

NOTES

Libations – נִסְכִּים: This refers to the wine offered on the altar. Wine libations were offered together with burnt-offerings of animals and peace-offerings, as well as with the leper's sin-offering and guilt-offering. Different quantities of wine were offered, depending on the animal that was sacrificed: One-fourth of a *hin*, i.e., three *log*, was offered for any sheep other than a ram; one-third of a *hin*, four *log*, was offered for a ram; and half a *hin*, six *log*, was offered for a bullock. Libations of wine could also be brought as independent, voluntary offerings.

From the well-watered pastures of Israel – מִמִּשְׁקָה יִשְׂרָאֵל: It is not immediately obvious that only foods permitted for consumption by Jews may be offered on the altar, as blood and forbidden fats, which may not be consumed, are in fact offered on the altar. As such, it must be noted that only specific forbidden foods may be offered on the altar; aside from these, only permitted foods may be offered.

What difference is there to me if it is prohibited due to a different prohibition – מַה לִּי אִיסוּר דְּבַר אֲחֵר: This question seems difficult to understand: If the prohibition against utilizing set-aside items is by rabbinic law, it would seem that this is the reason for the distinction between untithed produce and animals that are set aside; and the distinction is not that one is inherently prohibited and one is prohibited due to an external factor. Apparently, since there is no case where an object is prohibited as an offering by Torah law due to an external factor, the Sages also did not prohibit items from being brought as offerings for external reasons, as all ordinances that the Sages instituted parallel Torah law (Rabbi Elazar Moshe Horowitz).

Division of labors with regard to a Festival – חֵילוּק מְלָאכוֹת: The prohibitions of Shabbat differ from those of a Festival for the following reason: The very notion of division of labors, namely that one is liable separately for violating each of the primary categories of labor, is a novel one, and it is derived from verses in the Torah that pertain to Shabbat. Therefore, it is applied only to Shabbat and not to the Festivals.

HALAKHA

Orla is nullified in a mixture of two hundred – עֵרְלָה בְּטִיּוֹלָה: If produce from the first three years of a tree's growth becomes mixed with two hundred times as much permitted produce, the *orla* is nullified within the mixture. A grapevine is considered a tree in this regard. However, if it fell into a smaller amount of permitted produce, the mixture is forbidden (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot* 15:14).

Libations from untithed produce [tevel] – נִסְכִּין מִן הַטֵּבֵל: It is prohibited to bring meal-offerings or libations from *tevel* (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 5:9).

Offerings from animals that are set-aside – קִרְבָּנוֹת מִן הַמְּשֻׁבָּע: One may bring offerings of animals and wine that are set-aside during a Festival, as stated in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 5:10).

Division of labors – חֵילוּק מְלָאכוֹת: If one performs several primary categories of labor on Shabbat during one lapse of awareness, he must bring a sin-offering for each category of labor he unwittingly performs. However, if one performs many types of labor during a Festival, he is flogged only once (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Yom Tov* 1:3).

“מִן הַמְּאֵתִים” – מִמּוֹתַר שְׁתֵּי מֵאוֹת שְׁנֵשֶׁת־יָרֵד בְּבוֹר. מִכָּאן לְעֵרְלָה שְׁבַטִיּוֹלָה בְּמֵאֵתִים.

“מִמִּשְׁקָה יִשְׂרָאֵל” – מִן הַמּוֹתַר לְיִשְׂרָאֵל. מִכָּאן אָמְרוּ: אֵין מְבִיאִין נִסְכִּין מִן הַטֵּבֵל.

יְכוּל לֹא יָבִיא מִן הַמּוֹקֵצָה, אֲמַרְתָּ: מַה טָּבֵל מִיּוֹחֵד שְׁאִיסוּר גּוֹפּוֹ גֵרָם לוֹ, אִף כֹּל שְׁאִיסוּר גּוֹפּוֹ גֵרָם לוֹ, יֵצֵא מוֹקֵצָה שְׁאִין אִיסוּר גּוֹפּוֹ גֵרָם לוֹ אֶלֶּא אִיסוּר דְּבַר אֲחֵר גֵרָם לוֹ. וְאִי אֲמַרְתָּ אִיסוּר מוֹקֵצָה דְּאוֹרֵייתָא – מַה לִּי אִיסוּר גּוֹפּוֹ מַה לִּי אִיסוּר דְּבַר אֲחֵר?

וְעוֹד: הֲאֵת הוּא דְּאֲמַרְתָּ: חֵילוּק מְלָאכוֹת לְשַׁבָּת וְאֵין חֵילוּק מְלָאכוֹת לְיוֹם טוֹב.

