

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Liver (cont.)

Abaye finishes explaining why the Mishnah cited by R' Safra did not resolve his inquiry.

The Gemara relates what happened when R' Safra ascended to Eretz Yisroel a second time and his interaction with R' Zereika.

The Gemara relates that R' Pappa thought that the vinegar in which liver is soaked becomes prohibited, but Rava demonstrated that this was not the case.

A related incident is recounted.

It is noted that Rava bar Shaba's position in the previous incident is subject to a dispute between Tannaim.

Another related incident is presented.

2) Roasting liver or udder with other meat

The Gemara discusses cooking liver above meat on a spit and udder cooked with other meat on a spit. According to one version the udder prohibited the other meat, whereas according to the second version it is the liver cooked above the meat that renders the meat prohibited.

Mereimar teaches the halacha that applies in this case.

Another related incident is presented.

Mereimar's teaching is further clarified.

3) Blood

R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel discusses the blood that is left on the slaughtering knife.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel teaches that the plate used for salting meat may not be used for hot foods.

It is noted that Shmuel is consistent in this regard with another ruling of his.

4) Taste transfers

Ravin reported in the name of R' Yochanan that salting is not like boiling and pickling is not similar cooking, but Abaye demonstrates that Ravin's report in the name of R' Yochanan is not accurate.

R' Kahana taught that a plate used for salting meat may not be used for hot food but a raddish cut with a meat knife may be eaten with dairy.

Abaye explains why the plate is prohibited and the radish is permitted.

Rava rejects this explanation and offers his own rationale for R' Kahana's ruling.

R' Pappa unsuccessfully challenges this explanation.

Rav and Shmuel disagree whether hot fish placed on a meat plate may be eaten with dairy.

Each Amora explains the rationale behind his position.

It is noted that Rav's opinion was inferred from another ruling of his, and the inference was not correct.

A related incident is recorded.

Another incident involving a double-taste transfer is presented.

Chizkiyah in the name of Abaye issues different rulings that relate to double-taste transfers. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The sharp blade of a knife causes the taste to come out

צנון שחתכו בסכין שחתך בה בשר אסור לאוכלו בכותח

A plate or pot which contained hot meat absorbs the taste of the meat. As Rashi explains, once the substance of the meat has been removed and is no longer present, the taste of the meat remains as it becomes absorbed in the plate or into the walls of the pot due to the heat. If a piece of fish is now placed on the plate, it is exposed to only a taste of the meat, and by the time the taste arrives in the fish the meat has been weakened twice. Once, when it entered into the plate, and a second time from the plate into the fish. This twice-weakened meat is called "a taste of a taste—*נותן טעם בר נותן טעם*". Most Rishonim learn that the meat taste is so weak that the fish may now be eaten with milk.

The Gemara continues to illustrate other examples of "a taste of a taste" that is permitted. Chizkiya, in the name of Abaye, reports that although fish that was put onto a plate which was had meat taste imparted in it may be eaten with kutach, a milk preparation, it is not permitted to eat the milk preparation with a radish that was sliced with a knife which was used to cut meat. The meat flavor in the knife cannot generally contribute a significant influence when it emerges, as we have seen. However, in this case, the radish has a sharp taste, and it can therefore absorb the weakened taste of the meat in the knife. According to the second explanation of Rashi to this statement, the radish which has a strong taste can absorb better than does a piece of fish, and due to the sharp metal blade of the knife the taste of the meat in the turnip is considered as one step removed from the meat instead of two. It is more strict than fish, where the taste of the meat at this point would be weakened twice.

Toras Chaim points out that the difference between a turnip and a piece of fish cannot be just the sharp taste of the turnip. When cutting a piece of squash with a sharp knife we allow the spot of the cut to be scraped, and only then is the rest of the squash permitted with milk, while this is not the case with fish placed on a meat plate, where the fish may be eaten with the kutach without any corrective measures. It must therefore be that the cutting with the blade itself is also a factor. The full intent of Abaye's statement is that the taste in a knife comes out due to the sharpness of the blade. A turnip which has a sharp taste absorbs this taste, but squash would not.

