

# daf yomi summary

## parashat Shemot 5781

פסחים מ - מ

EDITION: 50

### MIXTURES WITH CHAMETZ & KOSHER CERTIFICATION

THANKS RABBI YONI ISSACSON

Pesachim 42-45 Mixtures with chametz and which products require kosher certification

In earlier days, we did not have the level and scope of kosher supervision which is now virtually taken for granted. Meat products were always purchased from reliable sources, and there were various decrees made requiring milk, cheese and bread to be produced by or in the presence of Jews, but many other products were purchased from regular suppliers and assumed to be kosher by default.

With the advent of the industrial age and the listing of ingredients on products, it was not uncommon to rely on these ingredients lists to accept products as kosher, and it is only in recent decades that a hechsher can be found for virtually every type of product imaginable, including some, such as bottled water, which certainly do not require one.

In order to make an educated decision as to which kinds of products required certification, which can be assumed by default to be kosher, and which can be treated as kosher based on ingredients, it is essential to have a broad and deep knowledge of all the halachik principles and laws pertaining to mixtures of kosher and non-kosher substances, AND ALSO of the facts on the ground in each locale where products are produced and stored. I do not profess to have this level of knowledge, and thus defer to experts in these matters, but as is our mandate, would like to at least highlight some of the issues from our dapim that relate to mixtures containing chametz on Pesach, as well as mixtures that might contain non-kosher ingredients throughout the year.

One argument made by some people (often layman, but also what appears to be a small minority of Bnei-Torah) who do not require certification for many shelf-items that contain mostly visible kosher ingredients is that any non-kosher ingredients do not form a significant part of the makeup and are thus בטל (nullified) by the majority of kosher ingredients or even בשישים (by sixty). Others might not go this far but are happy to simply read the ingredients and make decisions based on what is listed.

They sometimes argue that even if ingredient lists are not

completely accurate and the government allows small quantities of certain ingredients to be excluded from these lists, such amounts are clearly negligible and the rule of בטול applies, not only by majority, but even by 60 times!

Yet as we shall see, while there might be some merits to the arguments which allows one to rely on ingredients, assuming one is in fact familiar with each ingredient and what it is derived from (enzymes, flavorings, colorings spring to mind here), this is also not quite so simple for various reasons, some of which I hope to address today.

The opening dapim of this chapter contain some of the most important principles pertaining to kashrut in general, and chametz in particular, namely the rules regarding the halachik treatment of mixtures containing both permitted and forbidden foods. When a mixture contains both chametz and non-chametz material, for example, it is important to determine whether the mixture is defined based on its forbidden (chametz) ingredients or based on its permitted ingredients (non-chametz.) One of the rules used to define the status of such a mixture is the biblical rule of בטול ברוב - a minority of either permitted or forbidden ingredients is nullified by the majority with opposite status, and the mixture takes on the status of its majority ingredients.

However, there are times, either on a biblical or rabbinical level, where even a minority of forbidden ingredients can impart its forbidden status to the entire mixture, and though this can apply in all areas of halacha, chametz on Pesach is one of the areas where we are most stringent in this regard. The opening Mishna of the chapter lists various things that while forbidden and punishable on Pesach, are not subject to the extremely severe penalty of כרת .

Though there is some dispute amongst the Rishonim as to whether the Mishna is referring to a prohibition against eating these things or even against owning them, it seems to be agreed upon that the things listed therein can be divided into 2 categories:

1. תערובת חמץ גמור - a mixture containing fully fledged chametz
2. חמץ נוקשה - substances that have only partially fermented and are not fit for normal eating, but rather only for eating in an emergency.

