

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: חֶמֶץ בְּזִמְנוֹ, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ וּבֵין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – אֲסוּר בְּנִתְּנָן טַעַם. שְׂלֵא בְּזִמְנוֹ, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – מוֹתֵר.

And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to leavened bread that falls into a mixture during its time of prohibition, whether it is mixed with its own type of substance or another type of substance, it becomes prohibited only when there is enough of the forbidden item to give flavor to the mixture. However, not during its time of prohibition, but rather after Passover, it is always permitted, regardless of whether it falls into a mixture of its own type of substance or whether it falls into a mixture of another type of substance.

חֶמֶץ בְּזִמְנוֹ בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ בְּנִתְּנָן טַעַם – רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְטַעְמִיהָ, דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן וְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ דְּאָמְרֵי תְרוּוּיָהּ: כֹּל אִיסוּרֵין שְׁבִתוֹרָה, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – בְּנִתְּנָן טַעַם. שְׂלֵא בְּזִמְנוֹ, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – מוֹתֵרִין – כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן.

The Gemara explains this position: With regard to the statement that leavened bread that falls into a mixture during its time of prohibition, whether with its own type of food or with another type of food, then it is prohibited only when it gives flavor to the mixture, Rabbi Yoḥanan conforms to his line of reasoning below. As it is Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish who both say: With regard to any foods forbidden by the Torah that fall into a mixture, whether of its own type of food or another type of food, the mixture is prohibited when there is enough of the forbidden item to give flavor to the mixture. If less than this amount falls into the mixture, it is nullified by the large majority of permitted food. Rabbi Yoḥanan's statement that not during its time of prohibition, but rather after Passover, it is permitted, regardless of whether it falls into a mixture of its own type of food or into a mixture of another type of food, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who maintains that leavened bread owned by a Jew during Passover is not prohibited afterward.

Perek II  
Daf 30 Amud a

HALAKHA

A mixture of leavened bread – תַּעֲרוּבַת חֶמֶץ: During Passover, even a small bit of leavened bread that falls into a mixture renders it forbidden, whether it is mixed into the same type of substance or into a different type of substance, in accordance with Rava's ruling (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 447:1*).

Leavened bread after Passover – חֶמֶץ שְׂלֵא בְּזִמְנוֹ: The *halakha* with regard to a mixture containing leavened bread at a time that is not Passover, either before or after the Festival, is that the leavened bread is subject to nullification in the mixture regardless of whether it falls into the same type of substance or into a different type of substance, so long as it is less than one-sixtieth of the mixture (*Tur*). Most authorities rule that when the leavened bread fell into a mixture after Passover, the leavened bread can be nullified in a mixture so long as the permitted substance constitutes a majority of the mixture (*Be'er Heitev, Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 447:1*).

NOTES

But a mixture, no – אֲבָל עַל יְדֵי תַּעֲרוּבַת לֹא – It is insufficient for a mixture to have a one-to-one ratio of leavened bread to permitted food in order to be permitted. Rather, the leavened bread must be nullified by the majority of the permitted food, even if it still is of sufficient quantity to impart a noticeable taste (*Ritva*). This principle applies only when the leavened bread fell into the mixture unintentionally. However, if one intentionally created such a mixture, Rabbi Shimon would impose a penalty, and the mixture would be forbidden (*Ra'ah*).

Leavened bread from the gentiles – חֶמֶץ אֲדוּמֵי חֵילָא: Some explain that Rav Naḥman only instructed them to buy leaven, i.e., yeast, so that they could make their own bread, but he did not give them permission to purchase leavened bread itself. This distinction could be based on the stringency of the prohibition against leavened bread, or because Rav Naḥman himself is of the opinion that throughout the year one may not eat bread baked by gentiles (*Maharam Ḥalawa*).

אָמַר רַבָּא: הֲלִכְתָּא, חֶמֶץ בְּזִמְנוֹ, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – אֲסוּר בְּמִשְׁהוּ, כְּרַב. שְׂלֵא בְּזִמְנוֹ, בֵּין בְּמִינוֹ בֵּין שְׂלֵא בְּמִינוֹ – מוֹתֵר, כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן.