Rashi's first explanation is that often not all the meat fat is cleaned well off a knife before it is used to cut a radish. This is why the Gemara did not just say that a meat knife causes this effect, but that it is specifically a knife "that was used to cut meat" that transfers that meat taste to a turnip. It is also due to this residue that when the squash is cut that the spot where it is sliced must be scraped. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Alan Matten
in memory of their mother*

מרת חיי מאשה בת ר' דוד, ע"ה

HALACHA Highlight

“Nat bar nat”

הלכתא דגים שעלו בקערה מותר לאכלן בכותח

The halacha is that fish placed on a [meat] plate may be eaten with kutach

After discussion about the matter the Gemara cites Chizkiyah in the name of Abaye who rules that one may eat fish with dairy even after the fish had been placed on a meat plate while yet hot. This is called “nosen ta’am bar nosen ta’am” or “nat bar nat” and refers to a circumstance in which a taste has been transferred twice. In the Gemara’s case it refers to the meat taste that was transferred to the plate and then from the plate to the fish. Tosafos¹ relates that Rivan explained in the name of Rashi that if the fish was cooked in a pot that had been used for meat one may not eat the fish with dairy. The reason to distinguish between fish placed hot on a meat plate and fish cooked in a meat pot is based on the assumption that cooking transfers more taste than contact between a hot food and a cold pot. Tur², however, in the name of Rashi maintains that there is no difference in halacha whether the fish was placed on a meat plate or whether the fish was cooked in a meat pot; in both cases it is considered “nosen ta’am bar nosen ta’am” and the fish may be eaten with dairy.

Shulchan Aruch³ rules that the halacha of “nosen

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did R' Nachman want food stuffed down Shaba's throat ?

2. When did Shmuel eat spleen ?

3. What needs to be done with a knife that was used to cut cold food ?

4. What is the point of dispute between Rav and Shmuel ?

ta’am bar nosen ta’am” applies even when the fish was cooked in a meat pot. Therefore, one may eat fish that was cooked in a clean meat pot with dairy. Shach⁴ adds an important qualification to this rule. He references Rishonim who maintain that the halacha of “nosen ta’am bar nosen ta’am” applies only בדיעבד. In other words, if one already cooked fish in a meat pot and then is interested in eating that fish with dairy it is permitted. However, one may not cook fish in a meat pot with the intent to eat that fish with dairy. ■

¹ תוס' ד"ה הלכתא.
² טור יו"ד סי' צ"ה.
³ שו"ע שם סעי' א' ובי'.
⁴ ש"ך שם סק"ג. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Delight of Shabbos

”וקראת לשבת עונג...”

On today’s daf we find the mitzvah to prepare special foods for Shabbos.

Rav Shmelke of Nikolsberg, zt”l, never refused a poor person’s request for charity if he had any way to help him. He and his wife were happier knowing that a fellow Jew did not suffer want than with having more than their barest needs met.

Once, when a poor man came to Rav Shmelke for a donation, the rebbe realized that he had nothing for him, not a penny. After a moment’s thought he recalled that his wife had an expensive piece of jewelry under her pillow. Since he was sure that his wife would be happy

to give it for tzedakah he immediately rushed into the next room and brought the jewelry. As the poor man was leaving, obviously thrilled with the windfall, Rav Shmelke’s wife approached her home. She knew that they had nothing at all to give a pauper and immediately recalled her expensive jewelry. The first thing she did upon entering her home was chide her husband.

“I cannot understand. A poor man came and you gave him my only jewelry—I give it gladly! But you probably didn’t consider how much that jewelry is worth. He will likely get ten rubles, and the piece is worth three hundred! I don’t mind supporting the poor, but why should we allow some jeweler to make such a huge profit on the poor man?”

Rav Shmelke immediately rushed after the beggar. Although at first he was

afraid that they wanted the jewelry back and fled, Rav Shmelke overtook him and warned him of the true value of the jewelry. “Don’t allow the jeweler to cheat you!” he warned.

That Shabbos, Rav Shelke told this story to his chassidim. He then connected it to the mitzvah of oneg Shabbos. “Hashem told Moshe: ‘I have a precious gift in my storehouse: Shabbos. Tell this to the Jewish people.’ Of course it is a mitzvah to prepare delicacies for Shabbos. But—like the poor man—let us not ‘sell’ our Shabbos for a pittance. Shabbos should never be mainly food and drink! How can one trade the beautiful light of oneg Shabbos for mere kugel or the like?”¹ ■

¹ מפי הבית אברהם מסלוניס, מובא בספר אבקות ורכלים, ע' קס"ד. ■