The Bartenura explicitly states that the first 4 fit into the former category whereas the last 3 fit into the later category, and this grouping could be hinted at by the Gemara itself, which refers to "4

ברכות (63)	Jan 5 2020
שבת (156)	Mar 8 2020
עירובין (104)	Aug 11 2020
פסחים (120)	Nov 23 2020
שקלים (21)	Mar 23 2021
יומא (87)	Apr 13 2021
סוכה (65)	Jul 9 2021
ביצה (39)	Sep 2 2021
ראש השנה (34)	Oct 11 2021
תענית (30)	Nov 14 2021
הגלה (26)	Feb 11 2022
יבמות (121)	Mar 9 2022
כתובות (111)	Jul 8 2022
נדרים (90)	Oct 27 2022
נזיר (65)	Jan 25 2023
סוטה (48)	Mar 31 2023
גיטין (89)	May 18 2023
קידושין (81)	Aug 15 2023
בבא קמא (118)	Nov 4 2023
בבא מציעא (118)	Mar 1 2024
בבא בתרא (175)	Jun 27 2024
סנהדרין (112)	Dec 19 2024
מכות (23)	Apr 10 2025
שבועות (48)	May 3 2025
עבודה זרה (75)	Jun 20 2025
חוריות (13)	Sep 3 2025
זבחים (119)	Sep 16 2025
מנחות (109)	Jan 13 2026
מזילה (141)	Mar 2 2026
בבא מציעא (61)	Sep 20 2026
עירובין (33)	Nov 19 2026
תמורה (33)	Dec 26 2026
כריתות (27)	Jan 24 2027
תענית (36)	Feb 20 2027
גיטה (72)	Mar 28
SIYUM HASHAS	Jun 7 2027

states" and "3 professions", as well as later on daf 43. For our purposes, I wish to focus on the first category, and the four examples given by the Mishna:

1. כותח הבבלי (Babylonian 'kutach' [roughly translated as dip]) - the Gemara notes that this contains 3 unhealthy ingredients, namely נסיוני דחלבא (the fatty milky residue left over from cheese making), מלח (salt - according to Rashi specifically סדומית), and קומניצא דאומא (moldy bread)
2. שכר המדי (Median beer)- the Gemara notes that this contains barley water (what else it contains is not mentioned explicitly )
3. חומץ האדומי (Edomite vinegar)- the Gemara identifies this as wine vinegar that barley was added to in order to assist the fermentation process.
4. זיתום המצרי (Egyptian 'zeytun')- The Gemara says that this consists of one third barley, one third קורטמי (a kind of herb used among other things to treat impotence - see Gittin 70a) and one third salt.

In all four cases it appears that there is a significant minority of ingredients that contain chametz, and despite the usual rule of following the majority, the Gemara derives from כל מחמצת ("any leaven") that one is forbidden to eat such mixtures. The Gemara also notes that this stringency is not universally accepted but is the view of Rabbi Meir and/or Rabbi Eliezer (see debate between Rav Yehuda and Rav Nachman in this regard on daf 43a) - the chachamim hold that at least on a biblical level there is no such prohibition for such mixtures!

There are various possibilities regarding when and why this stringency would apply:

1. The moment a kezayis of the mixture is eaten בכדי אכילת פרס (in the time it takes to eat a loaf of bread - the usual period used for measuring a kezayis), seeing as we view the entire mixture as chametz.
2. Only if one eats a kezayis of the actual chametz contained within the mixture during the above period.
3. If the entire mixture contains the taste of the chametz, and a kezayis of the mixture is eaten within the above period.

The above are all discussed on the daf in the context of the principles of התר מצטרף לאסור and טעם כעיקר, an understanding of which is vital for any student of הלכות תערובות. The first principle, subject to debate, is that when it comes to certain prohibitions, when אסור (a prohibited substance) is eaten together with ריטה (a permitted substance), the permitted substance joins together with the prohibited one to make up the kezayis for which one is liable. It is thus possible to eat less than a kezayis of the actual אסור and still be liable.

The second principle tells us that if a permitted substance contains the taste of a forbidden substance (such as for a nazir - water in which grapes were soaked), even if there is an insignificant amount of the original forbidden substance in it, the entire substance is viewed as אסור.

Hopefully, we shall have more time to discuss these in the future - due to time limitations I have been forced to be brief of late, yet one can immediately see that it is important to be very sure what ingredients are contained in products that one buys, and that sometimes even miniscule amounts of non-kosher substances can

render the entire product non-kosher, in the case that they give taste to the mixture, and as we shall hopefully see in future discussions, under various other circumstances too.

