

DRAFT

THE
ELUCIDATED
ISSUR
V'HETER

Siman 87

Sif 1

This sif discusses when and where the prohibition of meat and milk apply.

It is written in the Torah “One may not cook a kid in his mothers milk” three times. This is to indicate that there are three prohibitions: To cook, to eat, and to have enjoyment from meat and milk. The reason the Torah delineates this prohibition with the term cooking, is that meat and milk only become forbidden by the Torah when cooked together in the normal way (*as opposed to soaking and salting. Shach*). The Rabbis, however, prohibited meat and milk (to be eaten together) even when they were not cooked together first.

Rema: Any meat and milk combination that was not prohibited by the Torah is permitted to have benefit from. (*Therefore, (according to most) it is permitted to derive benefit from chicken and milk, which is only rabbinically prohibited. Shach*)

Sif 2

Although the Torah says that “one shall not cook a kid in his mothers milk”

A kid is not literal, and neither is mothers milk. The Torah was only speaking about what was common.

Sif 3

This Torah prohibition applies only to kosher domesticated animals that were cooked with kosher milk (from kosher animals). Unkosher meat mixed with kosher milk, or Kosher meat mixed with unkosher milk, are only prohibited from eating, and not from cooking or benefit..

Meat from wild animals (chaya) or birds are never prohibited from the torah. (*Shach* cites some differing opinions)

Fish and grasshoppers may always be eaten with milk.

Although the Beis Yosef writes that we do not eat fish with milk because it is dangerous, that seems to be a mistake, as only fish and meat is dangerous. Shach and Taz

The Tur writes that that non kosher meat and kosher milk is assur mdrobbnon.

All authorities wonder why it would be necessary to even entertain the thought that the rabbis would prohibit the eating of non-kosher meat mixed with kosher milk as a prohibited food of basar bchalav, when the food is certainly not allowed to be eaten since it contains non-kosher!? Perhaps the reason would be to activate Chanan (see Siman 94), or for the stringency that a fine piece of meat cannot be batul (chaticha haruya lhischabed). This, however is not true, since those two stringencies only play a role when both entities (meat and milk) were once permitted items, and now became prohibited because of the mixing. Non-kosher meat was never permitted, though. Therefore, it is proper that the Mechaver reworded the text of that thought. Shach and Taz.

Rema: We are accustomed to make milk from almonds and eat it with chicken since the issur (if it were real milk) is only drabbonon. However, if one were to eat this almond milk with meat, then he should leave some almonds on the side to avoid the problem of maaris ayin (suspect), similarly to the rule in siman 66 (that if one eats fish blood (which is permitted, real blood is not) he should place some fish scales in the bowl so that it should be obvious to all that the blood is actually from a fish.

*The **Shach and Taz** both write that even by rabbinic prohibitions one should leave a sign to avoid suspicion, if possible.*

Sif 4

This sif teaches that even in some instances when cooking meat and milk is permitted, it may have a different issue of maaris ayin, suspect. This means that onlookers might see the cooking, and assume that issur is being cooked.

One may not cook with human milk because of suspect, if the human milk did fall in to a food, it is always batul, no matter the ratio.

Rema: Also, one should not cook with non kosher milk, or non kosher milk (even though the cooking is permitted (see sif 3) because of suspect, but chicken is permitted. (*per the **Shach and Taz** previously this should also be avoided*).

Sif 5

Eggs that are found inside birds: if they are complete, containing a white and a yellow, then even if they are scattered with veins (of the chick), they are (considered pareve and) allowed to be eaten with milk. If they only have a yellow (yoke), then they are considered meat in that they may not be eaten with milk. Milk may be eaten immediately afterwards, though.

*The **Shach** and **Taz** both ask that the **Mechaber** states in 86, that if one hit a chicken and it dropped an egg that was full of veins, but otherwise complete- that egg is considered meaty?*

*The **Taz** answers that the cases are inherently different. There the egg was forced out of the chicken, and indeed is considered as (an uncomplete egg as) part of the chicken. Here, the egg is clearly complete, and therefore does not contain meat taste. In any even, says the **Taz**, we should be stringent lchatchila and prohibit any such eggs to be eaten with milk.*

*The **Shach** answers similarly.*

Sif 6

If one smokes or cooks (milk and meat together) in the Tveriah hot springs, he does not incur lashes (*although it is prohibited. Shach*) If one cooks meat with milk-water (*explained later*), or with milk that came from a dead animal or with milk that came from males (*this refers to male animals. Shach*). Or if he cooked blood with milk (we rule that cooked boood , he is not guilty and does not incur lashes for cooking milk and meat together.

Rema: Also, milk from males (*this refers to male humans. Shach*) that fell into a pot does not prohibit it. Milk-water and milk from dead animals do, just like real milk. They lchatchila should not even be cooked together.

The Rema now lists 4 stringencies:

Some say that one should not stoke the flame under a fire of a non-jews pot, since the pot probably has infused tastes of both milk and meat.

This is not outright basar bchalav since cooking infused tastes is not derech bishul which is a requirement for the Torah prohibition of basar bchalav. Pri Megadim.

The Shach writes that one should also have special pots for his non jewish maids so that he should no come to stir them.

The Shach also writes that this stringency is not heeded.

Also, one should not mix water that was cooked in a milk pot together with water cooked in a meat pot even for the purpose of feeding his animal since he may not derive benefit from basar bchalav.

This must be talking about cold water since hot water is assur to

*mix, as well as derive benefit from. **Pri Megadim** and **R Akiva Eiger**. **Shach** learns that it was talking about hot water(?)
However, the reason for this stringency is not clear. [perhaps they were now in a Kli Sheni]*

Also, one should not use the pot that sat on the stove that is usually for shampooing his head since the pot has meat and milk infused in it.

*Shampooing is permitted since that is not called deriving benefit from the issur. **Shach**.*

Similarly one should not use the pots that sat in the oven for the same reason.

*Metal vessels are permitted, though, since they are continuously kashering themselves in the fire. **Shach**.*

Sif 7

It is prohibited to cook an amniotic sac in milk, as well as to eat it. If one cooks or eats a fetus or skins or nails of a fetus cooked with milk it is prohibited mbrabbonon. (**Shach**)

Sif 8

Some say that whey is not the same as milk-water, but rather it is (considered as real milk and therefore) assur from the Torah (to be cooked with meat). Milk-water is the product that remains from the whey after it is cooked and which floats to the top

Sif 9

The following sifim discuss the principles of milk. A cow drinks milk which ends up in its Kayva (one of the 4 stomachs). What is its status? The Tur cites a three-way dispute whether it is considered real milk, not like real milk, or, if the clear part is considered milk and the thick part not.

Milk that is found in the Kayva is not considered milk, and is therefore permitted to be cooked with meat. Even the clear part of it. Some do assur (cooking it with milk since they consider it to be real milk.)...

Rema: and that is indeed the custom. *(to be stringent by the clear part of the milk. **Taz** and **Shach**. Some do learn [**Maharshal**] that all of it is prohibited to be cooked with meat)*

Sif 10

Cheese is created by utilizing enzymes found in the kayva of cows. These enzymes are found in the milky substance that occupies the kayva. This sif discusses the ramifications of using that milk to create cheese after the 'milk' was salted together with the kayva- which is considered meaty. Does this substance now become prohibited because of basar bchalav- and may not be used to cheese other milk?

Milk that is found in the kayva (**Rema:** Initially, however, one should not put milk in the kayva at all, bdieved, though, we will not prohibited it.) and was salted together with the kayva, or if it sat in the kayva for a day (*24 hours of kavush, Shach*), one should not use that milk to create other cheese.

(according to the Mechaber, bdieved, if the milk was used to create other cheeses we would not prohibit it for we would rely on the opinions that it is not real milk. The Rema, however, argues. Shach)

Rema: If the kayva milk was indeed used to create cheese, then, if it was clear, everything is prohibited unless there is sixty times the amount of milk to the kayva-milk.

If the kayva milk was thick, then all is permitted even without sixty. *(since it is not considered real milk, it has no power to pass on the meat taste that it received from the kayva. It is even less the nat bar nat. Taz)*

If the milk was initially clear and then became thick, we should consider it as clear unless there is a loss involved, in which case we may consider it to be thick.

Sometimes people will salt and dry out the skin of the kayva and then place milk into it. This is permitted since the dried out skins are like wood, and don't have any meat moisture in it. *(Initially though, this should not be done. **Shach**)*

Sif 11

If one uses a kayva (including the skin) of a kosher animal to make cheese, then it is permitted if there is no taste of meat (*sixty times, according to us who do not rely on a gentile chef. Shach.*) However, if one uses the kayva of a non kosher animal it is prohibited no matter the ratio...

Rema: ...because something that causes another entity to solidify (davar hama'amid) is never batul. However this rule is only if the non kosher kayva was the only catalyst for solidification. If there was another (kosher) cause then the milk would be permitted if the non kosher is batul in sixty (*so long as the non kosher was unable to cause the solidification itself, and needed the kosher substance as well. The mere presence of the kosher substance does not suffice to consider it another cause. Taz and Shach*)

The Shach explains that the stringencies of davar hama'amid only apply when the ma'amid (kayva) is already assur. The fact that it may create issur (basar bchalav) is not enough.

Siman 88

Sif 1-2

These sifim discusses some Rabbinic rules that govern the proximity to meat and milk on one table.

Even meat of non-domesticated animals and birds (which will only be assur mdrabbonon if mixed with milk) may not be placed on the table when you are eating cheese, so that you should not come to eat them together (*which itself is only drabbonon; however we still do make this additional rule. Taz.*)

To place them together on a serving table is permitted.

The Mechaber now explains that the issur of meat and milk on one table is based on the assumption that one eating milk may ask his table-mate for some of his meat.

This issur only applies if the two people eating at the table know each other, and then even if they are generally unwilling to give away their food, it is still prohibited. However two guests who do not know each other may eat their (meat and milk) foods on the same table.

Even people who do know each other may eat at the same table if there is a reminder on the table between them, for example, each one eats on his own placemat, or they place a loaf of bread in between them for a reminder.

Siman 89

Sif 1

*This sif discusses the Rabbinic requirement to wait for a certain period of time after eating meat before eating milk. This is either because one may have meat stuck in between his teeth, or because meat leaves a residue on the palate and throat when swallowed. The Gemara mentions the idea to wait until the next meal. Some learn that since the amount of time between meals is six hours, that is the appropriate time to wait. Other say that one must not wait at all, but just not eat meat and milk in the course of one meal. Some (while holding of the second interpretation), still wait one hour as an added stringency. **Shach** and **Taz***

If one eats meat, even meat of non-domesticated animals or chicken, [*which is only assur mdrabbonon **Shach***] to eat with milk), he may not eat milk until he waits six hours. Even after the waiting, if he still has meat stuck in between his teeth, he is required to remove it. Even if one merely chews meat to serve to a baby is required to wait.