Rava said: The *halakha* is that with regard to the prohibition against eating a mixture of leavened bread during its time of prohibition, i.e., during Passover, regardless of whether it is mixed with its own type or with another type, it is forbidden,<sup>h</sup> even if any amount becomes mixed in, in accordance with the opinion of Rav. Not during its time of prohibition, but rather after the conclusion of Passover, regardless of whether the leavened bread was mixed with its own type or with another type, it is permitted, even when it gives flavor to the mixture. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who states that leavened bread owned by a Jew during Passover is permitted after Passover.<sup>h</sup>

וּמִי אָמַר רַבָּא הֵכִי? וְהָאֵמַר רַבָּא: רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן קִנְסָא קְנִיס, הוֹאִיל וְעֵבֶר עָלָיו בְּבַל יִרְאֶה וּבַל יִמְצֵא!

The Gemara asks: Did Rava actually say this, that according to Rabbi Shimon, leavened bread owned by a Jew on Passover is permitted after Passover? But didn't Rava himself say that Rabbi Shimon imposed a penalty forbidding one from deriving benefit from leavened bread owned by a Jew during Passover, since he transgressed the prohibition it shall not be seen and the prohibition it shall not be found?

הֲנִי מִלִּי – בְּעֵינֵיהָ, אֲבָל עַל יְדֵי תַּעֲרוּבַת – לֹא. וְאֲזָדָא רַבָּא לְטַעְמִיהָ, דְּאָמַר רַבָּא: כִּי הָיִינוּ בִּי רַב נַחְמָן, כִּי הוּוּ נִפְקֵי שְׁבַע יוֹמֵי דְפִסְחָא, אָמַר לָן: פּוֹקוּ וּזְבִינוּ חֶמֶרָא דְבִנֵי חֵילָא.

The Gemara resolves this challenge: This penalty applies only to leavened bread that is in its pure unadulterated form, but with regard to a mixture, no,<sup>n</sup> one does not impose a penalty, even though the leavened bread is still extant. The Gemara adds: And Rava follows his line of reasoning, stated elsewhere, that indicates that he rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as Rava said: While we were studying in Rav Naḥman's house, on the evening when the seven days of Passover had passed, he said to us: Go and buy leavened bread from the gentiles<sup>n</sup> who baked it on that day, the last day of Passover. Based on this story, it is clear that he maintained that one may eat leavened bread that was owned by a gentile during Passover.

**Pots on Passover – קְדוּרוֹת בַּפֶּסַח**: Pots used during the year for leavened bread should be cleaned from any actual particles of leavened bread and put away for the duration of Passover. However, one is permitted to use them after Passover, as stated by Shmuel and accepted by Rava (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 451:1*).

**Dough with milk – עִסָּה בְּחֵלֶב** – It is prohibited to put milk in dough, lest one eat the bread with meat, and if he kneaded the dough with milk, the bread may not be eaten. However, one may put milk in dough if he makes small rolls that can be consumed in one sitting or if they have a unique shape that distinguishes them as dairy (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 97:1*).

אָמַר רַב: קְדוּרוֹת בַּפֶּסַח יִשְׁבְּרוּ. וְאִמְאִי? לְשִׁינָהּ אַחַר הַפֶּסַח, וְלִיעֵבֵד בְּהוּ שְׁלֵא בְּמִינָן! גְּזִירָה דִּילְמָא אָתוּ לְמִיעֵבֵד בְּהוּ בְּמִינוּ.

