

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Support for a woman whose husband went out of the country

Rav and Shmuel disagree whether a woman whose husband went out of the country is supported from his property.

Shmuel mentions a circumstance in which Rav would agree with his ruling that she is not supported from his property.

Another qualification is added to this debate and the rationale behind each position is explained.

A practical difference between the two reasons suggested for Shmuel's position is explained.

Four unsuccessful challenges to Shmuel's position are presented.

Two explanations are offered for the last Baraisa's reference to "something else."

The Gemara analyzes whether the two explanations disagree with one another.

Another three unsuccessful challenges to Shmuel's position are recorded.

(Continued on page 2)

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?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Yaacov Maghen in loving memory of Davood Sasoon ben Itzchak And in memory of Rabbi Itzchak Kirzner o"n And in memory of Moshe Farzad ben Nejatollah, Rachamim ben Chaim, Aba Art ben Betty, Avraham ben Mashiach, Nadia bat Yossef, Esther bat Ovadia, Mahin bat Habib.

Distinctive INSIGHT

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 non-kosher 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. ■

HALACHAH 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 beracha (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

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

R' Dimi and Ravin present different conflicting versions of the rulings of Rebbi and R' Yishmael on the matter.

The Gemara rules in favor of Rav's position that a woman is granted support from her missing husband's property.

Tangentially the Gemara rules like R' Huna in the name of Rav that a woman can refuse her husband's financial support so that she does not have to give him her wages.

A seemingly unrelated ruling from R' Zevid concerning glazed vessels is presented.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents the second of Chanan's two rulings. ■

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

STORIES Off 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! ■