

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of ישראל צבי בן זאב גוטליב ז"ל

By the Weiss/Gotlib Families—London, England

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Combining permitted substances with prohibited substances (cont.)

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges Zeiri's statement that leaven on the mizbeach is another exception to the principle that in general permitted substances do not combine with prohibited substances.

R' Dimi repeated R' Yochanan's teaching and Abaye presented three unsuccessful challenges to this ruling.

2) Clarifying R' Yochanan's opinion

The Gemara questions how R' Yochanan could derive his conclusion from the word **משרת** when that word is needed for another drosha.

To answer this challenge the Gemara distinguishes between the view of Rabanan and the view of R' Akiva.

The views of Rabanan and R' Akiva are identified and explained.

R' Acha the son of R' Avya asked R' Ashi why, according to R' Yochanan, did R' Akiva not apply the principle that permitted foods combine with prohibited foods to all prohibitions. ■

REVIEW and Remember

- How much leaven must be burned on the mizbeach to create liability?
- Under what circumstances does halachah allow us to assume that ordinary grain fell into the pile of ordinary grain and that terumah grain fell into terumah grain?
- Explain: טעם כעיקר.
- At what point is an absorbed food assumed to impart a spoiled flavor?

Gemara GEM

A powerful taste makes a difference

משרת—ליתן טעם כעיקר

Reb Shlomo HaCohen of Radimsk, in his תפארת שלמה (Drasha on Shabbas HaGadol) speaks about Hashem's great compassion which He shows for the Jewish people in each generation. Even though our merits are diminished as compared to previous generations, Hashem looks upon us with favor, and He accepts our meager efforts willingly and with love. This approach is rooted in the Torah, where we find that even a small, trace amount of taste can make a difference. In earlier years, the mitzvos and the Torah of our people were notable both in substance and in impact. Their thoughts, their hearts and their actions all contributed to a significant service of Hashem. Now, after many punishing years in the exile, which is compared to darkness, our people continue to be dispersed, and it seems that all we can do is to contribute a "taste" of a true service of Hashem. Yet, Hashem lovingly allows us to partake of His Shechinah, which he casts upon us.

The verse in Mishlei (31:18) declares "She tastes that her merchandise is good, her candle does not go out at night." This refers to Hashem's glow remaining with us even in the darkness of the exile.

It is specifically on the festival of Pesach that we find the concept of a small morsel of chometz not being void, even when outnumbered and overshadowed. This reflects the hope that even if only a minute amount of merit remains with us, and even if it is not perceptible in substance or even in taste, we can still anticipate the great chessed of Hashem to shine upon us. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in honor of our father
Mr. Dov Berger, אהרון דב בן אפרים הלוי, on his birthday.
May he be זוכה to have many more years of learning.*

HALACHAH Highlight

Inedible chometz

כל נותן טעם לפגם מותר דגמרינן מנבילה

Anything which gives a repugnant taste is permitted as we learn out from neveilah.

There is a dispute amongst the Poskim about something whose taste is repugnant (i.e. which is not fit for human consumption¹) and subsequently becomes edible. The Chavos Daas² is lenient. His logic is that since it was repugnant, it lost its status of forbidden food and became relegated as "dust." When it subsequently becomes edible, it is as if dust became edible, and it is therefore permitted. Others say³ that if the food only lost its edibility for human consumption and subsequently became edible it would still be forbidden. However, if a food actually became unfit for consumption by a dog (and then became edible again) indeed they would concur with the Chavos Daas and the food would be permitted.