Rav said: Earthenware pots in which leavened bread was cooked during Passover should be broken, as some small quantity of the flavor of the leavened bread was absorbed into the pot. It is therefore prohibited to cook in them again, as the forbidden flavor of this leavened bread would be transmitted to the new food. The Gemara asks: **And why was Rav so stringent with regard to these pots? Let him retain the pots until after the conclusion of Passover and prepare mixtures of another type of food in them.** Even Rav maintains that when a small bit of leavened bread is mixed with another type of food after Passover, the mixture is permitted. The Gemara explains that he did allow this due to a rabbinic decree that perhaps one will come to prepare a mixture of the same type in these pots, causing their contents to become prohibited. He therefore instructed that one destroy these pots in order to avoid this pitfall.

וְשִׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: לֹא יִשְׁבְּרוּ, אֲבָל מְשִׁיחֵי לְהוּ לְאַחַר זְמַנּוּ, וְעֵבֵד בְּהוּ בֵּין בְּמִינוּ בֵּין שְׁלֵא בְּמִינוּ.

And Shmuel said: They need not be broken. Rather, he should retain them<sup>N</sup> until after its time, i.e., the conclusion of Passover, and then he may prepare food of either the same type or another type in them.<sup>H</sup>

וְאִזְדָּא שְׁמוּאֵל לְטַעְמֵיהּ, דְּאָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל לְהַנְהוּ דְּמִזְבְּנֵי בְּנֵי: אִשּׁוּ וְבִינֵי אֲבַנְדִּיכֵי, וְאִי לֹא – דְּרִשְׁינָא לְכוּ כְּרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן.

And Shmuel follows his line of reasoning, stated elsewhere, as Shmuel said to the pot merchants, who would dramatically raise their prices after Passover: **Level the prices for your pots. And if you do not bring your prices down, I will teach you that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon,<sup>N</sup>** that one is permitted to derive benefit from leavened bread after Passover. This ruling would lead people to retain their vessels and desist from purchasing new vessels after Passover, and consequently the merchants would lose business.

וְלִידְרוֹשׁ לְהוּ, דְּהָא שְׁמוּאֵל כְּרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן סְבִירָא לֵיהּ! אֲתֵרֵיהּ דְּרַב הָדוּ.

The Gemara asks: **Let him indeed teach this ruling to them, for Shmuel holds that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon,** as was previously mentioned. As such, why did he not publicize his opinion on the matter? The Gemara answers: **It was Rav's locale,<sup>N</sup>** and therefore it would not be appropriate for Shmuel to publicly present a position with which Rav did not agree. However, when he saw the merchants raising their prices in an unfair manner, he nevertheless threatened to make his opinion on the matter public.

הָהוּא תַנּוּרָא דְטָחוּ בֵּיהּ טִיחֵיָא, אֲסָרָה רְבָא בְּרֵי אֵהִילָאֵי לְמִיכְלֵיהּ לְרִיפְתָא אֲפִילוּ בְּמִילְחָא לְעוֹלָם, דִּילְמָא אָתֵי לְמִיכְלֵיהּ בְּכוֹתָתָא.

The Gemara recounts: There was a certain oven that they smeared with grease from meat, and consequently the flavor of meat was absorbed into it, and then they used it to bake bread. **Rava bar Ahilai prohibited eating this bread even with salt,** and not just with milk. This status would apply forever to bread baked in this oven, even during subsequent baking, **lest one eat** such bread with *kutah*, a dairy-based seasoning, which would be a violation of the prohibition against eating meat with milk.

מִיתִיבֵי: אִין לְשִׁין אֶת הָעִסָּה בְּחֵלֶב, וְאִם לֹשׁ – כָּל הַפֶּת כּוֹלֵה אֲסוּרָה, מִפְּנֵי הָרְגֵל עֲבִירָה. כִּיּוֹצֵא בּוּ

The Gemara raises an objection to this statement: It was taught that **one may not knead the dough with milk,<sup>H</sup> and if he did knead the dough with milk, then all of the bread is prohibited due to concern that he will commit a habitual transgression.** As one habitually eats bread with meat, there is a concern that one will come to eat this bread with meat as well, unwittingly transgressing the prohibition against eating meat with milk. **Similarly,**

NOTES

He should retain them – מְשִׁיחֵי לְהוּ: This appears to contradict the principle that one may not intentionally effect the neutralization of a prohibited item. As such, why was it permitted in this situation? The Ritva offers several reasons why this case is different. First, when the flavor of the leavened bread was absorbed by the walls of the pot it was still permitted, and the prohibition would apply only if it were to emerge via cooking during Passover. Second, even if the flavor of the leavened bread were transmitted by the pot, it would add a bad flavor to the food, which would not make it prohibited. Finally, it can be assumed that only a small bit of the flavor of the leavened bread will be transmitted by the pot, and consequently there is room for leniency.