Rema: If one does find meat stuck in between his teeth, he is required to wash out his mouth (kinuach and hadacha) as well before eating milk. [*however he does not need to wait another six hours from that time. **Shach***]

Some say that there is no six hour waiting period, and immediately after eating meat one can say birchas hamazon (*or any bracha acharona. **Shach***), wash out his mouth and start to eat milk.

The custom of our cities it to wait one hour in between meat and milk. However one must also say the bracha acharona, for without that, waiting any amount of time does not help, since any subsequent eating is still considered as part of the first seudah.

*[The **Taz** also requires washing out the mouth, the **Shach** does not.]*
Of course, if one found meat in his teeth, he still must remove it.
*[and wash out his mouth. **Shach** and **Taz**.]*

Some say that one should not say a bracha acharona in order to eat milk (since that indicates that it is really all the same seudah, and the bracha acharona is really just to eat the milk, and not end the seudah.), but we are not careful with that stringency. *[One must be careful with this stringency, and there is no proper reason to be lenient, since the bracha acharona is really just a preparation for the milk and not a conclusion of the first one. **Taz**.]*

Some are extra careful to wait six hours after eating meat before eating milk.

*The **Shach** and **Taz** both write that indeed any ben torah should wait six hours.*

Sif 2

If one eats cheese, it is permitted to eat meat afterwards, so long as he checks his hands to see if there is any cheese on it. At night, he must wash his hands, for we are concerned that he will be unable to properly examine them. [*Shach quotes R' Peretz that one should always wash his hands, even by day.*

The methods of hand washing are the same as by mayim acharonim except for the halacha of drying (required here), and rubbing hands against the wall. There is a dispute whether liquids other than water are permitted for this washing. Shach]

He also must wash out his mouth in the following manner: first he must eat some bread to clean out the mouth. It does not have to be bread, for any food will clean the mouth, except for some foods which stick to the gums, such as flour, dates, and certain vegetables. He then must wash out his mouth with water or wine. [*the Shach writes that the order is inconsequential*]

This is all said if he wishes to eat meat after the cheese. If he wishes to eat chicken, he may do so without washing his hands or his mouth.

Rema: Some are more stringent (to wait six hours) even to eat meat after cheese. This is indeed the custom after eating hard cheese, for we do not even eat chicken within six hours of eating hard cheese. Some are lenient, and we do not have to protest them, so long as they are careful to wash out their mouth and their hands. However, it is good to be stringent (and wait six hours). [*the Shach quotes the Zohar that one should never eat milk and meat 'at one time'*]

Hard cheese is defined as cheese which was aged for 6 months, or if it was aged until it became wormy (Taz and Shach)

Sif 3

If one ate food cooked with meat he may then eat foods that were cooked with milk and washing [the hands] in between them is optional. (**Rema:** some require washing.) If one wants to eat milk after eating a food cooked with meat, or if he wants to eat meat after eating a food cooked with milk, he is required to wash his hands.

Rema: The fats from meat (*or chicken. Shach*) are considered meat itself (and not merely to be food cooked with meat).

We now have the custom not to eat milk after a food cooked with meat.

However, foods that are merely cooked in a pot of meat (but without any actual meat) does not prevent one from eating milk following.

The Shach asks that this ruling is simple, after all in siman 95 we rule that it is permitted to eat something cooked in a meat pot (without meat- it is a nat bar nat) with milk! If so, what is the ruling of the Rema coming to add? The Shach answers that the Rema is referring to a case in which the pot was slightly dirty from meat particles. Although one may not eat the (pareve) food cooked in it with milk, it does not make one fleishigs and require him to wait six hours.

R' Akiva Eiger learns that the ruling of the Rema refers to a sharp item that was infused with meat taste. Even though it is considered a nat, and not a nat bar nat, it does not render the eater fleishigs.

The Pri Migadim asks that the Rema rules that one may not lchatchila eat a pareve item cooked in a meat pot with milk, so what is the Shach asking on the Rema, and the Rema is contradicting himself? He answers that this ruling is also brought down by the Bais Yosef in Orach Chaim 173 brings down this same ruling, and he rules that nat bar nat is permitted lchatchila, therefore the ruling

must be referring to something else, namely a dirty pot.

We also can eat meat after eating a food cooked with milk. However one should wash his hands between them. Even one who eats a food cooked with meat after eating a food cooked with milk should wash his hands if he touched the actual food (*even during the day, Shach.*) A servant who serves food need not wash his hands. *The Mechaber refers to Mayim Rishonim (netilas yadayim for a seudah). A servant need not wash his hands even though he is handling food, since the halacha was only intended for those eating.*

Sif 4

If one ate milk, and would now like to eat meat, he must first clear off all of the leftover bread pieces from his first meal. (*Similarly*) it is prohibited to eat milk on a placemat that was used for meat. It is certainly not permitted to cut cheese with a knife that is regularly used for milk. It is likewise not permitted to cut bread that is to be eaten with cheese with a meat knife.

Rema: The reverse case is also prohibited. However, if one does neitzah into hard ground, the knife is permitted to be used (*for cheese. In order to use them for bread, only cleaning is required.*

Taz. *The Shach is of the opinion that neitzah helps only for bread.) The Shach cites the Maharshal who prohibits neitzah for this purpose. The Shach argues that neitzah most certainly does work, and proves this from several cases. However, practically, we do have the custom to have two separate knives.*

However, now, we have the custom to maintain separate knives for meat and milk, and we make a sign on one of them. The custom is to mark the milk vessels.

Siman 91

Sif 1

This sif discusses the rules when meat touches milk.

Meat and cheese that touched are both permitted provided that the point of contact is washed off. They are permitted to be placed in one container.

*The **Shach** cites the **Bach** who writes that this requirement of washing is only if one of the items are wet. If they are both dry, no washing is required.*

Sif 2

Any food that needs to be washed (*if it touched food or even vessels of the other min, or non kosher food or vessels. Taz*) may not be placed on those vessels lchatchila, since one might come to eat the food without washing. This rule applies to cooked meat, which is not usually washed before use. However, food such as raw meat, which is generally washed before use, is permitted to be placed on those non-kosher vessels/ vessels of the other status.

The Taz asks that we usually do not make gzeiros when the food would anyways be permitted b'dieved. If so, why do make a gzeira that one may forget to wash the food before eating? (The Taz assumes that the halacha of washing is similar to the halacha of klipa, which is permitted b'dieved without its removal. Pri Megadim)

The Taz answers that this rule is said when there is questionable issur that needs to be further investigated. Here, the food immediately becomes prohibited when placed on the non kosher vessel. It can be rectified by washing it, but its current status is one of issur. Therefore we can make precautionary rules.

The Taz writes that the practice of certain travelers to eat pickles at roadside inns is incorrect, since the pickles need to be washed after being placed on the non kosher plates. The salt water dip, not able to be washed, will be completely assur! Some say that boarding by a non-jew is considered a shaas hadchak- extraordinary time of need- and is permitted (similar to klipa which is permitted b'dieved)

Rema: This rule only applies to those foods which have some wetness. Totally dry foods may be placed on the vessels IF the vessels only became non-kosher/of the other status by an infusion that went in while cold (*such as through soaking or salting*), without

any heat; then dry foods may be placed on it. The food does not need to be washed before eating.

*The **Taz** asks that the Rema's text is redundant. He suggests that the correct reading of the Rema should be that dry foods (in any case, even hot), or (even wet cold foods may be placed if) the plate only received its infusion from cold (salting or soaking). The **Taz** indeed hold of this position as well.*

*However, the **Taz** holds that this stringency is only for permanent use. One may use the vessel for even wet cold items temporarily! The **Shach** however holds that hot foods can never be placed, no matter what. He posits that there is no difference whatsoever how the infusion came into the plate. In any event, cold (even wet) food may be placed on the plate.*

*However, he cites the **Rashba** who rules that an earthenware vessel may never be used even temporarily and even for cold solids, since it can not be kashered, and its use may lead to issur later on. (Some explain that earthenware is worse since the infusions accumulate inside and never expel fully, they are easily 'leaked' out.) Also, sharp foods may not be used. Of course all of this is only for temporary use, permanent use of a non kosher vessel is never sanctioned.*

Sif 3

One must be careful to ensure that meat does not touch bread, for if it does, the bread may not be eaten with milk. So too, must he be careful not to allow it to touch milk, for the same reason.

*As mentioned earlier, this is only if the meat or milk was wet. **Taz.** The **Piskei Teshuva** writes that if the meat touched the crust then washing it would make it permissible to eat with milk, but if it touched the doughy part, scraping (greidah) is required.*

Sif 4

If hot meat and milk were combined together, or if one, even cold fell upon the other which was hot, everything is prohibited since the hot bottom one is stronger (tato gavar). If the bottom one was cold then the issur only extends to a klipa of the meat (**Rema**: if a klipa was not taken, bdieved it is permitted.) The entire milk is permitted though (since one cannot remove a klipa of liquid).

If they were both cold then a mere washing of the meat would suffice to permit it.

*The **Taz** writes that we must be stringent like the **Riva** and prohibit the milk in its entirety, since a klipa cannot be removed. The **Shach** writes that if the issur is visible we must be stringent and we would in fact require sixty times a klipa even bdieved, but if it is not we can be lenient.*

Sif 5

In this Sif we find that even cold foods can be susceptible to infusion transfer. This can occur if a food is very salty. The sif will clarify how salty the food must be.

Very salty food that can not be eaten due to its large amount of salt, which is (for example) the amount that it is salted for a pot (i.e. salted to remove the blood to make the meat kosher for cooking), and it is

left in the salt for that amount of time (that it takes to remove the blood) is considered salted to that level until the salt is washed off.

Rema: Some say that once the food sits idle for the same amount of time that it was salted for, it is no longer able to create infusions. In case of a great need, or for use in a large meal, we may be lenient in accordance with this opinion. Otherwise we should not regard it, even if the (*salting was not so intense and*) the meat was not salted on both sides, it is still considered salty to the degree that it becomes inedible. However, if it is salted to a lesser degree, even if it is salted on both sides, it is not able to create infusions.

The Shach discusses the following dispute regarding the amount of time the food needs to be salted. Some learn that food needs sit in salt for a certain amount of time and only then can be considered (like hot foods) and effect infusions. It will remain that way until washed off (or soaked). Before that time, it has no power and is considered like cold food that can not effect infusions.

