And** if he wants the dough to remain in place, its status is like that of the kneading bowl itself and is not an interposition.

NOTES

Is it necessary to teach that one prohibited substance joins together with another prohibited substance – **איסור ואיסור** – **מיבעיא**: Actually, there is a principle that one prohibited item does not combine with another. One is not punished for eating a mixture that contains half an olive-bulk of one prohibited item and half an olive-bulk of another prohibited item. Consequently, it is not at all obvious that one prohibited substance joins together with another prohibited substance. However, since the various foods prohibited to a nazirite are all included in the same prohibition, in this particular case it is possible to

derive the concept that prohibited substances join together by means of an *a fortiori* argument from the *halakha* of a mixture of permitted and prohibited substances (*Me'iri*).

אם מקפיד עליו – חוצץ: One's intention is of great significance with regard to matters of ritual purity and impurity. For example, the manner in which a person relates to an object can determine whether it is considered a vessel or an incomplete vessel, whether it is a broken or intact, or, as in this case, whether or not a substance is deemed an interposition for the purposes of ritual immersion.

NOTES

In a case where they serve to reinforce the bowl – במקום ששעשויין לחזק: Rashi explains that the term: Serve to reinforce, refers to dough that is placed in a crack on the base of the bowl, whereas dough that is placed in a crack on the side of the bowl does not serve to reinforce. According to the *geonim*, dough serves to reinforce the bowl if it is in a crack or a hole in a bowl, whereas any dough that is not in a crack does not serve to reinforce the bowl. Rav Yitzhak ibn Giat explains that dough placed in a crack that goes all the way through the bowl serves to reinforce the bowl, while dough does not serve to reinforce the bowl if it is in a crack that does not go all the way through the bowl. The *Me'iri* suggests a similar explanation.



Dough that serves to reinforce the base of a bowl, according to Rashi



Dough on the side of a bowl that does not serve to reinforce it, according to Rashi

גמ' אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: לא שנו אלא במקום שאין עשויין לחזק, אבל במקום שעשויין לחזק – אינו חייב לבער.

מכלל דפחות מבזית, אפילו במקום שאין עשוי לחזק – אינו חייב לבער.

איבא דמתני לה אסיפא: "ואם לאו בטל במיעוטו". אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: לא שנו אלא במקום העשוי לחזק, אבל במקום שאין עשוי לחזק – חייב לבער. מכלל דבזית, אפילו במקום העשוי לחזק – חייב לבער.

תניא בלישנא קמא, תניא בלישנא בתרא. תניא בלישנא קמא: בצק שבסידקי עריבה, במקום העשוי לחזק – אינו חוצץ, ואינו עובר. ובמקום שאין עשוי לחזק – חוצץ ועובר. במה דברים אמורים – בבזית, אבל בפחות מבזית, אפילו במקום שאין עשוי לחזק – אינו חוצץ ואינו עובר.

ותניא בלישנא בתרא: בצק שבסידקי עריבה, במקום העשוי לחזק –

GEMARA Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: They taught that one is obligated to remove a combined olive-bulk of leaven **only in a case where the pieces of dough are not** in a position where they serve to reinforce the kneading bowl. **However, in a case where they serve to reinforce the bowl^N and they will remain there for this purpose, he is not obligated to remove them; he may simply render them null and void.**

The Gemara concludes: This proves by inference that with regard to less than an olive-bulk, even in a place where it does not serve to reinforce the bowl, one is not obligated to remove it.

Some teach the statement of Rav Yehuda with regard to the latter clause of the mishna: **And if the dough is not an olive-bulk, it is nullified due to its insignificance.** Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: They taught that one is obligated to remove less than an olive-bulk of dough in one place **only in a place where it serves to reinforce the bowl; however, in a place where it does not serve to reinforce the bowl, one is obligated to remove it.** This proves by inference that if there is an olive-bulk of dough in one place, even in a place where it serves to reinforce the bowl, one is obligated to remove it.

The Gemara comments: It was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the first version of Rav Yehuda's statement, and it was taught in a different *baraita* in accordance with the latter version of his statement. The Gemara elaborates: It was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the first version of Rav Yehuda's statement: With regard to dough that is in the cracks of a kneading bowl in a place where it serves to reinforce the bowl, it does not interpose and invalidate the immersion for ritual impurity, and one does not violate the prohibition against having leaven in his possession during Passover. **And in a case where it does not serve to reinforce the bowl, it interposes, and one violates the prohibition against having leaven in his possession on Passover. In what case is this statement said?** It is in the case of an olive-bulk of dough; however, in a case where there is less than olive-bulk, even in a case where it does not serve to reinforce the bowl, it does not interpose and one does not violate a prohibition by having it in his possession.