I will teach you that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon – דְּרִשְׁינָא לְכוּ כְּרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן: In this case Shmuel wished to prevent the pot merchants from exploiting the people's piety to turn a larger profit. Therefore, he threatened to make the lenient opinion known, which would cause many people to desist from purchasing new pots after Passover.

Rav's locale – אֲתֵרֵיהּ דְּרַב: Ordinarily, when a certain Sage lives in a city and the people there accept him as their leader, then he is considered the spiritual leader of that place. The residents of the city are required to accept his legal rulings so long as they were not rejected categorically by the other Sages. Therefore, even after Rav's death it was still considered unacceptable for a Sage to present a position that Rav opposed in his locale.

NOTES

**Fat tail [alya] of a sheep** – אַלְיָה: The *alya* is the long, thick, fatty tail of the genus of sheep that was common in Eretz Yisrael and the surrounding areas during the Temple era. The tail covered the entire back of the sheep, to the extent that it was difficult to ascertain the gender of the sheep, particularly in younger animals. The Torah commands that when a sheep is brought as a peace-offering, the tail is one of the parts of the animal burned on the altar. This applies only to sheep, as other animals that were sacrificed, e.g., goats, do not have this kind of tail.

**These knives** – הַנִּי סְכִינֵי: Some explain that these knives require purging in boiling water and whitening by fire even though they are ordinarily used for cutting bread, because one will occasionally insert them into a pot that is cooking on the fire (*Mikhtam*).

**In boiling water in a primary vessel** – בְּרוֹתְחִין וּבְכָלֵי רְאוּשׁוֹן: Most authorities explain that this applies only to a primary vessel that is on the fire, and not to one that has been removed from the fire.

HALAKHA

**Rendering earthenware pots kosher** – הַכְּשֵׁרֵת קְדֵרוֹת לְפֶסַח: Earthenware pots that were used to cook leavened bread cannot be used during Passover, and even if one fills them with coals or places them in the oven there is still concern that he will not heat them thoroughly enough, as stated in the Gemara. The only way these vessels can be prepared for use on Passover is if they are returned to the kiln, as stated by *Tosafot* (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 451:1*).

**Rendering a griddle kosher** – הַכְּשֵׁרֵת בּוּכֵיָא: A griddle used for baking leavened bread cannot be used for Passover after being kindled from the outside. However, if one fills it with coals, it is permissible to use such a pan on Passover (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 451:2*).

**Rendering knives kosher** – הַכְּשֵׁרֵת סְכִינִים: In order to render a knife fit for use on Passover one must purge it in boiling water in a primary vessel, even if it is not resting on the fire (*Tur*). One must first be sure that it is entirely free of rust or other filth before this immersion (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 451:3*).

אִין טְשִׁין אֶת הַתְּנֹר בְּאַלְיָה, וְאִם טָשׂ – כָּל הַפֶּת בּוֹלֵה אֶסְוָה, עַד שֶׁיִּסְיֵק אֶת הַתְּנֹר, הָא הוֹסֵק הַתְּנֹר – מִיָּהָא שְׂרִי תִיּוֹבְתָא דְרַבָּא בְּרֵ אֶהֱלֵאִי! תִּיּוֹבְתָא.

אָמַר לִיָּה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אֲשִׁי: וְכִי מֵאֲחַר דְּאִיתְתַּב רַבָּא בְּרֵ אֶהֱלֵאִי, אֲמַאי קְאָמַר רַב קְדֵירוֹת בְּפֶסַח יִשְׁבְּרוּ. אָמַר לִיָּה: הָתָם – תְּנֹר שֶׁל מִתְכֶּת, הֵכָא בְּקִדְיָה שֶׁל חָרָס.

