

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Chilak

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok identifies the chilak fish and explains why it is prohibited if it comes from a non-Jew.

A related Beraisa and teaching of R' Avahu are recorded and discussed.

Additional rulings and incidents related to the kashrus of fish are presented.

2) A grain of chiltis

The reason a grain of chiltis is prohibited is explained.

Another ruling related to chiltis leads the Gemara into a discussion about the reliability of the wife of a chaver.

Another related Beraisa is cited.

3) One seal

Rav enumerates four items that are forbidden with one seal and four items that are permitted with one seal.

These rulings are analyzed and in one case one of the prohibited items is removed from the list and replaced with another item.

Shmuel presents different lists of items that are permitted or prohibited with a single seal.

A related Beraisa is cited and explained.

4) Salkundris salt

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel identifies Salkundris salt.

Three positions regarding the use of Salkundris salt are presented in a Beraisa.

Rabbah bar bar Chana explains the rationales behind each of the three positions.

A related report is presented.

The implication of the last line of the Mishnah is explained.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates items of non-Jews that may be eaten.

6) Milk

A Beraisa teaches that if a Jew sits near a non-Jew's herd of animals the milk is permitted.

The rationale behind this ruling is explained.

7) Honey

The reason honey obtained from non-Jews is permitted is explained.

8) Grape clusters

The Mishnah's lenient ruling about dripping grape clusters is unsuccessfully challenged.

9) Taris and brine

A Beraisa elaborates on the Mishnah's ruling related to taris and brine. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Refreshing the taste of prohibited foods that have dulled
דמפסקי ליה בסכינא אע"ג וכו' נותן טעם לפגם מותר, אגב חורפיה דחילתיתא מחליא ליה שמנוניתא

Among the items listed in the Mishnah (35b) which are prohibited to eat is a branch or slice of a *chiltis* fruit. The suspicion is that the non-Jew sliced this fruit with a knife which was used for a non-kosher food, and some residue of the non-kosher food such as fat from non-kosher meat remained on the knife and has now been spread on to the *chiltis* fruit slice.

Our Gemara explains that the general rule is that once the knife has remained overnight without being used, any fat residue that has been absorbed into the blade of the knife will only contribute a ruined taste into the *chiltis* (פגם). This taste should not be able to prohibit the *chiltis* fruit. Nevertheless, the *chiltis* has a sharp taste, and it has the effect of sweetening and refreshing the taste of the forbidden fats absorbed in the blade of the knife. As a result, the fat provides a positive taste in the *chiltis*, and it is therefore forbidden.

Tosafos (ד"ה אגב) asks why is it that the entire fruit which is sliced with this knife becomes prohibited? The Gemara in Chullin (8b) rules that if a non-kosher knife is used to slaughter an animal, we consider only the immediate area which came into contact with the knife to be affected by the non-kosher substance on or absorbed in the knife. Therefore, we must peel away the area which came into direct contact with the knife, and the rest of the animal is kosher. Here, too, we should only have to peel away the contact area, but the rest of the fruit should be permitted. Tosafos answers that the sharpness of the taste of the *chiltis* causes the prohibited substance to spread throughout the entire piece, and not just to the immediate area.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why were chilak from the Bav River permitted?

2. What is the application of the principle *אשת חבר כחבר*?

3. What is the reason one is permitted to eat food served by a host?

4. Does a Jew have to actually witness the milking of a cow for her milk to be permitted?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
ל'נר' מרדכי בן ר' פסח
by the Rosenbergs, Englewood, NJ

HALACHAH Highlight

May a woman put tefillin on a man who is ill?

מעשה באשה אחת שנשאת לחבר והיתה קושרת לו תפילין על ידו

It happened once that a woman married a chaver and she would tie his tefillin for him on his hand

Poskim discuss whether a man who is ill and cannot don tefillin by himself will fulfill the mitzvah if a woman binds the tefillin to him. The essence of the uncertainty is whether a woman, who is herself exempt from fulfilling the mitzvah of tefillin, may bind tefillin on a man who is obligated to fulfill the mitzvah. The uncertainty arises from our Gemara that teaches that a woman is unfit to write a Sefer Torah, tefillin, or a mezuzah. The reason a woman is not qualified to write these sacred writings is based on the relationship between the word **וקשרתם** – and you will bind them – and **וכתבתם** – and you will write them. The proximity of these verbs to one another teaches that only those who are obligated to bind them to their arm are authorized to write them. Accordingly, one could also suggest that only those who are obligated to bind tefillin to their own arm are authorized to bind them onto another.