אֶלֶּא: אֲפִיק הַבְּעֵרָה וְעִיִּל עֵצֵי אֲשֵׁירָה. וְאִזְהַרָה מִמֶּהָא: “וְלֹא יִדְבַק בְּיַדְךָ מְאוֹמָה מִן הַחַיִּים”.

אָמַר לִיהֵ רַב אֲחָא בְרִיה דְּרַבָּא לְאַבְיִי: וְנִלְקִי נְמִי מִשּׁוּם “וְלֹא תָבִיא תוֹעֵבָה אֶל בֵּיתְךָ”!

The phrase: **Out of two hundred**, is expounded with regard to wine brought as a libation.^N **From the remaining two hundred portions that remain in the vat.** This is referring to a case where wine prohibited as produce grown during a tree or vine's first three years [*orla*] is mixed with permitted wine. The *halakha* is that this wine mixture may be brought as a libation only if there is two hundred times more permitted wine than prohibited wine. **From here** it is derived that *orla* is nullified in a mixture of two hundred.^H

The phrase: **From the well-watered pastures of Israel**,^N means that sacrifices may be offered only from that which is permitted to Israel. **From here**, the Sages stated: **One may not offer libations from untithed produce [tevel]**,^H since Jews are prohibited from eating *tevel*.

I might have thought that **one may not offer** an animal that is **set-aside** on Shabbat or during a Festival; therefore, **you have said: Just as tevel is unique in that its inherent prohibition caused it to be prohibited for Jews to eat, so too, anything whose inherent prohibition caused it to be prohibited for Jews to eat is invalid as an offering.** This **excludes** an animal that has been **set aside**,^H which does not have an **inherent prohibition** that **caused it to be prohibited for eating; rather, a different prohibition**, i.e., the prohibition of utilizing set-aside objects on Shabbat, **caused it to be prohibited for eating. And if you say the prohibition of utilizing set-aside material is by Torah law, what difference is there to me if a food is inherently prohibited; and what difference is there to me if it is prohibited due to a different prohibition?**^N If there is a distinction between these prohibitions, it must be that the prohibition of utilizing set-aside material is by rabbinic law, and therefore, like many other rabbinic decrees, it does not apply in the Temple.

And furthermore, Abaye said to Rabba: It is possible to challenge your interpretation of the *baraita* from a different angle. **Wasn't it you who said**, as cited in tractate *Makkot*, that there is **division of labors with regard to Shabbat**, and therefore one is required to bring two sin-offerings if he performed two prohibited labors of different primary categories in one lapse of awareness, or if he performed a prohibited labor twice, during separate lapses of awareness; however, there is **no division of labors**^H with regard to a Festival,^N and therefore one is not punished with multiple floggings for performing multiple prohibited labors? Consequently, how could one be liable for multiple floggings for the prohibition of utilizing set-aside materials and for cooking the sciatic nerve on a Festival?

Rather, in order to make this *baraita* consistent with Rabba's opinion, **remove the prohibition of kindling a fire and add in its place the prohibition of using the wood of a tree designated for idolatry [asheira]. And the warning**, i.e., the source of the negative commandment associated with using this wood, is derived **from here**, a verse that relates to an idolatrous city that is burned: **“Nothing from the spoil shall cling to your hand”** (Deuteronomy 13:18).

Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, said to Abaye: If this case is referring to using wood from an *asheira*, **one should also be flogged due to having transgressed the prohibition of: “You shall not bring an abominable thing into your home”** (Deuteronomy 7:26). However, this would add an extra negative commandment to the list enumerated in the *baraita*.

אֶלָּא אֶפֶיךָ הַבְּעֵרָה, וְעֵייל עֲצֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ, וְאִזְהָרָה מֵהֵכָא: "וְאִשְׂרֵיהֶם תִּשְׂרֹפוּן בְּאֵשׁ; לֹא תַעֲשׂוּן כֵּן לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם."

אָמַר רַבִּי בַר חֲמָא: הָא דַּרְבַּ חֲסֵדָא וְרַבָּה – מַחְלֻקְתָּ דְרַבִּי אֶלְיָעוֹר וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ הִיא. דְרַבִּי אֶלְיָעוֹר סָבַר: אֲמַרִינן "הוֹאִיל", וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ סָבַר: לֹא אֲמַרִינן "הוֹאִיל".

