

23 Shevat 5781  
Feb. 5, 2021



Pesachim Daf 76

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

GEMARA: It was stated: [If] hot matter [falls] into hot,<sup>1</sup> all agree that it is forbidden;<sup>2</sup> cold into cold, all agree that it is permitted.<sup>3</sup> [If] hot [falls] into cold, or cold into hot, — Rav maintained: The upper prevails;<sup>4</sup> while Shmuel maintained: The lower prevails. (75b3 – 76a1)

We learned: If some of its gravy dripped on to the earthen[ware] and dripped back on to it he must remove its place. It was assumed that this refers to a cold earthenware; now it is well on Rav's view that the upper prevails: consequently, he must remove its place, because the gravy goes and heats the earthenware and the earthenware in turn heats the gravy, and when the gravy drips back on to the pesach offering, the pesach offering is roasted [at that spot] by the heat of the earthenware, whereas the Divine Law said, roast with fire, but not roast with something else. But on Shmuel's view that the lower prevails, since the earthenware is cold it actually cools the gravy; why then should he remove its place? — As Rabbi Yirmiyah said in Shmuel's name: The reference is to hot flour; so here too the reference is to hot earthenware. (76a1)

We learned: If some of its gravy dripped on to the flour, he must remove a handful from its place. It was assumed that this refers to cold flour. It is well on Rav's view that the upper prevails: consequently, he must remove a handful from its place, because it heats the flour around it and the flour in turn heats it, and the gravy is roasted by the heat of the flour, whereas the Divine Law said, 'roast with fire', but not roasted with something else. But on Shmuel's view that the lower

prevails, since the flour is cold it actually cools it; why then must he remove a handful from its place? — Said Rabbi Yirmiyah in the name of Shmuel: This refers to hot flour. (76a1 – 76a2)

We learned: If he basted it with oil of terumah, if they [who registered for it] are a company of Kohanim, they may eat [it]; if it belongs to Israelites: if it is [yet] raw, let him wash it off; if it is roasted, he must peel the outer part. It is well on Rav's view that the upper prevails: consequently [mere] peeling is sufficient, because the upper is cold.<sup>5</sup> But on Shmuel's view that the lower prevails, since it is hot it certainly absorbs; why then is peeling sufficient: let us forbid it entirely? — Basting is different, because a mere trifle is used. (76a2)

It was taught in accordance with Shmuel: [If] hot matter [falls] into hot, it is forbidden; similarly, if he put cold into hot, it is forbidden; hot into cold or cold into cold, he must wash it off. [You say], 'Hot into cold, he must wash it off'; [surely] since it is hot, until it cools it cannot but absorb a little; then it should at least require peeling? Rather say: hot into cold, he must peel it; cold into cold, he must wash it off. Another [Baraisa] taught: If hot meat fell into hot milk, and likewise if cold fell into hot, it is forbidden. Hot into cold or cold into cold, he must wash [the meat]. 'Hot into cold, he must wash [the meat]'; [surely] since it is hot, until it cools it cannot but absorb a little, then it should at least require peeling? — Rather say: hot into cold, he must peel [it]; cold into cold, he must wash [the meat].

<sup>1</sup> E.g., hot milk into hot meat, or hot forbidden flesh into hot permitted flesh, or vice versa. By 'hot', boiling is meant.

<sup>2</sup> Because each absorbs from the other.

<sup>3</sup> Because they do not absorb from each other.

<sup>4</sup> Thus: if hot falls into cold, the upper heats the lower, and it is tantamount to hot into hot: while if cold falls into hot, it is as cold into cold.

<sup>5</sup> I.e., the oil is cold. Nevertheless, peeling at least is required, because the oil cannot but soak slightly into the flesh.

The Master said: 'Cold into cold, he must wash the meat. Rav Huna said: They learned this only where he had not [previously] salted it; but if he had salted it, it is forbidden, for Shmuel said: Salted [matter] is like hot;<sup>6</sup> if preserved [in vinegar], it is like boiled.<sup>7</sup> Rava said: As to what Shmuel said, Salted [matter] is like hot, — this was said only where it cannot be eaten through the salt;<sup>8</sup> but if it can be eaten in spite of the salt, it is not so.