Others learn that when salted the food can immediately effect

infusions. However, once the salt sits in the food for a certain amount of time, that power will stop, and the food will no longer be able to infuse.

*The **Shach** suggests that perhaps there is no real argument: If salting is done when there is blood in the meat, then it immediately starts to have the power to infuse. Once all the blood is expelled, the power of the meat subsides. However if the meat is not salted to remove the blood, but is salted a second time, then it does not have the power to infuse until it sits in the salt for a certain amount of time, and once it reached that stage, will remain that way until washed.*

Rema:Some say that since we are not proficient in knowing the exact degree of saltiness, we should consider all salting as the inedible degree, even the (small) amount of salting that one does when he wishes to roast meat.

Initially (Ichatchila), we should be stringent like this opinion if there is no great loss involved.

If it is salted the amount that one salts to preserve for travel (which is more than salting for removing blood), it will be considered salty even if washed, until it is soaked in water. It will infuse (potentially assuring) a klipa into the food that it touches, but it will not receive any infusions from the other food. It is inconsequential whether the salty food was on top or on bottom in this case (unlike hot foods which are governed by the rules of *tato gavar*). Therefore if salty cheese and meat (both are salty) touched each other, both need a klipa removed from the part where they touched (since they each received a klipas worth from the other one). If only one was salty,

then the non-salty one requires a klipa (since it received a klipas worth from the salty one) and the salty one just needs to be washed (since it did, after all, touch the other food).

Rema: Some say that any salting (that created infusions) must be reckoned with a sixty to one ratio, and in siman 105 we indeed say that we are concerned that any meat may be fatty, and infuse its taste into the whole other food.

Also, this rule that if the non kosher one was not salty, and the kosher one was salty, that no infusion takes place, is not true if the non kosher food was a clear food. If so, it would infuse its taste into the adjacent kosher food, assuring it, leaving them both assur. This is only true if the salty kosher food was somewhat wet, for if it were totally dry (*even if slightly salty. Shach*), no infusion would take place.

If however, the salty food that touched was dry (and not wet), or even if it was wet, but not as a reaction to the salt, then merely washing the part that was touched is sufficient. (*in other words; the whole idea of salty foods creating infusions only applies when the food is wet from the large amount of salt that it contains.*)

Rema: Juice from meat that was salted, even if only lightly salted in preparation for roasting, is considered like hot food (and capable of creating infusions). Therefore if juice fell upon cheese, or upon a vessel (of milk), it becomes prohibited. The vessel would require purging (kashering) if it was earthenware it must be broken (since it cannot be kashered). If the drop only fell on one spot, then if it

was wooden, the part where it fell may be sanded down. *The Shach* writes that this is true even if fell all over the vessel, but since it is impracticable to sand down the entire vessel.

Sif 6

The previous halachos that mention that the food will become prohibited a kipa-worth is only talking about lean foods. Fatty foods will impart their taste throughout the entire food, prohibiting both of them. *Even if only one of them is fatty, it will infuse its taste into the other one, which in turn will infuse into the fatty food. Therefore no matter the case, both foods are prohibited. Shach.*

We do not know exactly which foods are considered fatty, therefore we assume that all foods are fatty, and require sixty times for everything.

Sif 7

This next sif discusses the problem of absorption. Absorption, as opposed to infusion, can happen to any foods, regardless of saltiness, heat level, or acidity (in the juice). However some foods are more absorbent than others.

There are three basic opinions found in the Rishonim:

- 1. Cooked meat is considered absorbent even while cold; if it is unspiced and contains no ridges only a klipas-worth is prohibited. If it contains ridges or spices, the entire meat is assur.*

Uncooked meat containing spiced or crevices will also be entirely prohibited.

- 2. Uncooked meat is never considered absorbent. Cooked meat is considered absorbent even while cold; if it is unspiced and contains no ridges only a klipas-worth is prohibited. If it contains ridges or spices, the entire meat is assur.*
- 3. Uncooked meat is never considered absorbent. Cooked meat can only be considered absorbent while hot, but never while cold: if it is unspiced and contains no ridges only a klipas-worth is prohibited. If it contains ridges or spices, the entire meat is assur.*

This distinction between saltiness is only said regarding (infusions of) raw meat. However, roasted (or cooled etc. **Shach**) foods then came in contact with (even mildly salty milk foods that) are edible even while salty (in which case the salt has no halachic concern) requires a klipa(s) worth to be taken off the meat, out of concern that the milk foods are **absorbed** in the meat.)

If the meat had ridges (crevices) or if it was spiced, and it is hot and roasted, all of the meat would be prohibited (because of the absorption of the milk. *(The crevices and/or spicing of the meat makes it more absorbent.)*)

Rema: Some rule that even if the roasted meat was cold, the rule is that way *(that the entire meat becomes prohibited if it was spiced or contains crevices)*. That is indeed the way to follow if not in case of great loss.

*The **Taz** and **Shach** both express surprise and the Rema for ruling leniently in cases of loss. First of all, most **Rishonim** rule like the stringency of the Rema. Also, perhaps we rule that even slight salting is enough to make the meat liable for infusions? Rather, they opine, in all cases the halacha follows the stringency mentioned in the Rema: Even cold cooked meat containing crevices or spices will entirely become prohibited if milk fell on it.*

Sif 8

Milk and meat that are salted or soaked together are not prohibited to derive benefit from, only to eat.

Siman 92

Sif 1

This Sif discusses a scenario in which a piece of meat fell into a pot of milk that was bubbling on the fire. The problem that arises is two-fold. One, the meat that falls into the pot will instantly make the milk treif if there is no bittul b'shishim/chef that can discern that there is no meat taste. Two, even if there is 60 times milk to the meat, we have to be concerned that the meat taste will enter the milk and create a meat-infused taste. If so, the milk itself is now meaty, and this milk may enter the rest of the milk and create a problem of basar b'cholov.

A kzayis sized piece of meat falls into a pot of boiling milk. A gentile (chef) should taste the mixture; if the milk has no meat taste, it is permitted. The meat is prohibited either way. This only holds true if the meat was immediately removed from the pot before it had a chance to cool down from its boiling. If not, we are concerned that the milk taste may have entered the meat, turned into Chanan, and was expelled into the milk. If so, we require bittul bshishim against the meat. The **Rema** notes that we never rely on a gentile chef nowadays, and therefore we always require bittul bshishim, even in the first step of the case.

*The **Taz and Shach** explain the reasoning of this case. There is a dispute among the Tanaim and the Rishonim regarding bitul. According to R' Yehuda (and Rashi) two like items that are mixed are never batul in each other (min b'mino lo batul). If so, in the second step of the case, we are concerned that the meat had accepted milk*

taste, turned it into Chanan, and expelled the meat-infused milk back into the rest of the milk. This creates two like items (the milk; one regular and one that is Chanan) that can not be batul in each other. Indeed this is the ruling halacha l'maaseh according to Rashi if the meat was not removed immediately.

Why does removing the meat immediately help? There is a principle in the Gemara that an item is not maflit umavlia k'achas. This means that an item cannot simultaneously accept and expel tastes. This will be explained in more detail below. In our case, the boiling pot of milk can infuse the milk into the meat, but the meat will not expel that taste back into the milk during the boiling. Only when the boiling comes to a rest can the taste in the meat be expelled back into the milk. Therefore it is important that the meat is removed from the pot immediately, before the boiling comes to a rest, so that the milk taste infused in the meat does not expel back into the regular milk causing min bmino lo batul.

This is all according to Rashi. According to Rabbeinu Tam, even min bmino can be batul in sixty. Therefore even if the meat is not removed from the pot immediately, and the meat infused milk will expel back in to the regular milk (which had sixty against the meat), this will also be batul in sixty. The Mechaber rules in accordance to Rabbeinu Tam. However, the Mechaber also is of the opinion that we rely on a gentile chef to taste the food to ascertain if there is indeed a meat (in this case) taste in the milk. However the gentile can not taste if meat-infused MILK is mixed with the regular MILK. Therefore, according to Mechaber, if the meat was removed before it had a chance to expel the infused milk back into the pot (while the pot was still boiling) then we can rely on the gentile chefs word that the milk had no meat taste. If the meat was not removed in time,

*we require sixty times the meat in the milk since the chef cannot tell if the meaty milk is mixed with the regular milk. According to the Rema, we never rely on the gentile chef, and require sixty times in any case. Even according to the Mechaber, the gentile is only relied upon if he is either a professional chef, or if he is unaware that his opinion is needed to decide a halachic ruling (**Shach**).*

*The principle of ain maflit umavlia k'achas- that an item cannot simultaneously accept and expel taste is explained in the **Bais Yosef**. Although two different tastes can be infused and expelled simultaneously, a taste that was infused into a food can not be expelled during the same session that it was infused. Therefore in our case, the milk was infused into the meat during the boiling, therefore the meat cannot expel that same milk back into the rest of the milk during the boiling (and can only do so when the boiling rests). However the meat taste (alone) can go into the milk at the same time that the milk taste is transferred into the meat. This is because they are two separate transfers.*

There is another opinion that ain maflit umavlia k'achas means that during one session (a boiling, for example) a taste can be infused into another item without that taste reversing the transfer backwards UP UNTIL A CERTAIN POINT. After the taste is fully saturated into the second item, however, the taste can reverse back to the original item (perhaps bringing with it Chanan, as in our case). This is true even during one boiling session. We are not expert in knowing at what point the taste may be fully saturated, though.

Sif 2

This Sif discusses a case where a drop of milk fell into a pot of meat. The problems are two-fold. Were the milk to fall on an individual piece of meat in the pot, that meat may become assur if it is not sixty times the size of the milk droplet. Secondly, that piece of meat may infuse its Chanana taste into the rest of the pot. Of course, had the milk droplet fell into the juice of the pot, and not on an individual piece of meat, the entire pot would be Chanana itself if there was not shishim. The definition of an individual piece of meat in a pot which can act as a separate piece (as if it was not in the pot at all- and the rest of the contents in the pot do not combine with this piece to create shishim) is a dispute among the Rishonim. The Ri learns that the piece must be resting on top of another piece which is already only partially submerged on the surface of the liquid in the pot. This piece would then be entirely out of the liquid and may be considered out of pot, for all practical purposes. Rashi learns that as long as the piece itself is only partially submerged in the liquid, it is still considered as if it is out of the pot.

Another issue discussed in the Sif is the idea of mixing or covering the pot. These actions may spread the taste to all items in the pot, even those items that were previously considered out of the pot.