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: וְדִילְמָא, עַד כְּאֵן לֹא קָאָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְיָעוֹר הֵתָם דְאֲמַרִינן הוֹאִיל – אֶלָּא דְבִעֵידָנָא דְקָא עֵיילִי לְתַנּוּרָא כֹּל חֲדָא וְחֲדָא חֲזִינָא לִיהֵא לְדִידֵיהִי, אֲבָל הֵכָא דְלְאוֹרְחִין הוּא דְחֲזִי לְדִידֵיהִי לֹא חֲזִי – אִימָא הֲכִי נִמְי דְלֹא אֲמַרִינן "הוֹאִיל".

אָמַר רַב שֵׁישָׁא בְרִיה דְרַבִּי אִידִי: וְדִילְמָא לֹא הִיא, עַד כְּאֵן לֹא קָאָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ הֵתָם דְלֹא אֲמַרִינן "הוֹאִיל" – אֶלָּא דְאִיכָא חֲדָא דְלֹא חֲזִינָא, לֹא לְדִידֵיהִי וְלֹא לְאוֹרְחִין. אֲבָל הֵכָא, דְחֲזִי מִיְהֵת לְאוֹרְחִין – אִימָא הֲכִי נִמְי אֲמַרִינן "הוֹאִיל".

אָמַרְוּהוּ [רַבְנָן] קַמֵּיה דְרַבִּי יִרְמְיָה וְרַבִּי זִירָא. רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה קִיבְלָהּ, רַבִּי זִירָא לֹא קִיבְלָהּ. אָמַר לִיהֵא רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה לְרַבִּי זִירָא: מִילְתָּא דְקִשְׁיָא לָן וְאִתְנָא כְּמָה שֵׁנִי, בְּמֵאִי פְלִיגִי רַבִּי אֶלְיָעוֹר וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ, הֲשֵׁתָא אָמְרוּהּ מִשְׁמֵיה דְגַבְרָא רַבָּה – וְלֹא נִיקְבְּלָהּ?

אָמַר לִיהֵא: הִיכִי אֶקְבְּלָהּ? דְתַנּוּנָא, אָמַר לִיהֵא רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ: לְדַבְרֵיךְ, הָרִי הוּא עוֹבֵר מִשּׁוּם "לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כֹּל מְלָאכָה" וְשִׁתִּיק לִיהֵא. וְאִי אִיתָא – לִימָא לִיהֵא: טַעֲמָא דִידִי מִשּׁוּם הוֹאִיל.

אָמַר לִיהֵא: וְלִיטַעֲמִיךְ, הָא דְתַנּוּנָא בְּבִרְיָתָא, אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי אֶלְיָעוֹר: לְדַבְרֵיךְ הָרִי הוּא עוֹבֵר מִשּׁוּם "בֵּל יִרְאֶה וּבֵל יִמְצָא" וְשִׁתִּיק לִיהֵא. הֲכִי נִמְי דְלֹא אֶהְדֵּר לִיהֵא? הָא קָא מַהְדֵּר לִיהֵא בְּמַתְנִיתִין, דְתַנּוּ: לֹא זְהוּ חֲמוֹץ שְׁמוֹזְהֵרִין עֲלֵיו מִשּׁוּם בֵּל יִרְאֶה וּבֵל יִמְצָא. אֶלָּא: שִׁתִּיק לִיהֵא בְּבִרְיָתָא, וּמַהְדֵּר לִיהֵא בְּמַתְנִיתִין. הֲכִי נִמְי אִימּוֹר: שִׁתִּיק לִיהֵא בְּמַתְנִיתִין, וְאֶהְדֵּר לִיהֵא בְּמַכִּילְתָּא אַחֲרֵיתִי.

Rather, remove the prohibition of kindling a fire and add in its place the prohibition of burning consecrated wood.^N And the warning, i.e., the source of this negative command, is from here: "And you shall burn their *asheira* trees with fire...you shall not do this to the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 12:3-4). Therefore, one who burns a consecrated item in a destructive manner is punished with lashes. In conclusion, no adequate proof can be adduced from the *baraita* to reject Rabba's opinion.

Rami bar Ḥama said: This dispute between Rav Ḥisda and Rabba with regard to the principle: Since, etc., is a matter of dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua in the mishna. As, Rabbi Eliezer, who says that *halla* should be separated only after the bread has been baked, holds that we say the principle: Since, etc.^N Since any portion of the dough could potentially be eaten if another part of the dough is designated as *halla*, therefore, one is permitted to bake bread without separating *halla* from it *ab initio*. And Rabbi Yehoshua holds: We do not say the principle: Since, etc.

Rav Pappa said that this claim can be rejected in the following manner: Perhaps Rabbi Eliezer only stated that we say the principle: Since, etc., there, in the case of the separation of *halla*, because at the time that it was placed into the oven, each and every loaf was fit for him, and there was no indication as to which loaf he would designate as *halla*. However, here, in a case where the bread one is baking on the Festival is fit for guests but is not fit for him, say that so too, even according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer we do not say the principle: Since, etc.

Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, rejected Rami bar Ḥama's statement for a different reason and said: Perhaps that is not so. Rabbi Yehoshua only stated that we do not say the principle: Since, etc., there, where there is one portion of the bread that is not fit for him or for guests, because the piece that is designated as *halla* cannot be eaten by anyone due to the fact that it is ritually impure. However, here, in the case of one who is baking bread during the Festival so that it can be eaten on a weekday, when it is at least fit for guests, say that so too, even according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, we say the principle: Since, etc.

The Gemara recounts: The Sages said Rami bar Ḥama's statement before Rabbi Yirmeya and Rabbi Zeira. Rabbi Yirmeya accepted it and Rabbi Zeira did not accept it. Rabbi Yirmeya said to Rabbi Zeira: The following matter has been difficult for us to explain for several years: With regard to what principle did Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua disagree? Now an explanation has been stated in the name of a great man. Shall we not accept it?

He said to him: How can I accept it? We already learned in a *baraita* with regard to their dispute: Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rabbi Eliezer: According to your statement, one violates the prohibition: "You shall not perform any labor" (Exodus 20:9). Rabbi Eliezer could not respond to this claim and was silent. But if it is as Rami bar Ḥama explained, Rabbi Eliezer should have said to him: The reason for my opinion is due to the principle: Since, etc., on the basis of which no prohibited labor has been performed.

Rabbi Yirmeya said to him: According to your reasoning, with regard to that which we already learned in a *baraita*, that Rabbi Eliezer said to him: According to your statement, he transgresses the prohibitions: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found, and in response to this challenge Rabbi Yehoshua was silent, did he too not respond to Rabbi Eliezer? He responded to him in the mishna, as we learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehoshua said: This is not the leavened bread about which we are warned with the prohibitions: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found. Rather, it must be explained in the following manner: He appeared to be silent in the *baraita* simply because his response was not recorded, but he responded in the mishna. So too, here it is possible to say that he appeared silent in the mishna, but he responded in a different tractate.

And add the prohibition of burning consecrated wood – וְעֵייל עֲצֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ – Presumably, there should be an additional prohibition for using such wood, as by doing so one is misusing consecrated property. However, since one is liable for misuse of consecrated property only if he derives benefit worth at least a small coin [*peruta*], this prohibition was not included with the other prohibitions, which one transgresses even at less than this amount (*Tosefot Rid*; *Tosefot Rabbeinu Peretz*; Maharam Ḥalawa).

Rabbi Eliezer holds that we say the principle: Since, etc. – רַבִּי אֶלְיָעוֹר אָמַר אֲמַרִינן הוֹאִיל – The early commentaries disagree with regard to the application of the principle: Since, etc., in this context. The explanation cited by Rashi and accepted by the Rif is that according to Rabbi Eliezer, one may bake all of the dough based upon the following application of this principle: Since one can request to have the *halla* status revoked such that it would revert to being his property, he would violate the prohibitions against seeing and owning leavened dough. Therefore, according to Rabbi Eliezer, the principle: Since, etc., applies only as a stringency and not as a leniency. However, according to Rabbi Yehoshua, the principle: Since, etc., does not apply in this case and one may separate the *halla* immediately without being concerned that he will violate any prohibition. This is because the potential to revoke the *halla* status is dependent upon him and it is in his power to maintain the designation, in which case no problem will arise (see *Sefer HaMa'or*; *Milhamot Hashem*; Maharam Ḥalawa).

LANGUAGE

Melogna – מִלּוֹגְנָא: The *ge'onim* recorded a version of the Gemara that reads *Maglona* and indicates that this unit of measurement was from the city of Maglo, home of Honi HaMe'agel. According to this explanation, Honi's name should be understood as a reference to his city, i.e., Honi HaMaglo'i. It is possible that it was Honi himself who established this unit of measurement (Rashbatz). Others suggest that the word refers to a large unit of measurement and is related to the Greek *μεγάλος*, *megalos*, meaning large.

HALAKHA

A *kav* from Melogna for Passover – קֶבֶא מִלּוֹגְנָא לְפִסְחָא: One may not knead more than an *issaron*, 43.2 egg-bulks, of dough at one time during Passover. This ruling is in accordance with the statement of Rav (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 456:1).

תַּנְיָא, רַבִּי אֹמְרִי: הֵלְכָה כְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, וְרַבִּי יִצְחָק אָמַר: הֵלְכָה כְּבֵן בֵּתְרִיא.