As such, it seems clear that when it comes to relying on ingredients alone, even in a place where kosher certified products are not available, the layman should not make these decisions himself, but should seek guidance from the kind of experts mentioned above, who are well-versed both in the theoretical and practical matters required to make such decisions.

These posts are intended to raise issues and stimulate further research and discussion on contemporary topics related to the daf. They are not intended as psak halacha.

In loving memory of my dear father, Moreinu haRav Avraham Benzion ben Azriel Hertz Isaacson zt'l, whose love of Torah, passion for justice, and acts of kindness inspire everything I do.  
www.yoniisaacson.com

## BACK TO THE MAKOR..... ANALYSIS OF PASUKIM IN THE DAF

THANKS DI GITTEL KUCHAR

Could you imagine a Pesach without matzah? When the biblical text describes the obligation to eat matza, it speaks of guarding the matzot, which is the focus of daf 40 in Masechet Pesachim. The Hebrew phrase for guarding is "shmirah" from which we derive the term "shmurah matza."

But a closer look at the verse that circumscribes the daf indicates that a secondary reading is also possible. Exodus 12:17 reads

ושמרתם את המצות כי בעצם היום הזה הוצאתי את צבאותיכם מארץ מצרים ושמרתם את היום הזה לדרתיכם חקת עולם

You shall observe the [Feast of] Unleavened Bread, for on this very day I brought your ranks out of the land of Egypt; you shall observe this day throughout the ages as an institution for all time.

The similarities in letters מצות, מצוות is striking.

Personally speaking, the commandment for me to eat matza stands, to some extent, in opposition to my commandment to observe the mitzvot. Diagnosed with Coeliac Disease some 38 years ago I could no longer eat matzah. While preparing our home for pesach, the sense of guilt when removing the hametz but not being able to fulfil the mitzvah of matza was overwhelming.

But I found reassurance by connecting the verse of שמרתם את המצות to another verse which speaks about protection. In sefer Dvarim, the bible uses the same phrase about protecting ones health, and passing our tradition to future generations.

It reads in ספר דברים פרק ד פסוק ט

Deuteronomy 4:9

רק השמר לך ושמר נפשך מאד פן תשכח את הדברים אשר ראו עיניך ופן יסורו מלבבך כל ימי חיך והודעתם לבניך ולבני בניך

But take utmost care and watch yourselves scrupulously, so that you do not forget the things that you saw with your own eyes and so that they do not fade from your mind as long as you live. And make them known to your children and to your children's children:

The Rambam explains that if fulfilling a commandment is in dissonance with protecting your health and well being one is exempted by the positive Mitzvah as it is in violation of “guarding your soul”. The coeliac - in many cases - is therefore not even obligated to perform the mitzvah of matzah, if to do so threatens one’s health. Therefore it seems obvious to me that the pasuk. “ושמרתם את המצות” has the duality of keeping the mitzvot generally and particularly matzah out by guarding our souls.

But shmirah or “guarding” as the Talmud understands it, is about all about speed, as we have to protect the dough from leavening. For me, this adds another dimension to the biblical verses. Just as matza can be spoiled by delaying and allowing moisture to leaven the grain, one should never delay the fulfillment and performance of a mitzvah. Seizing the opportunity to help speedily ensures comfort, safety, and sustenance to our fellow as the urgency arises. Don't delay or miss an opportunity. A moment later may be too late.

As a teacher, I feel a particular closeness to the mitzvot of the seder. The aspect of education, not only of the Exodus but of the totality of our tradition, which is so central to the seder, is accentuated through my interactions with my students. In the end, all of us are teachers, and engaged in the guarding of our tradition and its perpetuation.

Each person, whatever they are able to guard and share, should take advantage of the opportunities they have. What I've come to understand is that even a pesach without matza is an educational opportunity to understand the deeper meaning of the mitzvot and to amplify my experience of Jewish tradition.

THURSDAY 31 DECEMBER

פסחים מ

THANKS HADRAN - JULIE MELDENSOHN - CHAMETZ, SHATNEZ AND GOING AROUND THE VINEYARD

On Pesachim Daf 40, some interesting discussions of real life scenarios show us the extent to which we must consider our actions and their possible consequences. There was a boat carrying wheat, and it capsized in the river.

