

76b' HASOCHER ES HAPO'EL CHAP

אָפּוּמאָ גרָנפּאָ דלִישָׁא אַפּוּמאָ – a rim of dough at its mouth,<sup>[1]</sup> thus enabling the cauldron to be completely filled, ומלִיּוּה מִיָּא – and then filled [the cauldron] with water and boiled it.<sup>[2]</sup> אָמַר רַבָּא – Rava commented: מֵאֵן חֲכִים לְמַעְבַּד כִּי – Who would be so wise to perform hagalah on a cauldron in such a manner,<sup>[3]</sup> אִי לֹא רַב עֲקֵבְיָה דְגַבְרָא רַבָּא הוּא – if not Rav Akavyah who is a great person, and capable of making the following analysis: קִסְבֵּר כְּבוּלְעוּ כֶּךָ פּוּלְטוּ – He reasoned that since in the manner that the forbidden matter is absorbed into the lip of the cauldron, in the same manner it is to be expelled, מֵה בּוּלְעוּ בְּנִצּוּצוֹת – therefore, just as [the prohibited matter] was absorbed through splattering of non-kosher food, אַף פּוּלְטוּ בְּנִצּוּצוֹת – so too, it is expelled with the splattering of boiling water.<sup>[4]</sup>

1. [He attached the dough outside the pot] around the mouth (Rashi), with the rim of dough extending higher than the lip of the pot (Raavad). The mouth itself is not to be covered, since this would interfere with the hagalah (Mishnah Berurah 452:30).

2. The rim of dough allows the cauldron to be completely filled so that the boiling water will run over the lip of the pot (Rashi). Although it is still impossible to fill the pot beyond its capacity since the rim of dough does not hold water, nevertheless, the rim does allow the pot to be filled to the very top, while at the same time ensuring that the water will boil over the entire lip (Chazon Ish, Yoreh Deah 19:1).

3. Rashi, as explained by Ritva.

4. [Although normally hagalah can only be accomplished] with water which is in a utensil and not by passing water over the utensil (Ran, Meiri), since the absorption into the lip of the cauldron occurred through mere splatters of non-kosher food, rather than through the cauldron being inserted into another utensil, the lip of the cauldron can be purged of the absorption in the same manner, namely through the splattering of boiling water on the lip (Rashi; see Chazon Ish, Yoreh Deah 19:1). [This is due to the principle of כְּבוּלְעוּ כֶּךָ פּוּלְטוּ, [in the same manner] as the absorption was absorbed so it is expelled. However, this principle does not allow the utensil to be koshered without a rim of dough, since] without the rim of dough affixed to the pot, there is no way of being certain that the water will boil over the lip at this time. [We cannot, however, use this uncertainty regarding the likelihood of the pot boiling over to question the need for purification of the lip, by raising the possibility that the lip never absorbed non-kosher food, since] concerning the non-kosher use, being that it was used many times, we can be certain that there was splattering sometime during its use (Rashi).

[Since ultimately the purpose of the makeshift rim is to cause the water to run over onto the lip,] some Rishonim suggest that as an alternative, the pot can be koshered by filling it with water, bringing it to a boil, and then dropping a hot stone into the pot causing it to overflow, thus accomplishing hagalah on the lip of the pot (Meiri; Rosh, Pesachim 2:4, citing Rabbeinu Yoel and Avi HaEzri, and Ran, Pesachim folio 8b ד"ה עבד לה ד"ה; cf. Ritva, Pesachim 30b; Rabbeinu Yerucham, cited by Beis Yosef, Orach Chaim §452 ואם רבינו ואם...]

to come in contact with all parts of the non-kosher pot and kosher it. What if there is no other pot which is large enough to contain the non-kosher one? The Gemara suggests that the person stick dough along the outside upper edges of the pot, to create a band or ridge of dough which effectively raises the top of the pot a bit. Then, when the pot is filled with water and brought to a boil, the top of the pot and its "real" rim will have contact with the hag'alah water.

<sup>2</sup> Gemara, Avodah Zara 76a.

**Large Pots** In practice, most people would have a hard time handling a hot rock in their kitchen as they kosher. We therefore recommend a variation of Rosh's suggestion; the large pot that will be kashered should be filled with water and brought to a boil. At the same time, a saucepan

should be filled with water<sup>7</sup> and also brought to a boil. Once the water in both pots is boiling, the saucepan should be lowered into the larger pot [don't pour the water from the saucepan into the pot] which will cause the water to overflow from the pot.<sup>8</sup> Essentially, the saucepan is taking the place of an even m'lubenes which Rosh and Shulchan Aruch suggest.

<sup>7</sup> The water in the saucepan is not functional for the kashering and is just there (a) so that the saucepan does not "burn" when it is heated without anything in it, and (b) as a way of knowing when the saucepan is hot enough to serve its role in the kashering.

<sup>8</sup> For a brief video of this, see <https://bit.ly/LargePot>.