וְכַמָּה שִׁיעוּר עִיסָה? רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל בְּנוֹ שְׁלֵ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן בְּרוּקָה אָמַר: בְּחִטִּין – קַבִּין, וּבְשַׁעוּרִין – שְׁלֹשֶׁת קַבִּין. רַבִּי נָתָן אָמַר מְשׁוּם רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר: חִילוּף הַדְּבָרִים.

וְהַתְּנִיא, רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל בְּנוֹ שְׁלֵ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן בְּרוּקָה אָמַר: בְּחִטִּין – שְׁלֹשֶׁת קַבִּין, וּבְשַׁעוּרִין – אַרְבַּעַה קַבִּין! לֹא קָשִׁיא; הָא – בְּחִסְכָּתָא, הָא – בְּמַעְלִייתָא.

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: שְׁמַע מִינָה גְרִיעִין חִטִּין חִסְכָּתָא מְעֻלִּיתָא, טְפִי מְדַגְרִיעֵן שַׁעֲרֵי חִסְכָּתָא מְשַׁעֲרֵי מְעֻלִּיתָא. דְּאִילוּ הָתָם הִילָתָא, וְהָכָא רִבְעָא.

אָמַר רַב: קֶבֶא מִלּוֹגְנָא לְפִסְחָא, וְכֵן לְחֻלְהָ. (וְהַתְּנִיא)

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The *halakha* with regard to the separation of *halla* from impure dough during Passover is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. And Rabbi Yitzhak said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of ben Beteira.

The Gemara asks: How much dough may be kneaded at once on Passover without concern that the dough will become leavened in the process? Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, says: With regard to wheat, one may use the amount of flour that comes from two *kav* of grain; and with regard to barley, one may use the amount of flour that comes from three *kav*. Rabbi Natan says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: The matters are reversed. One may knead the flour produced from three *kav* of wheat or two *kav* of barley without concern that it will become leavened.

The Gemara asks: Wasn't it taught in a different *baraita* that Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, says: With regard to wheat, one may use the amount of flour that comes from three *kav* of grain, and with regard to barley, one may use the amount of flour that comes from four *kav*? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult, as this latter *baraita* is referring to low-quality grain, and that *baraita* is referring to high-quality grain. One can obtain a higher proportion of flour from high-quality grain than from low-quality grain, which contains a greater amount of chaff.

Rav Pappa said: Learn from this that the extent to which low-quality wheat is worse than high-quality wheat is greater than the extent to which low-quality barley is worse than high-quality barley, i.e., the discrepancy between the different levels of quality is more significant with regard to wheat, as there, in the case of wheat, they differ by one-third; and here, in the case of barley, they differ by only one-fourth.

Rav said: A *kav* from the place Melogna¹ is the amount that can be used to prepare dough for Passover.¹¹ And similarly, with regard to *halla*, that is the minimum amount of dough from which *halla* must be separated. The Gemara asks: Wasn't it taught in a *baraita*:

Perek III

Daf 48 Amud b

HALAKHA

The measure of flour for the obligation to separate *halla* – שִׁיעוּר הַחֵלָה: One is required to separate *halla* from bread made from 43.2 egg-bulks of flour. That is the measurement required by the Torah, as stated in the mishna (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 324:1).

LANGUAGE

Kefiza – קֶפִּינָא: Related to the Middle Iranian word *kabiz*, which refers to a measurement of volume.

NOTES

Kefiza by *kefiza* – קֶפִּינָא קֶפִּינָא: Some have a version that reads *kefiza*, which means a small amount, i.e., less than the large amount mentioned above (Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh).

חֲמִשָּׁת רְבָעִים קֶמַח וְעוֹד חִיבִין בְּחֻלְהָ! הֲכִי קֶבֶא מִלּוֹגְנָא נִמְנֵי אֲהָאי שִׁיעוּרָא קָאִי.

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: הֲנֵי נָשִׂי דִּידָן נְהוּג לְמִיפָא קֶפִּינָא קֶפִּינָא לְפִסְחָא. אָמַר לִיה אַבְיִי: מַאי דַּעְתִּיךָ – לְחַוְמָרָא, חוּמְרָא דְּאִתִּי לִיְדֵי קוּלָא הוּא, דְּקָא מִפְקַע לָהּ מִחֻלְהָ!

Dough made from five-quarters of a *log* of flour and a bit more obligates one to separate *halla*?¹¹ The Gemara answers that this is what Rav is saying: A *kav* from Melogna is the same measure as this, as it is not a regular *kav* but a larger measure, identical to the amount from which one is required to separate *halla*.