And it was taught in a different *baraita* in accordance with the latter version of Rav Yehuda's statement: With regard to dough that is in the cracks of a kneading bowl, in a place where it serves to reinforce the bowl,

it does not interpose in the immersion and one does not violate the prohibition against having leaven in his possession during Passover. **In a case where the dough does not serve to reinforce the bowl, it interposes in the immersion and one violates the prohibition against owning leaven on Passover. In what case is this statement said?** It is in a case where the dough is less than an olive-bulk. However, if it is an olive-bulk, even in a case where it serves to reinforce the bowl it interposes in the immersion and one violates a prohibition by having it in his possession during the Festival.

The Gemara asks: In any case, these *baraitot* contradict each other. Rav Huna said: Delete the first, lenient *baraita^N* from before the stringent one.

Perek III
Daf 45 Amud b

NOTES

Delete the lenient *baraita* – כמי קילתא: In other words, Rav Huna maintains that this version of the *baraita* was flawed. As the *baraitot* were transmitted orally, sometimes the *tanna'im* who taught them would err in reciting them.

אינו חוצץ ואינו עובר. במקום שאין עשוי לחזק – חוצץ ועובר. במה דברים אמורים – בפחות מבזית, אבל בבזית – אפילו במקום העשוי לחזק – חוצץ ועובר.

קשין אהדדי! אמר רב הונא: כמי קילתא מקמי חמירתא.

Two half-olive-bulk portions with a string of dough – שני חצאי זיתים וחוט: If two portions of dough, each half an olive-bulk in size, are separated in a kneading bowl, but are connected by a string of dough so that if the string of dough is lifted both pieces of leavened dough are lifted with it, one is obligated to remove them (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 442:8*).

Two half-olive-bulk portions in a house – שני חצאי זיתים בבית: If two segments of leavened dough, each half an olive-bulk in size, are located in one area of a house, the owner is obligated to remove them, as they might combine when they are gathered. If they are in two different areas of the house, one is not obligated to remove them, as it is unlikely that the two pieces will come together. Although the Gemara does not resolve this question, the *halakha* is lenient in this regard, as it is a case of uncertainty involving a rabbinic decree (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 442:8*).

Bread that grew moldy – פת שעפפשה: If bread grows so moldy before Passover that it is unfit for consumption by a dog, there is no obligation to eliminate it. If moldy bread is still fit to be eaten by a dog, it must be eliminated (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 442:9*).

Nullifying ritual impurity – ביטול טומאה: If ritually impure food is ruined to the extent that it is no longer fit for consumption by a dog, it becomes ritually pure (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin 2:18*).

Tanners' bowls – עריבת העבדנים: One is not obligated to eliminate the contents of a tanner's bowl into which flour was placed if someone places animal hides in the bowl even one hour prior to the time for removing leaven. If no one places hides in the bowl but the flour mixture sat for three days, one is similarly not obligated to remove the contents of the bowl. However, if three days have not passed since the flour was added, one is obligated to remove the bowl's contents, in accordance with the ruling of Rabbi Natan in the *Tosefta* (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 442:1*).

NOTES

In a house one is obligated to remove – בבית חייב לבער: Some commentaries maintain that this statement refers to two pieces of leavened dough attached by a string of dough (*Korban Netanel*). In the Jerusalem Talmud the opposite is stated: Two half-olive-bulk pieces of leavened dough in a single kneading bowl must be eliminated, as the bowl combines them. This is not the case if the two pieces are merely in the same house, as presence in a common building does not render them a single entity. Another explanation for why the *halakha* should be more lenient with regard to dough in a house than in bowl is that dough in a kneading bowl remains clean and can be eaten afterward, which is not true of dough left elsewhere in the house (Maharam Halawa).

Burned with ritually impure *teruma* – נשרפת עם הטמאה: The Rif infers from here that not only is it permitted to confer impurity on ritually pure leavened *teruma*, one is even obligated to eliminate and burn it. Rabbi Aharon HaLevi maintains that although this statement does indicate that a person may burn leavened *teruma*, there is no obligation to do so.

BACKGROUND

Tanning hides – עיבוד עורות: Tanning was performed in several different manners in the mishnaic and talmudic periods, depending on the type of hide and the quality of the leather one sought to produce. Flour was added for certain types of production, e.g., for parchments and similar products, as the leavening process facilitates their production.

Leather to which flour has been added is still considered unfinished, as additional steps are required to complete the tanning process.

אמר רב נחמן אמר שמואל: שני חצאי זיתים וחוט של בצק ביניהן, רואין: כל שאילו ינטל החוט ונטלן עמו – חייב לבער, ואם לאו – אינו חייב לבער.

