

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לעילוי נשמת צבי בן יחזקאל יוסף גרין, מחסידי דעעש
 From the Grin family, Sao Paulo, Brazil

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Combining permitted and prohibited (cont.)

Zeiri adds to R' Yochanan's statement (regarding cases when permitted and prohibited items combine to compose a violation) the prohibition against burning chometz on the altar.

The Gemara wonders why Zeiri did not also mention the case of eating chometz.

The reason Zeiri emphasized the case of burning chometz is explained.

Abaye challenges the earlier quote of R' Yochanan that it is only concerning nazir prohibitions that permitted and prohibited items combine when R' Yochanan is cited as giving a similar ruling even with regards to teruma.

R' Dimi answers Abaye's challenge.

The exchange between Abaye and R' Dimi is recorded.

Abaye challenges R' Dimi's assertion that if a person consumes an olive's volume worth of prohibited food within כדי אכילת פרס he has violated a Biblical prohibition.

R' Dimi responds to the challenge.

Abaye presents another challenge to R' Dimi's position. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the dispute between Abaye and Zeiri?

2. When does the touch of a tevul yom disqualify an entire porridge even though only some of the ingredients are teruma?

3. Is eating in an abnormal fashion considered eating?

4. Explain the principle of "שאני אומר".

Distinctive INSIGHT

The mixture of food and spice which is touched by a טבול יום המקפה של חולין והשום והשמן של תרומה ונגע טבול יום במקצתן לא פסל אלא מקום מגעו

Rabbi Yochanan said that in dealing with foods that the Torah prohibits, the permitted elements of a mixture do not blend and add to the volume of the prohibited food—אין היתר מצטרף לאיסור. A discussion ensued among the Amoraim in regard to a law found in a Mishnah (T'vul Yom 2:3): "A thick, cooked mixture of חולין had garlic and oil of teruma added as spices. If a person who was a second-degree tamei (טבול יום) comes in contact with a spot on the mixture, that spot alone is tamei." The Gemara detects that only teruma is susceptible to becoming tamei if touched by a טבול יום, and we would have expected the small amounts of teruma to have been considered void in the larger volume of חולין mixture. Regarding this halacha, Rabbi Yochanan explains that the reason the teruma maintains its integrity is that a non-kohen who might eat an olive-size amount of it would be liable for lashes for eating teruma. Abaye concludes by noting that a כזית of this mixture does not have within it a כזית of teruma, but yet, lashes are meted out. It must be, therefore, that the permitted חולין combines with the prohibited teruma to make the entire mixture a prohibited substance, and Rabbi Yochanan's premise is shown to be wrong.

Rashi (to Pesachim 44a) explains that the garlic and oil of teruma in this case are dissolved and no longer intact. He determines this from analyzing the earlier case in the Mishnah where the mixture is primarily teruma, and the spices are חולין. In that case, the entire mixture is treated as teruma and it becomes tamei when the טבול יום touches a spot, since the חולין spices are dissolved and nullified in the teruma mixture. In the second case, where the mixture is primarily חולין, only the spot which was touched is tamei, but the mixture as a whole is judged as חולין and is not susceptible to the tumah of a טבול יום.

Rabeinu Tam learns that the teruma garlic and oil is spread throughout the mixture, and the pieces are intact and recognizable. In the first case in the Mishnah, where the mixture is mostly teruma, even when the חולין spices are touched, they are considered extensions of the mixture at large (ידות), resulting in the entire mixture being tamei. In the second case, where the mixture is basically חולין, the teruma pieces of spice which are touched directly become tamei, but there is no connection between the ones which are touched and the other pieces throughout the mixture. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

The Beracha Acharonah for coffee and tea

הנח לכותח הבבלי דליכא כזית בכדי אכילת פרס

Put aside the case of kutach habavli since an olive's volume is not consumed within the time it takes to eat a peras

The Gemara explains that since kutach habavli is very sharp and people generally do not eat an olive's volume within the time span of **כדי אכילת פרס**, a person who eats kutach habavli in the normal fashion will not violate the Biblical prohibition against eating chometz. This matter has relevance for the question of whether one should make a beracha acharonah after drinking a hot liquid. Some Poskim¹ maintain that a beracha acharonah is required even though people do not drink a revi'is of the hot liquid within the time span it takes to drink a revi'is since for hot liquids it is common to take a longer period of time to finish. Therefore the time frame to finish drinking hot liquids will be measured by the normal time span it takes to finish drinking a revi'is of hot liquids. Others² disagree and assert that the time span allotted to finish drinking a liquid is uniform and does not change

according to the individual liquid. Proof to this assertion is our Gemara that teaches the amount of time for consuming food to be required to make a beracha acharonah remains fixed and does not adjust for sharp foods, so too the measure for liquids will be fixed and will not adjust for different liquids.

Mishnah Berurah³ writes that there is a dispute whether one should recite a beracha acharonah after drinking hot coffee or tea and the common custom is to not recite a beracha. Meticulous people, however, leave a revi'is of tea or coffee to cool down so that it could be drunk at once to generate an obligation to recite a beracha acharonah. Birkei Yosef⁴ cites opinions who question the validity of this practice based on our Gemara. Our Gemara teaches that eating a food in an unusual fashion is not considered eating. Similarly, it is considered unusual to drink coffee or tea after it has cooled down and thus it is not considered "drinking" that would generate a beracha acharonah. ■

1. שו"ת מהר"ם שיק או"ח סי' פ"ה ממנהג רבו החת"ס.
2. ע' משנה למלך פ"ג מהל' ברכות הי"ב.
3. מ"ב סי' ר"י סק"א.
4. ברכי יוסף או"ח סי' ר"ד סק"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Question of Chametz

"אי הכי לענן חמץ נמי..."

Today's daf discusses the parameters of forbidden chometz on Pesach.

Rav Shoshan was a very wealthy merchant who owned a large grain store in the middle of the open market of Djerba, Tunisia. After he passed away, the Sharei Tzion, zt"l, his only son, inherited the store. One year as Pesach approached, the Sha'arei Tzion sold the chometz of his store to a friendly non-Jew. The buyer studied the contract carefully and decided that if he were to sell the expensive products of the store, there

was nothing the Sha'arei Tzion could do to him in court.

When the Sha'arei Tzion heard that the buyer was selling chometz out of his shop, he rushed to verify the rumor. The moment he saw it was true he confronted the man. "How dare you sell my property?" he demanded.

"What do you mean? I am merely selling what you sold me," replied the non-Jew nonchalantly.

After Pesach, the Sha'arei Tzion summoned the non-Jew to the local court, where the man made the same claim to the gentile judge as he had to the Sha'arei Tzion.

"How do you propose to answer his claim?" asked the judge.

The Sha'arei Tzion responded, "I

have a grain shop. Although it is true that I sold him the chometz in it, who told him that what he is selling is chometz? Only leaven is genuine chometz. Even matzah is made of unleavened grains—the fact of the merchandise being grain does not necessarily mean that it is leaven. It is more than likely that my shop contains no actual chometz at all. I merely sold it to him to ensure that if some of the grain had inadvertently become leavened, I would not transgress the prohibition of owning chometz for the week of the festival. How dare he sell my property without permission?"

The judge ordered the gentile to pay for every bit of grain sold! ■

