

NOTES

**From the beginning of the sixth hour and onward – משש** – שעות ולמעלה: According to Rashi and others, the Gemara is referring to the sixth hour itself, at which point leaven is prohibited by rabbinic law. According to Rabbeinu Tam and others, the Gemara is speaking about the end of the sixth hour, when leaven is prohibited by Torah law, and the rabbinic decree mentioned by the Gemara is referring to the uncertain status of the mountain wheat. Some commentaries maintain that according to Rashi, another principle applies here: Anyone who betroths a woman does so contingent on the Sages' consent, and they annulled this type of betrothal (See *Kesef Mishneh*, *Sefer Milhamot Hashem* of the Ramban, and the Responsa of Rabbi Akiva Eiger).

**Wheat from the mountains – הישי קורדנאיתא**: The commentaries explain that this wheat, which grows in the mountains, is particularly hard and is therefore less likely to ferment. Some maintain that this wheat does not fully ripen by itself, and farmers would dig small pits around the wheat and fill them with water to facilitate ripening. As the water causes the wheat to become slightly fermented while still attached to the ground, the wheat assumes the legal status of hardened leaven (Maharam Halawa).

**Kneaded dough in his house – עיסה מגולגלת בתוך ביתו**: It is evident from the answer given here that this occurred during the twilight period before Shabbat began (Ritva). Alternatively, Rashi explains that this case involves full-fledged leaven, and the reference is to Passover eve.

LANGUAGE

**Mountains [kurdanaita] – קורדנאיתא**: According to most commentaries, the Gemara is referring to extremely hard wheat kernels, named for their place of origin, the mountains of Kurdistan. Indeed, Onkelos renders the mountains of Ararat (Genesis 8:4) as *turai Kardu*, the Kurdish mountains. The species of wheat that grows in this mountainous region is much harder than the grain that grows in the plains. Others claim that *kurdanaita* does not refer to its place of origin, but describes the grain itself, which is as hard as a rocky mountainside.



Kurdish wheat farmers collecting wheat grown in the mountains

וּמִבְטִילָהּ בְּשִׁית! בֵּין דְּאִסּוּרָא דְּרַבְנָן עֵלְוִיָּה – כְּדֹאֲרֵייתָא דְּמֵיָא, וְלֹא בְּרִשׁוּתֵיהּ קִיּוּמָא. וְלֹא מִצֵּי מִבְטִיל.

דְּאָמַר רַב גִּידֵל אָמַר רַבִּי חֵיָא בַר יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַב: הַמְקַדֵּשׁ מִשֵּׁשׁ שְׁעוֹת וְלִמְעָלָה, אֶפְיִלוּ בְּחֵיטֵי קוֹרְדְנֵיתָא – אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְקִידוּשֵׁין.

וְלִבְתָּר אִיסּוּרָא לֹא מִצֵּי מִבְטִיל לֵיהּ? וְהָא תֵּנָא: הֵיָהּ יוֹשֵׁב בְּבֵית הַמְדָרֶשׁ וְנוֹכַח שֵׁשׁ חֲמִיץ בְּתוֹךְ בֵּיתוֹ – מִבְטִילוּ בְּלִבּוֹ, אֶחָד שַׁבָּת וְאֶחָד יוֹם טוֹב. בְּשִׁלְמָא שַׁבָּת – מִשְׁבַּחַת לָהּ, כְּגוֹן שְׁחַל אֲרַבְעָה עָשָׂר לְהֵיוֹת בְּשַׁבָּת. אֵלָּא יוֹם טוֹב – בְּתַר אִיסּוּרָא הוּא!

אָמַר רַב אַחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב: הָכָא בְּתַלְמִיד יוֹשֵׁב לְפָנֵי רַבּוֹ עֶסְקִינוּ, וְנוֹכַח שֵׁשׁ עִיסָה מְגוֹלְגֶלֶת בְּתוֹךְ בֵּיתוֹ, וּמְתַיִירָא שְׂמָא תַחְמִיץ קָדִים וּמִבְטִיל לֵיהּ מִקְמֵי דְתַחְמִיץ.

דִּיקָא נְמִי דְקִתְנִי: הֵיָהּ יוֹשֵׁב בְּתוֹךְ בֵּית הַמְדָרֶשׁ, שָׁמַע מִיָּנָה.

The Gemara asks: **But let him render the leaven null and void during the sixth hour**, when he burns it. The Gemara answers: **Since there is a rabbinic prohibition that takes effect on the leaven**, as it is prohibited to derive benefit from it after the fifth hour, its legal status is like that of leaven prohibited by Torah law, and therefore it is not in his possession and he is unable to nullify it.