If a droplet of milk fell into a pot of meat, (a gentile chef) should taste the piece of meat that the milk fell on: If it does not have a milk taste everything is permitted. If it does have a milk taste then that piece is assur. The **Rema** adds that nowadays we do not rely on the word of a gentile chef, and require sixty times the milk in that particular piece of meat (not in the whole pot) in order to permit it.

If there was no bitul of the milk, and the piece of meat became assur, and then one subsequently mixed (or covered) the contents of the pot we require all the rest of the contents of the pot (excluding that piece of meat) to contain sixty times the amount than the piece of meat in order to permit the rest of the pot.

If, however, the pot was mixed (or covered) in the beginning until the end [*the **Shach** and **Taz** both rule that this is not literal, and it does not have to be mixed from the beginning until the end, and mixing the the beginning alone suffices. According to the **Shach** it is possible the the **Mechaber** does rule that the pot needs that level of mixing, but the **Rema** definitely disagrees.*], immediately when the droplet of milk fell in, thus mixing in the piece of meat with the rest of the pot, then the entire contents of the pot can combine to create bitul bshishim against the milk droplet.

*The Achronim discuss the Mechabers scenario. First of all, in Siman 105, the Mechaber writes that issur above the level of the liquid (Ri) or only partially submerged (Rashi) can only infuse its taste a klipa (a shells-worth-a very small amount) How then is it possible for the meat to transfer its taste to the rest of the pot? The **Taz** and **Shach** both answer several answers. Either the milk is considered to be fatty from the milk fat and can spread its taste farther than a lean item. Or, liquids can transfer the taste more than roasting. Alternatively, perhaps the scenario there was referring to a solid item that wasn't clear.*

Secondly, as mentioned in the introduction there is a dispute between Rashi and the Ri as to the position of the meat that the milk fell on. The Ri assumes that it is entirely out of the liquid of the pot (and is

resting on another piece of meat which is only partially submerged itself. The meat is then considered as if in a separate zone from the rest of the contents of the pot. According to Rashi, even if the meat is partially submerged in the liquid it is also considered as if it is in a separate zone.

*Either way, when the meat is in a separate zone, if it would become assur it would not affect the rest of the pot. This leniency has a stringent factor as well though. If the meat is in a separate zone, the rest of the contents of the pot cannot combine with the meat to create bitul. This is the traditional understanding as explained by the Rema in the **Darkei Moshe**. The **Taz** is of the opinion that according to Rashi, there is no lenient position. Even when partially submerged, the meat can transfer its (issur- after the milk fell on it) taste to the rest of the pot, but the rest of the pot cannot combine with the meat to create bitul. This is because bitul requires a mixture, which there is not since the meat is in a separate zone. Transfer of taste can happen regardless.*

The Taz assumes that the Mechaber is following this interpretation of Rashi. This is because the Mechaber gives two cases; The milk fell onto a piece of meat, and the meat will then transfer its forbidden taste to the rest of the pot, requiring it to have shishim to remain permitted. According to the Ri and the original approach to Rashi- any time that the piece of meat will become prohibited without combining the rest of the pot to create bitul, it must be in a separate zone and then can NOT transfer any taste further. Only according to the Taz's stringent interpretation of Rashi, that the taste can transfer even when the meat is in a separate zone regarding bitul, can the Mechaber make sense.

*The **Shach in Nekudos Hakesef** points out the the Taz misread the Mechaber in developing his proof to his new interpretation of Rashi. The Mechaber clearly writes that the meat will transfer its taste to the rest of the pot, ONLY when mixed with a spoon. In an ordinary case where it was not mixed, the prohibited meat would stay separate from the rest of the contents of the pot. He therefore learns that the case of the Mechaber is the case of the Ri, where the meat is entirely above the level of the liquid.*

Rema: Also, if the pot was not mixed at all, not in the beginning nor in the end, then the piece of meat that the milk landed on is assur (if there is no shishim), however the rest of the pot would be permitted if there was sixty times the amount against the droplet of milk. *[This Rema requires much explanation since if the pot was not mixed, the meat will not infuse its taste into the rest of the pot, since it was either above the level of liquid (Ri) or only partially submerged (Rashi). Additionally, if we are concerned about the infusion of taste, we should require sixty times the entire Chanan meat, not just the milk droplet. The **Shach** explains that even though the Mechaber was referring to a case in which the meat was above the liquid (like the Ri) , now the Rema is discussing a case in which the meat is partially submerged in the liquid. The Rema is uncertain of whether the halacha is like Rashi or the Ri. Therefore he rules with the stringencies of both of them. The outcome is as follow: If there is sixty times the milk in the pot, the pot is permitted according to all opinions- according the the Ri it was never a problem since the meat that the milk landed on was in the pot- the entire pot combines to bitul. According to Rashi the rest of the pot does not need to combine since the meat was only partially submerged, it is considered as if it was not in the pot regarding infusing its taste to other pieces.*

However the piece of meat will be assur since perhaps the rest of the pot will not combine to create bitul (like Rashi).

The Taz follows a different approach. As explained previously, he assumes that the Mechaber is discussing a case in which the meat was partially submerged in the pot, however Rashi is stringent and although the rest of the pot cannot combine to create bitul, the Chanan meat can infuse its taste to the rest of the pot. The Rema therefore, he concludes, follows the Ri in this case, and since the meat is partially submerged the contents of the pot will combine with the meat to create bitul. However as an added stringency, the Rema prohibits eating the first piece of meat that the milk fell on.]

Rema: Also, if one were to mix or cover the pot only in the very beginning and not at all in the end, the entire pot will combine to create bitul.

The Taz explains that the Rema inserts this ruling to argue on the Mechaber who quotes the Rambam as saying that the mixing must be done “from the beginning until the end”. Their dispute is based on the reading of the Gemara. The Taz suggests that perhaps this dispute is really only based on the understanding of the words “from the beginning until the end” but in halacha there is really no argument. The Tur assumes that from the beginning until the end means the entire time that the pot is on the fire. The Rambam learns that it means that one must mix very well, so that all of the milk is thoroughly dispersed throughout the pot. From the beginning- when the milk falls in, to the end- that the milk is dispersed. If the milk is dispersed properly while the pot is still on the fire, that is acceptable as well.

Similarly, if the droplet of milk fell into the liquid, or onto a piece- but we do not know which piece it fell on, one may mix the pot so that the taste of the milk will spread through the contents of the entire pot. Then one may ask a gentile (chef) to taste the mixture, and if it does not have milk taste it is permitted. If the gentile is not available then we may rely on bitul bshishim.

Rema: There are those that disagree, and hold that it does not help to mix the pot after the droplet of milk fell in if it was not done immediately.

This argument between the Mechaber and Rema has earlier roots in the Tur. The Tur quotes the Rambam as saying that if if the droplet of milk fell into the liquid, or onto a piece- but we do not know which piece it fell on, one may mix the pot so that the taste of the milk will spread through the contents of the entire pot. Because of the language used by the Rabmam, the Tur assumes that the Rambam is referring to a mixing after the droplet fell in, and not done immediately. This is because the expression used is “one should mix the pot” and not “if one mixed the pot. He therefore asks that there is no purpose in the mixing, as it is too late since the meat already became assur. Also, if the droplet fell into the liquid, it is already dispersed throughout the entire pot and the entire pot will combine to create bitul. He therefore rejects the Rambams ruling. The Beis Yosef comments that the Rambam does not indicate that the mixing is done later, and that the Rambam really meant that the mixing should be done immediately. The Rambam is just stating that one may rely on a gentile chef to permit the pot even if there was no bitul bshhishim.

*According to this explanation, a new question arises. How can the Rambam sanction the mixing of the pot in order to create bitul. Isn't the rule ain mvatlin issur lchatchiila- that one may not intentionally cause bitul? The **Taz** answers this question. If we do not know where the milk droplet landed, then there is no specific piece of meat to point at and assur. If so the meat does not become Chanan (this point is unclear as to why) and does not give off taste the the rest of the pot. Therefore, if the gentile would taste it without mixing it first, he might taste a milky taste since that it what is floating on the top. We therefore mix the pot, spreading the milky taste evenly around the pot so that the gentile will be able to discern the tastes of the whole pot collectively, properly. This is not a problem of mvatel issur lchatchiila because the action of bitul already occurred as soon as the droplet fell in. The mixing is just to spread the taste of the botul milk out. Similarly, if the milk fell on a unidentifiable piece of meat, we do not want the gentile to taste any random piece for he might choose one of the pieces at the top which have a larger chance of being the milky ones. Therefore we mix that meat to make them more spread out. This is also not mvatel issur lchatchiila since the action of bitul occurred before, immediately when the drop fell in. According to this the Mechaber does make sense and the Rema does need to side with the Tur against the Mechaber/Rambam.*

*The **Shach** however, while explaining the same principles adds that the basis for this idea that there is no Chanan when the issur is not recognizable is predicated on the idea that the issur is really batul brov min hatorah. Therefore there is room to create leniencies, similar to the example is Siman 111. He also adds that there is no m'vatel issur lchatchiila since the issur is not recognizable in one*

place, and the whole pot is in a state of questionable issur. The Shach explains that the Rema knew this explanation of the Rambam, but rejected it since there is no real safek. Even though the issur is not recognizable now, the gentile can taste every piece and discern which one was the milky one.

Sif 3

This sif discusses the idea of Chanan- Chaticha naaseh niveilah. This means that meat and milk combined form a new entity of issur-like neveilah. It is not just meat and milk together, but rather issur Chanan. The practical difference is in the amount of bitul needed. Since milk and meat individually are permitted items, if they were viewed as that, we would only need bitul bshishim against one of them, and the remaining non-batul one would be viewed as its own permissible item. However Chanan says that when combined, it becomes a new, single issur. Therefore we require sixty times against the combined sum of the meat and milk together. For example if 1oz. Of meat mixed with 1oz. Of milk, we require $2\text{oz} \times 60 = 120\text{oz}$. To create bitul. Without Chanan it would suffice to require only 60oz. Against either the meat or the milk.

A prohibited piece of meat (that had been mixed with milk) becomes entirely assur. If cooked with other foods, we require sixty times that entire piece of meat (even if the milk that fell into it was a smaller amount). If we recognize the prohibited piece of meat, we can discard it and the rest of food is permitted (if there was indeed bitul bshishim). If we do not recognize it, the entire food will be permitted provided that the meat was not a chaticha haruya lhischabed- a piece of meat that was fine enough to serve to guests. It is permitted even though we know that there is a forbidden piece in the mixture, because it is batul brov. And the rest of the ingredients are permitted because of bitul bshishim.