Rav Yosef said: These women of our family ordinarily bake *kefiza*¹ by *kefiza*,¹¹ i.e., three-quarters of a *log* at a time, on Passover, since it is easier to prevent small quantities of dough from becoming leavened. Abaye said to him: What is your opinion? Do you tell them to do this in order to be stringent? That is a stringency that leads to a leniency, as by working with small quantities one removes the dough from the obligation to separate *halla*.

הַפְּרֵשֶׁת הָלָה בַּפֶּסַח – Separating *halla* on Passover – On Passover, it is preferable to prepare dough in a small quantity, less than the amount from which one is required to separate *halla*, in order to reduce the likelihood that the dough will become leavened. One may then bring multiple portions of dough close to each other, so that *halla* can be separated from them collectively. However, it is preferable to place all of the fully baked *matzot* into one basket and to separate *halla* at that point, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Eliezer (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Ḥayyim* 457:1).

Combining to reach the amount required for *halla* – צרוף לחלה – If several loaves or portions of dough are not large enough for the commandment of *halla* to apply to each of them separately, the basket into which they are placed after they have been baked combines them into one batch, and *halla* is separated at that point. However, baking the loaves together in one oven does not combine them to add up to the minimum quantity required for separating *halla*. Placing the loaves together on a utensil that is not concave also does not combine these loaves, and there is no requirement to separate *halla* in this case. Although the issue of loaves on a utensil that is not concave is unresolved in the Gemara, in practice one is not required to separate *halla*, as the commandment of *halla* nowadays is by rabbinic law (*Shulḥan Arukh, Yoreh De'at* 325:1).

LANGUAGE

Rod-like loaves [*ke'akhin*] – כְּעֵקִין – Some explain that this means snakelike, i.e., long narrow strips that resemble a snake (*Ma'adanei Melekh*). Others explain that it is related to the Arabic كعك, *ka'k*, or the Persian *kāk*, meaning a loaf of bread, particularly one that is spiced.

Rim [*levizbezin*] – לְבִיבֵזִין – Apparently from the Greek λαβίς, *labis*, meaning handle, holder, or clamp. It refers to an edge or a small frame added to the edge of a window, table or shelf.

אמר ליה: דעבדן כרבי אליעזר, (דתינא), רבי אליעזר אומר: הרודה ונותן לסל – הסל מצרפן לחלה. ואמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: הלכה כרבי אליעזר.

Rav Yosef said to him: They do separate *halla* from the dough, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer.^H As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: One who removes loaves of bread from an oven and places them in a basket, the basket combines them^N to reach the quantity from which one is required to separate *halla*,^H even if each of the loaves would not attain the necessary measure for separating *halla* on their own. And Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. Therefore, the women of Rav Yosef's household would put all the finished *matzot* into a basket and separate *halla* from them.

אמר ליה: והא איתמר עלה, אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: לא שנו אלא כבודות של בבל, שנו שכבות זו מזו, אבל כעבין – לא! הא איתמר עלה, אמר רבי חנינא: אפילו כעבין.

Abaye said to him: But wasn't it stated with regard to that *baraita* that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: They taught that a basket combines the loaves only with regard to Babylonian loaves that bite from one another. In other words, the loaves are slightly attached, and when one separates them, a bit from one loaf comes off with the other loaf. However, it does not apply to long, rod-like loaves [*ke'akhin*]^{LN} that were baked separately. Therefore, that principle cannot be applied to the case discussed here, in which each batch of *matza* was baked on its own. Rav Yosef answered: Wasn't it stated with regard to that *baraita* that Rabbi Ḥanina said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer even with regard to long, rod-like loaves? This indicates that Rav Yosef accepted the view of Rabbi Ḥanina.

בעי רבי ירמיה: טבלא שאין לה לבזבזין מהו? תוך כלי בעינן – והא ליכא, או דילמא: אויר כלי בעינן – והא איכא? תיקו.

In light of this discussion, Rabbi Yirmeya raised a dilemma: With regard to a board without a rim [*levizbezin*],^L what is the *halakha*? Is it considered to be a vessel that combines loaves baked separately into one unit with regard to *halla*? Do we require the inside of the vessel in order to combine the loaves, and that is lacking, since the board is flat rather than concave? Or perhaps we require the airspace of the vessel, and that is present in this case? The Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

תנא, רבי אליעזר אומר: הסל מצרפן, רבי יהושע אומר: תנור מצרפן. רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: כבודות של בבל שנו שכבות זו מזו – מצטרפות.

