

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Containers owned by idolaters (cont.)

The Gemara concludes presenting its unsuccessful challenge to Meraimar's position that glazed earthenware utensils used for nesekh wine regardless of their color may be used.

A related incident is recorded.

2) Grape seeds and grape peels

A Baraisa rules that grape seeds from idolaters that are moist are prohibited but those that are dry are permitted.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel defines these terms.

Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan further elaborates on the halachos of grape seeds and peels from idolaters.

The Gemara discusses five items that are permitted after twelve months.

3) Muries

A Baraisa teaches that muries obtained by professionals is permitted as is chilak.

Avimi the son of R' Avahu cites another Baraisa that qualifies the leniency of using muries made by a professional.

A related incident is recorded.

4) Cheese of Beis Unyaki

Reish Lakish explains why cheese from Beis Unyaki is prohibited from benefit.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another unsuccessful challenge to the explanation of Reish Lakish is presented.

5) Ox waste

R' Achdavoï in the name of Rav rules that betrothal with the waste of an ox that is stoned is valid but not if it comes from an ox used for idolatry.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Is a fast for part of a day considered a fast?

2. What utensils become permitted after a period of twelve months?

3. Is all muries purchased from professionals permitted?

4. Why is a betrothal performed with the waste of an ox that is stoned a valid betrothal?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Adding wine to muries

ההוא ארבה דמורייסא דאתי לנמילא דעכו אותיב רבי אבא דמן עכו נטורי וכו'

The **מורייס** of an idolater, a concoction made from oils of fish innards, is prohibited for a Jew to eat, and, according to R' Meir, it is also prohibited from benefit (Mishnah, 29b). The reason is that idolaters regularly mixed wine into this mixture, or that fats from non-kosher fish might be mixed in to it. The sages prohibit eating **מורייס**, but they did not prohibit deriving benefit from it. Our Gemara cites a Baraisa where we find that **מורייס** made by an expert chef is permitted. The reason is that an expert would not blend foreign substances in his recipe for **מורייס**.

The Gemara then quotes Avimi b. R' Avahu who says that sometimes even the muries of an expert would be prohibited. The procedure was that water and salt were added to the muries in order to remove part of the fat. The first and second time this water and salt is added, the amount of fat was abundant, so no wine was added. However, the third time this was done, it was common even for an expert to add some wine to augment its taste, and the wine was beneficial. Therefore, from the third time and beyond, the muries even of an expert was prohibited.

The Gemara brings a story of a boat stocked with muries which arrived at the port at Acco. R' Abba assigned guards to make sure no wine was added to its contents. Rava questioned the efficacy of this gesture. Rava asked, "Who guarded it until it arrived at our port?" In other words, what guarantee was there that the muries on board had not already been contaminated?

R' Abba explained that at the point of origin of this boat, the cost of wine was much higher than the value of the muries. No one would have added the expensive wine to enhance the taste of the less valuable muries. In Acco, however, the cost of wine was cheaper, and it was less than the muries, so there now existed a great incentive for the merchants to add wine. It was also not reasonable to say that the sailors had brought wine via the city of Tzor, where wine was also inexpensive, because the tides and currents of the water there were dangerous.

Tosafos explains that the muries on the boat was that of an expert, and it was noticeable that it had not had water and salt the first two times. Maharsha explains that wine was not needed to improve the muries, and the guards were stationed to ensure that no wine was brought because of

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Kashering earthenware utensils

התורה העידה על כלי חרס שאינו יוצא מידי דופנו לעולם

The Torah testifies regarding earthenware utensils that it (prohibited taste) does not leave the walls of the utensil ever

The Gemara declares that the taste of nesseh wine contained in the walls of an earthenware barrel never leaves. Tosafos¹ challenges this declaration from the Gemara in Zevachim (96a) that teaches that it is possible to kasher a non-kosher earthenware utensil by putting it into a kiln. How then could our Gemara declare that the taste of nesseh wine can never be removed? Tosafos answers that putting an earthenware utensil into a kiln does not cause the prohibited taste to leave the walls of the utensil; rather it is considered as though a new utensil was manufactured that does not have the prohibited taste in its walls. Talmidei R' Yonah² further explain that when one puts an earthenware utensil in an oven it does not extract the taste from the walls, which is the normal process of kashering; rather it completely burns up the taste leaving a "new" utensil in its place.

Tosafos³ challenges his own explanation from a statement of the Torah. The Torah declares (Vayikra 11:35) that when an earthenware oven or stove become tamei it should be broken. If it is possible to remove prohibited taste by put-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

the cheap price. If the boat was filled with standard muries, there would have been a suspicion that wine had already been added to improve the taste, even though wine was expensive. Maharsha notes that Rashi explains that an expert's muries is ruined with wine the first two times it is blended, but Tosafos disagrees and says that wine is not needed for taste. ■

ting an earthenware utensil in a kiln and it emerges a "new" utensil why shouldn't one be able to also put a tamei utensil into a kiln and when removed it should be considered "new" and completely free of tum'ah? R' Shimshon of Shantz⁴ answers that the option of using a kiln to make a "new" utensil applies only to pots and other utensils but is not a valid method for ovens and stoves. When it comes to earthenware dishes in general that absorbed prohibited taste they are considered "new" when put into a kiln since that is not their normal manner of usage. In contrast, it is normal for earthenware stoves and ovens to reach the temperature of a kiln and in fact, that is how they absorbed prohibited taste in the first place. As such, they do not become "new" when put into a kiln. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה שאינו
2. תלמידי ר' יונה ד"ה דמדייתי
3. תוס' הנ"ל
4. מובא דבריו בתוס' הנ"ל ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The White Garments

במה שימש משה

Rav Shmuel Ehrenfeld, zt"l, the Av Beis Din of Mattersdorf, would often travel to Belz to visit the rebbe, Rav Yisachar Dov of Belz, zt"l. During his visits he would either stay with Rav Ahraon of Belz, zt"l, the son of the rebbe, or with the rebbe's son-in-law, Rav Pinchas of Ostila, zt"l.

The rebbe drew him very near, often giving him great honor. One Shavuos, he even received the aliyah when the Aseres Hadibros are read, a very great honor. He afterwards commented that he was certain that this honor was only given to him because he was a direct

descendant of the Chasam Sofer, zt"l.

When the rebbe was living in the town of Ratzfert, Rav Simcha Bunim Ehrenfeld, zt"l, once paid the rebbe a visit. While the two spoke in learning an interesting question came up, which Rav Simcha Bunim answered from a statement on today's daf.

The rebbe asked Rav Simcha Bunim in a puzzled tone, "What is this I hear that in Mattersdorf the custom is for the father of the child, the mohel, and the sandek to wear a kittel during the bris?"

Rav Shmuel replied that he believed this custom had been extracted from the Gemara. "On Avodah Zarah 34 the gemara speculates whether Moshe Rabbeinu wore priestly garments during the seven days that he did the avodah. Did he wear them or, because he was

not actually a kohen, did he wear white garments while he served instead? The Gemara offers two answers, and both sources maintain that he wore the white garment while he served.

"We see that when a non-kohein does avodah he must wear a white garment. In view of the Midrash Rabbah in Parshas Yayeira which teaches that a bris is like bringing a korban and offering incense, it is not difficult to understand why the custom in Mattersdorf is to wear white!" ■

1. ושמואל בדורו ע' נ"א

(Insight...continued from page 1)

The Gemara offers a logical explanation for this ruling and one that is based on a verse.

Rava asserts that both of these rulings can be derived from the Mishnah. ■