



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Liver

The *Gemora* continues to discuss Abaye’s question about cooking a liver. When Rav Safra returned to *Eretz Yisroel*, he asked Rabbi Zeraika, who told him that it is permitted, as he and Rabbi Ami’s son, Yanai, went to the house of Yehudah, the son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, and they served them the windpipe and all the organs that follow from it, including the liver, and they ate it.

Rav Ashi (or Rabbi Shmuel from Zrukinia) challenged this proof, as perhaps the opening of the windpipe was pointing out of the pot, providing an exit path for the liver’s blood. Alternatively, perhaps they had scalded the liver first, to trap the blood in it, as Rav Huna’s household would trap the blood by placing it in vinegar, and Rav Nachman’s would trap it in boiling water. Rav Pappa thought that the vinegar in which it was placed is prohibited, as it has the blood of the liver, but Rava told him that if it was prohibited, the liver itself would be prohibited, as it would reabsorb the blood from the vinegar.

Rav bar Shva went to Rav Nachman’s house. They served him a well cooked liver, but he did not eat it. When they told this to Rav Nachman, he said they should force him to eat it.

The *Gemora* says that this corresponds to a dispute of *Tannaim* about the liver. The *braisa* says that Rabbi Eliezer says that the liver prohibits other meat, but does not

become prohibited, while Rabbi Yishmael, the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says that if it is spiced or well cooked, it prohibits other meat, and also itself becomes prohibited.

Rabbah bar Rav Huna went to the house of Rabbah bar Rav Nachman for *Shabbos*, and they served him three *se’ahs* of white bread, smeared with oil and honey. He asked if they knew he was coming, to prepare this special food, and they answered that they prepared this specially for *Shabbos* itself, which must be honored with enjoyable food. Then they brought him a liver, which lobes full of blood, and he asked him how they can serve that. When they asked what they should do further, he told them they must slice it length and width, and roast it with the cut facing down. The *Gemora* says that this is necessary only for the liver, but the liquid that is in the spleen is simply fats, as we can see from the fact that Shmuel would be served a dish of spleen when he let blood.

The *Gemora* says that if one roasts a liver above meat, the meat is permitted, as the blood slides off, but if one roasts an udder above meat, the meat is prohibited, as the milk adheres to the meat.

Rav Dimi cites an opposite version, since the milk in the udder is only Rabbinically prohibited with meat, while the blood of the liver is prohibited from the Torah.

Meraimar taught that if meat may be roasted above a liver

or udder. It should not be roasted under either, but is permitted after the fact.

Rav Ashi went to the house of his father in law, Rami bar Abba, and he saw Rami's son putting a liver above meat on a spit. He remarked that this was brazen, as we only permit the meat once it was roasted below the liver, but we prohibit one from roasting it.

The *Gemora* adds that if a utensil was under the roasting liver to catch the fat, the fat is prohibited. Although doing this with meat is permitted, the blood of the meat settles to the bottom, so one can take the top, while the blood of the liver floats to the top, prohibiting the whole mixture. (111a)

Transferring tastes from utensils

Rav Nachman quotes Shmuel saying that one may not cut hot food with a knife used to slaughter, as it has absorbed blood. Some say that cold food cut with it must be rinsed, and some say it need not be.

Rav Yehudah quotes Shmuel saying that a plate in which meat was salted to remove its blood may not be used to eat hot food, since the plate has absorbed blood, as Shmuel says that salting is akin to heating, and pickling is like cooking.

When Ravin arrived, he quoted Rabbi Yochanan saying that salting is not like heating, and pickling is not like cooking.

Abaye says that this is incorrect, as an earthenware vessel in Rabbi Ami's house was used to salt meat from its blood, and he smashed it. Rabbi Ami, a student of Rabbi Yochanan, must have done this since he heard from his teacher that salting is like heating.

Rav Kahana, the brother of Rav Yehudah, was sitting in front of Rav Huna, and said that one may not eat hot food

on a plate on which meat was salted, but one may eat a milk dip with radish sliced with a meat knife.

Abaye explains that in the first case the plate absorbed blood, which is inherently prohibited, while in the second case, the radish absorbed meat, which is permitted on its own.

Rava challenges this, as once the meat comes in contact with milk, it also is a prohibited food.

Rather, Rava says that in the case of the radish, one may taste it first to see if there is a meat taste.

Rav Pappa asked why we don't give the hot food placed on the plate to a non-Jewish chef, who can tell us whether he tastes blood in it, and Rava said that indeed he was referring to a case where there is no non-Jewish chef.

The *Gemora* cites a dispute about hot fish that were placed on a meat plate. Rav says they may not be eaten with a milk dip, as the meat utensil gives the fish a taste of meat, while Shmuel says they may be, as the taste is already one step removed from the actual meat.