A young pigeon fell into a jug of kamcha,<sup>9</sup> [and] Rav Chinena the son of Raba of Pashronya permitted it. Said Rava: Who is so wise as to permit such a thing if not Rav Chinena the son of Raba of Pashronya, who is a great man. [For] he can tell you: when did Shmuel say: Salted matter is like hot? — Where it cannot be eaten through the salt; whereas this could be eaten in spite of the salt. That is, however, only if it is raw; but if roasted, it requires peeling. Further, this was said only if it contains no splits; but if it contains splits, it is [altogether] forbidden; and if it is seasoned with condiments, it is forbidden.<sup>10</sup> (76a2 – 76a3)

Rav said: Fat meat of a [ritually] slaughtered [animal] which was roasted together with lean meat of neveilah<sup>11</sup> is forbidden. What is the reason? They fatten each other.<sup>12</sup> But Levi maintained: Even lean meat of a [ritually] slaughtered [animal] which was roasted together with fat meat of neveilah is permitted. What is the reason? It is a mere smell, and smell is nothing. Levi gave a practical decision at the house of the Reish Galusa in the case of a goat and 'something else.'<sup>13</sup> An objection is raised: One may not roast two pesach offerings together, on account of the mixture. Surely that means, the mixture of [the] flavors,<sup>14</sup> which is a difficulty on Levi's view? No; [it means] the mixture of their

carcasses.<sup>15</sup> This too is logical, since the second clause teaches: Even a kid and a lamb. Now it is well if you say [that it is] on account of the carcasses; hence he teaches, 'even a kid and a lamb.'<sup>16</sup> But if you say [that it is] on account of the mingling of [the] flavors, what does it matter whether it is a kid and a lamb or a kid and a kid? — What then? You are bound [to say] that it is forbidden only on account of the mixing of the carcasses, but the mingling of flavors is permitted; shall we say [then] that this is a refutation of Rav? — Said Rabbi Yirmiyah: The case we discuss here is e.g., where he roasted them in two pots. [You say] 'In two pots — can you think so!<sup>17</sup> — Rather say, as though [they were roasted in] two pots,<sup>18</sup> and this is what it teaches: One may not roast two pesach-offerings together, on account of the mixture. What mixture? The mixture of the flavors. And even [when roasted] as it were in two pots it is forbidden on account of the [possible] confusing of the carcasses, and even a kid and a lamb [must not be roasted together]. (76a3 – 76b2)

Rav Mari said: This is dependent on Tannaim. If a man removes a hot loaf [from the oven] and places it on a wine barrel of terumah, — Rabbi Meir forbids it;<sup>19</sup> whereas Rabbi Yehudah permits it; while Rabbi Yosi permits it in the case of [a loaf of] wheat, but forbids it in the case of barley [flour], because barley absorbs. Surely then it is dependent on Tannaim, one Master holding: Aroma is nothing; while the other Master holds: Aroma is something [substantial]? According to Levi, it is certainly dependent on Tannaim.<sup>20</sup> Shall we say that it is [dependent on] Tannaim according to Rav [too]? — Rav can tell you: All agree that aroma is something [substantial]; [and as to the ruling of Rabbi Yehudah] was it not stated regarding this, Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said in the name of Rish Lakish: In the case of a hot

<sup>6</sup> 'Salted', this is soon defined — it is regarded as hot, and necessitates peeling.

<sup>7</sup> And the whole of the permitted matter rendered forbidden.

<sup>8</sup> Until the salt is washed off.

<sup>9</sup> A relish containing milk, among other things.

<sup>10</sup> In both cases the meat absorbs more freely than otherwise.

<sup>11</sup> In the same oven on separate spits and not touching.

<sup>12</sup> The aroma of the fat meat enters the lean meat and makes it fat, and then in turn the aroma of the lean meat, which is forbidden enters the permitted meat and renders it forbidden too. — Hence if the meat of neveilah itself is fat, it is certainly forbidden.

<sup>13</sup> A pig.

<sup>14</sup> Each absorbs the flavor of the other through its smell, which would thus be enjoyed by those who have not registered for that animal.

<sup>15</sup> The animals themselves may be mixed up with each other.

<sup>16</sup> Though a mistake is less likely there.

<sup>17</sup> The pesach-offering may not be roasted in pots at all.

<sup>18</sup> A heap of coals or ashes intervening between the two sacrifices.

<sup>19</sup> To a lay Israelite, because it has absorbed the aroma of the wine.