The Taz and Shach disagree if the meat is considered issur itself, or if it is heter with issur inside of it. The difference is whether we

require cooking to transfer taste, or it is enough if the two pieces of meat (one that was basar bchalav) touch each other.

Sif 4

*This Sif discusses the issue of Chanan, as well as the issue of Efshar Lsochto- the ability to 'squeeze', i.e. purge the forbidden meat of its issur. The **Tur** cites a dispute between Rabbeinnu Tam and Rabbeinu Ephraim about this matter. According to Rabbeinu Tam, Efshar Lsochto is assur. This means that once forbidden, a piece of meat can never become permitted again, even if it is subsequently cooked in a pot with sixty times its own amount. The rest of the food may or may not be permitted to eat, depending on bitul. In fact, the whole pot, including this forbidden piece of meat may be permitted if the forbidden piece is not distinguishable. This is because it is batul brov, as explained in Sif 3. However, if identified, the forbidden piece is assur to eat. Rabbeinu Ephraim is of the opinion that Efshar Lsochto is permitted. This means that if cooked in sixty times its' amount, the prohibited piece of meat will become permitted. The issur leaves the meat and enters the contents of the pot, becoming batul bshishim immediately. The formerly assur piece of meat now becomes permitted.*

It should be noted that the entire concept of Chanan mentioned in Sif 3 is based on the idea of Efshar Lsochto Assur. That is, if Efshar Lsochto Mutar, there can obviously not be Chanan.

There is an additional point of contention between these two Rishonim. Although everyone agrees that meat and milk is an issur that creates Chanan (as explained in Sif 3, and also in this Sif), there is a disagreement if we engage Chanan by other issurim. For example if a piece of Chelev (forbidden fat) is cooked with a piece of kosher meat- does the entire meat become assur, or is it

merely kosher meat infused with some not kosher (the fat) taste? The difference is in the amount of bitul needed. R' Tam (besides for ruling that Efshar Lshochto is assur) rules that we do engage Chanan. R' Ephraim does not hold of Chanan by other issurim.

For example, consider the following scenario: Chelev (item A) is cooked with kosher meat (item B) and then the meat is mixed with kosher stew (item C).

According to R' Tam, we require the stew to contain sixty times the entire piece of (formerly) kosher meat. This is because, when mixed with item A, the entire piece of meat became a new issur (like neveilah). R' Tam also maintains that without Chanan, the meat (item B) cannot assur the stew (item C) at all. He would agree that the meat (B) is assur, since it contains forbidden infused taste from the fat (item A).

According to R' Ephraim, we would require the stew (C) to contain merely sixty times the amount of fat (A) that was infused into the meat (B). This is because he does not agree to the principle of Chanan by other issurim.

Also noteworthy, is that both Rishonim agree that if the amount of fat (A) was minimal (less than sixty times the meat (B), but is not batul because of the rule of min, bmino lo batul (obviously they [A and B] would both need to be from the same min)) then the meat (B) would not assur the stew (C) at all. This is because there is not enough issur to consider the meat (B) as carrying the original issur (A) over to the stew (C).

We only engage the principle of Chanan by cases of meat and milk.

However, by cases of other issurim, for example; A kzayis of chelev was infused into a piece of meat which did not have sixty times the amount needed to create bitul, and subsequently became assur. That piece then fell into a pot that contained other pieces of meat. We do not require the pot to contain sixty times the amount of meat, only sixty times the amount of chelev. The piece of meat would then also become permitted. [*The Mechaber is using the principle Efshar Lsochto Mutar, in accordance with the opinion of R' Ephraim*]. The **Shach** and **Taz**, both ask that the Mechaber in Siman 106 rules that the piece of meat does not become permitted. The **Taz** comments that Siman 106 contains the correct ruling. The **Shach** answers that here the meat is not assur because of itself, but just contains prohibited taste. However in 106 the meat was itself a prohibited piece.

Shach and Taz: *The reason why meat and milk are always susceptible to Chanan is that meat and milk are inherently permitted items. By forbidding them, the Torah is creating a new issur.*

Rema: There are those who maintain the we do engage the principle of Chanan by other issurim, and that is the accepted custom, and it is not to be changed.

This (that we do engage Chanan) is only true if the issur is either attached to the heter, or if the piece of heter meat was totally outside of the liquid of the pot. If however, the piece was partially submerged in the liquid AND the issur was not attached to the heter, we do not engage Chanan. Therefore the entire pot can combine with the piece of heter to be mvatil the issur. However, we should be stringent and prohibit the piece of meat itself.

[*The Taz explains that attached issur is more stringent since it is*

likely that in was lifted out of the pot by itself for a moment and immediately became Chanan, and was then returned to the pot. If it was totally outside the liquid, it needs to be hot, for if it was cold, Chanan was not engaged until it was placed into a hot pot, and then the bitul would occur before the Chanan would engage.

The reasoning of the Rema is the following: even though the Rema ordinarily rules in accordance with Rashi (that even only partially submerged food is considered in a separate zone from the rest of the food), here he ruled according to the Ri (that partially submerged can become batul) because Chanan is only a stringency by other issurim and therefore there is room to be lenient like the Ri.

*The **Shach** notes that the Rema (as earlier) is unsure of whether to side with the Ri or Rashi and therefore prohibits the meat, however since engaging Chanan by other issurim is only a stringency the Rema was lenient for the rest of the pot and ruled according to the Ri that it is permitted. The Shach adds that the true view is in accordance with the Ri.]*

This is all only by other issurim, but by meat and milk, in call cases (even if the issur is not attached AND the meat is partially submerged) we do engage Chanan.

Some do say that we do not engage Chanan if both the issur and heter are liquids (liquid means something that gets mixed in, and not just mixed up). This leniency can be applied only by other issurim in cases of great loss, but never by meat and milk.

If dry (heter) and dry (issur) that became mixed (dry means that the

issur and heter were mixed up and not mixed in), we do not engage Chanan even by meat and milk.

Vessels can not become Chanan, and we only require sixty against the amount of issur that went it to it.

Sifim 5, 6, 7

This Sif discusses the scenario in which a drop of milk fell on the outside of a pot that was cooking meat on the fire. There are several issues involved.

Do we look at this case as two parts: Part one-The milk falls on the pot, infusing its taste into the meaty pot. Part two-If it will assur the pot, the pot will then possibly assur the (meat) food that is cooking in it. According to this position we must analyze if the pot would become entirely assur, or if only an amount sixty times the droplet of milk will become assur. This makes a tremendous difference in the amount required for the contents of the pot to be mevatal the pots infused Chanan taste.

Alternatively do we say that the milk does not stop when it hits the pot, but continues its way through the pot and enters the (meat) food immediately. If the milk does enter the food it may become immediately batul in sixty times the amount of food.

A droplet of milk fell on the outside of a (meat) pot while it was on the fire. If it fell below the level of food inside, (it will bypass the pot and enter the food immediately, and) we require the food to contain sixty times the amount of the droplet and the food will be permitted. *[The pot however, will be assur. Therefore one should immediately pour the food out of the pot. The Taz cites the Maharshal that in actuality the pot should be permitted, but is indeed prohibited since it looks like a non-kosher pot. Shach and Taz]*

If it fell above the level of the food inside (against an empty area), (we are concerned that perhaps) it entered the pot and spread out

close (see **Taz** below that this means far) from the food inside (not allowing for bitul), infusing its milk taste to that area of the pot. If that happens, and food that passes over that area of the pot will become Chanan, assuring not only itself, but perhaps also the other food in the pot. The solution is to turn off the fire, allowing the pot to cool. Once cooled, the contents of the pot may be passed over that area of the pot without becoming assur. *[It is not suggested to bore a hole in the bottom to allow the liquid to escape, or even to pour the liquid out the other side of the pot, since one will probably shake the pot as he tries, causing the liquid to rise to the sides and become assur. **Shach.**]*

*The **Taz** asks why the Mechaber writes that the droplet may have fell on the walls close to the liquid, when in fact he means far from the liquid? He answers that the Mechaber is alluding to rule that one should not do anything to shake the pot such as drilling holes are pouring, since the issur may have spread out close to the liquid so that the splashing liquid would touch the issur and become assur itself.*

*The **Bais Yosef** also indicates that if there would be much moisture in the pot, that would combine to help create bitul on the milk droplet. The **Taz** writes that this is certainly not so, for one does not know how much moisture is there. The **Taz** cites a dispute between the **Maharam** and the **Smak** regarding the spreading of moisture. According to the **Maharam**,*

- 4. The drop of milk never bypasses the pot and enters the food, possibly becoming batul.*
- 5. The pot will always remain assur, even if the food is mvatel the drop of milk.*

6. *One may, however, pour the food out of the pot without waiting for it to cool down since it contains sixty times the amount of issur (the drop of milk).*

The Smak, argues on all counts. The primary question is whether the issur spreads at all or stays in its place, not how far it spreads.

- *If it spreads (when it falls below the liquid level) it will bypass the pot and immediately become batul.*
- *If it stays where it is, the food remains permitted.*
- *Either way the pot is permitted. Either the issur bypassed the pot, or the issur is stuck in the pot, and just like it does not dislodge for this food, it won't for subsequent foods.*

Rema: This ruling is only by a pot that is used and has meat infusions in it (so that the milk will make the infused taste Chanan). If, however, the pot was new [*or even old, but is not a ben-yomo. Shach.*] we only require sixty times the amount of original droplet. (This is because there will be no Chanan.) [*The Shach asks how we can ever consider the pot to be new when the scenario discussed is that meat was currently cooking in the pot? He answers that we must not consider the whole pot to become infused with meat that spread throughout the entire pot (making the pot meaty), because if so, we should then assume that likewise, the milk drop spread downwards, entering the pot and becoming batul in sixty. Or, perhaps the case is that the food was not hot at the time that the droplet of milk fell in. Alternatively, perhaps the meat was not even in the pot when the milk droplet fell in.*]

[Sif 6]

This Sif discusses the rules regarding the the previous case.

The custom is to prohibit the food and the pot if the milk indeed fell above the liquid level. However, if the milk fell adjacent to the fire, it would be permitted, provided that it was only a small amount of milk. A larger amount would assur the pot and food even if it was adjacent to the fire. *[The pot must actually be on the fire, and not merely hot from the fire. Taz.]* If it fell below the liquid level, then we can be mvatel it in sixty, permitting the food.

Rema: The pot would remain assur, though. Therefore (in order not to cook in this newly prohibited pot) one should immediately pour the food out of the other side *(and not wait for it to cool down, since the issur might spread at any given time. Shach)*. If one subsequently cooked a second time in this very same pot, he again requires sixty to be mvatel it.