The concern is that the wheat is now potentially going to leaven due to contact with water. Rava proposed that one could sell this wheat to gentiles, but not to Jews. But then Rabba bar Levai objected, showing that Rava holds more stringently in a comparable case of a garment that might be shatnez. Basically, a linen string gets lost while weaving a wool garment so the status of the garment (like the wheat) is unclear. In that case, Rava does not permit one to sell the garment even to a non-Jew or make it into a saddlecloth for a donkey.

The fear is that the gentile might at some point resell this material to a Jew. Rava does allow one to use the potentially compromised fabric to cover a dead body, believing that no one will remove the shroud from a dead body out of respect. In light of the valid concern that the gentile will later sell the grains from the boat to a Jew, Rava changes his mind and permits the merchant to sell only small quantities of the grain quickly to different Jews who will most likely use it before Passover. Interestingly, it does not say in the text of the Gemara that the merchant has to inform the buyers that the product is possibly chametz.

However according to a note in the Koren Steinsaltz Talmud, the

later commentators do hotly debate this issue. I think I certainly would want to know!

Rava, who on this same page holds that the grains for matza must be watched from the time of harvesting, challenges us to think several steps beyond our immediate actions. While it may be easier or more convenient to assume that nothing will happen if we do something “borderline”, we should try to follow our actions to their logical ends. Just a few lines later, in another discussion about soaking grains in vinegar, Ulla insists on being very stringent to avoid any possible consumption of chametz.

He quotes, “Go around, go around and do not approach the vineyard, they say to the Nazirite.” Because a Nazirite is not supposed to drink wine or eat grapes, it is best for him to avoid the vineyard altogether. Many times we have the opportunity to put one more step in between a person and something that they should not do...whether it is stopping yourself from eating the whole box of cookies or protecting children from negative influences.

Of course, there is a limit to what we need to anticipate (for example, stealing clothes from a dead body). But there may be room to act a bit more like Rava’s very careful mother and keep our eye on things.

FRIDAY 1 JANUARY

THANKS RUSSEL LEVY

פסחים מא

Our daf introduces many chakiroth, or distinctions between cases that may, on the surface, seem similar, but because of different underlying principles, the halacha is different.

One is the definition of cooking, and the prohibition of doing so for the Korban Pesach, and Shabbat. On Shabbat, it is forbidden from cooking meat (even boiled in water), and it is forbidden to eat a Korban Pesach cooked in water (boiled) - it must be grilled.

Since both eating a Korban Pesach boiled in water and boiling meat in water on Shabbat are both forbidden, Rav Chisda taught that there is an exception to these rules, namely a case where cooking on Shabbat may be permitted according to Torah law, but the same meat would be forbidden from being eaten as the Korban Pesach: cooking it in a natural hot spring, such as those near Tiberius. The meat, since it was not cooked via the heat of a fire or something heated up by fire would be permitted to be eaten on Shabbat; however, since it is cooked, it would be forbidden to be eaten as a Korban Pesach.

The Rishonim and Acharonim give many reasons for the distinctions. We will discuss one, due to lack of space. Others who discuss this are R' Elchanan Wasserman in Kovetz Shiurim, the Sochachover Rebbe in the Eglei Tal, R' Moshe Feinstein in Igrot Moshe, and R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach in Minchat Shlomo.

The Mabit explains that the prohibition from cooking on Shabbat is derived from the work done in the Mishkan. Since any meat cooked in the Mishkan was done using fire, heat derived from another source (natural springs, or the sun) would not be problematic on a Torah level with regards to cooking. On the other hand, the Korban Pesach is prohibited to be eaten if it is in a state of cooked, which the food would attain no matter what the heat source. According to the Mabit, the prohibition on Shabbat is inherent from the process,

whereas the prohibition on Pesach is inherent in the object itself.

SHABBAT 2 JANUARY

## פסחים מב

THANKS TO ELI YOUNGER

We start the new perek with a Mishna telling us which items are forbidden to own on Pesach - based on the biblical prohibition of baal year'eh and bal yematza.