אמר עולא: לא אמרן אלא בעריבה, אבל בבית – חייב לבער.

מאי טעמא – דוימנין דכניש להו, ונפלי גבי הדדי.

אמר עולא, בעו במערבא: בית ועליה מהו, בית ואכסדרא מהו, שני בתים זה לפנים מזה מהו?

תיקו.

תנו רבנן: הפת שעפפשה ונפסלה מלאכול לאדם, והקלב יכול לאוכלה – מטמאה טומאת אוכלין בכביצה, ונשרפת עם הטמאה בפסח. משום רבי נתן אמרו: אינה מטמאה.

כמאן אזלא הא דתנו, כלל אמרו בטירות: כל המיוחד לאוכל אדם – טמא עד שיפסל מלאכול לקלב. כמאן – דלא כרבי נתן.

תנו רבנן: עריבת העבדנין שנתן לתוכה קמח, תוך שלשה ימים – חייב לבער, קודם שלשה – ימים אינו חייב לבער. אמר רבי נתן: במה דברים אמורים – שלא נתן לתוכה עורות, אבל נתן לתוכה עורות – אפילו תוך שלשה אין חייב לבער.

אמר רבא: הלכה כרבי נתן, אפילו יום אחד ואפילו שעה אחת.

Rav Nahman said that Shmuel said: With regard to two half-olive-bulk portions of leavened dough with a string of dough^H connecting between them, one observes: In any case that were the string taken and the portions are taken with it, one is obligated to remove the dough, as the string unites them into an olive-bulk of leaven. And if the portions are not taken with it, one is not obligated to remove them.

Ulla said: We stated this leniency that it is not necessary to remove half-olive-bulk portions of leavened dough only when the segments are in a kneading bowl, stuck separately to the sides of the bowl. However, if they are located in a house,^H one is obligated to remove^N them even in the absence of a string of dough connecting the two pieces.

What is the reason for this? It is because a person will sometimes gather them when cleaning his house and they will fall adjacent to each other. If this occurs, the two portions will form an olive-bulk of leavened dough.

Ulla said: The Sages raise a dilemma in the West, Eretz Yisrael: If one piece of leavened bread was in the main area of a house and the other piece was in the upper story, what is the *halakha*? If one piece is in the house and the other is in a portico, what is the *halakha*? Similarly, if the two segments are in two houses, one inside the other, what is the *halakha*?

The Gemara states: Let these dilemmas stand unresolved.

The Sages taught: With regard to bread that grew moldy^H and was rendered inedible for consumption by a person, but a dog can eat it, it can become impure with the ritual impurity of foods in the measure of an egg-bulk in size, as it is still considered food. If the moldy bread was ritually pure *teruma*, it may be burned with ritually impure *teruma*^N on Passover. Once the bread is no longer fit for human consumption, the prohibition against actively rendering it impure no longer applies. They said in the name of Rabbi Natan: It cannot become ritually impure.

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is that which we learned in a mishna: The Sages stated a principle with regard to ritual purity: Any food that is designated as food for a person that becomes impure remains ritually impure until it is rendered unfit to be consumed by a dog.^H The Gemara reiterates: In accordance with whose opinion is that statement? The Gemara answers: It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan, as his statement indicates that food designated as food for a person is rendered ritually pure as soon as it becomes unfit to be eaten by a person.

The Sages taught: With regard to tanners' bowls^H into which one placed flour in the production process of leather,^B if the flour was placed within three days of the start of Passover, one is obligated to remove it, as it is still considered edible leaven. However, if one added the flour prior to three days before Passover, one is not obligated to remove the contents of the bowl, as the flour will have already been rendered inedible by the odor of the vessel before the beginning of Passover, and is no longer considered edible. Rabbi Natan said: In what case is this statement said? In a case where one did not place animal hides into the bowl; however, if one placed hides into the bowl, even if Passover is within three days of when he placed the flour in the bowl, he is not obligated to remove the flour. Once the foul-smelling hides are placed in the bowl, the flour is certainly no longer edible.

Rava said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan with regard to this issue. Consequently, there is no set time at which the flour is considered spoiled, as it is considered inedible even one day or even one hour after hides were added to the bowl.

If one is particular about it, it interposes – אם מקפיד עליו חוצץ: For an impure vessel to be purified through immersion, it must be cleaned from any substance that interposes between it and the water. If the owner of the vessel does not object to the substance remaining on the surface, the immersion is effective, provided that the majority of the vessel is not covered. However, if the owner objects to the presence of the substance, the immersion of the vessel is ineffective (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Mikvaot* 1:12).