Maharsham¹ suggests that this question could be resolved from a comment of Haghos Maimonios². Rabbeinu Tam maintains regarding any mitzvah that a woman is not obligated to fulfill that she may not participate in the process of making the mitzvah object. For example, a woman is not obligated in the mitzvah of tzitzis and therefore she may not make tzitzis. Haghos Maimonios challenges this position of Rabbeinu Tam from our Gemara that tells of an instance in which a woman put tefillin on her husband.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Ritva notes that some texts of our Gemara have the word “שמנוניתא” while other texts do not. According to the texts where this word appears, the lesson is that although the fat on the knife has remained on the knife overnight and now contributes a dulled taste, the sharpness of the chiltis sweetens the fat that is on the knife and it will now contribute a beneficial taste.

According to the texts which do not have the word “שמנוניתא,” the lesson of the Gemara is that the chiltis’s sharp taste sweetens the knife, meaning the prohibited taste that is absorbed in the blade itself.

Ritva then cites the opinion of R”I who says that “being left overnight causes the taste of something to be dulled” is only said of absorbed tastes (**בליעות**). However, actual substance of prohibited food, such as fat residue on the surface of the knife, does not become diminished by sitting overnight. Accordingly, we would say that the store owner generally cleans off the surfaces of his knives, and we are only speaking about absorbed taste of prohibited fats. ■

He answers that there is a difference between making a mitzvah object and assisting another person in the fulfillment of his mitzvah. Rabbeinu Tam only taught that a woman may not make a mitzvah object for a mitzvah that she is not obligated to fulfill. When a woman binds tefillin to a man’s arm she is not making a mitzvah object she is merely assisting him in the fulfillment of his mitzvah and a woman is not disqualified from providing that assistance. ■

1. הגהות מהרש"ם או"ח סי' ל"ט.

2. הגהות מיימוני פ"א מהל' ציצית הי"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

“An Expert”

”אלא מן המומחה...”

Acertain take-out restaurant opened up which did not have any rabbinic supervision. The owner was a religious Jew and claimed that everything sold in his store was made from items with the best hechsheirim. When asked why he did not get a hechsher himself, he said he felt this was an unnecessary expense. “After all, isn’t one witness believed in matters of halachic prohibition? Why am I any different than any person cooking for his family? Does he too require a hechsher?”

But not everyone was so easily convinced. After all, there had been scandals before and people who are careful never buy in a concern without a hechsher unless

the owner was known to have profound fear of heaven. And even then, how was one to know that this was not just an act to enable his business?

When this question was asked to a posek, his reply validated what many had suspected, that this was not a simple matter at all. “In Avodah Zarah 39 we find that many items, such as wine, milk, and cheese were only purchased from an ‘expert.’ The Ran there explains that an expert is one who is known to be a God-fearing Jew.

“The Rambam takes this a step further. In Yad Hachazaka he rules that one may not even purchase meat, cheese, and fish without a siman even from someone not suspected of underhandedness. Although the Ravad there argues, the Rama rules like the Rambam.¹ And the Darchei Teshuvah, zt”l, explicitly writes that they even made a decree not to purchase food that could only be rabbinically prohibited from a concern

without a hechsher from a rav or av beis din.²

“As far as why this is necessary, the Aruch HaShulchan writes that **עד אחד נאמן באיסורין** does not apply to a merchant selling from his store since he tends to whitewash anything questionable in order to make more money. The proof to this is the Gemara that beis din must appoint people to insure that merchants keep honest weights. Although it seems fitting to trust the storekeeper not to steal since he has a chezkas kashrus, we cannot do so since he is tempted to violate this prohibition to make money. The same is true for relying on a storekeeper for the kashrus of his goods!”³ ■

1. רמב"ם, הלכות מאכלות אסורות, פ"א, ה' כ"ה, ש"ע יו"ד, סי' קי"ט, סי"א

2. דרכי תשובה, סי' קי"ט, סי"ק ו'

3. ערוך השלחן יו"ד, סי' קי"ט, סי' י"א ■