The Shach quotes the Mahariai, the the established custom is in fact to permit the food even when the drop falls above the liquid level, by allowing the pot to cool and then emptying the contents. Even according the the Mechaber that the custom is to prohibit the food, that is only by an old, ben yomo pot, that does not contain 3660 (minus a bit) times that amount of the original droplet.

(The Taz also quotes a Prisha who similarly writes that the only stringency is to leave it until the pot cools down and not pour immediately, but disagrees.)

The pot however, always remains prohibited because we are concerned that some of the issur did not dislodge from the pot.

Therefore even on subsequent cookings we would require sixty times the original droplet of issur.

[Sif 7]

This Sif discusses the leniencies given even according to the custom to be stringent according the Mechaber in Sif 6.

In extreme circumstances, such as Erev Shabbos (*or a poor person, or in cases of great loss, or even for guests. **Shach** and **Taz***), we may be lenient and require sixty times even if the food fell above the liquid level.

*Since the pot remains prohibited one must empty the contents. **Taz** and **Shach** argue whether to do so immediately, or initially try to wait for it to cool down, if there is time to do so.*

Rema: This is indeed the custom.

The Rema now discusses a scenario in which a hot pot is placed on a puddle of milk that had spilled.

If hot milk or another issur spilled on the ground (or counter top) and a hot (meat) pot was placed on it, if the spill was not near the fire then it is only considered to be the level of a Kli Sheni and therefore the pot is assur since it was infused with a little bit of taste, but the food in the pot is permitted, since we engage the principle of Tato Gavar- the bottom is stronger.

This Rema is based on several key principles used in Issur V'heter. Firstly, the idea that a hot pot can transfer taste but not a cold pot. To be considered hot, an item (whether food or vessel) must be Yad Soledes Bo (so hot that the hand will recoil from the intense heat),

as well as in a *Kli Rishon*- a first vessel (meaning the vessel that contained the food directly on the fire). Both criteria are required to transfer taste, for even if the heat has reached a temperature of *yad soledes bo*, if the food is only in a *kli sheni*- a second vessel (meaning that the food was heated up in a different vessel and then poured into the current vessel) the heat is not intense enough to transfer tastes. In our case, a spill (even from a *Kli Rishon*) that is now on the floor or counter top, will only be considered a *Kli Sheni* and hence unable to transfer taste. It is, for all practical halachic purposes, cold. The pot however, is hot. And it touches the cold (halachically) spilled milk. Can a taste transfer occur when the top item is hot but the bottom is cold? The principle given by the *Gemara* is that *Tato Gavar*- the bottom is stronger. This means that the bottom item status will overpower that of the top item, cooling it down if it was hot and heating it up if it wasn't. Therefore, in our case when the hot pot touches the bottom cold spilled milk, *Tato Gavar* rules that the milk will cool down the hot pot, not allowing for a complete transfer of taste. A minute amount, however, will indeed be transferred. This amount is assumed to be a *kliya* (shell) worth, only affecting the outer shell of the top item. In our case the outermost shell of the top item was the pot. Therefore the pot will be the prohibited *kliya* and the rest of it (the contents) will remain permitted.

The **Taz** notes that if the pot was next to the fire, it can become hot enough to heat up the cold milk underneath it, prohibiting everything.

The **Shach** asks why our case is one of *Tato Gavar* since there is no top and bottom, and it should be considered a case of two pots

that touch each other on their sides, which only assures a klipa. He answers that since the spill originated from up high that is the upper. Or, since the second pot did not move, that is the bottom.

*The **Taz** actually writes to consider the scenario as (a more lenient) one of pots touching one another (and not Tato Gavar). However, he writes, that the Rema was stringent in that case, requiring more than a klipa.*

The Rema now discusses a scenario in which a pot on the stove spilled over, and its overflow touched a pot of the other min.

If a boiling pot spilled over and reached a cold pot of the other min, if the spill was not connected to the pot when it reached the second pot, then it is also considered as a Kli Sheni [*and therefore since both pots are considered cold, no transfer of taste is activated at all*].

If the spill was connected to the original pot when it reached the second pot then the spill is considered as being poured from the first pot (more severe than Kli Sheni) and halachically considered hot, able to transfer taste. However, it will only assure the pot, and not the contents, since the bottom pot is cold, and a pouring (even from a hot pot on the fire) can only assure a klipa (shell) worth. [*This is also because of the principle of Tato Gavar*].

If however, the second pot is hot as well (Kli Rishon) then whether the overflow is hot or not is inconsequential. Either way, the rule of Tato Gavar causes the second (bottom) pot to assure everything, pot and liquid, since it is hot and overpowers the top item (the spill).

The Rema now discusses a scenario in which a drop of milk fell on a meaty pot cover.

If a droplet of milk fell on a pot cover, it is similar in ruling as if it fell on the outside of the pot below the liquid level- if the pot was steaming. This is because the steam from the contents of the pot travels upwards towards the pot cover and falls back down again [*causing the entire pot to be considered as if it were full*].

The Taz writes that this ruling of the Rema is too lenient. Perhaps the steam only reaches the top (cover) sometimes, and did not when the cover became assur. The rest of the pot would then not combine to create sixty. The next time steam does hit the top though, it can bring with it issur, and assur the whole pot. The Taz writes to be stringent, and only in a case of D'Rabbonon can one be lenient.

Sif 8

If a milk pan was located under a meat pot that was suspended above it, the steam that rises from the pan may enter the pot, causing it to be assur [**Rema**] if there is no shishim. This is of course, only when the pan is uncovered and the steam is hot (yad soledes) in the place where it enters the pot. Otherwise we are not concerned with the steam having an effect on the pot, just like (even) two pots that touch each other do not have any effect on one another. Initially, however, one should try to avoid all of this.

The Taz writes that if one baked a milk dish on the floor of an oven, one may subsequently place a meat pot on that same floor (if cleaned first) since it is no worse than two pots touching one another.

Sif 9

This Sif discuss a scenario in which a candle made of (not-kosher) animal fat was placed near food, and the heat of the flame caused some of the wax to drip into the food. The Mechaber will differentiate between a drip that fell from the top of the candle, heated directly from the flame, and a drip that fell from the bottom of the candle, heated by indirect heat.

A candle made of animal fat that is formed like a wax candle that dripped onto a vessel. The drip only causes a slight infusion of taste and scraping away that part of the vessel is sufficient.

[This is referring to a drip that fell from the bottom of the candle, heated by indirect heat.]

A candle made of melted fats that dripped (is more severe and) the whole vessel needs to be purged.

[This refers to a drip that fell from the top of the candle, heated directly from the flame. This can cause a greater infusion of taste.]

*The **Taz** writes a lengthy comment, proving that a ladle that is used to transfer the contents of a Kli Rishon to another vessel is itself also considered a Kli Rishon since it was placed into the Kli Rishon. That would make the second vessel (the bowl, for example) only a Kli Sheni and not a Kli Shlishi. This is especially true if the ladle was left in the Kli Rishon pot for a period of time.*

*The **Shach** in **Nekudas Hakesef** seems to agree.*

Siman 93

Sif 1

This Sif discusses a scenario in which milk was cooked in a pot that had been used for meat (or vice versa). The essential principle that is mentioned is that of Nosen Tam Lifgam- that although taste is absorbed by the food cooked in a pot, that taste has a limited life-span. According to the Torah, any taste that is more than 24 hours old can no longer impart its taste to another item, be it vessel or food. The taste is still there, but it is considered Pagum- vile. This vile taste (caused by the lack of freshness) masks its preceding taste, no longer allowing it to impart to other items. The Rabbbonon were concerned that, if allowed to cook milk in meat pots that are 24 hours old, people would soon start to cook in those pots sooner than that time. They therefore prohibited to initially cook milk in pots of meat that are 24 hours old. B'dieved- after the fact- the food would be permitted. This phenomenon is called Ben Yomo- within the day, referring to the 24 hours that the taste is considered able to impart its taste to others.

The Mechaber first discusses the status of the food that is cooked in a pot of the opposite type.

A pot that had been used to cook meat should not be used to cook milk. If milk was cooked in it within 24 hours of the cooking meat then that food is prohibited if it gives taste

[That is to say, according to the Mechaber a gentile chef may taste it and decide whether the meat flavor given off by the pot affected the milk. If not, the milk is permitted. According the the Rema, it may be batul in sixty.

(We usually consider the entire pots walls to be saturated with taste,

since we are unsure of how to calculate it otherwise. In our case, meat was previously cooked in this pot. We are concerned that the entire pot walls are saturated with meat taste. All of that infused taste may expel into the cooking milk. Only if the milk contains sixty times the amount of taste in the walls would bitul be created.)

*The **Shach** comments that it is rare to find a pot that contains sixty times the contents of its walls. Therefore the Rema is basically ruling that the milk is prohibited. However, some uncommon scenarios may allow for bitul. If the pot was new and only used once with a known amount of meat, then the amount of saturation in the walls cannot be more than that amount. The milk may then contain sixty times that amount. Alternatively, the pot may be very wide, and also very thin. In that sort of pot, there may be sixty times the contents of the pot against the volume of its walls.]*

If the milk was cooked after 24 hours of cooking the meat, then the (meat cannot give off any taste to the milk since it is pagum and therefore the) milk is permitted.

The Mechaber now discusses the status of the pot.

The pot however is prohibited to use for the subsequent cooking of either meat or milk, since it is infused with both of those tastes, albeit they are Aino Ben Yomo, and would be permitted b'dieved after 24 hours of the second cooking. (Chanan does not occur here, since the meat taste was Aino Ben Yomo when the milk infusion occurred. The pot now contains both Ben Yomo milk infusions and Aino Ben Yomo meat infusions)

*[The **Taz** writes to defend the position of the **Baal Haitur** quoted in the **Tur** that the pot may be used for anything, either meat or milk.*

He writes that we are discussing a earthenware pot which we are assuming cannot be completely purged of its infused tastes. After all, the Gemara states that an earthenware vessel can never be purged, and has not use once it becomes assur.

*The Taz introduces a novel idea: that M'doraisa the pot **can** be purged, but the Rabbonon were stringent to rule that it cannot. (He learns that the Gemara only mentioned that according to the Torah, the pot cannot be purged for use of Kodshim, but for normal use it indeed can be.)*

The assumption that the taste cannot come out and that we therefore are unable to purge the pot of its taste would result in the loss of usage that pot. Therefore the Baal Haitur rules that we may be lenient and rely on the din Torah that the taste can come out, together with the fact the the cooking of the milk weakened the taste in the walls of the pot, to permit the use of the pot for either type of food (milk or meat). Even according the Taz, though, this leniency can only be applied to this case however. A pot with non-kosher (or even Chanan) taste cannot be purged with this method, even b'dieved. Only here, where the issur is now being caused by the milk can we say that that same milk itself will cause the purging, and that we can rely on the din Torah that the taste really does come out.]