וְאִיבְעִית אִימָא: הָא וְהָא בְּשֶׁל חָרָס, וְהָ – הִסְיֵקוֹ מִבְּפִנִים, וְזֶה – הִסְיֵקוֹ מִבְּחוּץ. וְכִי תִימָא הֵכִי נִמְי לְיַעֲבֹד לִיָּה הִסְקָה מִבְּפִנִים – חֲיִים עֲלֵיהָ מִשׁוּם דְּפִקְעָה.

הַלְכָּךְ, הָאִי בּוּכֵיָא – הִסְיֵקוֹ מִבְּחוּץ הוּא, וְאֶסְוֹר. וְאִי מְלִיָּה גּוֹמְרִי – שְׂפִיר דְּמִי.

אָמַר לִיָּה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אֲשִׁי: הַנִּי סְכִינֵי בְּפֶסַח אֵיכִי עֲבָדִינָן לְהוּ? אָמַר לִיָּה: לְדִידֵי חֲדַתָּא קָא עֲבָדִינָן. אָמַר לִיָּה: תִּינַח מִר דְּאֶפְשָׁר לִיָּה, דְּלֹא אֶפְשָׁר לִיָּה מֵאִי? אָמַר לִיָּה: אֲנָא כְּעִין חֲדַתָּא קְאָמִינָא; קִתְּיָהוּ בְּטִינָא, וּפְרִזְלֵיהוּ בְּנֹרָא, וְהָדָר מְעִינָא לְקִתְּיָהוּ בְּרוֹתְחִין. וְהָלְכָתָא: אִידִי וְאִידִי בְּרוֹתְחִין, וּבְכָלֵי רְאוּשׁוֹן.

one may not smear the inside of an oven with the fat tail [*alya*] of a sheep,<sup>N</sup> because it is meat. And if one did smear it over the oven, then all of the bread baked in it is prohibited, lest one accidentally eat this bread with milk. However, this applies only until one kindles the oven and burns off this fat. The Gemara infers from this *baraita* that if the oven was kindled afterward then it is permitted in any case. This would seem to present a conclusive refutation of the statement of Rava bar Ahilai who maintains that the bread cooked in this oven is prohibited forever, even after the oven is rekindled. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, this is a conclusive refutation of his opinion.

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: Since the statement of Rava bar Ahilai was refuted, why did Rav say that pots that were used for leavened bread on Passover should be broken? Presumably, their status could be remedied in the same way as was that of this oven, by heating them on a fire until the flavor of the leavened bread absorbed in them was removed. Rav Ashi said to him: There is a distinction between these two cases. There, it is referring to a metal oven, which can be cleansed through an additional kindling, while here, it is referring to an earthenware pot, where additional kindling is insufficient, as the earthenware has the capacity to absorb more of the flavor of the leavened bread and it cannot be purged by fire.

If you wish, say instead that both this, the oven, and that, the pot, are earthenware, but that the following distinction applies. This, the oven, is kindled from the inside, and as the fire is kindled inside the oven itself, it consumes the absorbed flavor of the leavened bread. While that, the pot, is kindled from the outside, such that the flavor of the prohibited material absorbed in the pot is not purged by the fire. And if you say, so too here, in the case of the pot, he should perform the kindling procedure on the pots from the inside to remove that which has been absorbed, this is not reasonable. Presumably, the owner of the pot will be concerned lest it burst if he makes the pot too hot. Therefore, he will not use sufficient heat to ensure that the leavened bread that has been absorbed will be completely purged.<sup>H</sup>

The Gemara concludes: Therefore, based on this principle, this griddle made from earthenware tiles that was used to bake bread is a type of oven where the kindling is from the outside and therefore prohibited. But if he fills it with burning coals, then it seems well and it can be used afterward.<sup>H</sup> Because this vessel is often subject to a high level of heat, the owner will not be concerned that it will break when heated.

