

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Sending a gift to a gentile

R' Yehudah sent a gift to a gentile on the day of an idolatrous festival and explained that it is permitted since that gentile does not worship idolatry.

This practice is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another related incident is presented.

2) Collecting wages for transporting nesseh wine

A contradiction between the Mishnah and a Baraisa is noted whether wages for transporting nesseh wine are permitted only if that activity takes place when the work day is over.

Abaye offers one resolution to the contradiction.

Rava offers an alternative resolution to the contradiction.

A Baraisa is cited that supports Rava's resolution.

3) Renting a donkey to transport nesseh wine

The necessity for the Mishnah to discuss the case of the donkey is explained.

This leads the Gemara into a discussion as to whether a renter has the right to place flasks on the donkey.

R' Pappa clarifies the Baraisa's ruling related to the right of a renter to put his provisions on the rented donkey.

A related incident is recounted and examined.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the consequence of nesseh wine falling onto grapes or other fruit.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What verses indicate that the pleasure of the World-to-Come will surpass the pleasures of this world?
2. Under what circumstances may a renter place his provisions on the back of his rented donkey?
3. Do grapes become prohibited if nesseh wine spills on them?
4. Why does wheat become prohibited when nesseh wine spills on it if it is not cracked?

Distinctive INSIGHT

When a prohibited food ruins the taste of a mixture

כל שאין בהנאתו בנותן טעם מותר, כגון חומץ שנפל על גבי גריסין

The Mishnah concludes with a general rule regarding when prohibited foods become mixed together with permitted foods. Whenever there is benefit from the taste of the prohibited food, the mixture is forbidden due to the taste of the prohibited food which is detectable in the mixture. Whenever the contribution of the prohibited food is not beneficial, the mixture is permitted to be eaten. The Torah only forbids a mixture when the prohibited food enhances the taste of the mixture, and not when it ruins the taste. The Mishnah gives one example of a mixture where a taste of the food is ruined by one food blending with another. This is where vinegar (from יין נסך) falls into grits. The vinegar ruins the taste of the grits, and the mixture is permitted to be eaten.

Rambam (Commentary to Mishnah) explains the term "אין בהנאתו בנותן טעם"—the forbidden food does not contribute any beneficial taste," used in the Mishnah. He says this concept is referred to in the Gemara as *נותן טעם לפגם*, and it means that the prohibited food does not contribute any benefit to the food mixture.

Rambam gives four examples of how a forbidden food contributes to the taste of a mixture. One is if a prohibited food has a taste or odor which ruins a mixture with a permitted food. This is where the bad taste occurs immediately and does not dissipate with time. This is referred to as "a ruinous taste from the beginning to the end." Tosafos Yom Tov gives an example of fat or fish oil which falls into honey, or a concoction made with honey. This is permitted to be eaten in all cases of prohibited foods.

A second scenario is where a prohibited food mixes with the permitted food and its taste improves the mixture, and this improved taste remains as a positive factor even as time passes. This is referred to as "משביח מתחילה ועד סוף"—it improves the taste from beginning to end." This type of mixture is prohibited in all cases of prohibited foods.

A third category is where the prohibited taste first enhances the taste of the mixture, but when as it remains in the blend for a bit longer it loses its positive contribution to the taste, and even later it causes the taste of the mixture to be ruined. This is referred to as *השביח ולבסוף פגם*.

The final situation is where the prohibited taste at first results in a poor taste, but it later changes and enhances the taste of the mixture. This is called *פוגם מעיקרא*.

Rambam writes that the halacha in the third and fourth cases is not clear, so we must be strict and prohibit such mixtures. This is why he understands that the case of our Mishnah is where the vinegar fell into hot grits, where the vinegar ruins the taste of the grits completely. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Selling prohibited items to gentiles

בגד שאבד בו כלאים הרי זה לא ימכרנה לעובד כוכבים

A garment in which sha'atnez is lost, one may not sell it to an idolater

The Gemara teaches that one is not permitted to sell to a gentile a garment that contains sha'atnez that is not easily discernable out of concern that the gentile will sell the garment to a Jew. The consensus of Poskim¹ is that the restriction against selling prohibited items to a gentile applies even if the item is only Rabbinically prohibited. Even though the concern over the Rabbinically prohibited item is a *safek* – uncertain – nevertheless, *l'chatchila*, the item should not be sold.