The *Gemora* explains that Rav never explicitly said this, but we inferred his position from a story. Rav once went to the house of his grandson Rav Shimi bar Chiya, and his eyes hurt him. They prepared medicine for his eyes in a pot, and then used that pot to cook food. When Rav ate the food, he remarked that the medicine's taste was still discernible in it, implying that Rav says that a food cooked in a pot gets the taste of other food cooked earlier in that pot.

The *Gemora* says that this can be deflected, as perhaps this is only true in the case of the herbs used for medicine, which have a strong bitter taste.



Rabbi Elozar was serving Shmuel, and they brought him fish in a meat utensil, which Shmuel ate with milk dip. Rabbi Elozar did not eat, and Shmuel asked him why he did not, since Rav, Rabbi Elozar's teacher, ate it. When Rabbi Elozar asked Rav about this, he denied it, saying that he never ate it, and he never reversed his position prohibiting the fish with milk dip.

Rav Huna and Rav Chiya bar Ashi were sitting on opposite banks of the river in Sura. One of them ate fish from a meat utensil together with milk dip, while the other ate figs and grapes in the middle of a meal without making a separate *brachah*. Each one berated the other, asking whether his teacher would do the same. In response, the one eating the fish said that he was following Shmuel, who permitted it, while the one eating the figs and grapes said that he was following Rabbi Chiya, who says that the *brachah* on bread exempts all foods, and the *brachah* on wine exempts all drinks.

Chizkiyah quotes Abaye ruling that fish put in a meat utensil may be eaten with milk dip, while radish sliced with a meat knife may not be eaten with milk dip. The *Gemora* clarifies that only radish is prohibited, as it absorbs more due to its sharpness, but if gourds that were sliced with a meat knife, the surface of the cut may simply be scraped, and the rest eaten with milk dip. If one sliced stalks of turnip, they may be eaten with milk, but sliced beets may not be. However, if one sliced turnips in between slices of the beets, this removes the meat flavor, and the subsequent beets may be eaten with milk. (111a – 111b)

INSIGHTS ON THE DAF

Fish in a meat utensil

The *Gemora* rules that fish that were in a meat utensil do not have the taste of meat, and may be eaten with milk. The Rishonim debate the definition of this case, and what

exactly is being permitted.

Rashi, as quoted by the Rivan in Tosfos (11b Hilchesa) says that the case is limited to fish that were placed on a meat plate after being cooked. However, if they were cooked in a meat pot, they may not be eaten with milk.

Tosfos notes that this may be consistent with the ruling in the *Gemora* that a sharp radish sliced with a meat knife may be eaten with milk.

Assuming that slicing a sharp food is not more effective than cooking, this would imply that cooking a food in a meat utensil makes it prohibited with milk.

Tosfos notes that one may deflect this, by explaining (as Rashi suggests) that the case of the radish is due to the residue of fats that are invariably left on a knife, which would not apply to a clean meat pot.

Tosfos notes that Rashi's commentary itself implies that even if the fish were cooked in the meat pot, they may be eaten with milk, as long as they were not cooked with the meat.

The Rambam rules that the fish are permitted with milk even if they were cooked in a meat pot.

The Sefer Haterumah says that this is limited to cooking in a meat pot (with water), but not to fish that were roasted in a meat pot (with no liquid).

The Ran notes that this only applies to meat and milk, which are each individually permitted. To create the prohibition, one must have bona fide taste of meat and of milk. However, if food was cooked in a pot which absorbed prohibited food, the food is prohibited, with the full force of the original prohibition, as there is no dilution of the



taste of inherently prohibited food.

The Shulchan Aruch (YD 95:1) rules like the Rambam, permitting fish with milk, whether they were roasted or cooked in a meat pot.

The Rama (2) says that we are concerned for the opinion cited by the Rivan, and we therefore prohibit mixing food cooked or roasted in a meat pot with milk, but permit one to mix food placed on a meat plate with milk. In either case, if it already was mixed with milk, we permit the mixture.

The Shach (4) cites the Maharshal, who says that if the food was roasted in a meat pot, it is prohibited, even after mixed with milk.

The Bais Yosef (YD 95) cites a number of Rishonim who limit the statement of the *Gemora* to a case where one already put the fish in the meat utensil, but state that one may not a priori place them in the meat utensil, planning to eat them with milk. The Shach (3) cites and rule like this position, even according to the Shulchan Aruch.

See Yabia Omer (YD 9:4) for a lengthy discussion of the final ruling of the Shulchan Aruch on this issue.

Wine and other drinks

The *Gemora* cites the statement of Rabbi Chiya that bread exempts all foods, and wine exempts all drinks.