The Gemara continues: There is proof that the Sages were stringent with regard to leaven prohibited by rabbinic law, as **Rav Giddel said that Rabbi Hiyya bar Yosef said that Rav said**: With regard to a man who betroths a woman on the fourteenth of Nisan from the beginning of the sixth hour and onward,<sup>N</sup> even if he does so with wheat from the mountains [*kurdanaita*],<sup>NL</sup> which is particularly hard and there is no certainty that it will ferment even if water falls on it, nevertheless, as it is possible that the wheat leavened, its legal status is that of leaven. Consequently, it is prohibited to derive benefit from this wheat, which is legally worthless. Therefore, if a man gives the wheat to a woman for the purpose of betrothal, **one need not be concerned that it is a betrothal.**<sup>H</sup> The reason is that a betrothal is effective only if the man gives the woman an object worth at least a *peruta*. In this case the Sages disqualify the betrothal and allow the woman to marry another man, despite the fact that by Torah law she is betrothed to the first man, as the leaven with which he betrothed her is prohibited only by rabbinic law.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And is it indeed the case that after the leaven has become prohibited one is unable to render it null and void? But wasn't it taught in a baraita**: If one was sitting in the study hall and he remembered that there is leavened bread in his house, he should render it null and void in his heart, both on Shabbat and on the Festival? The Gemara analyzes this statement: **Granted, on Shabbat you can find this case**, as one can nullify the leaven before it becomes prohibited, in a case where the fourteenth of Nisan occurs on Shabbat and he remembers to nullify the leaven before the prohibition takes effect. **However, if he remembered on the Festival itself, it is after the prohibition has taken effect**, as the Festival has already begun, and yet the *baraita* says that one may render the leaven null and void.

Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said: **Here we are dealing with a student sitting before his teacher, and he remembers that there is kneaded dough in his house,**<sup>N</sup> and he is afraid lest it leaven before he can return home to warn the members of his household. Since the dough has not yet leavened and is not yet prohibited, he can take earlier action and render it null and void before it becomes leavened.<sup>H</sup>

The Gemara comments: The language of the *baraita* is also precise in accordance with this explanation, as the *baraita* teaches: **If one was sitting in the study hall**. This indicates that the dough has not yet risen, and the problem is that he cannot arrive home in time to prevent it from rising. However, if it had already become leavened, rendering it null and void will not remedy the situation even if he were home. The Gemara concludes: **Indeed, learn from this proof that Rav Aha bar Ya'akov's interpretation is correct.**

HALAKHA

**One who betroths with wheat – מקדש בחיטין**: With regard to a man who betroths a woman on the eve of Passover after the sixth hour with wheat that has been exposed to water, there is no concern that this betrothal might be effective, even if the wheat is of a particularly hard species (*Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 28:21).

**ביטול עיסת חמץ**: If one has dough in his house on Passover that has not yet begun to rise, and for whatever reason he cannot return home before it rises, he can render the dough null and void from afar before it becomes leavened (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 444:8).

**Bread that became moldy** – הפת שעינפשה: When *matza* is baked without puncturing the dough with holes, it resembles leavened flatbread. It can become moldy and therefore be confused with leavened bread.



Flatbread

## NOTES

**Second tithe** – מעשר שני: The second tithe was a tenth of the produce that remained after *teruma* had been given to the priests and the first tithe had been given to the Levites. The second tithe was separated during the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the Sabbatical cycle. After the second tithe was set aside, it was brought to Jerusalem to be consumed there by its owner. If the journey to Jerusalem was too long, so that it would be difficult to carry all the second tithe there, or if the produce became ritually impure, it could be redeemed for an equivalent sum of money. If the owner redeemed his own produce he had to add one-fifth of its value. This redemption money was brought to Jerusalem, where it could be spent only to purchase food.

**On the Temple Mount it is non-sacred money** – בהר הבית: Some commentaries explain that one would not ordinarily enter the Temple Mount with coins. Consequently, any coins found there were probably spent by the Temple treasury to purchase sacred items for the Temple and the money was redeemed in the process, rendering them non-sacred coins (Ra'avad; Me'iri).

## HALAKHA

**Coins that were found in Jerusalem** – מעות שנמצאו: With regard to coins found in Jerusalem when the Temple was standing, if they were discovered near animal merchants they are assumed to be second-tithe coins. If they were found on the Temple Mount they are non-sacred coins. If they were discovered in other places in Jerusalem, during a Festival they are presumed to be second-tithe coins and during the rest of the year they are presumed to be non-sacred coins (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Ma'aser Sheni* 6:9–10).

**Bread that was found during Passover** – פת שנמצאה: If one finds a loaf on Passover and does not know whether it is leaven or *matza*, he is even permitted to eat it. If it is moldy, if enough days of Passover have passed that it is possible that it turned moldy during Passover, it is permitted. However, if this is not possible, it is assumed to be leaven and thus prohibited, in accordance with the conclusion of the Gemara and the opinion of Rabba bar Rav Huna (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 446:4).

אמר רבה בר רב הונא אמר רב: הפת שעינפשה, כיון שרבתה מצה – מותרת, היכי דמי? אילימא דידע בה דחמץ היא – כי רבתה מצה מאי הוי?

