

Mishnah Berurah Digest

Based on the Sunday morning shiur
by Dayan Y. Abraham, שליט"א

NUMBER 11

דיני הברכות ליתר מאכלים
ש"ע סימן ר"ד, סעיף א ומ"ב

Continuing in this **סעיף**, we have been discussing the various examples given in the **ש"ע** of foodstuffs that take a **שְׁהַכֵּל**, and the general principles that emerge from these particular instances.

The **מחבר** makes reference to a type of almond that he calls "שקדים מתוקים", "sweet almonds," a variety that becomes sweet when fully grown and is not cultivated to be eaten at an early stage of development. The **מ"ב** reminds us of a different variety of almonds to which the **מחבר** drew our attention in **ה"ב**, **ה"ב**, namely, the "שקדים מרים", "bitter almonds." The latter type need to be eaten at an early stage of growth since they become inedible and even harmful later on to the point of not taking a **בְּרַכָּה** at all. At an early stage of growth one should say **הַעֵץ** on bitter almonds because this is the right time for them to be eaten.

However, **שקדים מתוקים**, sweet almonds, are grown with the intention that they will be eaten when fully grown, and sweet. Therefore, if they are eaten at an earlier stage one should say **שְׁהַכֵּל**. The **מ"ב** explains that at this stage of growth one would be enjoying the **קְלִיפָה**, the outer shell, rather than the kernel, the actual almond, and people do not plant almond trees with the intention of eating the outer shell; they plant them for the almonds. Even though one is indeed enjoying eating the [underdeveloped] almond in its shell, one must say **שְׁהַכֵּל** nonetheless, because it is only the secondary product that is being enjoyed at this stage, that is, the outer shell, that will be discarded once the almond is fully grown and ripe. The **מ"ב** draws a parallel with "קורא," the soft, edible growth on a palm tree (from which the branches will extend, and which later becomes hard wood), which also takes **שְׁהַכֵּל** because it is certainly not the primary food for which palm trees are cultivated.

The **מחבר** now mentions "שחת," which the **מ"ב** explains is grain that has not even reached one third of its full growth, but is nevertheless edible. Now, once ripe, grain would take **בְּרַכָּה פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה** (and **הַמּוּצָא** or **מְזוּנוֹת** once ground into flour and manufactured into a baked product); this unripe grain, however, takes a **שְׁהַכֵּל**, because "דלא גמר פירא" - "it's fruit is not complete" - and it 'drops one level' from **הָאֲדָמָה**. The **מ"ב** writes that this is a principle that applies to any vegetable that is not ripe but is already edible - one should say **שְׁהַכֵּל** and not **הָאֲדָמָה**.

Fresh pumpkin, "קורא חיה," is now introduced by the **ש"ע** as an example of a food that is more enjoyable in a cooked state than

when raw. For this reason, such a vegetable takes **שְׁהַכֵּל** when raw. Another example of this would be potato. This discussion arises later in **סימן ר"ה**, where we shall also see that a vegetable that is enjoyable both raw and cooked will take **בְּרַכָּה פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה** in both states.

The **מחבר** rules also that one says **שְׁהַכֵּל** on barley flour, and the **מ"ב** adds that this is also true regarding flour made from any of the five grains (wheat, barley, rye, oats and spelt). Barley flour is singled out, explains the **מ"ב**, because it is particularly difficult to digest and can cause discomfort, and one might think it does not take any **בְּרַכָּה** at all; it is therefore used as an example in order to indicate that since at least a modicum of benefit or pleasure is gained from eating it, it does indeed still take **שְׁהַכֵּל**.

The next example given by the **מחבר** is that of beer made from barley. The **מ"ב** explains that since the barley has been made into a clear drink it is not at all considered as a food upon which one would be required to say "מזונות." The **מ"ב** makes a particularly interesting reference to **תוספות**, who argue that even if one ingests [by drinking barley beer] a "כזית בכדי אכילת פרס" - that is, a 'shiur,' a volume and concentration of barley within a certain time frame that would otherwise and in terms of other **דינים** (e.g. **תְּרוּמָה**) demand to be treated as **מְזוּנוֹת**, nonetheless one still makes **שְׁהַכֵּל**. See **תוספות**, **ברכות** **לח**:

"לא הוי בהו ממש שעורים ואין שר טעמא בעלמא..."
"...there is not real barley in it and beer is no more than the mere flavour [of barley]..."

In relation to these **הלכות** **Dayan Abraham** now asked a question relating the discussion to **חֲמֵץ**: "Is beer (or whisky) considered a mixture of **חֲמֵץ** or is it, in fact, **חֲמֵץ גָּמוּר**, actual **חֲמֵץ**?" The outcome of this **שְׁאֵלָה** has serious implications, with respect, for example, to the **איסורים** of **ימא** and **בל יראה** (the prohibitions of 'seeing' and 'finding' **chometz**), the selling of **חֲמֵץ**, and the punishment of **כָּרַת**, which applies to **חֲמֵץ גָּמוּר**. Do we, asked the **Dayan**, treat beer and whisky as **חֲמֵץ גָּמוּר**? He answered, "yes, the **הלכה** is that we do," explaining that since these drinks contain concentrations of grain they are therefore considered to be proper **חֲמֵץ**. As far as **Pesach** is concerned, the **Dayan** continued, we have to look at the flavour: these drinks are simply barley [or another grain] drunk in a liquid form - a barley concentrate. However, in terms of **הַלְכוֹת בְּרַכּוֹת**, a clear drink can not be classified as "מְזוּנוֹת" and one should therefore make **שְׁהַכֵּל**.

* * *