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: With regard to these knives,<sup>N</sup> how do we prepare them for use during Passover? Rav Ashi said to him: For me, personally, we craft new ones. Ravina said to him: It works out well for Master, as you are able to afford new knives. However, what should one who is unable to purchase new knives do? He said to him: I was speaking of making them like new by thoroughly cleaning them in the following manner: One should cover the wooden handles in mud, so that they will not be burned, and heat the metal with fire until it is white-hot. And then I place the handles of the knives in boiling water in order to remove anything that had been absorbed into the wood. And the halakha is that with regard to both this, the blade, and that, the handle, it is sufficient to immerse them in boiling water, so long as this water is still in a primary vessel.<sup>NH</sup> The water must still be in the original pot in which it was boiled and not poured from another pot.

אמר רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: עץ פרוו מגעילו ברותחין ובכלי ראשון. קסבר: כבולעו כך פולטו.

בעו מיניה מאמימר: הני מאני דקוניא מהו לאי שתמושי בהו בפסקא? ירוקא לא תיבעי לך - דודאי אסירי. כי תיבעי לך - אוכמי וחיורי מאי? והיבא דאית בהו קרטופני - לא תיבעי לך, דודאי אסירי. כי תיבעי לך - דשיעי מאי?

אמר ליה: חזינא להו דמידייתי, אלמא בלעי ואסירי, והתורה העידה על בלי חרס שאינו יוצא מידי דופיו לעולם.

ומאי שנא לענין יין נסך, דדריש מרימר: מאני דקוניא, בין אוכמא בין חיורי ובין ירוקי - שרי. וכי תימא: יין נסך - דרבנן, חמץ - דאורייתא. כל דתקון רבנן - בעין דאורייתא תקון. אמר ליה: זה תשמישו על ידי חמין, וזה תשמישו על ידי צונן.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: A wooden ladle<sup>n</sup> should be purged in boiling water in a primary vessel in order to remove the flavor of the forbidden food that it absorbed. The Gemara states: He holds in accordance with the principle: **As it absorbs the flavor of the forbidden substance, so it emits it.** The same cooking method and level of heat that caused the flavor of the forbidden substance to be absorbed in the vessel suffices to discharge the flavor of that substance from the vessel. Therefore, a ladle that absorbed flavor of leavened bread from a pot of boiling water which was over a fire will discharge the flavor of leavened bread once it is placed in the boiling water again.

**They raised a dilemma before Ameimar:** Concerning certain glazed [konya]<sup>h</sup> earthenware vessels,<sup>hb</sup> what is the halakha with regard to using them during Passover? The Gemara explains: With regard to green vessels, the dilemma need not even be raised, as they are certainly prohibited as their coating does not prevent them from absorbing the flavor of leavened bread. **Let the dilemma be raised with regard to black and white vessels:** What is the halakha here? **And furthermore, the dilemma need not be raised when they have cracks;** as the leavened bread will remain stuck in these cracks, **they are certainly prohibited.** **Let the dilemma be raised with regard to smooth vessels:** What is the halakha in that case?

Ameimar said to him: I saw that some of the liquid is expelled [demidayeti]<sup>n</sup> from the outside of the vessel. Apparently they absorb and are therefore prohibited, as they cannot be prepared for use on Passover through cleansing, and the Torah testified about earthenware vessels that when they absorb the flavor of a prohibited substance, they will never leave their defective status<sup>n</sup> and they remain permanently prohibited. The Torah states that a person may cleanse other vessels by scouring and rinsing them, whereas it states that earthenware vessels must be broken.

