

INSIGHTS FROM OUR CHABUROS

Coated earthenware vessels

הני מני דקוניא חיורי ואוכמי שרי, ירוקי אסירי

Rav Zevid discusses the status of earthenware vessels that are coated with lead (Rashi) or a type of glass (Tosafos) and used to hold wine of a gentile (יין נסך). If the coating is white or black, the vessels can be permitted for kosher use. The coating causes the earthenware vessel to not absorb the wine, and the vessel can therefore be kashered. If, however, the vessel is coated with a green coating, the vessel cannot be kashered. The green lead (or glass) has a strong element to it which causes the earthenware to become more absorbent, and the non-kosher wine becomes embedded in the walls of the containers.

The Gemara here rules according to Rav Zevid. The reason a ruling is necessary is that this issue is a matter of dispute (Avoda Zara 33b), where Mereimar holds that the vessel is permitted even if it is covered with the green coating if it was used for wine, because wine is stored in a vessel as a cold beverage (without heat). Therefore, Mereimar holds that the vessel does not absorb the non-kosher wine. However, vessels used for chametz are prohibited for Pesach, no matter what the color of the coating, as this is a food that is typically prepared with heat.

Rashi here (ד"ה ירוקי) "writes that the ruling in our Gemara to prohibit green coated vessels is in regard to chametz on Pesach. Tosafos (ד"ה ירוקי) "immediately notes that it is not necessary to rule according to Rav Zevid in this case, as even Mereimar agrees that vessels used with hot foods (chametz) are prohibited.

The Rishonim explain the reason earthenware vessels coated in either black or white are permitted is that they can now be treated as metal vessels, which can be kashered. Green coated vessels, however, contain alum, which does not prevent the clay from absorbing the nonkosher contents. Ramban and Rosh hold that purging the vessels with hot water or pouring hot water over the vessel does not help, but aging the vessel for twelve months without using them would render the absorbed non-kosher food as null. Raaved and Ran, however, write that a twelve month hiatus would not help.

Tur Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh De'ah 135:6) rules that black or white coated vessels with cracks have the same status of earthenware vessels, and they can be kashered with boiling water or by not being used for twelve months.

REVIEW AND REMEMBER

- 1- What is the case which Rav and Shmuel dispute concerning sustenance from an absent husband's property?
- 2- Why would a wife receive support from an absent husband's property but not his children?
- 3- When does a yevama collect sustenance from her yavam?
- 4- Is a woman permitted to refuse to work and give her income to her husband?

STORIES OF THE DAF

The Returning Soldier

"פוסקין מזונות לאשת איש"

Our Gemara discusses a wife's right to be fed when the husband is away. A certain young married man was drafted into the army. After waiting for three years, the wife heard news of her husband. He had completed his tour of duty, but oddly enough he had not returned home. The moment the wife discovered his whereabouts, she didn't ask any questions. She immediately sold the husband's place in shul, the only thing remaining to her to sell, and purchased a horse and wagon to bring her husband home.

As soon as the husband arrived home he summoned the man who had purchased his place in shul to Beis Din, and said, "This man got the place very cheap because my wife was in a rush to get money. I am perfectly willing to pay back what he paid for my place. What right did my wife have to sell my place at such a loss?"

This query was eventually presented before the Chasam Sofer, zt"l. He replied, "She had every right to sell the husband's place in shul. The Ramban and Shulchan Aruch both rule as we find in Kesuvos, that the wife may sell the husband's property for food and clothing. It would even be proper to sell his property in order to procure ornaments for herself if not for the fact that since her husband is not around, she has no one for whom she might adorn herself.

The Chasam Sofer continued, "All this is true in the case of a wife seeking to secure mezonos; that, according to many poskim, is Rabbinic and it is not even for the husband's sake, only the wife's. All the more so may she sell property in order for him to fulfill the mitzvah of עונה which is a Torah law, and the mitzvah of פריה ורביה. For that, she may sell his property out of Beis Din!

HALACHA HIGHLIGHT

Immersing plastic utensils

והלכתא כותיה דרב זביד בקוניה

The halacha follows R' Zevid regarding glazed utensils

Poskim discuss at length the question of whether there is an obligation to immerse plastic food utensils that were purchased from a non-Jew. Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that there is a Rabbinic obligation to immerse glass utensils since they could be melted and refashioned into a utensil, similar to metal utensils and in contrast with earthenware utensils. The Chelkas Yaakov² wrote that although plastic also has this characteristic it is not necessary to immerse plastic utensils. He bases this ruling on a Magen Avrohom³ who rules, in a different context, that we do not have the authority to extend decrees of Chazal even when they seem similar. Therefore, although plastic has the characteristic that makes it similar to glass and should therefore require immersion, nonetheless we do not have the authority to draw such a conclusion, especially when it could easily lead to making an unnecessary (ברכה לבטלה).

