The Chicago Center
Digest
Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Wed, Apr 20, 2022 ■ י"ט ניסן, תשפ"ב
סימן תנ"א סעיף י"ג

Overview

Siman 451 Seif 13:

A utensil that has a patch but the patch was attached before the utensil absorbed the prohibited taste it need not be removed since the manner in which the taste was absorbed is the manner in which it is extracted. If the prohibited taste was absorbed before the patch was attached it is necessary to remove the patch before hagalah or to place coals on the patch so that if there is prohibited food it would be incinerated. Afterwards hagalah may be done on the rest of the utensil. If the utensil is made of wood there is nothing to do short of widening the scratch so that one could remove the food that is there. It is permitted to do hagalah on a utensil in which the manufacturer left a mark on the inside of the utensil since it is made when the utensil is new and could be easily cleaned.

- Shulchan Aruch refers to where the patch is on the inside of the utensil. (M.B. 72)
- Shulchan Aruch refers to where the patch is attached tightly so that there is no concern that chometz entered beneath the patch. (M.B. 74)
- Even though the patch is attached tightly there is a concern that some chometz remains on the utensil from before the patch was attached and in such a case hagalah is ineffective. Some Poskim are also concerned for absorbed taste that may not be fully extracted since the patch is in the way. (M.B. 75)
- If the concern is for actual chomEtz libun kal is sufficient and if the concern is for the absorbed taste libun chamur is necessary. If the utensil is not ben-yomo one may adopt the lenient approach. (M.B. 76)
- This discussion relates to a patch that is attached with nails but if it is attached by fire it can be kashered with hagalah. (M.B. 76)

Halacha Highlight

Kashering a utensil with a patch

Shulchan Aruch Siman 451 Seif 13

כלי שיש בו טלאי

A utensil that has a patch

Shulchan Aruch discusses kashering a utensil that has a patch that was attached to the utensil. Mishnah Berurah (ס"ק ע"ו) explains that the discussion relates to a patch that attaches only with nails or screws. If the patch was attached to the utensil using fire, there is no question that the utensil may be kashered with hagalah. The method of kashering a utensil with such a patch depends on the sequence of events. If the patch was attached to the utensil before the prohibited taste became absorbed in the walls of the utensil it is sufficient to do hagalah on the utensil. The same way that the taste was absorbed with the patch is the manner by which that taste is extracted. If, however, the utensil absorbed the prohibited taste and then a patch was placed on the utensil one must remove the patch before kashering or do libun to the place of the patch.

Mishnah Berurah (ס"ק ע"ה) gives two reasons why hagalah is not effective to extract a taste from the walls of a utensil that is covered with a patch. His first reason is the concern that there may be actual chometz that became lodged between the utensil and the patch and hagalah is ineffective as far as actual chometz is concerned. The second reason focuses on the absorbed taste rather than actual chometz and the concern is that the patch will serve a barrier that prevents the prohibited taste from being fully extracted from the utensil. Interestingly, when Mishnah Berurah (לעיל ס"ק כ"ב) discussed the presence of rust he did not explain that the rust would serve as a barrier that prevents the taste from being extracted. Pri Megadim (משב"ז סק"ו) explains that hagalah is strong enough to extract taste through rust but it is not strong enough to extract taste through a patch.

Stories to Share

The Missing Knife

ש"ע תנ"א, י"ג: "כבולעו כך פולטו..."

Today's amud continues to discuss the halachos of kashering.

A certain man in Israel purchased a large quantity of sabra fruit from an Arab vendor and asked him to remove the prickly thorns. When the seller agreed, the Jew handed him a knife and he began to work. After the seller finally finished the job, the buyer took the cleaned sabras, thanked him, and left.

Later the buyer realized that he had forgotten his knife and he rushed back to where the Arab had been.

When he saw that the Arab was gone he gave up on ever seeing his knife again.

The next day, he noticed that the Arab vendor was back. Before he had a chance to say anything, the Arab called him and returned his knife.

After his initial gratitude wore off, he realized that he had a halachic question on his hands. He knew without a doubt that he had given up on the knife. Since it had been with the Arab, did this not mean that the Arab had acquired the knife? If it had been the Arab's it clearly required immersion in a kosher mikveh with a blessing.

When he consulted with Dayan Fischer, he ruled that the knife did not require immersion. "You are definitely correct that since you gave up on the knife, if the Arab had wished to acquire it would have been his. In this case you would be obligated to immerse the knife. But since he returned it to you willingly upon seeing you, it seems that he did not wish to acquire the knife. If this is the case, he did not take halachic possession of it.

"Since the status of the knife is unclear, we can leave it in its previous chazakah. It does not require immersion or even kashering, since we can assume that he did not use it. Nevertheless, one who wishes to be stringent can immerse it without a blessing and kasher it in boiling water."

ספר אבן ישראל, ח"ט, ס' ע"א