גדנפא דלישא. שפה של עיסה סביבות פיה כדי שתקבל מים הרבה ויעברו הרותחין על שפתה: כזולעו. כענין שזלעו שפת הדוד את האיסור יפליטהו: מה זולעו בניצוצות. לאו זולעו אלא ע"י ניצוצות שניתו הרתיחות שם ולא הוכנסה לתוך יורה אחרת בשעת זליעת האיסור: כך בשעת פליטה אע"פ שלא הכניסה לתוך יורה אחרת הואיל ונתמלאת יפה יפה ומעלה ניצוצות על שפתה ופולטו. ומיהו גדנפא זענין משום דאי לאו הכי דלמא לא הוה מסקא ניצוצות על השפה זחא זימנא אצל איסור הגתזשל צה פעמים הרבה אם לא העלה ניצוצות כל שעה העלה פעם אחת: ונועלה. אע"פ

ומליוה מיא וארתחה למעבד כי הא מילתא ברא רבא הוא קסבר בולעו בנצוצות אף זן שפה והיא מהורה: חמא ינועצה עשרה רב הונא בריה דרב

חזון חלכות בשר בחלב סימן יח איש

סימן יט

בע"ה יום ג' פ"ה למב"י ר"ח סימן עור"ת מינסק

א) ע"ז ע"ז צ"י מה זולעו זולעו אף פולטו זולעו, צפרשיי ובר"ן מצוהר דכאי גדנפא הוא כדי שיעלו המים והרתיחה על שפתי הכלי ומצוהר דכא דאמר יורה קטנה בחוך גדולה אינו כדי להגשיל גם מצחון דלעולם הרתיחה מצפנים מפלגת מכל עובי הדופן, אלא מפני שאי אפשר למלאות הכלי על כל גדותיו, אמרו דיגשיל יורה בחוך יורה וע"ז חדש רב עקצ"י דמכני גדנפא, ואפ"צ דלכתי לא יכול למלאחו שיכיו המים על כל השפחות שאין גדנפא דליטה מחזקת המים, מיהו ע"י גדנפא יכול למלאחו בחופן שיכיו צוות שמעולם לא נתמלא יותר מדכהשתא, וגם כשירתיח יכיו צוות שהרתיחה עברה על כל שפתי הכלי, ומים הקצועים בכלי כשגרתחים פעולת פליעתן יותר חזקה מהמים הצחים על הכלי מחמת הפשטת הרתיחה, והלכך אם היתה הבליעה צמים שוכנים לא מהני הגעלה ע"י הפשטת הרתיחה, אצל כשנזלע צהפשטת הרתיחה, אהני הגעלה צהפשטת הרתיחה, ונלוצות דקאמר כיונו צעצועי הרתיחה.

The Art of Halacha  
Shiur 44 - Kashering Keilim - Haagala and Hadacha Part 2  
Rabbi Yisroel Isaacs

Mishnah Berurah 451

(מט) בשטיפה - דהיינו ששפשו

תחלה היטב במים כדי להסיר כל

הדבוק עליו ואח"כ שטפו במים:

YESHIVAT HAR ETZION  
ISRAEL KOSCHITZKY VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH (VBM)

Hilkhot Kashrut  
By Rabbi David Brofsky

Shiur #11: Hakhsharat Keilim (Part 1)

### Why must we kasher utensils?

In our first shiur, we addressed the issue of "ta'am ke-ikkar," i.e., the taste is akin to the substance. We noted that the tanaim, as well as the rishonim, debate whether the taste of a prohibited substance, without the presence of the substance itself, is prohibited mi-de'oraita or mi-derabanan.

Those who maintain that "ta'am" is considered "ke-ikkar" mi-de'oraita parasha as a proof (Pesachim 46b).

insist that the utensils be kashered if not for the concern that they may impart taste to the food cooked in them? If so, then the process of "hakhsharat keilim" is clearly, on a minimal level, an attempt to extract or destroy the prohibited taste absorbed in the walls of the utensils. What emerges, according to this opinion, is that the Torah commanded the Jewish people to subject the utensils taken from Midian to two distinct processes: hakhshara, which extracts or destroys the prohibited substance, and tevila, which ritually cleanses the utensil.

Seemingly, those who maintain that "ta'am ke-ikkar" is only of rabbinic origin will find difficulty in explaining the need for kashering utensils! What is the value in extracting or destroying that which is halakhically insignificant?

The Ra'ah (Bedek Ha-Bayit bayit 4 sha'ar 1) cites the Ramban, who apparently also grappled with this issue, as viewing the requirement to kasher utensils as a "ma'ala she-

## VI.

### Kashering with *hadachah*

The process of *hadachah* is the means by which one removes any residue of nonkosher food from a utensil. *Hadachah* is used for two purposes:

1. *Hadachah* is used as a preparatory step before other forms of kashering in order to remove any prohibited matter or any substance that may interfere with the kashering process. The *hadachah* must be done in a manner that ensures that all residue is removed. If simple rinsing does not remove the residue, one must use soaps, detergents, or abrasive substances to scrub the utensil clean.
2. *Hadachah* is also a form of kashering in itself. When a utensil was used only with cold nonkosher food, the required method of kashering is *hadachah*. Since heat was not present during the use of the utensil, no taste is absorbed and heat is not required in the kashering process. Merely washing the utensil thoroughly is the required and sufficient method of kashering.