The Minchas Yitzchok⁴ disagreed with this ruling. He ruled that since plastic could be melted and refashioned it should be immersed but added that it should be immersed without a beracha. The reason he ruled that a beracha should not be recited is based on a rationale put forward by Rav Dovid Tzvi Hoffman⁵, the Melamed Leho'il. Melamed Leho'il wrote that since immersing glass is only a Rabbinic obligation, one could assert that Chazal only included glass utensils in their decree, to the exclusion of other materials that could be melted and refashioned. Therefore, to be sensitive to all possibilities Minchas Yitzchok ruled that plastic utensils should be immersed without a beracha.

An interesting related matter is that Minchas Yitzchok cites as proof to his position the ruling of Misgeres Hashulchan that porcelain utensils should be immersed without a beracha since they can be repaired if they break. What makes this interesting is that earlier sources maintain that porcelain utensils are not immersed and the reason they give is that they cannot be repaired if they are broken.

1. שו"ע י"ד סי' ק"ב
2. שו"ת חלקת יעקב סי' קס"ג אות ב'
3. מג"א סי' ש"א ס"ק נ"ח
4. שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ג סי' ע"ו
5. שו"ת מלמד להועיל סי' מ"ט
6. ע' בנה"ג סי' ק"ב הגה"ט אות י' ושירי ברכה שם סק"ג.

PARSHA CONNECTION

In this week's daf the Gemara discusses a promise that a lady may have to make if she wants to marry. This week's parsha begins with a discussion between the rabbis and Klal Yisroel which took place at the end of the 40 years. The Possuk (כ"ט פסוק ט') says: אתם נצבים היום כלכם לפני ה' אלהיכם ראשיכם שבטיכם זקניכם ושטריכם כל איש ישראל. The Possuk addresses Klal Yisroel first in the plural but lists different groups, unlike we would find elsewhere. Secondly the next possuk (דברים פסוק י') says: ה' אלהיך ובאלתו אשר לעברך בברית ה' אלהיך כרת עמך היום which is all in the singular. Lastly we need to understand why this additional discussion was necessary.

The Gemara as well as the Rishonim explain that this discussion concerns the ערבות which we have for each other, this is why a special discussion was needed and also explains why the groups are listed separately. The responsibility of a leader is very different than the responsibility of the individual. Therefore, ראשיכם, for example, are listed as a separate category, because they are responsible for a large group, etc. The Rambam explains that this is an individual covenant between each and every individual and the רבש"ע and the purpose is for us to realize that Hashem values each and every one of us enough to engage with us individually. Perhaps we can suggest that these ideas are interconnected, as follows: because each of us is so important to the רבש"ע we have an obligation to look after each other and be responsible for one another. This message is especially relevant for the ימים נוראים which the Zohar writes in hinted in the words "היום נצבים" whereas היום השנה!

POINT TO PONDER

The Mishna says that if somebody's wife went away and a stranger provided her support, according to גדולים בני כהנים he can collect from the husband with a שבועה. Is this true because he said your husband will repay me or even if he doesn't say anything he can collect?

Response to last week's Point to Ponder:

The Gemara says that Rav Nachman took the case of the fellow sent to him by רב ענן before taking the case of the תומים. The Gemara says that רב ענן was wrong in this story and Eliyahu stopped seeing him as a result. However it seems like Rav Nachman isn't blamed for his actions. If prioritizing a תלמיד חכם will cause the other side to get confused and lose his claims, how come Rav Nachman wasn't concerned about this possibility?

In a case where one of the parties is a known תלמיד חכם, there is no concern that the other party would feel intimidated if their case goes first. The problem in the case in our Gemara is that he wasn't actually a תלמיד חכם, just that Rav Nachman mistakenly assumed that he was. Therefore the other party, couldn't figure out why he was getting preferential treatment, and became confused. (שיטה מקובצת)

For more points to ponder by Rabbi Yechiel Grunhaus, or insights by Rabbi Yitzchok Gutterman, please visit our website, dafaweek.org, or download the app

To share an insight from your Chabura please email info@dafaweek.org

The shavua matters is published by the Daf a week program under the rabbinical guidance of Harav Meir Stern shlita and Harav Shmuel Kamenetsky shlita

To sponsor a publication, please contact Rabbi Zacharia Adler, Executive Director at info@dafaweek.org or call 507-daf-week. Sponsorship for one week is \$100

Sections reprinted with permission from the Chicago Torah Center