

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Smell (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its explanation of how Abaye could explain that all Tannaim subscribe to his opinion.

2) Flavor imparted by a forbidden substance

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel states that the halacha follows our Mishnah that flavor imparted by a forbidden substance is prohibited only when the flavor is to one's benefit.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel qualifies the Mishnah's ruling regarding prohibited vinegar that falls onto split beans.

Reish Lakish adds a qualification to the principle that flavor imparted by a forbidden substance is permitted if it is not for one's benefit.

A second version of this qualification is recorded.

R' Avahu cites a related statement of R' Yochanan.

A detail of R' Yochanan's statement is clarified.

R' Kahana infers from the previous discussion that all opinions maintain that a prohibited substance that imparts a detrimental flavor is permitted.

Abaye notes that the wording of Reish Lakish indicates that he does not necessarily follow this opinion.

R' Kahana's statement implies that there are opinions that do not maintain that a prohibited substance that imparts a detrimental flavor is permitted and the Gemara begins to search for that opinion.

A Baraisa is cited that presents a dispute between R' Meir and R' Shimon.

The Gemara explains the rationale behind R' Meir's position and the subsequent exchange between R' Meir and R' Shimon.

The rationale behind R' Shimon's opinion is presented.

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the halacha when forbidden vinegar falls onto split beans?

2. What is the difference between the two versions of Reish Lakish's opinion regarding נותן טעם לפגם?

3. How do we know that there is a position that holds נותן טעם לפגם אסור?

4. What is the meaning of בת יומא?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The taste is equivalent to the essence—טעם כעיקר

טעמו ולא ממשו אסור ואין לוקין עליו

The Gemara brings two halachos of R' Yochanan regarding the laws of mixtures where the prohibited element ruins the taste of the blend. The second halacha is where the prohibited additive is no longer intact, and only its taste is still perceptible. For example if milk or prohibited fat (melted) falls into a pot of meat. In this case, the liquid becomes absorbed into the solid pieces of meat in the pot, and it is no longer visually noticeable, although its taste can still be detected. R' Yochanan rules that the food may not be eaten, but one who does eat it is not liable for lashes.

If the taste of the prohibited additive causes the taste of the mixture to be ruined, it is permitted. Rashba explains that the food in the pot is only permitted to be eaten provided that the permitted food is the majority of the mixture. In this case, the prohibited food is nullified due to its being outnumbered (בטל ברוב), and its taste is harmful. This is why it is permitted.

What is the principle of טעם כעיקר—the taste represents its essence? This means that just as it is prohibited to consume a prohibited item, so too it is prohibited to eat a permitted food that has the taste of a prohibited food mixed into it. For example, a pot of cooked vegetables which is cooked in a pot in which prohibited meat was previously cooked. The vegetables may not be eaten, even if the prohibited meat was already removed from the pot before the vegetables were added. The taste of the meat is present in the pot, and it is absorbed by the vegetables. The Ri-shonim discuss whether this concept is a Torah law (Tosafos, Pesachim 45a), or if it only rabbinic (Rashi, Chullin 98b).

Many Rishonim explain that the term "טעם כעיקר" used in the Mishnah is synonymous with "טעמו ולא ממשו" used in the Gemara.

What is the nature of this restriction? Some hold that once the permitted food becomes tainted with the taste of the prohibited food, the entire food transforms into being a large piece of forbidden food. Therefore, if someone would consume an olive's volume of this tainted food, it is not as if he has only consumed a small amount of the taste of the forbidden food which is mixed into the permitted food, but it is as if he has eaten a full olive's volume of for-