Minchas Yitzchak⁴ and others⁵ forbid it even in that case. R. Moshe Feinstein⁶ concurs with the Chavos Daas. According to him, gelatin made from skins⁷ which are no longer edible (e.g. made into shoes) are permitted, whereas gelatin made from non-kosher animal skins, neveilos, and treifos⁸ would be forbidden. ■

1. ובטעם שרק פגום קצב [שאינו אוסר כ"ז שאינו מרבה בכמות (ולרשב"א גם כשמרבה בכמות אבל בטל חד בתרי) וכמש"כ הר"ן בע"ז בדפי הרי"ף סוף ל"ב ע"א והובאו בשו"ע יו"ד ק"ג ס"א] ששוב הושבחו, ברמב"ם במאכ"א פט"ו הכ"ח ועוד, אסרוהו והפ"ח שם ס"ק א' אסרו אפילו כשעדיין פגום. וכו"פ ויד אברהם שם ס"ל שפר"ח רק כ"כ כשיודע שלבסוף ישבחו ויע"ש ש"ך וע"ה ש"ש ואכמ"ל
2. החות דעת בסימן ק"ג בביאורים א'
3. החלקת יואב והובא בשו"ת מנחת יצחק דלהלן
4. מנחת יצחק ח"ה סימן ה' אות י"ט, וע"ה ש"ח"א סין נ"ב ש"ז במנח"י
5. באג"מ ביו"ד ח"ב סימן ל"ז בד"ה והנכון
6. באג"מ שם בסוף סימן כ"ג
7. באג"מ שם בסוף סימן כ"ז. וכן בסוף סכ"ג בעורות כבשר ואפי' כשנעבדו, למסקנתו לא התירם ■

Gemara GEM

The Torah law and its rationale – טעם כעיקר

לכדתניא: משרת ליתן טעם כעיקר, שאם שרה ענבים במים ויש בהם טעם יין חייב

Rashba (to Chullin 99a), quoting from Ra'avad explains the rationale behind the rule that the taste of a prohibited food has the status of the food itself. When we have a permitted substance that absorbs the taste of a prohibited item, and the taste is discernable in that substance, the taste is considered as if the prohibited item is present. As the verse states (Iyov 12:11): "...as the palate tastes food." After all, the taste of a food is an essential aspect of its importance.

This reason may account for the fact that the taste has significance, and that we should not eat a permitted food which is "contaminated" with a taste of a prohibited substance. However, Rashi is of the opinion that the permitted food itself is now fully prohibited, and it is counted toward the volume of food which is prohibited. For example, if we

have one-half a k'zayis of kosher food which is mixed with one-half k'zayis of prohibited food, and the taste of the disallowed food is noticeable, Rashi holds that eating the one k'zayis is punishable. How does the taste of something transform its carrier into being fully prohibited?

R' Elchonon Wasserman, zt"l, in his קובץ שיעורים, suggests that perhaps the very reason a prohibited substance is not allowed to be eaten is not specifically due to its bulk, but rather due to its taste. For example, according to the opinion that holds that the גיד הנשה is a sinew that has no meat taste of its own, there would be no contribution of taste which it makes when mixed with other kosher foods, and it is merely prohibited on its own. Therefore, when we have the taste of a prohibited item mixed in with kosher food, and its taste permeates the entire blend, we, in fact, have a large quantity of איסור, and the entire bulk which has a prohibited taste is part of that איסור.

This would account for an explanation how this rule applies to foods which are prohibited to be eaten. And

this is the opinion of the ר"א and ר"ב. However, Rosh and Ran at the end of Avoda Zara are of the opinion that the rule of טעם כעיקר applies to items whose benefit is prohibited (איסורי הנאה).

The Gemara in Avoda Zara (87a) suggests that when we have a substance that only has the taste of איסור but the prohibited item itself is absent (Rashi explains that this refers to where we have only טעם) it is prohibited to eat it, but there are no lashes given. The Gemara in Chullin (98b) explains that this suggests that this rule is not a Torah rule, but it is only rabbinic.

Rabeinu Tam points out that Rashi's understanding leads us to a problem with the Gemara in Pesachim, where we have stated that this rule is a Torah law, and it is derived from the law of Nazir and the laws of utensils of a non-Jew which must be koshered.

Tosafos explains that the case in Avoda Zara is not one of טעם, which is דאורייתא, but rather where we do not have a full k'zayis within the volume of four eggs – אכילת פרס. This case is only prohibited מדרבנן. ■