



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. When something hot falls onto something hot, there is definitely absorption. When something cold falls onto something cold, there is definitely not absorption.

The Gemora starts to deal with a classic kashrus discussion of things getting mixed together. The Gemora tells us that absorption happens through heat. Therefore, if something hot falls onto another hot item, there is definitely a mixing of the two items. Similarly, if a solid cold item fell on another cold item, nothing was absorbed.

2. When one item is hot and one is cold, there is an argument whether the top or bottom item determines whether or not absorption occurred.

Rav says that the top item that fell onto the bottom item determines absorption. Therefore, if the falling item was hot, it causes the bottom item to absorb it (to a certain extent). However, if the falling item was cold, it does not absorb from the bottom item that is hot. This is known as “Ila’ah gvar” -- “the top is stronger.” Shmuel holds that the exact opposite is true, as he holds “Tata’ah gvar” -- “the bottom is stronger.”

3. The Gemora explains that Shmuel does not hold that there is no absorption at all when the falling item is hot and the bottom is cold.

The Gemora asks that it must be that the heat of the falling item absorbs something from the cold item before it becomes cool. It therefore says that Shmuel agrees that in such a case one would have to peel away a layer. [For example, if hot milk fell onto cold meat, or hot meat fell in cold milk, one would have to peel away a layer from any surface of the meat that came in contact with the milk (see INSIGHT).] In contrast, if both items were cold, one could merely wash each of them off and not have to peel off a layer.

4. There is an argument about the law regarding two pieces of meat, one fatty permitted piece and one lean forbidden piece that are roasted simultaneously in the same oven.

Rav says that the pieces of meat absorb from each other, and therefore the permitted piece of meat becomes forbidden. Levi says that when there is no direct contact between the pieces, the smell alone does not cause absorption.

5. This argument, according to Levi, is actually an argument among the Tannaim.

The Gemora quotes a braisa that discusses a hot loaf of bread that was put on top of a barrel of terumah wine. Rabbi Meir says it becomes like terumah, Rabbi

Yehuda says it does not, and Rabbi Yosi says that if it is a wheat loaf it is permitted and if it is a barley loaf it is forbidden, as barley draws in the wine. The Gemora concludes that Levi holds this is indeed an argument among the Tannaim, and he holds like Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemora explains at length why Rav can say that he does not necessarily argue on any of these Tannaim.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Gemora explains that Shmuel does not hold that there is no absorption at all when the falling item is hot and the bottom is cold. Rather, the layer that came in contact must be peeled away.

The Sfas Emes asks, which layer is Shmuel talking about? Is it a layer from the hot item that fell, the cold item on bottom, or both? It seems from the simple explanation of the Gemora, the Sfas Emes says, that only the hot item that fell requires that a layer be removed.

However, the Sfas Emes notes that Tosfos explicitly writes that both items must have a layer peeled. On the other hand, the Rashba in Chulin (112a) writes that the bottom item needs to be peeled. The Sfas Emes asks that this definitely seems to conflict with the simple understanding of our text in our Gemora.

Transfer of Heat

In our sugya we find one of the most basic principles in the halachos of milk and meat. Here, we are introduced to the machlokes between Rav and Shmuel whether *ila'a gavar* – the top overpowers, or

tata'a gavar – the bottom overpowers. That is to say, taste can be transferred from one substance to the other through the medium of heat. If hot meat touches hot cheese, taste travels from one to the other and they both become forbidden. What if one of the pieces is hot and the other cold? According to Rav *ila'a gavar* – the top overpowers. Thus, if the piece on top is hot, and the bottom one is cold, then the heat from on top overpowers the cold, and a transfer of taste occurs. Both pieces are then forbidden. According to Shmuel (and the accepted halacha, Shulchan Aruch Y.D. 91:4) *tata'a gavar* – the bottom overpowers. Thus if the bottom is hot, and the top cold, the heat from the bottom overpowers the top and both pieces become forbidden.

Generally, the Tannaim and Amoraim from the Gemara argue over halacha. Very rarely do they argue over physical phenomena that can be investigated and proven one way or the other. In this case too, it seems odd that Rav and Shmuel would argue over how heat and taste travel. Could they not just experiment until the matter is proven one way or the other?

Furthermore, how can they make such blanket generalizations, as if to say that heat always overpowers from one direction or the other? Should this not depend on many factors, such as the temperature of the foods and their size? According to Shmuel who holds that the bottom overpowers, what would be the case if a tiny, cool piece of butter sat on the bottom, and a giant scalding hot slab of meat on top. Would he not agree to Rav in this case that the cool butter on the bottom could not possibly overpower the hot meat on top?

In answer to the first question, the Noda B'Yehuda (Y.D. I, 28) explains that it is very difficult to prove from scientific evidence how taste travels. A kitchen is not a laboratory. Sometimes the same mixtures of ingredients under the same degree of heat will produce different results. Furthermore, since we are dealing with forbidden tastes, we cannot sample the foods to see if and how the taste traveled. Nor is it always feasible to ask a gentile to sample the food for us. Therefore, the Sages debated what the halachah should be in these questionable situations.