Rema: Pareve foods would be permitted to be cooked in that pot though. *The reasoning for this rule is that although there is a rabbinic decree not to use aino ben yomo meat pot for milk, there is no decree no to eat a pareve food that has infused with aino ben yomo tastes of both meat and milk.*

*[The **Shach** writes that as per the **Rema** in Siman 94:5, the custom is not to use the pot at all, even for*

Pareve].

The Rema will now discuss that there is an opinion that pot covers are excluded from the leniency of Aino Ben Yomo.

A pot cover has the same leniency of Aino Ben Yomo as a pot. There are those who say that it doesn't and that we treat an Aino Ben Yomo pot cover as a Ben Yomo cover. Some areas do have this custom, and I myself follow this custom. However, it is a stringency without any reason! If a town has this custom, one may combine any mitigating factor, or even the occurrence of a loss of money, or a rush on Erev Shabbos to be lenient on a Aino Ben Yomo and consider it in fact as such.

*[The **Taz** and **Shach** both discuss this ruling. They struggle to find a reasoning for this stringency. Perhaps it is because the steam of the pot cause mass infusions directly to the cover. Or, perhaps large amount of steam will cause some actual particles of food to stick to the cover. Both of these reasons are difficult to understand. Should the cover be worse off then the pot which held the actual food?*

*In the end both Poskim agree to the explanation of the **Maharshal**: Some pot covers are funnel shaped, and are difficult to clean properly inside their long narrow centers. This stringency must be including only those pot covers. Even so, the **Shach** writes to be lenient in the presence of any mitigating factor, or for any need. The **Taz** writes that there will probably be sixty times the amount of food in the pot against the little bit of particles left in the narrow part of the cover. Nevertheless, one should be stringent with that type of pot cover.*

The Taz then explains the words of the Tur: If one cooked vegetables

(Pareve) in a meaty pot, and the amount of food in the pot was equal to the amount of meat one cooks in the pot, he may subsequently cook milk in the pot, for the infusions of meat are weakened. However, if he just cooked a lesser amount, the infusions would not be weakened.

The Taz goes on to explain more words of the Tur: That if one soaked milk in a milky pot overnight, and then cooks meat in it, the meat is permitted since the infusions in the pot are aino ben yomo. Even though milk was soaking in the pot, it did not enter the walls, for the walls were previously fully saturated with infusions. Of course were one to soak the milk for 24 hours, then the principle of Kavush Kmvushal would apply, and the milk would enter the walls, for the infusions in the wall would expel because of the Kvisha, similarly to cooking.

The Rema now discusses the scenario of a pot cover that is placed on top of a pot of the other type. A ruling must be made on the pot, the cover, and the food that was in the pot.

The rule will depend on which vessel was hot.

If a pot cover was placed on the top of a pot of the opposite: If both are hot, then the pot, its contents and the cover are all assur if the pot was boiling, and steam was rising.

If the cover was cold and the pot was hot, then rule of Tato Gavar applies, likewise prohibiting the cover, the pot, and the food.

If the cover was hot and the pot cold, all is permitted, but one should remove a klipa (shells-worth) of the food if possible.

*[The **Shach** argues that the pot should also require a klipa. (Unless the pot is sanded down, that is difficult to accomplish- must the pot be kashered? Some are lenient in the case of loss)]*

Of course, if there was no food in the pot, everything is permitted, since two hot vessels cannot transfer taste without liquid or steam.

Siman 94

Sif 1

*This sif discusses the scenario of a spoon of one type that was placed inside a pot of food of the other type. There is a question among the Rishonim about metal spoons. According to some, if we know how much of the spoon went in to the pot, we are only concerned about that amount regarding bitul. If we don't know how much of the spoon went in then we must assume the worst case scenario- that the entire spoon went in. According to Rabbeinu Peretz we apply the principle of Cham Miktzaso Cham Kulo.- A (metal) item that is partially hot is considered entirely hot. This can have several meanings. R' Perez assumes it to mean that even if only part of the metal spoon was placed inside the pot of food of the opposite type, since the food is hot and heats up that part of the spoon, that heat travels through the entire spoon, bringing the infused taste with it. To evaluate bitul, the pot now must contain sixty times the amount of the entire spoon. The Rema (and the Mechaber as well- **Shach**) do not hold like R' Peretz and require sixty only against the amount of spoon that was actually placed into the pot.*

If one sticks a milk spoon into a meat pot (that contained meat) or vice versa, we must evaluate bitul against however much of the spoon was placed in the pot (*generally only the cup- **Shach***).

Rema: This is only true if the milk spoon was within 24 hours, ben yomo, of being used with milk in a Kli Rishon. [*The **Taz** writes that Iru'i Kli Rishon is like Kli Rishon in this case. He quotes Maharshal that even a pot heated by the fire can be considered a Kli Rishon even if it is not at the temperature of Yad Soledes Bo. However, the*

Toras Chatas disagrees, and that is how we rule.

*The **Shach** notes that even if hot water (Kli Rishon) was placed on the spoon during its 24 hour period of use with hot milk, that does not extend the time and we still evaluate the 24 hours based on the original time that it was used with hot milk. However, by a spoon of Issur, we would reset the 24 hours each time that it comes in contact with hot liquid (Kli Rishon or Irui) during its original 24 hours.*

There are those that argue and say that we must evaluate bitul based on the entire spoon, and not just the part that was placed into the pot, because of the principle of Cham Miktzaso.

Rema: The first opinion is the main one, and that is the custom.

*[The **Shach** explains that we do not extend Cham Miktzaso to say that the infused taste can travel throughout the entire spoon. The **Pri Megadim** explains that there are still two other applications of Cham Miktzaso. One, if an item was heated up on one side, and issur fell on its second side. Cham Miktzaso would mean that the second side was considered hot as well, allowing the issur to infuse inside that side (but not necessarily transferring it to the first side). A second application is if one side of a vessel did have infused taste, and the second side was (later) dipped into hot liquid (Kli Rishon). Do we say the the infused taste will transfer into the liquid through the second side which is now hot.]*

Sif 2

This sif continues the case of the previous one, but with an added twist. Here, the spoon was placed into the meat pot twice, consecutively. What are the requirements for bitul?

If one stuck the spoon (of milk) into the pot (of meat) two times, and did not know that it created issur in between (the two times), we require twice times sixty (120) in order to create bitul.

Rema: Some say that sixty is enough, and that is the custom.

*The **Shach** and **Taz** explain this as follows: First we must deal with the idea that there is a difference whether one knew of the issur between the two placings of the spoon in the pot. The source of this is from the Mishna in Orlah. The idea behind it is that if one knew of the issur in between, that finalizes the bitul process. If so, subsequent placings of the spoon would just activate a second bitul, since the contents of the pot are considered all heter (post the bitul). If he did not know of the issur, then we view the two placings in freeze frame perspective, and it is as if two spoons were placed into the pot- each with its own issur. The Taz explains that this is because the first placing may have only expelled part of its infused taste. The meat in the pot would then enter the spoon, causing Chanan. A second placing of the spoon would then cause that new Chanan issur to enter the pot. That is how one spoon can give off issur double the amount that it could possibly contain.*

*The reason why the **Rema** disagrees with the Mechaber and rules that sixty alone suffices, is that we do not say Chanan by infused*

taste. The **Shach** writes that even though we generally rule that we do say Chanan by infused taste, here since the whole idea of requiring double the amount of bitul then usual is a stringency, we may be lenient here, and not also be stringent regarding Chanan.

The **Shach** asks why we do not apply the principle of *Chozer V'niur* here. *Chozer V'niur*- return and reawake- means that even after bitul, if the *issur* to heter ratio is readjusted, we may reevaluate the bitul based on the new ratio. Since that is essentially what is happening here, albeit with infused taste, why don't we apply that principle? He answers that the idea behind *Chozer V'niur* is that since more non-kosher is added to the mixture after the first bitul, the new amount of meat combined with the original amount may now be tasted. Even by like mixtures (*min-bimono*) we apply *chozer v'niur* since that is taste that is usually identified with other foods. However, by infused taste, the tastes are never really tasted, they are only prohibited because of the torah prohibition of *Taam K'Ikur*-taste is like the original substance. Therefore the reasoning behind *Chozer V'niur* does not apply. Only if we rule Chanan by infused tastes can the ratio of *issur* be added to.

Sif 3

This Sif discusses the status of the vessels and food in the previous two Sifim.

If the food contains sixty times the amount of the spoon, then the food and the pot are permitted, but the spoon is assur to use with either meat or milk, since it is infused with both tastes. Even if it was already used again, the food that is was used with is assur b'dieved, if it was still ben yomo from the second infusion. (If not, b'dieved the food would not be affected).

[The Taz notes that we do not consider the placement of the spoon into the pot as Hagala- purging, since hagala requires boiling water, not merely hot water. Additionally, the rabbonon did not consider it as hagala since one might err, and only insert the spoon partially. Hagala requires that the entire spoon be inserted.

If however, the food in the pot does not contain sixty times that amount of the spoon, then pot and food are also prohibited. It is however permitted to use the pot, if one is not deriving benefit from the actual issur in the pot, such as to contain cold fruits.

Sif 4

If the (milk) spoon (that was placed into the meat pot) was not ben yomo, then the food and pot are permitted, but the spoon is prohibited since it is infused with both milk and meat tastes. However, if it was used [*in a meat food- **Shach***], the food is permitted b'dieved, after the fact, since the spoon was not a ben yomo from the milk, only from the meat.

Sif 5

*This Sif refers to the principle of nat-bar-nat- nosen taam bar nosen taam. The basic ideas are as follows: If a pot touched hot meat, then the pot becomes infused with meat taste. This is called nosen taam. The pot is not actual meat, it is rather classified as a nat (nosen taam- infused with taste) of meat. If hot water is subsequently placed into that pot, the taste goes out of the pot and enters the water. However that taste (being transferred twice) is not weak. The water now has the status of a nat bar nat- a second infused taste. The rule is that a second infused taste of issur remains prohibited. A second infused taste of heter, however, is considered weak, unable to affect or transfer taste to combine meat and milk. Two caveats, introduced by the Poskim, are that if the two infusions occur simultaneously then the leniency of weak taste does not apply (**Chaavas Daas**), and that the taste only becomes weak if it is transferred from a food to a vessel and then back to a food (**Pri Migadim**).*

The governing rules of nat bar nat are quite complex.

