

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Handles (cont.)

A third version of the discussion between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish is cited.

R' Yochanan unsuccessfully challenges Reish Lakish's position.

### 2) Gravy

Rava and Abaye dispute the intent of the Mishnah's reference to gravy.

Abaye's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 3) Sediment

Rabbah and R' Pappa dispute the intent of the Mishnah's reference to sediment.

### 4) Foods that liquefied

A Mishnah rules that one is liable for consuming liquefied cheilev.

Reish Lakish explains why there is liability.

A Baraisa is cited that discusses liability for consuming liquefied grain on Pesach and again Reish Lakish explains why there is liability.

Another Baraisa discusses liability for consuming liquefied neveilah and again Reish Lakish explains why there is liability.

The reason why one is not liable if the neveilah liquefied from the sun is explained.

The necessity for each of these expositions is explained.

Another Baraisa teaches that one is liable for consuming liquefied sheretz.

The reason this last teaching is necessary is explained.

Another Baraisa discusses other cases in which a liquefied food is treated the same as solid food.

The Gemara explains that these new cases are derived from the halacha of bikkurim.

It is decided that bikkurim cannot serve as the source for the other halachos and it is suggested that the halacha could be derived from terumah.

The use of terumah as the source for these halachos is also refuted.

It is suggested that these other cases are derived from a combination of terumah and bikkurim but this is also refuted.

The conclusion is that the other cases are derived from terumah or bikkurim and one of the original four cases.

The Gemara cites a number of Mishnayos and explains each one in light of the different opinions and sources regarding liquefied foods. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The technical fulfillment of "eating" when drinking liquefied solids*

לחם עוני אמר רחמנא והאי לאו לחם עוני הוא

Our Gemara discusses the halacha of eating an item which is a solid in its natural state, but where the person imbibes it when it is liquefied. Three examples are given: drinking liquefied cheilev, drinking liquefied chametz on Pesach, and drinking a liquefied neveilah of a kosher bird, and its ability to cause the one who drinks it to become tamei. In each case, the Gemara points out that in order to have violated the prohibition one has to "eat" the forbidden product, and drinking a liquefied form of what is naturally a solid is not a legal form of eating. Why, then, should he be liable?

Reish Lakish answers that one is fully liable and accountable for the consequences of consuming the liquefied forbidden product, and the reason is that the word "נפש—a soul" appears in the context of each topic (cheilev in Vayikra 7:25; chometz in Shemos 12:15; and neveilah of a kosher bird in Vayikra 17:15).

In this discussion, the Gemara also noted that if one eats matzah for the mitzvah, but he consumes it in a liquid form, he has not fulfilled his obligation. The reason is that the Torah says that matzah must be "לחם עוני – bread of affliction," and when drinking liquefied matzah one is not considered to have eaten bread.

Toras Chaim notes that the Gemara does not say that drinking liquefied matzah fails the test of "eating," as was pointed out in regard to the three forbidden foods, but rather that drinking is not considered to be consuming bread. The explanation for this is that in regard to forbidden foods, when the Torah prohibits their consumption, this means that one is liable only when he ingests the item as it is normally eaten. This is the only time one derives full benefit from the item. But, for example, where one liquefies cheilev, it becomes down-graded and somewhat ruined, and consuming it in this state is not included in the Torah's law not to eat it. Nevertheless, in each case listed in our Gemara, Reish Lakish found that the word "nefesh—soul" appears, in order to forbid consuming these items in liquefied form.

Toras Chaim explains that as opposed to the three cases of eating forbidden foods, the mitzvah of eating matzah is not a function of benefitting from the nutritious aspect of the matzah, and it is not designed for one's enjoyment. Here, had it not been for the Torah's requirement to eat "bread," the mitzvah "to eat" matzah would have been adequately fulfilled with drinking a liquefied form of matzah. This is why the Gemara did not address the lack of fulfillment of "eating" in regard to matzah, and, instead, it only referred to the requirement to eat "לחם עוני – bread of affliction". ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By the Okner family  
In memory of their grandfather  
Dr. Peter Harry Okner  
ר' פנחס הערש בן ר' שמואל, ע"ה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Eating matzah in an abnormal manner

המחנה וגמעו ... אם מצה היא וכו'

If he dissolved it and swallowed it ... if it was matzah etc.