The Mishna then lists various lesser forms of chametz, known as mixtures of chametz (taaroves chametz) and chametz that is unpleasant (nuksheh).

Amongst the items listed is beer: beer contains barley, which is one of the five grains that can cause chimutz, so ultimately it is a chametz issue. Rav Rosner refers to a Gemara in Brachot where it says that the 5 grains that require a mezonot bracha cannot be batul, so if they are mixed into another food they still require the mezonot bracha.

The question is raised by Tosfot: So why do we not make a mezonot on beer?

Three answers are given:

1) there is no actual barley substance in the beer, there is only a flavour, and this follows those that hold that the flavour of something does not create the bracha requirement (ta'am k'ikkar).

2) It is not the primary use of barley - barley is ultimately used to bake bread with. In its various stages before the end product it commands different brachot - if we eat it raw it is ha'adama, if we eat the flour it would be sh'hakol, if we eventually bake with it we would make mezonot. So too here, whilst it is in beer it is shehakol.

The 3rd answer is a blanket rule that all drinks are shehakol (except for wine etc). Irrespective of what the drink is, you always make shehakol. This rule is relevant for a machloket when you have items such as Tropicana, using oranges which are grown specifically for orange juice production - a minority hold you would make ha'etz. But we generally pasken against this and hold that it is shehakol because it is now a drink. This does not necessarily extend to soup.

SUNDAY 3 JANUARY

## פסחים מג

THANKS BENNY LAST

Can women eat chametz on Pesach ?

A strange question one might think, but from today's daf, it appears not to be completely off the wall. The Mishna on yesterday's daf listed items that were food or drink that contained chametz mixed with non-chametz, and other items that contained chametz but were inedible. The Mishna concluded by saying that these items were prohibited just like regular chametz, BUT one would not receive the prescribed punishment of Karet. Our daf enquires who the Tanna of our Mishna might be.

The second suggestion our Gemara proposes, in the name of Rav Nachman, is that our Mishna follows Rabbi Eliezer, who said in a Braita that "for eating regular chametz, one is punishable by Karet, but for eating a mixture, one has transgressed, but is not punished with Karet", just like our Mishna (he Gemara deals with the issue that the Braita does not mention inedible items containing chametz, which is part of the Mishna).

The Gemara then asks, how does Rabbi Eliezer actually know that eating (or indeed owning) a mixture with chametz is a Biblical prohibition?

The Gemara again suggests two answers, but as it discards the first, we will focus on the second. The possuk in Shemot 12:20 says, "Anything that has been leavened, you shall not eat." The word

anything (kol) is used to include something extra, and that is, according to Rabbi Eliezer, food mixtures which contain some chametz (even if the chametz is indistinguishable). However, the Gemara queries this answer, referring to the previous possuk 12:19 which says, "For anyone who eats something that has been leavened shall be cut off."

Here too the work kol is used, which would also include something extra, and the possuk continues by stating the punishment of Karet. This suggests that the extra item, chametz in a mixture, is indeed punished by Karet, which is not what Rabbi Eliezer is saying. The Gemara answers that when the word kol is used in 12:19, it comes to include something different, it comes to include 'women'. The Gemara then asks, but why would you think women would not be included in this prohibition?

After all, we have learnt a possuk in Bamidbar 5:6, 'when a man or a woman will commit any of the sins...' and Rav Yehuda says we learn from here that men and women are the same regarding all punishments (and their relevant prohibitions). Says the Gemara, we have a special rule that women are not obligated in positive commandments that have a time limit. Now, in Devarim 15:3 it states, "You shall not eat chametz (with the Korban Pesach), for seven days you shall eat with it matzot." The fact that both the prohibition not to eat chametz, and the commandment to eat matzot for seven days are next to each other in the same possuk shows that they are linked.

Therefore, one might conclude that if one part of the possuk, the obligation to eat for seven days, does not apply to a particular group (ie women), then maybe the other half, the prohibition to eat chametz, also doesn't apply. That's why we do indeed need the word KOL to teach us to include women, and the conclusion, unsurprisingly, is that women are fully included in the positive commandments, the prohibitions and the respective punishments.