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: A basket combines different loaves placed in it with regard to the obligation to separate *halla*. Rabbi Yehoshua says: An oven combines them.^N Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Babylonian loaves that bite from one another are combined; however, if the loaves are connected to any lesser degree, e.g., if they are together in an oven or basket, they are not considered combined for the purpose of separating *halla*.

מתני' רבן גמליאל אומר: שלש נשים לשות כאחת, ואופות בתנור אחד, זו אחת זו.

MISHNA Rabban Gamliel says: Three women may knead their dough as one,^N meaning at one time, and bake the batches of dough in one oven, one after the other, and they need not be concerned that their dough will become leavened while they are waiting to use the oven.

וחכמים אומרים: שלש נשים עוסקות בבצק כאחת, אחת לשה, ואחת עורכת, ואחת אופה.

And the Rabbis say: Three women may be engaged in preparing dough as one, in the following manner: One kneads her dough as another one arranges her own dough so it takes the form of *matza*, while another one bakes her dough.

NOTES

הסל מצרפן – The basket combines them – Some say that this applies only when the bread is moved directly from the oven to a basket, but not when it is moved somewhere else in between (*Tosefot Rid*), while others disagree (*Or Zarua*).

Long rod-like loaves – כעבים – See Rashi. According to the *ge'onim*, this phrase actually refers to dome-shaped loaves that were baked separately. Others explain that it refers to small rolls, which, due to their size, do not become pressed together and stuck to each other (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

An oven combines them – תנור מצרפן – According to Rashi and others, Rabbi Yehoshua contends that just as an oven combines the different rolls for the purposes of *halla*, a basket certainly combines them. However, others claim that according to Rabbi Yehoshua only an oven combines them, whereas a basket does not (Ritva).

According to some, there are three opinions with regard to the obligation of separating *halla*. According to one opinion, *halla* is taken only from a single batch of dough, based on the verse: "The first of your dough" (Numbers 15:20). According to Rabbi Yehoshua,

an oven combines discrete pieces of dough to attain the required measurement. According to Rabbi Eliezer, the loaves of bread are combined only when they are placed in one vessel (Maharam Ḥalawa).

שלש נשים לשות – כאחת – Three women may knead their dough as one – Rabban Gamliel is presumably setting a maximum time limit with his statement, asserting that if dough sits idle for the time it takes to bake two sets of *matza* it will not become leavened, but if it remains for longer, it will become leavened. Others explain that he permits this procedure only when each batch of dough is handled the entire time; however, if more than three women join the rotation, the dough may become leavened despite being handled. According to the Rambam, the dough will not become leavened as long as it is being handled, and there is no particular significance to the fact that the case cited here discusses three women (see Rabbeinu Gershom and the Ritva). According to Rav Sa'adia Gaon and other early *ge'onim*, the case is one in which three women are preparing one batch of dough.

NOTES

If the dough begins to rise she should spread cold water – תפח תלטוש בצונן: Some understand this expression differently, explaining that if the dough begins to rise in the oven, then one must strike it with one's hand so that it will not become leavened (Arukh).

Moist wood – עצים לחים: From this statement it can be understood that at the time, dough was kneaded and arranged into loaves or matzot before the oven was lit, as otherwise there would be no difference between a hot or cold oven or between moist or dry wood (Me'iri).

HALAKHA

As long as they are engaged in the dough – כל זמן שעוסקות בצעק: Dough being used to prepare matza should not be left idle, even for one moment. This is because as long as someone is handling the dough it will not become leavened, even if a great deal of time passes, as stated in the baraita (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 459:2).

Cracked dough and dough at the beginning of the leavening process [siur] – סידוק: Dough is considered to be leavened once it has begun to rise and cracks appear on its surface. A person is liable to receive karet for eating such dough on Passover, even if the cracks are not intermingled. However, if the dough's surface has merely become pale, one is exempt for eating it. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis in the mishna, rather than the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 459:2).



Dough rising and forming cracks

BACKGROUND

Antennae of locusts – קרני חגבים: This expression is used to describe both the shape of the cracks as well as their size. The antennae of locusts have a distinct shape and are 12–15 mm.



Locust with antennae

רבי עקיבא אומר: לא כל הנשים ולא כל העצים ולא כל התנורים שוין. זה הכלל: תפח – תלטוש בצונן.

גמ' תנו רבנן: לשה, היא מקטפת וחבירתה לשה תחתיה. מקטפת – היא אופה וחבירתה מקטפת תחתיה, והשלישית לשה. אופה – היא לשה, וחבירתה אופה תחתיה, והשלישית מקטפת, וחזרת חלילה. כל זמן שעוסקות בצעק אינו בא לידי חימוץ.