Shevet Halevi² was asked about a person who purchased a rug for his house and discovered that it contained sha'atnez. Is it permitted to use the rug despite the fact that it contains sha'atnez and if not, may he sell it to a gentile? Shevet Halevi answered that if the material of the rug is soft it is Rabbinically prohibited to use the rug out of concern that the threads will wrap around a part of his body and provide warmth. It would also be prohibited to sell this type of rug to a gentile out of concern that it will be resold to a Jew. If, however, the threads of the rug are stiff and the only sha'atnez concern is that a person may walk on the rug barefoot, the rug may be sold to a gentile. The reason is that in this case the likelihood that selling the rug to a gentile will lead to a violation is considered too remote for concern. There is an uncertainty whether the gentile will resell the rug to a Jew and even if he does the

(Overview...continued from page 1)

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains how the incident cited in the Mishnah does not contradict the Mishnah's ruling.

In a related incident Rava ruled that wheat could be sold even though nesech wine spilled on it.

This ruling was successfully challenged and consequently revised.

The assumption that wheat becomes prohibited when nesech wine spills on it is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

sha'atnez prohibition may never be violated since it is violated only if someone were to walk on the rug barefoot.

Someone purchased a restaurant and was concerned that the dishes may have been used to serve non-kosher food and wanted to know whether it would be permitted to sell those utensils to a gentile. *Minchas Yitzchok*³ answered that even though the dishes would only be Rabbinically prohibited for use since more than twenty-four hours passed since they had been used for non-kosher food, nevertheless, the restriction against selling items that are Rabbinically prohibited to a gentile applies. In his final ruling, however, he combined a number of different factors together to permit the sale of these dishes. One of them being that since they would be used for serving or eating (*כלי שני*) rather than cooking according to many opinions the dishes were not rendered non-kosher and thus may be sold to a gentile. ■

1. עי פתיש יו"ד סי' פ"ו סק"ו.
2. שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ז סי' קע"ב.
3. שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ה סי' נ"ט. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Challenges of This World

"אית לכו כי האי גונא לעלמא דאתי"

Rav Yonasan Eibeschutz, zt"l, answers a very powerful question on today's daf. "On Avodah Zarah 65 we find that Bar Sheshes asked Rabbi if the Jews will ultimately have as much pleasure as he had in his hedonistic lifestyle. Rabbi replied that in the ultimate future not only will Jews derive great benefit, but it will be even better than anything any idolater has ever experienced. How could Bar Sheshes be foolish enough to think for an instant that the spiritual delights of the next world will in any way be comparable

to the lowly physical pleasures of the material world?

Rav Eibeschutz answered his own question. "We find that there is a disagreement between Shmuel and Rav whether the days of Moshiach will be a time when we lose our free will or if it will be just like today with the exception that we will not be under any other political authority. The truth is that both opinions are true. At first we will only be freed of being under other authorities. Eventually the time will come when we will no longer have free will as well.

"It is regarding this time that Bar Sheshes spoke. He meant to ask whether in the future we will lose free will and not be challenged with such powerful draws to materialism, since we will have such

understanding that to indulge in such areas would be disgusting to us. Of course, since when we have the hardest time doing what we should when we feel freest, if we lose our free will and are not afforded such challenges we are better off before Moshiach's arrival.

"Rebbi really replied that we will have even greater challenges at first, since we will still be living in a material world but will not have to worry about being under foreign authority. Therefore, in the times of Moshiach we will be challenged strenuously, yet we will keep our faith and persevere in doing Hashem's will despite the lack of worries. Clearly this will make our eventual reward even more abundant."¹

1. יערות דבש, ח"ב, דרוש ב' ■