Rabba bar Rav Huna said that Rav said: With regard to a vessel that contains several loaves in which there was **bread that became moldy**,<sup>b</sup> and it is not evident whether it is leaven or *matza*, **once there was more *matza* than leaven in the vessel, it is permitted**. The Gemara first analyzes the case itself: **What are the circumstances? If you say that he knows that this loaf is leavened bread, even if there were more *matza*, what of it?** What difference does it make that most of the food is *matza*, if it is clear that this loaf is leaven?

אלא, דלא ידעינן בה אי חמץ הוא אי מצה הוא – מאי איריא כי רבתה מצה? אפילו כי לא רבתה מצה נמי, ניזיל בתר בתרא!

Rather, Rav must be speaking of a case **where we do not know whether it is leavened bread or whether it is *matza***. However, in that case, **why discuss specifically a situation where there was more *matza* in the vessel? Even in a case where there was not more *matza* in the vessel as well, the questionable loaf is likely to be *matza*, as let us follow the last item placed in the vessel, which even on the first day of Passover would be *matza*.**

מי לא תנן: מעות שנמצאו לפני סוחר ביהמה – לעולם מעשר, בהר הבית – חולין.

**Didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to coins that were found before animal merchants in Jerusalem, they are always assumed to be money of the second tithe**,<sup>n</sup> as most of the animals purchased in Jerusalem were bought with that money. This *halakha* applies both during a Festival and throughout the year, as people would purchase animals for meat with their second-tithe money, and it can therefore be assumed that these coins have the status of second tithe. However, if the money was found **on the Temple Mount it is non-sacred money**,<sup>n</sup> even during a Festival. It can be assumed that one who enters the Temple Mount has already purchased all the animals that he required beforehand. Any coins in his possession are non-sacred money, not tithes.

בירושלים, בשעת הרגל – מעשר, בשאר ימות השנה – חולין.

If the money was found elsewhere **in Jerusalem during the Festival**, when many people came to Jerusalem with their second-tithe money, the coins are presumed to be second-tithe money. However, if the coins were found **during the rest of the year, it is non-sacred money**.<sup>h</sup>

ואמר רב שמעיה בר זירא: מאי טעמא – הואיל ושווקי ירושלים עשויין להתכבד בכל יום. אלמא אמרינן: קמאי קמאי אזלי ליה, והני אחרני נינהו. הך נמי – נימא: קמא קמא אזיל, והאי דהאידידנא הוא!

The Gemara explains the proof. **And Rav Shemaya bar Zeira said: What is the reason that during the rest of the year the coins are considered non-sacred money, even on the day after the Festival? Since the markets of Jerusalem tend to be cleaned every day, any money left there would already have been found by the street cleaners. Consequently, any coins found there were left there recently. Apparently, we say that the first ones are gone and these objects are later ones. Here too, with regard to moldy bread, let us say: The first ones have been eaten and are gone, and this food is from now and is undoubtedly *matza*.**

שאני הכא, דעיפושא מוכיח עילויה. אי עיפושא מוכיח עילויה – כי רבתה מצה מאי הוי? אמר רבה: לא תימא שרבתה מצה, אלא אימא: שרבו ימי מצה עילויה.

The Gemara rejects this proof: It is **different here, as the mold proves about the loaf that it is leaven, as food does not become moldy unless it has been sitting for a long time. The Gemara retorts: If its mold proves about the loaf that it is leaven, if there was more *matza* in the vessel, what of it?** Even in that case, the very fact that it is moldy proves that it is leaven. **Rabba said: Do not say there was more *matza* than leaven in the vessel; rather, say that several days of eating *matza* have passed over the vessel.** In other words, several days of the Festival, during which *matza* is consumed, have passed. Therefore, it is more likely that the moldy loaf is *matza*.

אי הכי פשיטא! לא צריכא, דעיפושא מרובה. מהו דתימא: כיון דעיפושא מרובה – איגליא מילתא דודאי חמץ מעליא הוא, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara asks: **If so, it is obvious that the moldy loaf is *matza*, not leaven. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary to teach this *halakha* with regard to a situation where its mold is extensive. Lest you say: Since its mold is extensive the matter is revealed that it is certainly leavened bread, therefore Rav teaches us that one cannot be entirely sure that this is the case.**

כיון שרבו ימי מצה עילויה, אמרינן: כל יומא ויומא נהמא חמימא אפה, ושדא עילויה ועפשא טפי.