”רבי עקיבא אומר לא כל הנשים וכו’.” תניא, אמר רבי עקיבא: דנתי לפני רבן גמליאל, ולמדנו רבינו בנשים זריות או בנשים שאין זריות? בעצים לחים או בעצים יבשים? בתנור חם או בתנור צונן? אומר לי: אין לך אלא מה ששנו חכמים, זה הכלל: תפח תלטוש בצונן.

מתני' שיאור ישרף, והאכלו פטור, סידוק – ישרף, והאכלו חייב כרת.

איזהו שיאור – בקרני חגבים, סידוק – שנתערבו סדקין זה בזה, דברי רבי יהודה. וחכמים אומרים: זה וזה האכלו חייב כרת. ואיזהו שיאור – כל שהכסיפו פניו, באדם שעמדו שערותיו.

גמ' תנו רבנן: איזהו שיאור – כל שהכסיפו פניו באדם שעמדו שערותיו. סידוק – בקרני חגבים, דברי רבי מאיר. וחכמים אומרים: איזהו שיאור – בקרני חגבים, סידוק – שנתערבו סדקין זה בזה. וזה וזה האכלו חייב כרת.

והאנן תנן: שיאור ישרף, והאכלו פטור, דברי רבי יהודה! אימא: לרבי מאיר זה וזה האכלו חייב כרת.

אמר רבא: מאי טעמא דרבי מאיר – אין לך כל סדק וסדק מלמעלה שאין לו כמה סדקים מלמטה.

Rabbi Akiva says: Not all women, not all wood, and not all ovens are the same, and therefore no set rules should be established. Rather, this is the principle: If the dough begins to rise, she should spread cold waterⁿ in which she immersed her hands, onto the dough, in order to stop the leavening process.

GEMARA The Sages taught in a baraita: When the woman who kneads first completes her kneading, she arranges her dough and another woman kneads in her place. When the first woman finishes arranging her dough, she bakes and another woman arranges her dough in her place, and the third woman kneads her dough. When the first woman finishes baking, she kneads the dough for her next batch, and another woman bakes in her place, and the third woman arranges her dough, and they continue in turn. As long as they are engaged in handling the dough,^h it will not become leavened.

It was taught in the mishna that Rabbi Akiva says that not all women, not all wood, and not all ovens are the same. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Akiva said: I deliberated this matter before Rabban Gamliel, asking: May our master teach us if your statement, cited in the mishna, was said with regard to diligent women or women who are not diligent? Was it said with regard to an oven fueled with moist woodⁿ or dry wood? Was it said with regard to a hot oven or a cold oven? Rabban Gamliel himself said to me: You have only what the Sages taught, which is that this is the principle: If the dough begins to rise such that there is a concern that it may become leavened, she should spread cold water onto the dough to prevent it from becoming leavened.

MISHNA Dough at the beginning of the leavening process [siur], must be burned, but one who eats it is exempt from the punishment of karet because the dough had not become fully leavened. Dough that has reached the stage of cracking must be burned, and one who eats it intentionally is liable to receive karet, as he has intentionally eaten leavened bread during Passover.

What is considered siur? Dough that has been leavened to the point that it has cracks that look like the antennae of locusts.^b The stage of cracking occurs later in the leavening process, when the cracks intermingle. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. And the Rabbis say: One who intentionally eats either this or that, dough with cracks like locust antennae or with cracks that have become intermingled, is liable to receive karet, as once dough begins to crack it has certainly become leavened. And what is siur? It is any dough whose surface has become pale like the face of a person whose hair stands on end due to fear.^h

GEMARA The Sages taught: What is siur? It is any dough whose surface has become pale like the face of a person whose hair stands on end due to fear. Cracking is considered to have occurred when cracks like the antennae of locusts appear. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: What is siur? It is when the dough forms cracks like the antennae of locusts, and cracking is when the cracks intermingle. And one who intentionally eats either this or that is liable to receive karet.

The Gemara asks: But didn't we learn in the mishna that siur must be burned but that one who eats it is exempt from karet; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. The opinion attributed to the Rabbis in the baraita appears to be the same as that which is attributed to Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna, but according to Rabbi Yehuda, one who eats siur is exempt from karet. The Gemara answers: Say that the baraita should be understood in the following manner: According to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, whose opinion was mentioned previously, one who intentionally eats either this or that is liable to receive karet, whereas according to the Rabbis he is exempt.

Rava said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Meir? It is that there is no crack above that does not have several cracks below. Therefore, even if only one small crack appears on the surface, it is a sign that the inside of the dough is filled with cracks and has become leavened.