



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Combination of Permitted and Forbidden

Ingredients

[Generally, when the Torah punishes someone for eating an amount of prohibited food, the whole amount, normally a *k’zayis*, the size of an olive must be prohibited food in order to be liable. For example, a person who would eat half of a *k’zayis* of forbidden fat along with half of a *k’zayis* of permitted meat would not receive lashes. Our Gemora teaches us some novel halachos regarding this topic.]

Rabbi Avahu says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Concerning all prohibitions in the Torah, the permissible food does not combine with the forbidden one to complete the minimal punishable amount, except for the prohibitions regarding a *nazir*, for the Torah has stated, *mishras* (anything which is soaked in wine, he may not drink). (If bread is soaked in wine and there is not enough wine by itself for the *nazir* to be liable, but combined with the bread, there is the punishable quantity, he will be liable.)

Zeiri says: This concept applies to the prohibition against burning leaven on the Altar. (If one burns less than a *k’zayis* of chametz together with some matzah on the *mizbeach*, and together, it totals a *k’zayis*, he will be liable.)

The Gemora asks: Zeiri must be following the opinion of Rabbi Elozar, who expounds the word “*kal*.” [It is written in regards to the prohibition of eating chametz on Pesach: “*Kal machmetzes lo socheilu*.” All leaven you shall not eat. Rabbi Elozar derives from the word “*kal*” that is one eats a food that is a mixture of chametz and other permitted ingredients, but together, it totals a *k’zayis*, he will be liable. So too, Zeiri expounds the verse regarding burning leaven on the *mizbeach*. It is written: “*Ki kal se’or v’chal dvash lo saktiru*.” The word “*kal*” teaches us that he can be liable even if there is only a partial amount of leaven in this mixture.] If so, this concept should apply to chametz (on Pesach) as well (why did Zeiri say that the exception is only with respect to a *nazir*?)!

The Gemora answers: This is indeed the case (it does apply to chametz on Pesach as well). The reason why Zeiri mentioned the prohibition of burning leaven on the Altar was in order to illustrate that he disagrees with Abaye who holds that one is liable for burning leaven on the Altar, even if it contained less than a *k’zayis*. Zeiri taught that one is not liable unless he burned an amount equivalent to a *k’zayis*. (He taught us this by stating that one will be liable in a case where he burns less than a *k’zayis* of chametz together with some matzah because of the principal

of “combining.” Otherwise, he would be exempt. According to Abaye, he would be liable anyway, for he holds that one is liable for burning leaven on the mizbeach, even if it less than a k’zayis.) (35b – 36a)

Porridge and Dips

Rav Dimi was sitting and he said over this entire discussion. Abaye asked him from the following *Mishna*: If there is porridge of *terumah* and there is also *chullin* garlic and oil mixed in, and a *tevul yom* (one who was tamei, but has immersed himself in a mikvah; he is considered a *tevul yom* until nightfall) touched part of them, he has disqualified the entire mixture. [This can be explained in different ways: either he touched the garlic or the oil and the porridge is disqualified for the garlic and the oil are considered “handles” to the porridge. Or, he touched the porridge and the entire mixture is disqualified. We do not consider the oil and garlic to be dividers between the various parts of the mixture, for they are only secondary to the porridge.] If, however, there is porridge of *chullin* and there is also *terumah* garlic and oil mixed in, and a *tevul yom* touched part of them, he has disqualified only the place where he touched.

And the *Gemora* asked: Why is the place that he touched disqualified? [Terumah cannot become Biblically tamei if it is less than the size of an egg. The *Gemora* assumes that the garlic, which is only being used as a spice, certainly is not equivalent to the size of a *beitzah*!] Rabbah bar bar Chanah answered in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that it is because a non-Kohen will receive lashes for eating the garlic if there is a k’zayis (and therefore it is significant enough that

it will become disqualified when touched by a *tevul yom* even if it less than a *beitzah*).

Abaye articulates his challenge by explaining Rabbi Yochanan: Rabbi Yochanan must hold that the non-Kohen will be liable for eating the porridge (although it contains less than a k’zayis of *terumah*) because the permitted ingredients (the grain) combines with the forbidden ingredients (the oil and the garlic) for the minimal punishable quantity! (This would prove that Rabbi Yochanan holds of the “combination” principle by *terumah* as well. This is inconsistent with what Rabbi Avahu reported in his name that the only exception is by *nazir*!)