The Gemara explains the reason for the uncertainty. **Since several days of eating *matza* have passed over the vessel, we say: Each and every day he baked warm loaves, which he placed upon the previous days' *matza*, causing it to grow moldier. Therefore, it is possible that even though only a brief time has passed, the *matza* has grown very moldy, due to the moisture and heat inside the vessel.**<sup>h</sup>

NOTES

**One recites a blessing over the search – מְבַרֵךְ עַל הַבְּדִיקָה** – The novelty in this statement is that one recites a blessing despite the fact that the essential part of the mitzva is the removal of leaven, as the search for leaven is merely a stage in the preparation for its removal. Additionally, it can be suggested that the main mitzva is not even to remove leaven; rather, one is commanded to ensure that no leaven remains in his house. Therefore, the Gemara informs us that the search for leaven is considered the beginning of the process of its removal, and for this reason one recites a blessing before beginning the search (Rosh). The meaning of the term removal [*biur*] includes both the search and the removal of leaven (Ritva). Alternatively, the formula of this blessing serves to emphasize that the purpose of the search is to facilitate removal of the leaven (Rabbeinu Gershom). Yet others explain that the obligation to remove leaven is by rabbinic law, whereas the obligation to search for leaven is by Torah law (Maharam Ha'awa).

ומי אֲזַלְיָן בְּתַר בְּתַר אֲזַלְיָן? וְהָאֵתְנָא, רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: תִּיבָה שְׁנַשְׁתַּמְשׁוּ בָּהּ מְעוֹת חוֹלִין וּמְעוֹת מְעֵשֶׁר, אִם רוֹב חוֹלִין – חוֹלִין, אִם רוֹב מְעֵשֶׁר – מְעֵשֶׁר. וְאִמַּאי? לְזִיל בְּתַר בְּתַר!

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בְּרַי יִצְחָק: הֲכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינַן – כְּגוֹן שְׁנַשְׁתַּמְשׁוּ בָּהּ מְעוֹת חוֹלִין וּמְעוֹת מְעֵשֶׁר, וְאִין יוֹדְעַי אֵיזוּהּ מִהוֹן בְּסוּף. רַב זְבִיד אָמַר: כְּגוֹן שְׁנַשְׁתַּמְשׁוּ בָּהּ צִיבּוּרִין צִיבּוּרִין, רַב פְּפָא אָמַר: כְּגוֹן דְּאִישְׁתַּכַּח בְּגוּמָא.

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: הַבּוֹדֵק צָרִיךְ שִׁיבְרֵךְ. מַאי מְבַרֵךְ? רַב פְּפִי אָמַר מִשְׁמִיחָ דְרַבָּא: (אָמַר) "לְבַעַר חֵמֶץ". רַב פְּפָא אָמַר מִשְׁמִיחָ דְרַבָּא: "עַל בִּיעוּר חֵמֶץ". בְּ"לְבַעַר" – כּוֹלֵי עֵלְמָא לֹא פְּלִיגֵי דְוֹדָאֵי לְהַבָּא מִשְׁמַע.

In regard to the aforementioned principle, the Gemara asks: **And do we, in general, follow the last item in determining the identity of the item in question? But wasn't it taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: With regard to a box that people used for both non-sacred coins and second-tithe coins, if the majority of its use was for non-sacred money, the coins are considered non-sacred. If the majority of its use was for second-tithe coins, the coins are considered second-tithe money.** The Gemara asks: **But why is this so? Let us follow the last item placed in the box.**

**Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where people used the box for both non-sacred coins and second-tithe coins, and he does not know which of the two kinds of money was placed there last.**

**Rav Zevid said:** The *baraita* is referring to a case where he used one part of the box for piles of non-sacred coins and another part of the box for piles of second-tithe coins. In this case, there was no definitive most recent use of the box, as a coin may have moved from one side of the box to the other.

**Rav Pappa said:** We are dealing with a case where the coin was found in a hole in the box. The concern is that this coin might not be of the type last placed into the box. Instead, it is possible that this coin remained from a previous use and was not removed because it was obscured in the hole.

**Rav Yehuda said: One who searches for leaven must recite a blessing.<sup>n</sup>** The Gemara asks: **What blessing does he recite, i.e., what is the correct formula of the blessing? Rav Pappi said in the name of Rava that one recites: Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us to remove leavened bread. Rav Pappa said in the name of Rava: One should recite: Concerning the removal of leavened bread.** The Gemara comments: **With regard to the formula: To remove, everyone agrees that it certainly refers to the future.** This formulation undoubtedly indicates that the person reciting the blessing is about to begin fulfilling the mitzva of removing leaven, and it is therefore an appropriate blessing.

Perek I  
Daf 7 Amud b

NOTES

The phrase to perform versus the phrase concerning the mitzva – לַעֲשׂוֹת וְעַל מִצְוֹת: Several of the early commentaries seek a guiding principle for when the formula of the blessing recited before performing a mitzva concludes with the infinitive: To perform, and when the formula of the blessing concludes with: Concerning the mitzva. According to Rabbeinu Tam, one recites the formula: Concerning, before a mitzva that he performs immediately, whereas if the performance of the mitzva is not immediate he recites the blessing in the infinitive form. According to Rav Yitzhak ben Asher (*Tosafot*) and the Ramban, the formula is: Concerning, for any mitzva that can be performed by means of an agent, and for a mitzva that cannot be performed by means of an agent, the infinitive is used. The Ritva accepts several of these opinions, and adds that for any mitzva whose blessing is recited after its performance, or for a mitzva that one is not absolutely obligated to perform, e.g., ritual slaughter, one recites the formula: Concerning. The *Me'iri* also adopts some of these opinions and contends that when one performs only part of a mitzva he recites: Concerning. Yet other early commentaries claim that there is no guiding principle with regard to this issue (Rabbeinu Yitzhak in *Tosafot*).