HALACHAH Highlight

Why there is no beracha on the Shabbos meals

וכך היו עושין בערבי שבתות בציפורי

And this is what they would do on Erev Shabbos in Tzipori

The Gemara relates that in the city of Tzipori there was a custom to eat a food made of beans and vinegar and it was called שחליים. This practice seems to support the statement of Shulchan Tahor¹ that one should make an effort to prepare a food made only for Shabbos, like kugel. Pesach Dvir² wonders why Chazal did not enact a beracha to be said when one eats the Shabbos meals. He answers his question with a comment of Avudraham³ regarding the four cups of wine at the Pesach Seder. Avudraham writes that Chazal only enacted a beracha on a mitzvah that is done all at once without interruption. Since the mitzvah of drinking the four cups of wine is performed at different points in the Seder and even if one were to drink them all at once the mitzvah would not be fulfilled, a beracha was not enacted. Similarly, the mitzvah of the Shabbos meals is spread out over the course of Shabbos and even if one were to eat all three meals at once the mitzvah would not be fulfilled. Therefore, Chazal did not enact a beracha to be recited.

Sdei Chemed⁴ questions the parallel drawn between the four cups of wine and the three Shabbos meals. The four cups of wine constitute one mitzvah and since drinking

(Insight...continued from page 1)

bidden food. Others say that the permitted food does not become one large mass of prohibited food, but it is prohibited to eat this food only due to the small taste of the prohibited food that is mixed into it. One would therefore only be liable if he consumed enough for the prohibited amount mixed in to add up to a full k'zayis.

Ra'aved explains the we do not use the rule of the majority nullifying the minority (ביטול), because the noticeable taste is present and, as such, cannot be nullified. ■

them at once does not fulfill the mitzvah Chazal did not enact a beracha to be recited. In contrast, each of the Shabbos meals represents a different mitzvah and as such Chazal could have enacted a beracha to be recited for each of the meals since it can be fulfilled at one time.

Sdei Chemed quotes others who explain that Chazal enacted berachos to be recited on those mitzvos where it is evident that the person's behavior is due to the command of Hashem. When a person eats a Shabbos meal it is not evident from his behavior that he is fulfilling a mitzvah since people eat meals even when it is not Shabbos. This rationale also explains why Chazal did not compose a beracha to be recited when eating on Erev Yom Kippur. ■

1. שלחן טהור (קאמרנא) ס"י רמ"ב סעי' ט.
2. פתח דביר ח"ג ס"י רע"ד אות א'.
3. אבודרהם סדר ההגדה ד"ה יש שואלים.
4. שדי חמד פאת השדה מערכת ברכות ס"י ג'.

STORIES Off the Daf

Eating the Inedible

”נותן טעם לפגם...”

On today's daf we find the halacha of נותן טעם לפגם.

A certain rabbinic student in Israel visited the Cohen family for Shabbos. While they were sitting the young man revealed that he had grown up in a former communist-bloc country. As he described his life there, he explained that there were virtually no toys and hardly any luxuries.

“For example, the soap there was made of plain animal fat and tasted absolutely repugnant.” he concluded.

“But were you halachically permitted to eat soap?” asked one guest. “Besides,” he added, “Why did you eat the soap if it tasted so bad?”

“Well, like I was saying, there really weren't any normal games, so the children would play various games of wits. The loser of each round was required to lick the soap. So of course I know exactly what that soap tastes like,” he added ruefully.

“As far as your question, why shouldn't you be allowed to taste soap? It is absolutely נותן טעם לפגם.”

“It's actually not quite as simple as that,” observed Rabbi Cohen. “Although since you did not want to taste the soap, it was ok for you, it is a machlokes haposkim whether one may

eat something that was forbidden but became completely blemished. The Minchas Kohein, zt”l, holds that one may not purposefully eat something forbidden, even if it is no longer fit to be eaten by a human being. But the Pri Chadash, zt”l, argues. He explains that the only potential problem is בל תשקצו, if the person disgusts himself by eating it.¹

“But this is only if one has no reason to eat it. If he needs to take a medicine which is made of non-kosher material but is completely inedible for human beings, the Zera Avraham, zt”l, writes that this is permitted according to all authorities.”² ■

1. פרי"ח, יו"ד, ס"י ק"ג, ס"יק ח'
2. שו"ת זרע אברהם, ס"י כ"ו