MONDAY 4 JANUARY

## פסחים מד

THANKS GASTON GRAUSZ

כזית כדי אכילת פרס הגמרא ממשכה לעסוק במאכלים המוזכרים במשנה הפותחת את הפרק, שאסור לאוכלם בפסח אך אין חייבים עליהם כרת. חלק מן המאכלים מכילים תערובת חמץ, ובעקבות זאת עוסקת הגמרא בדיון "כזית בכדי אכילת פרס", כלומר תערובת ששיעור האיסור בה גדול מספיק כדי שתערובת שהתנפחה מכילה כזית איסור. הגמרא מביאה דעות שונות בעניין זה, יש הבדל לעניין חיוב מלקות בין איסור שנתערב בשיעור כזית בכדי אכילת פרס לאיסור שנתערב בשיעור קטן יותר. שיעור כזית בכדי אכילת פרס מוכר לנו מהלכות נוספות הקשורות בפסח, כגון אכילת מצה בלילה הראשון, שבה יש לאכול כזית מצה בשיעור הזמן המספיק לאכילת פרס. ההבנה המסתברת היא שיש לקשר זאת להגדרתו של מעשה האכילה - אכילה איטית יותר מאבדת את הגדרתה כמעשה אחד, ונמצא שהאדם לא אכל כזית שלם אלא כחצי זית ולאחר זמן עוד כחצי זית. לכאורה אפשר היה להסביר כך גם בסוגייתנו - כאשר האיסור מעורב בכמות גדולה של היתר האדם האוכל את התערובת אינו יכול לאכול כזית בכדי אכילת פרס, וממילא הוא לא יוכל להתחייב על אכילה זו. על פי הבנה זו יש מקום לחייב גם אדם שאכל תערובת של פחות מכזית בכדי אכילת פרס, אם האכילה נעשתה במהירות, ובפועל הוא אכל שיעור כזית מן האיסור בזמן של פחות מכדי אכילת פרס. אך אפשר להעלות הבנה שונה, מדף קודם, הראשונים נחלקו בפירוש הביטוי "עוברין" המוזכר במשנתנו ובשאלה אם הוא מלמד שהמאכלים

המוזכרים במשנה כלולים באיסור 'בל יראה' או שיש בהם רק איסור אכילה. מדברי הרמב"ם (חמץ ומצה ד, ח) נראה שהוא פסק שאכן איסור 'בל יראה' נוהג גם בתערובת חמץ: "תערובת חמץ עוברין עליה משום בל יראה ובל ימצא, כגון המוריס וכותח הבבלי ושכר המדי שעושין אותו מן הקמח וכל כיוצא באלו מדברים הנאכלים". מפרשי הרמב"ם נחלקו: יש שפירשו שדבריו של הרמב"ם נאמרו רק ביחס לתערובת המכילה כזית חמץ בכדי אכילת פרס, אך תערובת דלילה יותר אינה אסורה באיסור בל יראה. לעומתם, יש שסברו שדין כזית בכדי אכילת פרס כלל אינו שייך ביחס לדין בל יראה, שהרי כל עיקרו של דין כזית בכדי אכילת פרס מבוסס על פגם בהגדרת האכילה, אך לגבי דין בל יראה אין צורך במעשה אכילה, ודי בכך שיהיה ברשות האדם כזית חמץ, יהא חלקו בתערובת אשר יהא.

that while כעיקר טעם is Biblically prohibited, one would only be liable to lashes if there was the volume of an olive that could be consumed within three minutes. Any less than that would not trigger lashes as there would be sufficient "quality taste".

WEDNESDAY 6 JANUARY

פסחים מו

THANKS TO DR YARDAENA OSBAND - TALKING TALMUD PODCAST

The Mishna on this daf discussed the case of separating impure challah on Pesach:

כיצד מפרישין חלה בטמאה ביום טוב, רבי אליעזר אומר, לא תקרא לה שם עד שתאפה. רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר, תטיל בצון. אמר רבי יהושע, לא זה הוא חמץ שמזהרים עליו בבל יראה ובבל ימצא, אלא מפרשתה ומנחתה עד הערב, ואם החמיצה, החמיצה:

"How do they separate challah on the festival [from dough which is] in [a state of] uncleanness? Rabbi Eliezer says: She should not call it [challah] until it is baked. Rabbi Judah ben Batera says: She should put [the dough] into cold water. Rabbi Joshua said: This is not the chametz concerning which we are warned with, 'It shall not be seen' and 'It shall not be found'. Rather she separates it and leaves it until the evening, and if it ferments it ferments."

