

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Pilgrimages (cont.)

Shmuel's ruling regarding the permissibility of doing business with a Jew on his way to or from a pilgrimage is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa provides guidelines for doing business with Jews and idolaters who are on their way to or from an idolatrous fair.

The Gemara clarifies why there is a difference between a Jew and an idolater who is on his way back from the idolatrous fair.

Reish Lakish qualifies the Mishnah's ruling related to doing business with idolaters on their way home from a pilgrimage.

2) Containers owned by idolaters

A Baraisa discusses the use of containers owned by idolaters.

R' Pappa clarifies the Baraisa's last ruling related to pouring pitch into a container and thus rendering it permitted for use.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Zevid offers an alternative explanation.

R' Pappi suggests an application of R' Zevid's explanation but it is rejected.

A related incident is cited.

The ruling that emerges from this incident is further explained.

A Baraisa discusses the use of earthenware utensils obtained from idolaters.

The Gemara inquires whether the Baraisa's last ruling related to using brine of *muryas* may be used initially or only after the fact.

It is demonstrated that this method may be used even initially.

The process of burning out earthenware of nesech wine is discussed.

The Gemara presents a dispute whether beer poured into a prohibited container becomes prohibited.

Two related incidents are recorded.

R' Yosana in the name of R' Ami rules that a *nesser* container can never be purged.

The Gemara explains what is a *nesser* container.

Another incident is cited.

Two types of earthenware utensils that do not absorb taste are identified.

R' Assi and R' Ashi disagree about the permissibility of earthenware drinking cups.

Two versions of the dispute are noted.

The Gemara gives a ruling on this matter.

R' Zevid discusses the status of different types of earthenware.

Meraimar disagrees with R' Zevid's ruling.

The Gemara begins a challenge to Meraimar's ruling. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Placing beer into the wine containers of an idolater

איבעיא להו מהו ליתן לתוכו שכר

The Gemara discusses wine containers and barrels owned by idolaters, and beverages owned by Jews placed into them.

When the question was asked by the students in the beis midrash regarding putting beer which is made from barley into these wine containers, Rav Nachman and Rav Yehuda ruled that it is prohibited to do so. Rava permitted it.

The Gemara then tells the story of Ravina, who permitted Rav Chiya b. R' Yitzchak to put beer into wine barrels of idolaters. Rav Chiya mistakenly put wine in the barrels instead. When Ravina heard about this error, he insisted that his ruling to allow placing beer in the container was correct, and that the mistake of Rav Chiya was an unusual oversight.

The Rishonim offer various interpretations regarding the precise issue involved in this question and answer. Rashi explains that the taste of beer cancels the taste of the forbidden wine, as we find is the case with salt brine and fish hash (*mories*). The question is whether beer is comparable to wine which is placed in the containers of idolaters, which becomes prohibited because the wine in the walls flows into the Jew's wine and ruins it. On the other hand, we know that when water is placed in these containers the water dilutes the wine which flows from its walls, and the water is permitted. The question was whether the beer is similar to water, and permitted, because the taste of the forbidden wine is nullified.

Ra'aved learns that the basis for the question was that beer may certainly be placed in these containers, as it ruins the taste of any wine that might flow into it. However, the question was whether the sages ruled that the container must be koshered before placing beer into it as a precaution that one might inad-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Under what conditions is it permitted to do business with someone returning from a pilgrimage?

2. What is the method of "kashering" containers previously used to store nesech wine?

3. Is it permitted to store beer in container that previously held nesech wine?

4. What is the point of dispute between R' Zevid and Mereimar?

HALACHAH Highlight

Issuing a decree after one incident

ואפילו הכי לא חש לה למילתא אמר אקראי בעלמא הוא

Nevertheless, he was not concerned about the matter. He said that it was an isolated occurrence

The Gemara relates that Ravina permitted R' Chiya the son of R' Yitzchok to put beer into leather containers that had previously held wine belonging to idolaters. The basis for his allowance is that the taste of the beer nullifies the taste of the wine and it remains in the walls of the utensil rather than entering the beer. R' Chiya the son of R' Yitzchok erred and stored wine in the utensil rather than beer. When Ravina found out about the error he did not see fit to prohibit storing beer in these utensils out of concern that someone else would also make a mistake and store wine instead of beer.