In answer to the second question, the Aruch HaShulchan concludes that we cannot interpret the Gemara as such a blatant contradiction to our own observation. Surely Rav and Shmuel both agree that the amount of hot or cold food in question plays a great role in deciding whether the top or bottom overpowers. A tiny amount of hot butter on the bottom cannot overpower a giant slab of hot meat on top. Rather, Rav and Shmuel argue in a case where both the top and bottom foods are of the same size.

The Yad Yehuda (105:12), on the other hand, argues that none of the Poskim throughout the generations made this distinction. They cite Rav and Shmuel's argument without any conditions, implying that whatever the size of the two foods, Rav always holds that the top overpowers, and Shmuel always holds that the bottom overpowers.

The Darchei Teshuva (91:18) cites both opinions, and gives credence to them both. On the one hand, we cannot deny what we see and understand, as the Aruch HaShulchan says. On the other hand, as the

Yad Yehuda says, we cannot veer from the rulings of the Gemara and its commentaries. Therefore, we must follow the stringencies that arise from both opinions. A tiny piece of hot butter on the bottom will overpower a large piece of cold meat on top, and both the butter and the meat are forbidden. Even though we find this hard to understand, this is the simple explanation of Shmuel's opinion, as the Poskim seem to have interpreted it.

On the other hand, a large piece of hot meat on top will overpower a tiny piece of cold butter on the bottom. According to the Aruch HaShulchan, even Shmuel agrees to this obvious fact. The butter is heated up by the meat, and both pieces are forbidden.

Matza and Chametz in the Same Oven

The Mordechai (Pesachim 570) and Rabbeinu Tam were both asked what to do with matza that was baked together in the same oven with chametz bread. Does the matza become chametz? They ruled that if the matza and chametz touched, then the matza is forbidden. Otherwise, the matza is permitted.

In order to understand this ruling, we present here some of the basic principles of transfer of taste through "smell" and "vapor," as discussed by the Poskim in the Yoreh Dei'ah section of Shulchan Aruch. These are only basic guidelines, and a qualified rav should be consulted before applying them in practice.

Transfer of taste: Hot foods that touch impart their tastes to one another. Furthermore, taste may also

be imparted from one food to the other through the medium of a cooking utensil. For example, if treif is placed on the floor of an oven, and then kosher food is placed on the same spot, the treif taste absorbed by the oven can be imparted to the kosher food and render it treif. Even if the treif and kosher foods were in two different parts of the oven, the Poskim question whether the taste might travel through the oven floor from one food to the other. However, if the foods are in pots or baking trays, then the tastes cannot travel through their pots into the floor of the oven (see Y.D. 97, Shach s.k. 2). Presuming that either the matza or the bread in our case was placed in a baking tray, there can be no transfer of taste through the oven floor.

apor: When food cooks, its moisture evaporates and rises up as steam. If the steam of treif food enters into kosher food, it may render the kosher food treif. For this reason one may not use a milk pot top on a meat pot. The steam from the meat rises to the pot top, absorbs its milk taste, and creates a mixture of milk and meat tastes. The same is true when food cooks in a small oven, such as the ones we commonly have in our homes. Steam from food can rise and be absorbed in the walls of the oven. For this reason, many people have separate ovens for milk and meat, or an oven with two chambers. Otherwise, milchig steam might be absorbed in the oven walls. Later, when one cooks meat, the fleishig steam will rise, absorb the milchig taste from the walls, and create a mixture of milk and meat tastes. However, vapor is only a concern when baking in a small oven. In a large oven whose door is left open, the vapor dissipates before it reaches the oven walls (Shulchan Aruch Y.D. 108:1).

Smell: Even in such a case when vapor is not a concern, the foods cooked still generate a smell. Is there a halachic problem when the smell of a nonkosher food enters a kosher food? This is the subject of debate between Rav and Levi in our sugya. Rav holds that just like non-kosher taste, non-kosher smell can also render foods forbidden. Levi contends that it cannot. The accepted halacha follows Levi. Therefore, if fatty treif meat is roasted near kosher meat, and its smell travels into the kosher meat, the kosher meat remains kosher (ibid). However, even Levi agrees that this is only b'dieved. One should not roast kosher and treif meat together le'chatchilah.

The smell of baking bread: Rabbeinu Tam writes that although the Gemara discusses the smells of different forbidden foods, which may or may not render other foods forbidden, we find no opinion that forbids the smell of nonkosher bread or chametz. Just the opposite, we can prove from the Gemara that bread does not create a forbidden smell. When the *korban toda* was offered in the Beis HaMikdash, four different types of bread offerings were brought along with it. Some were chametz, while others were strictly matza. It was permitted le'chatchilah to bake the chametz offering together with the matza offering, and there was no concern at all that that chametz smell might invalidate the matza offering. From here we can infer that it may be permitted even le'chatchilah to bake matza in the same oven with bread, provided that the oven is large and open, the bread is in a pan, and the matza and bread do not touch.