Tosfos (Berachos 41b Yayin) says that just as we do not rule like his statement about bread, as it only exempts foods related to the meal itself, so we do not rule like his statement about wine.

The Rosh and Rabbeinu Yonah disagree, and rule like Rabbi Chiya's statement about wine.

The Shulchan Aruch (OH 174:2) rules like Rabbi Chiya's statement about wine, saying that it exempts other drinks from both the *brachahs* before and after them.

The poskim discuss the details of when this applies, including whether one had to have the other drinks in mind or even present when drinking the wine. See Mishnah Berurah and Biur Halachah for a deeper discussion of the various positions on this question.

The Derech Hachayim, cited by the Mishnah Berurah (3) notes that one must have actually drunk from the wine, and not just heard someone else say the *brachah*. Although hearing one say the *brachah* suffices to fulfill the obligation of *kiddush*, it does not suffice to exempt other drinks.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Rabbi who relied on a Jew who relied on a gentile

Shulchan 'Aruch rules (Y.D. 92:1): "If a *kezayis* of meat fell into a pot of boiling milk, a gentile should taste it. If he says that it tastes of meat, the pot is forbidden and if not, it is allowed even if the milk is not 60 times the amount of the meat." This ruling is based on our Gemara. As we know, *treifah* cooked with kosher food forbids the kosher food unless the kosher food exceeds the *treifah* by 60 times. Our Gemara adds that we may allow a gentile cook to taste the kosher food to hear his opinion as to if the taste of the *treifah* is felt therein.

When the sense of taste fades: This permission is not all-inclusive but has a few exceptions, including an interesting limitation cited in *Darchei Teshuvah* (92, S.K. 7), that we mustn't rely on the taste of an 80-year-old person because an elderly person who is ignorant and a sinner loses his

sense of taste at that age. We may also rely on a gentile who is not a cook, providing that he doesn't know that we rely on him but he should be given to eat naturally (see *Shulchan 'Aruch*, Y.D. 92:1 and 98:1 and *Shach*, *ibid*, S.K. 2).

The Remo: The custom is not to rely on a gentile's taste:

The Remo adds a brief remark to *Shulchan 'Aruch* (*ibid*): "We are not accustomed now to rely on a gentile but we estimate everything according to 60 parts" (for the reason see *Chidushei Rabbi 'Akiva Eiger* on *Shulchan 'Aruch*, *ibid*). The Ashkenazim therefore had the custom to be strict not to rely on our Gemara regarding a gentile's tasting.

Can we rely on a Jew? Before we examine the sides of the disagreement, we shall mention another disagreement among the *poskim* – namely, according to the Remo, can we rely on a Jew who tasted the food and said that it contains no taste of a prohibition? (*Shach*, *ibid*, S.K. 5, and see *Pischei Teshuvah*, S.K. 3).

How could it be that a Jew would eat a doubtful food to know its taste? Indeed, the possibilities are many. For example, a Jew who vowed not to eat a certain food and that fell into his pot. All Jews are not prevented from eating the mixture and therefore everyone, aside from the vower, may examine the food (*Shach*, *ibid*).

We are faced with two disagreements: The first is if we can rely on a gentile's taste and the second, in the opinion of those who forbid it, is if we can rely on a Jew's tasting. *Badei HaShulchan* cites an interesting explanation (98, S.K. 4) for these disagreements.

The sense of taste faded over the generations: First of all, we should clarify why the Remo was strict not to rely on gentiles. The author of *Minchas Kohen* zt"l wrote (I, end of 87) that because of different reasons the reliability of gentiles diminished and therefore we cannot rely on them when they express their opinions about tastes. On the

other hand, the author of the *Levush* (cited by the *Shach*) indicates that the Remo ruled so as over the years people's taste discrimination faded and there are no longer experts who can discern a slight taste mixed in a food.

Therefore, if we want to know if we can rely on a Jew's tasting, it turns out that it depends on the two explanations: If the Remo's ruling is based on a suspicion of lack of trust, then concerning Jews this suspicion doesn't exist. However, if people's sense of taste has faded, there's no difference between a Jew and a gentile, all have a weaker sense of taste than their ancestors.

As for the halachah, *bedieved* – if a Jew tasted it we may rely on him (*Badei HaShulchan*, *ibid*).

DAILY MASHAL

Everything Must Be Done Not to Resort to Others

Let's imagine the incident described in the Gemara: A person arrives in Sura on the eve of Yom Kippur. He has an intestinal illness, has no clothes of his own and must eat before the holy day. But he doesn't knock on the doors of merciful Jews but looks for *cachal* (part of an animal) and cooks it in old grape pits! Could it be? Look, concluded HaGaon Rav Chayim Shmuelevitz zt"l, how obvious it was to him that everything must be done so as not to resort to others (*Sichos Musar*, *Moach Velev*, 34).