

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) An idolater's wine (cont.)

R' Yehudah ben Besaira's ruling that wine deposited by an idolater remains permitted for benefit is challenged.

R' Zeira resolves the contradiction by distinguishing between the position of R' Eliezer and Rabanan.

Amoraim are cited as ruling in accordance with R' Eliezer's position.

2) Seals

R' Elazar states that everything is guarded with a seal except wine and R' Yochanan maintains that even wine is guarded with one seal.

The Gemara asserts that they do not disagree with one another.

A second understanding of their respective positions is presented.

Rava defines a seal within a seal.

A Baraisa discusses wine that comes from different places and whether it is prohibited.

The two stages of this halacha are explained.

The Baraisa's ruling that closed barrels from these places are permitted is challenged.

R' Zeira offers an answer to this challenge.

R' Yirmiyah challenges this explanation and offers his own explanation.

3) Beer of idolaters

Two different explanations are given for why Chazal prohibited the consumption of beer of idolaters.

R' Nachman's explanation is that it is related to the fact that it was uncovered. This is unsuccessfully challenged.

Further discussion of the prohibition of beer of idolaters is presented.

Another aspect of the prohibition against uncovered liquids is mentioned. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What happens to wine when it is deposited by an idolater?

2. Give some examples of a seal within a seal?

3. What are the two possible reasons Chazal prohibited the beer of idolaters?

4. What is the reason Arameans are unaffected by the harmful effects of uncovered liquids?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Fruit beverages and liquors

אתמר מפני מה אסרו שכר של עובדי כוכבים וכו'

The Gemara brings a discussion which took place regarding שכר, liquors made from fruits, that are produced by idolaters. The question was posed why these beverages were prohibited for Jews. Tosafos (ד"ה מפני) immediately notes that we do not find a source which states that these juices and liquors are actually prohibited, not in a Mishnah, nor in a Baraisa. Tosafos suggests, therefore, that perhaps these were declared to be prohibited in the days of Amoraim. Meiri writes that the sages never declared these to be prohibited, and the discussion in the Gemara is referring to a custom among the pious to abstain from these beverages as an extended degree of purity. In fact, Meiri cites a text which reads "Why did they say (אמרו) that these are not to be used?" rather than "Why are these prohibited (אסרו)?"

Two reasons are offered to explain why these liquors are not allowed for Jews. Rami bar Chamma says that it is in order to avoid socializing with the gentiles. Ultimately, if we mix socially and drink these beverages with them, we might mingle and our children might eventually marry among each other. Rav Nachman explains that it is due to the danger of גילוי—the beverage might have been left exposed, and a snake might have tasted from it and deposited his venom in the container. The gentiles are not careful to guard against this, so we must avoid these beverages as a precaution not to be exposed to this risk.

In Sefer HaYashar, Rabeinu Tam points out that according to Rav Nachman, fruit beverages of idolaters are prohibited because of the danger of גילוי. Yet, this particular danger was already recognized in the time of the Mishnah. Why were fruit juices not included in the original restrictions with the other beverages and foods which are susceptible to snake's venom? Why was this only enacted upon in the time of the Amoraim?

Rabeinu Tam explains that in the time of the Mishnah the sages did not want to prohibit fruit juices and liquors because water was not always easy to find in certain areas. If they would have prohibited drinking fruit beverages it would have caused too much of a hardship for the community. Furthermore, the sages did not feel that the problem of גילוי was a serious problem in the case of fruit juices, as snakes did not seem to drink from these beverages. This can be seen from the opinion of Rami bar Chamma, who said that the only problem with these beverages was a social

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Is coffee prohibited if it is made by a gentile?

מפני מה אסרו שכר של עובדי כוכבים

Why did Chazal prohibit beer of idolaters?