The Gemara asks: **What is different about wine used for a libation,** with regard to which the halakha of earthenware vessels is more lenient? **As Mareimar taught: A glazed earthenware vessel is permitted whether it is black, white, or green** if it was used to store wine belonging to gentiles.<sup>h</sup> Any wine that came in contact with gentiles is suspected of having been poured as a libation offering to idolatry. **And if you say that it is possible to distinguish between the prohibition of wine used for a libation, which is a rabbinic prohibition, and that of leavened bread, which is forbidden by Torah law, this is difficult, as all ordinances that the Sages instituted, they instituted similar to Torah law.** Once they have declared that this item is prohibited, the principles applicable to Torah prohibitions apply to it as well. **Ameimar said to him:** The distinction between the two cases is that with regard to this vessel, which is used for cooking during Passover, its primary use is with hot foods, and therefore the flavor of the leavened bread has become absorbed within its walls. **But with regard to this vessel, which is used to store wine, its primary use is with cool liquids, which are not absorbed to the same degree.**

LANGUAGE

Glazed [konya] – קוניא: From the Greek *κονία*, *konya*, meaning cement. This phrase refers to vessels plastered with lime or stucco.

HALAKHA

Glazed vessels – מאני דקוניא: Glazed vessels are considered the same as earthenware vessels with regard to the method of rendering them kosher for Passover (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 451:23).

Glazed vessels and libation wine – כלי קוניא בין נסך: A glazed vessel, i.e., earthenware covered in glass, that has been used to store cool wine belonging to a gentile must be scoured and washed in order to be used on Passover (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 135:6).

BACKGROUND

Glazed vessels [manei dekonya] – מאני דקוניא: As described in the Talmud, *manei dekonya* are glazed vessels, where the glaze was made from different types of materials in order to give the vessel various colors. Due to the variation in material, different types of glaze also affected the degree to which the contents of the vessels were absorbed into their walls.

The image displays clay vessels coated with a red glaze from the talmudic period discovered in Dura-Europos, Babylonia, which is in modern Syria, and a clay jug with a green glaze from the same area. Note the difference between the glazed and unglazed sections of the jug.



Glazed pottery

NOTES

Wooden ladle – עץ פרוו: Some say that this was not a ladle used for stirring but a peg placed into a cauldron full of thick stew in order to cool it down (Ritva; Maharam Halawa).

Expelled [demidayeti] – דמידייתי: Some explain that this word is related to the word for ink [deyo], and means that they be-

came black as ink, for the outside of the vessel would blacken after repeated use, due to the food cooked inside it (*Me'iri*; Rabbeinu Hananel; Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh).

Their defective status – מידי דופיו: There are variant readings for this phrase. The standard version has the word *dofyo*, mean-

ing blemish, implying that once the forbidden substance enters an earthenware pot, the pot remains prohibited forever. However, other versions have the word *dofeno*, meaning wall. In that case, the phrase means that the forbidden substance remains absorbed within the walls of the vessel (see *Me'iri* and others).

Can be used for *matza* – משתמש בהן מצה: The early commentaries disagree about whether this statement indicates that one may use this vessel only for cold food on Passover or whether he may use it for hot food as well, as it did not absorb any flavor of leavened bread in the course of its use (see Rosh).

אמר רבא בר אבא אמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר שמואל: כל הכלים שנשתמשו בהן חמץ בצונן – משתמש בהן מצה, חוץ מן בית שאור, הואיל שחיימוצו קשה. אמר רב אשי: ובית חרוסת כבית שאור שחיימוצו קשה דמי.

אמר רבא: הני אגני דמחוזא, הואיל ותדירי למילש בהו חמירא, ומשהו בהו חמירא – כבית שאור שחיימוצו קשה דמי. פשיטא! מהו דתימא: כיון דרווחא – שליט בהו אוירא ולא בלעי, קא משמע לן.

מתני' גוי שהלוה את ישראל על חמץ אחר הפסח – מותר בהנאה, וישראל שהלוה את גוי על חמץ אחר הפסח – אסור בהנאה.

גמ' איתמר, בעל חוב, אבני אמר: למפרע הוא גובה, ורבא אמר: מכאן ולהבא הוא גובה. כל היבא דאקדיש ליה וזבין ליה – כולי עלמא לא פליגי דאיתי מלוה וטריף.