Terumas Hadeshen¹ extrapolates from this that there is no need to issue a decree when a mistake happens only once. He wrote this in response to one of the Torah leaders who suggested instituting a decree in response to the following error. A married man was away during Chanukah and he did not light Chanukah lights at his lodging because he assumed his wife was lighting for him in their home. His wife did not light at home on her husband's behalf because she assumed that he was lighting at his lodging. The Torah leader suggested instituting a decree that a married man should light Chanukah lights when away from home so that this error does not occur again in the future. Terumas Hadeshen rejected the suggestion asserting that decrees are not made in response to an incident that happened once.

In a similar vein Pri Chadash² cites the opinion of Knesses

(Insight...continued from page 1)

vertently put wine into the container. The opinion which permits it holds that we are not concerned that permitting beer might lead to confusion and that wine might be put into the container before it would be koshered. In the case of Rav Chiya, where this exact mistake occurred, Ravina still dismissed it as an anomaly.

Ritva explains that the question was whether beer itself can act as a koshering agent to purge an idolater's container from its forbidden wine as we find in the case with brine and fish hash. Their beer had a strong sharpness due to the taste of the hops which were used in its production. Or, perhaps brine and fish oils are stronger than the beer, and only they have the ability to kosher the containers.

Rosh learns that the beer placed into these containers is permitted, even if the beer does not have a sixty-to-one ratio against the walls of the barrel. The reason to permit this is that the wine contained in the walls is already considered tainted (פגום) as it mixes with the beer. ■

Hagedolah³ who wanted to prohibit frying food in matzah flour during Pesach. The rationale for the decree was that once a woman fried fish in matzah flour during Pesach and her neighbor mistakenly thought it was regular flour and the next day she fried fish in regular flour. To prevent this error from recurring Knesses Hagedolah asserted that a decree should be issued prohibiting frying food in matzah flour during Pesach. Pri Chadash rejected the suggestion since our Gemara teaches that decrees are not issued when a mistake happens only once. ■

1. שו"ת תרומת הדשן סי' קי"א.
2. פרי חדש או"ח סי' תס"א ד"ה עוד.
3. כנסת הגדולה או"ח שם בתשובה בהגב"י. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Nature of the Material

"כי תיבעי לך דשיעי..."

An area of halachic inquiry of interest to many older people involves the status of dentures. Does one require separate dentures for milk and meat? Must one do hagalah on dentures before Pesach?

When the Shut Sheila Shalom, zt"l, was asked to rule on this question he replied that there was no halachic problem regarding milk and meat. "In Avodah Zarah 33 we find that there are substances that do not absorb. Even dentures made of bone must surely be fashioned in

a manner so that they do not absorb. In addition, one surely cannot eat or drink anything hotter than a keli sheni. And most foods are not even yad soledes bo in any event.

"One may well wonder why it is permitted to eat meat and then milk since perhaps something was absorbed and who can say with certitude that nothing will come out? We can ask the same question about one's natural teeth. The obvious answer must be that the Torah was not given to angels and the same reply applies to this question about dentures.

"Nevertheless, before Pesach one is certainly required to do hagalah since even an infinitesimal amount of chometz is prohibited on Pesach."¹

The Darchei Teshuvah, zt"l, recounts

that when he went to Vienna he asked a professor about dentures without explaining why he needed to know about them, and the professor confirmed what the Maharsham had surmised. "Dentures are never made of a substance which can absorb. This is to ensure that there is not residual matter in the dentures that could breed various kinds of dangerous germs which could be hazardous to a person."

Nevertheless, the Darchei Teshuvah concludes that a yarei Shamayim will use two pairs of dentures, one for milk and one for meat. And all the more so must he take care to do hagalah on them before Pesach.² ■

1. רשו"ת שאילת שלום, מה"ת, קצ"ה
2. דרכי תשובה, סי' פ"ט, ס"ק י"א ■