כִּי פְּלִיגֵי – בְּ"עַל בִּיעוּר". מִן סִבָּר: מַעֲיָקְרָא מִשְׁמַע, וּמִן סִבָּר: לְהַבָּא מִשְׁמַע.

מִתִּיבֵי: "בְּרוּךְ אַשֶׁר קִדְּשָׁנוּ בְּמִצְוֹתָיו וְצִוָּנוּ עַל הַמִּילָה!"

הֲתָם הֵיכִי נִימָא? נִימָא "לְמוֹל" – לֹא סָגִיא דְלָאוּ אִיהוּ מְהִיל? אָבִי הַבֵּן מַאי אֵיכָא לְמִימַר? אֵין הֲכִי נָמִי.

Where they disagree is with regard to the formula: Concerning the elimination of leaven. One Sage, Rav Pappi, maintains that it is referring to an act that was performed previously. Since this formula is referring to the removal of leaven as a task already completed, it would be more appropriate for a blessing recited after performance of that mitzva was completed. **And the other Sage, Rav Pappa, maintains that this expression refers to the future.<sup>n</sup>**

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Pappi's opinion from the formula of the blessing recited just prior to circumcision: **Blessed are You...Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us concerning circumcision.** Apparently this expression indeed is referring to a future act.

The Gemara rejects this contention: That is no proof, as what alternative formula can we recite there? If we say: He, Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and commanded us to circumcise, is there no alternative to he himself, i.e., the boy's father, circumcising his son? The father is commanded to circumcise his son, and he may appoint one who is not commanded to circumcise his son to act in his stead. Therefore, the more general formula of the blessing is recited: About the circumcision. The Gemara raises a difficulty: In a case where the child's father himself circumcises his son, what can be said? The Gemara responds: **Yes, it is indeed so.** If the father himself performs the circumcision he in fact recites the blessing: And has commanded us to circumcise.

מיתבי: "ברוך אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו על השחיטה". התם נמי הכי נימא? נימא "לשחוט" – לא סגי דלאו איהו שחט?

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Pappi's opinion. The blessing recited over ritual slaughter is: **Blessed...Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us concerning slaughtering.** This blessing likewise indicates that this formula is appropriate prior to an action. The Gemara again rejects this claim: **There too, what alternative formula can we recite? If we say: Who has commanded us to slaughter, is there no alternative to his slaughtering the animal?** There is no mitzva to slaughter an animal. It is merely the necessary preparation before one may eat meat. Therefore, the more general formula of the blessing is recited: Concerning slaughtering.

פסח וקדשים מאי איכא למימר? אין הכי נמי.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, with regard to the slaughter of the Paschal lamb and other consecrated animals, **what can be said?** One is indeed commanded to slaughter these animals. The Gemara answers: **Yes, it is indeed so.** When slaughtering the Paschal lamb or any other offering, one recites: Who has commanded us to slaughter.

מיתבי: העושה לולב לעצמו מברך "שהחיינו וקימנו והגיענו לזמן הזה". נטלו לצאת בו אומר "אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו על נטילת לולב". שאני התם, דבעידנא דאגבהה נפק ביה.

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Pappi's opinion from the *Tosefta*: **One who prepares a lulav for himself recites the blessing: Who has given us life, sustained us, and brought us to this time.** When he takes it to fulfill with it the obligation to take the *lulav*, he says: **Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us concerning the taking of the lulav.** Although he has yet to perform the mitzva, he does not recite the formula: To take. The Gemara answers: **It is different there, as at the time when he lifts the lulav before he recites the blessing, he already fulfilled his obligation by Torah law.** Consequently, the formula: Concerning the taking, is indeed more appropriate for an action that he has already performed.

אי הכי, "לצאת בו"? "יצא בו" מיבעי ליה! אין הכי נמי, ומשום דקא בעי למיתנא סיפא "לישב בסוכה" תנא רישא נמי "לצאת בו".

The Gemara raises an objection: **If so, the statement that he takes it to fulfill his obligation with it is imprecise, as the tanna should have said that he took the lulav with which he already fulfilled his obligation.** The Gemara answers: **Yes, it is indeed so;** the *tanna* should have formulated the *halakha* in that manner. **But due to the fact that he wants to teach the latter clause of the baraita: One who comes to sit in the sukka, he likewise taught in the first clause: To fulfill his obligation with it.** This phrase maintains the consistency of the language of the *Tosefta*, even though it is imprecise with regard to the *halakha* of *lulav*.

דקתני סיפא: העושה סוכה לעצמו אומר: ברוך אתה ה' שהחיינו וקימנו והגיענו לזמן הזה. נכנס לישב בה אומר: ברוך אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו לישב בסוכה. והלכתא: "על בעיור חמץ".