Rav Dimi responded: That is not the reason why the non-Kohen would be liable for eating the porridge. The reason is because he has eaten a k’zayis amount of *terumah* within the time it takes to eat a *peras* of the porridge. [A *peras* is a half of a loaf of bread. If one eats a k’zayis of a forbidden food within the amount of time it takes to eat a volume of four eggs (between three and nine minutes), he is liable, even though he did not eat it at once. In our case, there was a k’zayis of oil and garlic and he ate the porridge in a manner of which we are certain that he ate a k’zayis in the minimal amount of time necessary to be liable.]

Abaye asks: Is this concept of eating a k’zayis within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras* a Biblical one? [Tosfos explains that although we know that it is a Biblical concept, perhaps that is only when there are no permitted ingredients involved, and one is only eating the forbidden component. How do we know that this is applicable even in a mixture?]



Rav Dimi replied: Yes it is!

The *Gemora* asks: If so, why do the *Chachamim* argue on Rabbi Elozar regarding the Babylonian *kutach*? [The quantity of chametz in this dip is very small. Rabbi Elozar holds that one is liable for eating this on Pesach because of the “combination” principle. The *Chachamim* maintain that even if one eats a *k’zayis* of the chametz contained in this dip within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras*, he will still be exempt. If this is a biblical concept, why do they disagree?]

Rav Dimi answered: Leave this case alone, for there cannot be a *k’zayis* of chametz consumed within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras*. For if he swallowed the entire mixture at once, this fashion is considered abnormal, and is therefore not called eating. And if he ate it in a “dip-like” fashion, it will not be fast enough for him to be liable. (36a – 36b)

Terumah and Chullin

Abaye asked Rav Dimi from the following *braisa*: If there were two boxes, one that has *chullin*, non-sacred produce inside and the other contains *terumah*. In front of those two boxes are two *se’ah* (volume measure between two and three gallons) containers of produce, and one *se’ah* container contains *chullin* and one container contains *terumah*. The contents of the *se’ah* containers fell into the other two boxes, and we know that each of the *se’ah* containers fell into a different box, but we do not know which box each *se’ah* container fell into. We

rule that the *chullin* is permitted as it was before this occurred, because we assume that the *chullin* produce fell into *chullin* and *terumah* fell into *terumah*. If the principle of a *k’zayis* within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras* is a Biblical one, what gives us the right to be lenient in this case and say that “we assume etc.”?

Abaye explains further: According to me that the reason that the non-Kohen is liable for eating the porridge is because the permissible ingredients combine with the forbidden one’s, we can say that the *braisa* is referring to a case where there is more *chullin* than *terumah* (and even if the *terumah* fell into the *chullin*, it would be nullified)! However, according to you that holds that the reason that the non-Kohen is liable for eating the porridge is because he is eating a *k’zayis* within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras*, what difference does it make that there is more *chullin* than *terumah*?

Rav Dimi answered: Leave the case of *terumah* nowadays alone, for it is only Rabbinic in nature. (36b – 37a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Drinking Bread

The Maharil writes that if one eats bread that wine fell into it, he should recite the blessing made over wine, i.e. *borei peri hagafen*. In the footnotes, the following verse is mentioned as support to this halachic novelty: *Anything which is soaked in wine, he may not drink*. Although he is eating something

which was steeped in wine, the Torah refers to it as “drinking,” not “eating.”

Blessing after Coffee

The Tosfos Yom Hakippurim (Yoma 79b) wonders as to the necessity of reciting a blessing after one drinks coffee. Perhaps it should not require a blessing at all since a person does not drink a *revi'is* at once; rather, he drinks a little at a time, and it emerges that he does not drink a *revi'is* within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras* (*half a loaf of bread*). Or, perhaps one might counter and say that this principle should only apply to other liquids, where one has the ability to drink it at once, but he chooses not to. However, coffee, which one cannot drink at one time, and on the contrary, it is natural to take short sips with long intervals in between, perhaps the entire drinking will combine to the required amount for the blessing to be recited.

He resolves this question from our *Gemora* which states that if one eats the Babylonian *kutach* (a dip that has a minimal amount of *chametz* in it) in a “dip-like” fashion, he will not be liable for eating *chametz* on *Pesach*. This is because he did not eat it a *k'zayis* within the amount of time it takes to eat a *peras*. Now, it is not normal to eat a dip at once, and nevertheless, one is not liable for eating the dip in its normal fashion. This would prove that one should not recite a blessing after drinking a cup of coffee.

The *Minchas Chinuch* rejects the proof: One would not be liable because of the *kutach*. It is because of the *chametz* that is mixed into it. *Chametz* by itself is normal to eat a *k'zayis* within the amount of time it

takes to eat a *peras*. Therefore, he is not liable on the dip when he eats it in a normal manner. However, with respect to coffee, it is usual to drink the coffee slowly, and therefore, one would be obligated to recite a blessing afterwards.