Mishnah LaMelech<sup>1</sup> contends that just as someone who eats a prohibited food in an abnormal fashion does not violate the Biblical prohibition against eating that food, so too, when eating a food for a mitzvah if it is eaten in an abnormal manner one does not fulfill that mitzvah. For example, if one mixed a bitter substance with his matzah and ate it, the mitzvah would not be fulfilled. He does not draw a definitive conclusion of the matter since he did not find earlier authorities address the matter. Kesav Sofer<sup>2</sup> agreed with Mishnah LaMelech's position and wrote at great length proving that when eating to fulfill a mitzvah the eating must be performed in the normal manner of eating. He expresses uncertainty, however, regarding eating maror. Since the Torah does not use the term אכילה – eating – in reference to maror it may be that one could fulfill the mitzvah of eating maror in an abnormal manner.

Toras Chaim<sup>3</sup> disagrees and argues that one does fulfill the mitzvah if he ate the food in an abnormal manner. He explains that eating in an abnormal manner is considered eating, it is just that the Torah does not hold one accountable for eating if that eating was not pleasurable. This exemption is lim-

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the Mishnah's definition of רוטב?

---

2. Why does the Torah teach in three cases that one is liable for drinking a liquefied food?

---

3. What are the unique characteristics of bikkurim?

---

4. Explain דון מינה ואוקי באתרה

---

ited to liability for eating a prohibited food. Positive commands that are fulfilled by eating may even be done in an abnormal manner of eating since mitzvos were not given for our pleasure. He proves his contention correct from our Gemara that rules that one does not fulfill the mitzvah of matzah if it was dissolved in water before it was consumed. The reason given is that dissolved matzah does not fulfill the requirement for "bread of affliction." Why does the Gemara have to invoke the issue of "bread of affliction" when seemingly it could have explained that this is not the normal manner of eating? It must be that even eating in an abnormal manner is considered eating and for that reason it was necessary for the Gemara to introduce a new explanation, namely, "bread of affliction." ■

1. משנה למלך פ"ה מהלי יסודי התורה הי"ח ד"ה יש לחקר.
2. שו"ת כתב סופר או"ח סי' צ"ו אות ב' ויו"ד סי' י"ח.
3. תורת חיים לסוגייתנו. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Fruit and Its Produce

תירוש וצהר אין מידי אחרונה לא

Eating a variety of foods on Pesach can be a bit challenging for those who do not eat kitniyos. In certain families, the festival can sometimes feel like an endless flow of heavy protein, oil, matzah—with potatoes as the perpetual accompaniment. When one family wished to use sesame oil for variety, they wondered if this was permitted. After all, sesame is definitely a form of kitniyos.

When they asked the Kli Chemdah, zt"l, about this, he permitted using sesame oil on Pesach. "This is clear from the sugya in Chullin 120. There we find the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua that liquids

which emerge from most fruits and the like are not likened to the fruit itself. Since the halachah follows this opinion, it seems clear that the decree against using sesame and other kitniyos does not apply to oil extracted from them."

But when the author of Chavalim B'neimim, zt"l, heard this, he strongly objected. "Your statement that the oil extracted from kitniyos is permitted contradicts the Rema on this matter in Darchei Moshe. He explicitly writes that it is permitted to use oil of kitniyos for lamps on the table on Pesach. It is clear from there that he never permits actually eating such oil on Pesach, only its use for lighting. The Maharil, zt"l, records that the pious Jews of Neustadt did not use this oil on Pesach since it is obviously kitniyos. This is clear from the Rema in Siman 464 as well. There we find that

mustard is forbidden even if it was mixed with wine before Pesach. Although the mustard is mixed with liquid it is still forbidden."

He concluded, "You might have claimed that there is some of the solid mustard left in the wine and it is this solid which is forbidden. But in Chullin 120 we see that such a mixture is not considered solid food at all. We find there that drinking melted fats—which certainly contain some solids—is considered drinking, not eating. We only know that drinking forbidden fats is prohibited because of a clear indication in a verse. We see, then, that the liquid which emerges from mustard is prohibited. And the same is true regarding sesame oil."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. שו"ת כבלים בנעימים, ח"א, סי' ז' ■