Tosafos¹ writes that beer that is made by cooking grain is not prohibited if it was cooked by gentiles (בישול). Even though the grain could not be consumed raw and thus qualifies for the prohibition of food cooked by a gentile, nevertheless, since the volume the grain added to the beer is minimal it is nullified in the water and thus not subject to the prohibition of food cooked by a gentile. This approach also explains why the beracha on this liquid by-product is shehakol. This ruling is codified by Rema².

Pri Chadash³ objects to Rema's position that beer made from grain as opposed to dates is permitted. Since the Gemara states without qualification that beer is prohibited, the implication is that all beer is prohibited even if it is made from grain. However, it is permitted to drink coffee that was made by a gentile. One reason he offers for this is based on the principle established by Tosafos. When drinking coffee one is not consuming dissolved coffee grinds; rather the hot water merely absorbs the taste of the coffee grinds. The volume the coffee grinds add to the water is minimal. Therefore, just like the halacha is that one makes a shehakol on

(Insight...continued from page 1)

consideration of weddings, and he disregards the issue of snakes completely. Sefer Lechem Sesarim says that wine itself was prohibited due to a concern that it might be confused with wine of gentiles used for libation (ייין נסך). They did not want to prohibit fruit juices, as this would be a גזירה לגזירה. The Amoraim saw fit to prohibit these beverages due to further review of their circumstances. ■

coffee since the water is the primary ingredient, so too, coffee is also not subject to the restrictions of food cooked by a gentile since water is not subject to those restrictions.

Teshuvos Panim Meiros⁴ disagrees with Pri Chadash's lenient ruling concerning coffee that was made by a gentile. He writes that Bach⁵ already took issue with the rationale of Tosafos. When manufacturing beer from grain it is unreasonable to assert that the grain is secondary when a large quantity of grain is used in the beer making process and the taste comes from the grain rather than the water. The reason the beracha is shehakol is that the grain has been physically changed from its original state, and the beracha of shehakol has nothing to do with the grain being considered secondary. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה ותררויהו.
2. רמ"א יו"ד סי' קי"ד סעי' א'.
3. פרי חדש שם סק"ו.
4. שו"ת פנים מאירות ח"ב סי' ס"ב.
5. ב"ח יו"ד סי' קי"ד סעי' א'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Apple Does Not Fall Far from the Tree

"אלא שם יהו פירותיו..."

The Chasam Sofer, zt"l, was a huge opponent of Moses Mendelssohn and his many works. Even so, a certain Yiddish paper claimed otherwise in an edition commemorating one hundred years from Mendelssohn's death.

When Rav Shlomo Alexander Sofer, a grandson of the Chasam Sofer, heard of this paper's false claim, he related a statement of his father, Rav Shimon Sofer, zt"l, which refuted their position once and for all.

Rav Shimon had asked his own father why he was so certain that Mendels-

sohn's works were not appropriate reading. After all, he knew that his father had not actually read them, so how could he comment in such a harsh tone against them?

The Chasam Sofer's reply was very revealing. "The verse states, 'מקום שיפול — העץ שם יהו — The place where the tree has fallen is where it will be.' The Gemara in Avodah Zarah 31 understands this verse to refer to a talmid chacham who has fallen—who has left the world. The Gemara asks the obvious question: if he has left the world, how could he still be there? It replies that this refers to his 'fruits'—his students and children.

"This teaches us that we can know a rav's true character from the actions of his students and children. Although the rav himself may exhibit all the signs of purity, his students show what is really in

his heart since they receive his direction. This is how people explain the Mishnah in Avos, which contrasts the students of Avraham Avinu with the students of Bilaam. Even regarding Bilaam himself, the only way for us to determine his true character is to examine his students.

Rav Shimon concluded, "The students, and especially the children, of Avraham went in his ways and kept to Hashem's path. The students of Bilaam took a very different direction. They denied Hashem and did not guard their daughters from immodest ways. My father's words were almost prophetic. As we know now in the fullness of time, Moses Mendelssohn has not one Jewish descendant. All his progeny without exception are not Jewish or are meshumadim."¹ ■

1. רבינו שמעון סופר, ח"ב, ע"י ש"א ■