This Mishna discusses a complex halakhic scenario where challah (the dough that needs to be separated to be given to the kohanim) needs to be separated on Pesach from impure dough. Since the dough is impure it cannot be eaten but the kohen can still use it for fuel (similar to tamei terumah). Usually, when there is dough that needs challah separated from it, the portion for challah is separated and set aside. However, on Pesach there is a concern that if the dough is set aside, it will leaven and become chametz.

The Mishna provides three solutions to this problem by Rabbi Eliezer, Ben Beitara, and Rabbi Yehoshua. The Gemara looks to understand the machloket between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua.

The Gemara explains that the source of this disagreement is around the halakhic principal of הוּאִיל, which literally means since. הוּאִיל allows that a set of circumstances may change and a possible future scenario needs to be considered when determining the final halakha. הוּאִיל allows for flexibility: it acknowledges that circumstances may change and that change needs to be considered.

On this daf, Rabbi Eliezer invokes הוּאִיל: Since the owner of the dough can revoke the challah status in the future it shows that the owner of the dough still retains some ownership of the challah and therefore challah should be separated at a later time when it can no longer become chametz because the owner still maintains some rights to the dough.

The Gemara continues its examination of הוּאִיל by sharing the machloket between Rav Chisda (who does not hold הוּאִיל) and Rabbah (who holds הוּאִיל). The concept הוּאִיל maintains that circumstances can change and the possibility of that change in the future can impact the halakha.

TUESDAY 5 JANUARY

THANKS TO DAVID GROSS

פסחים מה

Our Daf piggybacks onto the dispute as to whether chametz in a mixture constitutes a prohibition or not, and opens with the denouement of some of the foundational disputes in the Talmud regarding kashrut. We shall spend this slot expanding upon the subject of בעיקר טעם, i.e. whether the taste of something is equivalent to its actual constitution. Our Gemara wants to ascertain the source for this halacha. The Rabbis hold that טעם כעיקר finds its source from לא ישתה וכל משרת יין לא ישתה, whereas Rabbi Akiva is of the opinion that the source is found in the concept of גיעולי נכרים - that one has to kasher utensils that belonged to a non-Jew.

The Meiri writes that טעם כעיקר expresses itself in two modes:

1) טעמו וממשו - when a forbidden food falls into a permitted mixture and is entirely absorbed into the food, and the taste of the prohibited food is recognizable, then eating the mixture would constitute a transgression of Torah prohibition, provided that the amount of prohibited food was at least the volume of an olive which could be consumed in (depending on the posek) three minutes.

2) טעמו ולא ממשו - when only the taste of a prohibited food was absorbed into a permitted mixture - the classic case is from the sides of a pot, and is the subject of a wide-ranging dispute as to whether the prohibition is mandated rabbinically or by the Torah even to the point that Rabbeinu Tam holds that there is no dispute that it is a Torah law, but rather what its source is.

There are four basic approaches in the Rishonim:

a) Rashi, the Ran, the Ra'avad, the Ritva and the Ramban all hold that טעם כעיקר is rabbinically mandated and one would not be liable to lashes if one consumed such a mixture.

b) As mentioned above, Rabbeinu Tam holds that it is a Torah law, as does the Rosh and the Rashba, and that one would receive lashes for consuming such a mixture.

c) One of the more famous Ba'alei HaTosfot, Rav Ya'akov of Orleans, holds like Rabbi Akiva that the transgression of טעם כעיקר comes from גיעולי נכרים, but that one would not receive lashes as it is a positive commandment to kasher vessels previously owned by non-Jews.

d) Others of the Ba'alei HaTosfot, such as the Ba'al HaMa'or, hold