<sup>20</sup> For Rabbi Meir's view certainly contradicts his.

loaf and an open barrel, all agree that it is forbidden; in the case of a cold loaf and a closed [stoppered] barrel, all agree that it is permitted. They differ only in the case of a hot loaf and a sealed barrel, [or] a cold loaf and an open barrel;<sup>21</sup> and this too<sup>22</sup> is like a hot loaf and an open barrel.<sup>23</sup> (76b2)

Rav Kahana the son of Rav Chinena the Elder recited: A loaf which was baked together with roasted [meat] in an oven may not be eaten with kutach.<sup>24</sup> A fish was roasted [i.e., baked] together with meat, [whereupon] Rava of Parzikiya forbade it to be eaten with kutach. Mar bar Rav Ashi said: Even with salt too it is forbidden, because it is harmful to [one's] smell and in respect of 'something else.'<sup>25</sup> (76b2 – 76b3)

MISHNAH: Five things [sacrifices] may come in tumah, yet must not be eaten in tumah: the omer, the two loaves, the Showbread, the sacrifices of the public shelamim-offerings, and the male-goats of Rosh Chodesh. the paschal lamb which comes in tumah is eaten in tumah, for from the very beginning it came for no other purpose but to be eaten.<sup>26</sup> (76b3)

GEMARA. What does 'five' exclude?<sup>27</sup> — It excludes the chagigah [for example] of the fifteenth.<sup>28</sup> For I might argue, since it is a public sacrifice<sup>29</sup> and a season is fixed for it, let it override tumah; therefore he informs us [that] since you can make it up the whole seven [days],<sup>30</sup> it does not override the Shabbos,<sup>31</sup> and since it does not override the Shabbos, it does not override tumah. Now, let him [the Tanna] state the he-goats of festivals too? — He does indeed state the sacrifices

of the public shelamim-offerings. If so, let him not state the male-goats of Rosh Chodesh either, seeing that he states the sacrifices of the public shelamim-offerings? — I will tell you: It is necessary for him [to teach about] the male-goats of Rosh Chodesh. I might argue, surely 'appointed season' [mo'ed] is not written in connection with it; therefore he informs us that Rosh Chodesh is designated mo'ed, in accordance with Abaye's [dictum]. For Abaye said: Tammuz of that year<sup>32</sup> was indeed made full,<sup>33</sup> as it is written: He has proclaimed an appointed time [mo'ed] against me to crush my young men.<sup>34</sup> (75b3 – 76a1)

### 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

<sup>21</sup> And it is only in such cases that Rabbi Yehudah permits.

<sup>22</sup> Sc. the case disputed by Rav and Levi.

<sup>23</sup> Which even Rabbi Yehudah agrees is forbidden.

<sup>24</sup> This contains milk.

<sup>25</sup> Tzaraas.

<sup>26</sup> All these are brought even if the community is tamei, which of course makes them tamei too through the handling of the officiating Kohen; nevertheless, they may not be eaten for they are brought merely in discharge of public obligations, but their main purpose is not to be eaten.

<sup>27</sup> It is assumed that the number has this purpose, for otherwise the Mishnah would simply state, The omer . . . come in tumah etc.

<sup>28</sup> And similarly the chagigah of any other Festival.

<sup>29</sup> In the sense that all Jews must bring a chagigah.

<sup>30</sup> If not brought on the first day, it can be brought for a week afterwards.

<sup>31</sup> A public sacrifice overrides the Shabbos only when it cannot be offered on any other day.

<sup>32</sup> In which the spies scouted the promised Land, with disastrous results.

<sup>33</sup> I.e., it consisted of 30 days. When it consists of 29 days it is called defective. Now, as they set out on the 29th of Sivan, the third month, the 40 days of their mission ended on the ninth of Av, the fifth month. Thus their weeping on that night became the forerunner of subsequent lamentation on that date for many generations, for it is the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple.

<sup>34</sup> Abaye appears to interpret thus: God caused Rosh Chodesh (i.e., the 'appointed time' — mo'ed) of Tammuz in that year to be proclaimed on such a day that their return and the weeping of the people would coincide with the future anniversary of the destruction of the Temple. Hence, on this interpretation, Rosh chodesh too is designated 'mo'ed'.



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.

**Vapor:** 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.

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### Hashem Desires our Hearts

Although we have no Beis HaMikdash today in which to offer the Korban Pesach, our longing to offer the Korban Pesach had we been able is precious before Hashem as if we had actually offered the Pesach. He grants us the same blessing as if we had actually offered it. Our sincere desire to perform the mitzva is very precious to Him (Reb Tzadok HaKohen of Lublin, Pri Tzaddik on Pesach).