The Gemara continues discussing the ways that a vessel must be cleansed so that it can be used during Passover. Rava bar Abba said that Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Shmuel said: Any vessel that was used for leavened bread only while cool can be used for *matza*,<sup>N</sup> because no flavor of the leavened bread was absorbed by the vessel. The exception to this rule is the leaven container where the yeast was stored, since its leavening is more potent, and it can be assumed that the flavor from the yeast has entered the walls of the vessel even without heat. Rav Ashi said: And the spice container, in which potent spices that contained flour were stored, has the same status as the leaven container whose leavening is potent.<sup>H</sup>

Rava said: With regard to certain bowls of Mehoza, since it is common to knead leavened bread in them and then store the leavened bread in them, they are considered to be like a leaven container whose leavening is potent.<sup>H</sup> The Gemara asks: Why did Rava find it necessary to make this statement? Isn't it obvious that these bowls are the same as a leaven container? The Gemara answers: Lest you say that since these bowls are spacious, the air dominates them and they do not absorb the leavened bread in the same way as does a leaven container, therefore, he teaches us that no such distinction applies.

**MISHNA** If a gentile lent money to a Jew,<sup>H</sup> and the Jew gave him leavened bread as collateral until after Passover, and after Passover the gentile retains this leavened bread in lieu of payment, then one is permitted to derive benefit from this leavened bread. Since the leavened bread was retained by the gentile based on the transfer that took place prior to Passover, the leavened bread is considered to have belonged to the gentile during Passover. Whereas if a Jew lent money to a gentile,<sup>H</sup> and leavened bread was given as collateral during Passover in the same manner as in the previous case, then after Passover it is forbidden to derive benefit from this leavened bread. Since this leavened bread was considered to be in the Jew's property during Passover, it is forbidden to derive benefit from it afterward.

**GEMARA** It was stated that the *amora'im* disagree about the rights of a creditor with regard to collateral. Abaye said: He retroactively collects the property. In a case where the creditor had a lien on the property of the debtor and the debtor defaults on the loan, it is considered as if the creditor acquired rights to the collateral at the time of the loan and not at the time of collection. And Rava said: This is not the case, but rather, he acquires the collateral from that point forward, and has rights to the collateral only from the time that the loan was due. This dispute has ramifications for the status of the property, and actions undertaken with regard to it, during the intervening period. The Gemara sets several limitations on the scope of this dispute: Anywhere that the debtor consecrated or sold the field that was serving as collateral, everyone agrees that the creditor can come and seize this property and override the sale, because its status as collateral preceded its sale.

## HALAKHA

Vessels used for cold foods – כלים שהשתמש בהן בצונן: An earthenware vessel that has been used only for cold leavened bread may even be used for hot foods during Passover. The exception to this is a vessel in which leaven or a spice-flour mixture is kept, as their leavening is more potent (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 451:22).

Vessels used for kneading – כלי לישה: Vessels used to knead leavened bread during the year require purging in boiling water if one wishes to use them on Passover, even if they were used only with cold foods. However, the common practice is not to

use them at all (Rema, citing *Mordekhai; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 451:17).

If a gentile lent money to a Jew – גוי שהלוה את ישראל: If a gentile lent money to a Jew, and the Jew gave him leavened bread as collateral, stating that if he does not repay the loan, the leavened bread will be transferred to the gentile from the time of the loan, then if the Jew did not pay by the set time, the leavened bread is considered to have belonged to the gentile from the time of the loan, and the Jew does not violate the prohibition: It shall not be seen (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 441:1).

If a Jew lent money to a gentile – ישראל שהלוה את גוי: With regard to a Jew who lent money to a gentile, and the gentile gave leavened bread as collateral, if the gentile stipulated that the leavened bread would be transferred retroactive to the time of the loan if he did not pay, and the gentile did not pay, the leavened bread is forbidden. However, if the Jew does not take responsibility for the collateral and the gentile did not stipulate that it would be acquired retroactively, the leavened bread is considered the property of the gentile and it is permitted after Passover (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 441:2).