As it teaches in the latter clause of this *baraita*: **One who erects a sukka for himself recites: Blessed are You, God, Who has given us life, sustained us, and brought us to this time.** When he enters to sit in the *sukka* he says: **Blessed...Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and has commanded us to sit in the sukka.** In summary, no conclusive proof has been found for either side of this debate. The Gemara concludes: **And the halakha is that one should recite: Concerning the removal of leaven, as that expression is referring to the future as well.**<sup>H</sup>

דכולי עלמא מיהא. מעיקרא בעינן לברוכי מנלו? דאמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: כל המצות מברך עליהן עובר לעשייתן.

The Gemara poses a question: **In any event, it is clear from the previous discussion that everyone agrees that one is required to recite a blessing prior to performing a mitzva. From where do we derive this principle?** It is as Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: **With regard to all the mitzvot, one recites a blessing over them prior to [over] their performance.**<sup>HN</sup>

מאי משמע דהאי עובר לישנא דאקדומי הוא? אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק, דאמר קרא: "וירץ אחימעץ דרך הכפר ויעבר את הכושי". אביי אמר, מהכא: "והוא עבר לפניהם". ואיבעית אימא, מהכא: "ויעבר מלכם לפניהם וה' בראשם".

The Gemara asks: **From where may it be inferred that the word over is the language of priority?** Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that the verse said: **"And Ahimaaz ran by the way of the plain, and overran [vaya'avor] the Cushite"** (II Samuel 18:23), i.e., Ahimaaz overtook the Cushite. **Abaye said: It is derived from here: "And he passed [avar] before them"** (Genesis 33:3). **And if you wish, say instead that the proof is from here: "And their king passed [vaya'avor] before them and God at their head"** (Micah 2:13).

#### HALAKHA

**ברכת בעיור חמץ – עובר לעשייתן:** Before searching for leaven, one recites the blessing: Concerning the removal of leaven (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 432:1).

**עובר לעשייתן – עובר לעשייתן:** One should recite the blessing prior to performing a mitzva, as close as possible to its performance. This ruling is in accordance with Shmuel's statement, which is universally accepted (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 25:8, 158:11).

#### NOTES

**עובר לעשייתן – עובר לעשייתן:** The *ge'onim* explain that although there is another word that means before, *kodem*, this term can refer to a time long before performance of the mitzva. The word *over* means immediately beforehand and therefore it is preferable (*Me'iri*).

Except for immersion – חוץ מן הטבילה: One obligated to immerse himself recites the blessing after immersing. This ruling is in accordance with Rav Hisda's statement and the conclusion of the Gemara (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 268:2*).

בי רב אמרי: חוץ מן הטבילה ושופר. בשלמא טבילה – דאפתי גברא לא חזי, אלא שופר מאי טעמא? וכי תימא: משום דילמא מיקלקלא תקיעה. אי הכי אפילו שחיטה ומילה נמי!

אלא אמר רב חסדא: "חוץ מן הטבילה" בלבד איתמר. תניא נמי הכי: טבל ועלה, בעלייתו ואומר: ברוך אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו על הטבילה.

"לאור הנר וכו'". מנא הני מילי? אמר רב חסדא: למדנו מציאה ממציאה, ומציאה מחיפוש, וחפוש מחיפוש, וחפוש מנרות, ונרות מנר.

מציאה ממציאה – כתיב הכא: "שבעת ימים שאר לא ימצא בבתיכם", וכתיב התם: "ויחפש בגדול החל ובקטן כלה וימצא". ומציאה מחיפוש דידיה,

וחיפוש מנרות – דכתיב: "בעת ההיא אחפש את ירושלים בנרות", ונרות מנר, דכתיב: "נר (אלהים) [ה'] נשמת אדם חפש כל חדרי בטן".

תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: לילי ארבעה עשר בודקים את החמץ לאור הנר, אף על פי שאין ראיה לדבר – זכר לדבר, שנאמר: "שבעת ימים שאר לא ימצא", ואומר: "ויחפש בגדול החל ובקטן כלה", ואומר: "בעת ההיא אחפש את ירושלים בנרות", ואומר: "נר (אלהים) [ה'] נשמת אדם חפש".

In the school of Rav they say: One recites a blessing prior to performing all mitzvot, **except** for the ritual immersion after a nocturnal emission and the blowing of the *shofar*. The Gemara elaborates: **Granted** one does not recite a blessing prior to immersion, as this man who has not yet immersed is still unfit to recite a blessing because he is ritually impure. **However**, with regard to a *shofar*, **what is the reason** that one does not recite a blessing before sounding the *shofar*? **And lest you say** the reason is due to a concern lest the sounding of the *shofar* emerge flawed, and the blessing will be in vain, **if so**, one should not recite a blessing even prior to ritual slaughter and circumcision, as in those cases too one might fail to perform the action in the requisite manner.