NOTES

Doesn't the mishna teach: And similarly – הא...קתני: Some commentaries have noted that a difficulty of this kind, based on the phrasing of the mishna, is generally raised only when there is an alternative explanation available that would not require a deviation from the accepted text of the mishna. When there is no acceptable alternative, the emended reading of the mishna is accepted (Rashash).

”וכן לעגן טומאה אם מקפיד עליו חוצץ ואם רוצה בקיומו הרי הוא כעריבה.”

We learned in the mishna: **And similarly, with regard to the halakhot of immersion to purify the bowl from ritual impurity, if one is particular about the dough that is stuck in the cracks and he plans to remove it and use it, it is a foreign substance that interposes^h between the kneading bowl and the water of the ritual bath, and invalidates the immersion of the bowl, leaving it ritually impure. And if he wants the dough to remain in place, its status is like that of the kneading bowl itself and is not an interposition.**

מי דמי? התם – בשעורא תליא מילתא. הכא – בקפידא תליא מילתא.

The Gemara asks: **Is it comparable?** How can the mishna compare the *halakhot* of leaven on Passover to the *halakhot* of interpositions that invalidate an immersion to purify from ritual impurity? **There**, with regard to leaven, **the matter is contingent upon the measure** of the dough, as an olive-bulk of leaven is prohibited. **Here**, with regard to interpositions that invalidate an immersion, **the matter is contingent upon** whether or not one is **particular** about the presence of the dough. In other words, with regard to interpositions it is the attitude of the owner of the bowl that is the decisive factor, not the quantity of the dough.

אמר רב יהודה: אימא ולעגן הטומאה אינו כן.

The Gemara answers that **Rav Yehuda said: Say** that the mishna should be read: **And with regard to interpositions that invalidate an immersion to purify from ritual impurity, it is not so**, as it is not the quantity of the dough but the particularity of the owner that is the decisive factor.

אמר ליה אביי: הא ”וכן לעגן טומאה“ קתני! אלא אמר אביי: הכי קאמר: וכן

Abaye said to him: Doesn't the mishna teach: And similarlyⁿ with regard to ritual impurity. The text of the mishna cannot be so drastically emended merely to resolve a difficulty. **Rather, Abaye said: This is what the mishna is saying: And similarly,**

Perek III
Daf 46 Amud a

לעגן צירוף טומאה בפסח. ובשאר ימות השנה איכא פלוגתא.

with regard to the combination of two pieces vis-à-vis ritual impurityⁿ during Passover, when it depends upon their volume. However, during the rest of the year there is a distinction based upon whether the owner is particular about it or not.

היכי דמי? כגון דאיכא פחות מבביצה אוכלין, ונגעו בהאי ביצה. בפסח דאיסורו חשוב – מצטרף, בשאר ימות השנה, דבקפידא תליא מילתא. אם מקפיד עליו – מצטרף, אם רוצה בקיומו – הרי הוא כעריבה.

The Gemara explains: **What are the circumstances of the mishna's case?** It is a case **where there is less than an egg-bulk of ritually impure food, and it touched this dough** in the bowl, and then it came into contact with ritually pure food. **During Passover, when the prohibition that applies to the dough causes it to be considered significant** although it is a very small quantity, **it combines** with the first piece of food. Together they are the size of an egg-bulk, which is able to transmit the ritual impurity of foods. However, **during the rest of the year, when there is no prohibition that imparts this significance to the dough, the matter is dependent on the owner's particularity; if he is particular about it, i.e., he does not want the dough to be there, it is considered food rather than part of the bowl, and it combines with the other piece of food. However, if one prefers its continued presence in its current location, it is considered like part of the kneading bowl itself, rather than food.**

מתקוף לה רבא: מי קתני מצטרף? והא חוצץ קתני! אלא אמר רבא: וכן לה עלות טהרה לעריבה.

Rava strongly objects to this: Was the language taught in the mishna: Combines? Didn't the mishna teach that it interposes? Abaye's explanation does not account for this term. **Rather, Rava said that the mishna should be understood as saying: And so too with regard to purifying the kneading bowl via immersion.**

NOTES

With regard to the combination of two pieces vis-à-vis ritual impurity – לעגן צירוף טומאה: Seemingly, it would have been simpler to say that the mishna is referring to contracting ritual impurity: On Passover, the prohibition causes an olive-bulk of dough to be considered significant and thus susceptible to contracting ritual impurity. During the rest of the year, this small amount of dough is considered to be part of the kneading bowl, in which case it is not susceptible to the ritual impurity of foods, provided the owner does not object to its presence. If the owner is particular about its presence, it is treated as dough. This explanation is not presented because the dough is prohibited during Passover in any case, and therefore its susceptibility to the ritual impurity of foods is irrelevant (*Tosafot*).