It is interesting to note that the second type of *hadachah* requires the first as well; i.e., when kashering with *hadachah*, one must first clean the utensil from any residue and then rinse it again in water to kasher it.<sup>170</sup>

170. See M.B. *ibid.* §49.

cite the above

Why would the Torah

## The Art of Halacha

### Shiur 44 - Kashering Keilim - Haagala and Hadacha Part 2

Rabbi Yisroel Isaacs

asu be-keilim," a unique stringency, similar to the requirement to tovel (immerse) utensils. If so, then the Torah actually required that utensils taken from Midian be subjected to two SIMILAR processes, hakhshara and tevila. What, therefore, is the difference between them? **One may suggest** that through the somewhat symbolic act of hakhshara, which extracts or destroys that which is absorbed in the walls of the utensil - despite its halakhic insignificance - one severs the utensil from its past associations. Afterwards, one immerses the utensil in a mikveh, sanctifying it and permitting its future use.

This question of whether hakhsharat keilim should be viewed as a process of extracting or destroying prohibited food in order to prevent its consumption, or as an act more similar to tevilat keilim - part of a process of spiritual purification of the utensil - may help us to explain a number of halakhic disputes.

The rishonim debate whether hakhsharat keilim should be included in the list of the 613 mitzvot. Most rishonim, who do not include this halakha, most likely view the process of kashering utensils as not much different from removing bugs from vegetables, which is clearly no more than a means of avoiding the consumption of prohibited substances and therefore would not warrant an additional, independent mitzva. A few rishonim, including the Semak (198) and the Tosafist R. Yosef Mi-orleans, however, seem to count hakhsharat keilim as a mitzvat aseh. It would seem that according to their opinions, one must attribute to hakhsharat keilim more than the mere removal of issur in order to count it as a mitzva.

Similarly, unlike tevilat keilim, no berakha is recited on hakhsharat keilim. Some (Issur Ve-heter 58:104) suggest that since one is merely preventing the consumption of a prohibited substance, there is no need for a berakha. This is clearly the simplest understanding.

However, some offer alternative explanations, such as the Orchot Chayyim (Chametz U-matzah 95) who suggests that a berakha is not required since one can just as easily use new utensils. Seemingly, the very search for a reason other than the above explanation may imply that fundamentally hakhsharat keilim DOES warrant a berakha (as it is not just a means of purging the utensil from prohibited substances), and does not receive one for a completely separate reason.

**A debate between the Biblical commentators may also shed light on our question.** The commentators note that the Torah refers to utensils which have "come into fire," which must be passed through fire, and those which "have not come into fire," which must be

## The Art of Halacha

### Shiur 44 - Kashering Keilim - Haagala and Hadacha Part 2

Rabbi Yisroel Isaacs

passed through water. What type of contact with prohibited substances is the Torah referring to, and what are the methods of kashering these utensils?

Some commentators explain that the Torah is referring to two separate modes of absorption of issur. If the utensil absorbed a prohibited substance over the fire, the utensil must be kashered over the fire, i.e., through what is commonly known as "libbun." If, however, the utensil absorbed issur in a different manner, i.e., through cooking in a liquid, the utensil must be immersed in boiling water, i.e., hagala. If so, the Torah specifies two different methods of kashering utensils.

Others (see Ramban) explain that any utensil that has absorbed issur through contact with heat must be kashered through contact with heat. However, there may be different levels of absorption and hence of hakhshara. A utensil that absorbed issur while directly exposed to fire must undergo "libbun," while a utensil which absorbed issur without direct exposure to fire, must undergo "hagala." The first verse, then, is referring to the several types of hakhshara (not just one), and may be expressing the principle of "ke-bol'o kakh polto" – the way is which a utensil absorbed a prohibited substance is the way which the utensil will expel that substance. If so, one may ask, what is the second verse referring to? Some explain that the Torah is merely stating that a utensil that did not absorb prohibited taste, but rather came into contact with a prohibited substance without any heat, must be "passed through water," i.e., must be washed. This explanation seems rather odd. Isn't it obvious? Must the Torah command us to wash our dishes?

**One might suggest** that we might have thought that this utensil must also undergo a process of hakhshara, and the Torah is telling us that washing is sufficient. Yet, one may wonder, why would I have thought that? Seemingly, such a "hava amina" must assume that hakhsharat keilim is NOT merely extracting or destroying the prohibited taste, for here, the taste was never absorbed! Accordingly, I may have viewed the process of hakhsharat keilim as similar to tevilat keilim, which applies to all utensils. The Torah's conclusion, however, remains unclear. Is our "hava amina" rejected, or merely modified?

...**[O]ne may suggest** that merely washing a utensil is ALSO considered a form of hakhsharat keilim. This seems to be the explanation of the Ramban. If so, then clearly hakhsharat keilim is NOT just a process of extracting or destroying issur, but rather an attempt to demonstratively separate the utensil from its past, even by a token act of washing it, before sanctifying it for its future use.