Rather, Rav Hisda said: **Except for prior to immersion<sup>H</sup> alone** was stated, due to the aforementioned reason. The Gemara adds: **That was also taught in a baraita:** With regard to one who immersed for ritual purification after a nocturnal emission and emerged, as he emerges he recites: **Blessed... Who has made us holy through His mitzvot and commanded us concerning immersion.<sup>N</sup>**

The mishna states that one searches for leaven by the light of the lamp, etc. The Gemara asks: **From where are these matters**, i.e., that the search should be conducted by the light of the lamp, derived? **Rav Hisda said:** We derive it by the hermeneutic principles of verbal analogy and juxtaposition: The term finding in one context is derived from finding in another context, and finding is derived from the word searching, and this searching is derived from searching elsewhere, and searching there is derived from the word lamps, and lamps is derived from lamp.

The Gemara cites the relevant verses included in the above derivation. Finding in one context is derived from finding in another context by verbal analogy, as it is written here: "Seven days leaven shall not be found in your houses" (Exodus 12:19), and it is written there: "And he searched, starting with the eldest, and ending with the youngest; and the goblet was found in Benjamin's sack" (Genesis 44:12). And the word finding in this verse is connected to searching in that same verse by juxtaposition, as the verse says: "And he searched... and was found."

And searching is derived from lamps by means of juxtaposition, as it is written: "And it shall come to pass that at that time I will search Jerusalem with lamps" (Zephaniah 1:12). And finally, the word lamps is derived from lamp<sup>N</sup> by means of juxtaposition, as it is written: "The spirit of man is the lamp of God, searching all the inward parts" (Proverbs 20:27). Together these verses indicate that the search for leaven must be conducted by the light of the lamp.

Similarly, the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: On the night of the fourteenth one searches for leavened bread by the light of the lamp. Although there is no absolute proof for this matter, there is an allusion to this matter,<sup>N</sup> as it is stated: "Seven days leaven shall not be found in your houses," and it says: "And he searched, starting with the eldest, and ending with the youngest; and the goblet was found." And it says: "At that time I will search Jerusalem with lamps," and it says: "The spirit of man is the lamp of God, searching all the inward parts."

NOTES

Concerning immersion – על הטבילה: According to Rashi, this is the blessing for all types of ritual immersion. However, the *ge'onim*, cited in *Tosafot*, maintain that this ruling refers specifically to the immersion of a convert. The Ra'avad on the Rambam (*Sefer Nashim, Hillkhot Ishut 3:23*) adds that if a mitzva, or part of it, is dependent on others, the blessing is recited after the performance of the mitzva.

Lamps is derived from lamp – נרות מנר: As the words lamps and lamp do not appear together in the verse cited, this derivation is problematic. *Tosafot* explain that the search of Jerusalem with lamps is derived from the search of one's spirit with a lamp.

There is no proof...there is an allusion – זכר לדבר – אין ראיה...וכך לדבר: According to Rashi, these verses do not provide an absolute

proof, because the verbal analogy is derived from the Prophets rather than from the Torah. Other commentaries explain that it is only an allusion because the verse: Searching all the inward parts, does not refer to a lamp but to a metaphorical search conducted by God (*Tosefot Hakhmei Angliya*). Yet others maintain that these verses do not provide incontrovertible proof as they are not dealing with the search for leaven at all.

Neither by the light of the sun – **לֹא לְאוֹר הַחֶמֶה** – In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that this is referring to one who neglected to search for leaven on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan and had no choice but to conduct his search on the morning of the fourteenth.

## HALAKHA

Searching for leaven by the light of the sun – **בְּדִיקַת לְאוֹר הַחֶמֶה**: Even if one conducts the search for leaven during the day, he may not search for leaven by the light of the sun. The lone exception to this principle is an area adjacent to a window. The same *halakha* applies to the light of the moon, in accordance with the *baraita* (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 433:1).

Searching for leaven with a torch – **בְּדִיקַת בְּאֵבוּקָה**: One may not conduct the search for leaven with a torch. The legal status of two candles braided together is like that of a torch in terms of this *halakha* (Rema, citing Mahari). Instead, the search should be performed with a single lamp (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 433:2).

מאי תימא? וְאוֹמֵר?

With regard to this teaching, the Gemara asks a question: **What is the reason for the last citation introduced by the final And the verse says?** Why doesn't the previous verse, "At that time I will search Jerusalem with lamps," provide sufficient proof that the search must be conducted by the light of the lamp?

וְכִי תִימָא: הָאִי "בְּעֵת הַהִיא" קוּלָּא הוּא, דְּקָאֵמֵר רַחֲמֵנָא: לֹא בְּדִיקָנָא לֵה בִירוּשָׁלַיִם בְּנִהוּרָא דְאַבוּקָה, דְנִפְיֵשׁ נִהוּרָא טוּבָא, אֲלֵא בְנִהוּרָא דְשֶׁרָגָא, דְזוּטֵר נִהוּרָא טָפִי, דְעוֹן רַבָּה מִשְׁתַּכַּח וְעוֹן זוּטֵר לֹא מִשְׁתַּכַּח – תָּנָא שְׁמַע: "נֵר ה' נִשְׁמַת אָדָם".

And the Gemara answers: The last verse is necessary, **lest you say that this verse: "At that time, etc." is a leniency, as God is saying: I will not search Jerusalem by the light of a torch, whose light is great, and through which I will expose every sin. Rather, I will search by the light of a small lamp, whose light is smaller, which will ensure that great sins will be discovered and small sins will not be discovered.** To counter this argument, the *tanna* states: **Come and hear, "The spirit of man is the lamp of God, searching all the inward parts."** This verse indicates that everything will be found by the light of the lamp, which is the most effective manner of searching.

תַּנּוּ רַבָּנֵי: אֵין בּוֹדֵקִין לֹא לְאוֹר הַחֶמֶה, וְלֹא לְאוֹר הַלְּבָנָה, וְלֹא לְאוֹר הָאֵבוּקָה, אֲלֵא לְאוֹר הַנֵּר,

The Sages taught: **One does not search for leaven, neither by the light of the sun,<sup>NH</sup> nor by the light of the moon, nor by the light of a torch.<sup>H</sup> Rather, the search should be conducted by the light of a lamp,**

## Perek I

## Daf 8 Amud a

מִפְּנֵי שְׂאוֹר הַנֵּר יִפֶּה לְבִדְיָקָה. וְאֵף עַל פִּי שְׂאִין רְאִיָּה לְדָבָר – זְכוֹר לְדָבָר, שְׁנֵאֵמֵר: "שִׁבְעַת יָמִים שְׂאוֹר לֹא יִמְצָא בְּבֵתֵיכֶם", וְאוֹמֵר: "וַיִּחְפֹּשׂ בְּגָדוֹל הַחֹל", וְאוֹמֵר: "בְּעֵת הַהִיא אֲחַפֵּשׂ אֶת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם בְּנֵרוֹת", וְאוֹמֵר: "נֵר ה' נִשְׁמַת אָדָם הַפֶּשׁ כֹּל חֲדָרֵי בֵּתָן".

because the light of a lamp is effective for searching. And even though there is no proof for this matter, there is an allusion to this matter, as it is stated: "Seven days leaven shall not be found in your houses" (Exodus 12:19), and it says: "And he searched, starting with the eldest, and ending with the youngest; and the goblet was found in Benjamin's sack..." (Genesis 44:12). And it says: "At that time I will search Jerusalem with lamps" (Zephaniah 1:12), and it says: "The spirit of man is the lamp of God, searching all the inward parts" (Proverbs 20:27).

הָאִי אֹר הַחֶמֶה הֵיכִי דְמִי? אִי נִמְא בְּחָצֵר – הָאֵמֵר רַבָּא: חָצֵר אֵינָה צְרִיכָה בְּדִיקָה, מִפְּנֵי שְׁהַעוֹרְבִין מְצוּיִין שָׁם. אֲלֵא בְּאַכְסְדְרָה – הָאֵמֵר רַבָּא: אַכְסְדְרָה לְאוֹרָה נְבִדְקָת!

The Gemara asks a question: **This light of the sun, by which one may not conduct the search for leaven, what are the circumstances of this case?** If we say it is referring to conducting a search in the courtyard,<sup>H</sup> didn't Rava say that a courtyard does not require searching, due to the ravens and other birds that are found there, and will certainly eat any leaven there? **Rather, perhaps this ruling is referring to a portico, which is not frequented by ravens.** However, this cannot be the correct interpretation either, as **didn't Rava say with regard to that case that a portico may be searched by its own light, i.e., one need not use a lamp at all when searching a portico, but one may search it by sunlight?**<sup>H</sup>

לֹא צְרִיכָא, לְאוֹרֵה דְבִתְדָר. וְדִהִיכָא? אִי לְבִהְדֵי אֹרֵהָ – הֵינּוּ אַכְסְדְרָה, אֲלֵא לְצַדִּיין.

The Gemara answers: **No, this statement with regard to sunlight is necessary with regard to the skylight that is in a room.** The Gemara asks: **And with regard to the area to which the *tanna* is referring, where in the room is it located?** If he is referring to the place opposite the skylight, the legal status of that area is like that of a portico, as its abundant sunlight is adequate to search for leaven. **Rather, the *tanna* is referring to the sides of the room.** In those areas, one cannot rely on the sunlight from the skylight. He must search by the light of the lamp.

## HALAKHA

Searching a courtyard – **בְּדִיקַת חָצֵר**: It is not necessary to search the middle of a courtyard for leaven, as it can be assumed that any leaven left there would have been eaten by birds, in accordance with the opinion of Rava (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 433:6).

Searching a portico – **בְּדִיקַת אַכְסְדְרָה**: One who searches for leaven during the day in a portico with a great deal of light or in an area near a window does so without a lamp (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 433:1).