If water was cooked in a new pot, and one first placed a milk spoon inside. New water was then placed into the pot, and a meat spoon was placed inside. If both spoons were ben yomo, and there was no shishim in the water against any of the spoons, then the pot is considered infused from both meat and milk tastes (even though they are both only nat bar nat) and may not be used for milk or meat. It may be used for pareve, though. [the **Darkei Moshe** explains that the reasoning of this Mechaber is that nat bar nat is not an across the board leniency. Rather, it is similar to nosen taam lifgam, and it is permitted only b'dieved.]

Rema: If the pot was used for either milk or meat, the food is permitted b'dieved.

If a pot of meat was cooking something pareve, and one placed a milk spoon inside. If either of the vessels are aino ben yomo, or if the water contains sixty times the spoon, then all is permitted.

*[The **Taz** asks that this leniency of sixty only holds true if we are worried about the nat bar nats meeting in the water and turning into nat bar nat of issur. If the problem is that the spoon and pot actually touched each other, it is of no consequence.]*

However, the custom is to prohibit the vessel which was not ben yomo (even for pareve. **Shach**), and treat the pareve food as the type of min (milk or meat) that the ben yomo vessel was. *[The water should be discarded. **Shach**]* This, however, is all a big stringency, since it is all really permitted (based on the laws of nat bar nat). *[In the case of sixty, there is no reason for stringency as even nat bar nat did not occur. **Shach**]*

*The **Shach** also writes that the stringency of the Rema to eat the food as the type of min of the ben yomo is not a stringency at all, for that is the ruling of the Mechaber and Rema in Siman 95:2. Perhaps the Rema meant that one should only eat the pareve food using vessels of that min.*

*The **Shach** writes against these stringencies of the Mechaber and Rema, and tries to prove that nat bar nat is definitely permitted, especially in this case.*

First of all, the entire stringency is purported to be taken from the

Smak (Bais Yosef, Beer Hagolah).

However, writes the Shach, a closer look at the Smak will reveal what he really said.

*The Smak writes that his Rebbe, the **Maharii**, did indeed prohibit a new pareve pot that had two spoons being placed consecutively into it. However the Smak disagrees, and writes that since the case is one of nat bar nat, the pot is certainly permitted. He writes that the **Maharii's** ruling would only fit if the case were in fact that actual meat and milk were cooked in the pot (not within 24 hours of each other). In that case the pot would be infused with both meat and milk taste and would be l'chatchila prohibited from subsequent cooking. Only b'dieved, since the infusions would become lifgam, would the food cooked in such a pot be permitted.*

Secondly, writes that Shach, the Mechaber certainly holds that nat bar nat is weak taste, and permitted as is indicated in the next Siman, even by cooking! In fact, in 95:3 the Mechaber rules that we do rely on the leniency of nat bar nat by a very similar case. Additionally, the halacha is clear by Kashering for pesach that we rely on nat bar nat dhitaira.

(The Shach writes that if a pareve pot was infused with nat bar nat of one min, perhaps it should be designated for further cooking only for that min since that taste slightly potent. However it was then used for the other min, that second min should now be the new designated use of the pot. However in the opposite case, if it was first used for real meat or milk, even if it was later used for nat bar nat of the other min, the first min (being actual taste) is more potent, and remains the designated use of the pot.)

*Additionally, writes the **Shach**, in our case there are 3 nats: the*

spoon to the water to the pot. If the Mechaber permits eating fish that was infused with meat (nat bar nat) with milk, certainly here, when there are 3 nats we can permit it. In fact, we can even permit it if the two spoons were placed into the pot with 24 hours of each other, since, after all we are not concerned with nat bar nat.

Even more, the fish was an actual 2nd nat and may be permitted to be eaten with milk, whereas in our case, the pot is the 2nd nat, - and any food that receives its taste would be considered a 3rd nat (at least, the presence of water may make it 4 or 5 nats). Therefore, these stringencies of the Mechaber and Rema here have no consequence. The Shach ends off advising that although nat bar nat does not affect anything, a new pareve pot that was infused with nat bar nat should indeed be designated for that type of food only.

*The **Taz** in **Kuntres Acharon** defends the Mechaber, and writes that the stringencies are not based on the **Smak** because of nat bar nat, but rather since there are two conflicting presences in the pot, we are unsure which type to designate it as. The pot therefore remains prohibited from both milk and meat use.*

*The **Taz (regular)** gives another reasoning for the stringencies of the Mechaber and Rema. Once we are stringent in the Rema regarding the food, requiring it to be eaten as the same min of the vessel that was ben yomo, we must then be stringent on the pot, which was also infused with nat bar nat taste from the ben yomo. If so, in the case of the Mechaber, we may also be stringent, prohibiting the pot which was infused with 2 conflicting tastes.*

*The **Shach** also asks on the Rema, who rules leniently himself in siman 95:3, can rule stringently here. He answers that either this*

stringency is only taken on by some, and the main ruling is that it is permitted as per 95:3. Or, perhaps here there is a special stringency since the only reason of nat bar nat dhiteira was because one vessel was aino ben yomo. Therefore one might get confused with ben yomo- causing nat bar nat disura. In 95:2 however, the case was food which cannot be confused. Also perhaps here we we are dealing with cooking is more severe then there when we are dealing with washing.

Sif 6

This Sif discusses a fundamental difference between heter and issur. An item that is infused with a heter taste (meat, for example) that falls into a mixture (milk) requires bitul only against the amount of meat that was originally infused into it. However, issur that was infused into an item spreads to that entire item, and if it subsequently falls into another mixture, we require sixty against the entire item, even if the amount of issur that was originally infused was much less.

Onions or other vegetables that are infused with meat, and were then cooked in a milk pot.

*[The **Taz** adds that the infusions must have occurred with heat, or by dicing the onion. Merely cutting the onion once would not spread the infusion throughout the onion, only sixty times a netilah]*

We only require sixty times the amount of meat that was infused into the vegetables. If that amount is unknown, then we require sixty times the entire vegetable. *[The **Shach** comments that the Mechaber who rules that we do not say Chanan by other issurim would hold that even if the vegetables were infused with issur the ruling would be the same. However, Ashkenazim who are stringent for Chanan by other issurim would only apply this leniency by meat, as mentioned by the Mechaber.]*

Rema: This is because we do not say Chanan by heter, and the vegetable is able to be accounted for by evaluating how much meat entered it.

Even more so, if one cooked water in a ben yomo milk pot, and then

cooked meat in the pot, we do not require sixty times the amount of water in the pot since it is all heter. *[This is a easier example because here the infusion of water back into the pot took place under nat bar nat and not from actual milk. **Taz and Shach.**]*

This means to say, that if the pot was infused with issur, the water that was cooked would be infused with that issur and then transfer it back to the pot. The pot would then be considered infused from all of the water that had been in the pot, and not merely the (perhaps smaller) amount of issur that was originally infused.

*The **Shach** argues that the reason for this leniency of the Rema is not necessarily based on Chanan, but rather it is based on nat bar nat dhitaira vs. disura. The water that cooked in the milk pot is only a nat bar nat of milk, therefore it cannot infuse anything back to the pot. However, if the pot was infused with issur, then the water cooked in it would be nat bar nat of issur which can transfer taste back to the pot.*

Therefore, even those poskim who rule that we do not say Chanan by other issurim (and only by basar b'cholov) would agree to the ruling of the Rema.

The Shach mentions parenthetically that we rule that Efshar L'Sochto is permitted by heter. This means that if a potato was infused with meat and then fell into sixty times the amount of milk, the potato would be permitted to eat. However if the potato was infused with issur, then it would have to be removed if recognized, even when batul.

Sif 7

If hot meat was cut with a milk knife, the entire piece requires sixty times the of the blade of the knife to permit it. [*This Mechaber assumes that we do not apply Cham Miktzaso Cham Kulo in this application (see above Sif 1). There is a dispute as to how much bitul we would require if one says (after the fact) that he is certain that only a limited portion of the knife was used. Do we believe and only require 60 against that amount, or do we say that since it was not expected of him to notice how much of the knife touched the meat, he cannot possibly not the exact amount.*] If the knife was not ben yomo, or even if we are uncertain if it is a ben yomo, it is also permitted.

[*The Shach comments that although usually there is a principle of Tato Gavar, in this case the severity of fact that the knives pressure infused the taste will negate that, and spread the infusion throught the meat. This is also why this case is more severe than if two pieces of meat touched each other without liquids. In that case, we only require a netilah. (Additionally, there is a case in siman 96 in which a non kosher knife was used to cut a radish (sharp food). We only require a netilah in that case. Our case is more severe because there was heat, whereas in that case the radish was cold).*

The Shach (later) further explains that in the case of the radish we combine the suspect of fat on the knife (Rema) with the infused taste on the klipa of the knife to require netilah even when the knife is aino ben yomo.]

Rema: The whole issue only arises if the meat was hot in a Kli Rishon. (and if so, and the knife was indeed ben yomo, and there was no shishim the knife would also require kashering.)

If the meat was only in a Kli Sheni then no real transfer takes place. The meat would then only require a klipa and the knife neitza. This is the custom. Even if the knife is not a ben yomo, one should scrape the meat a bit in case there was fat on the knife.

*The **Taz** asks that we should require a klipa in the first case of the Mechaber as well. And in the second case we should require shishim!?! He answers that we do indeed require klipa in the first case, and stipulation at the end- that we require a klipa- was covering both cases. Regarding shishim, it is assumed that every piece contains shishim of klipa.*

*The **Taz and Shach** also writes that there is a stringent view expressed by many achronim that any solid mass that is hot has the same halacha as a Kli Rishon. Kli Sheni is only by liquids whose container walls cool it down.*

Sif 8

If (wet) cheese fell on top of a hot meat knish (**Shach**) or a hot meat pot used for knishes (**Taz**), or if a hot slice of cheese fell onto a (not necessarily hot) meat ben yomo pot, it only assures a klipa.

*The **Shach** explains that we only assure a klipa instead of the usual netilah because cheese by nature only infuses its taste a little bit. Even in the second case, the infused taste does not enter more than cheese would. The **Taz** explains since both (even the wet cheese) are considered dry foods, they only assure a klipa. Additionally there is no pressure of knife to spread the infusion farther, especially if there was fat on top of food that was cut.*

Sif 9

If honey was cooked in a ben yomo meat pot, and it was then placed into a ben yomo milk pot, it is still permitted since it is nat bar nat dhiteira.

*The **Shach** and **Taz** both explain that there is an additional reason to be lenient in this case. Even without the heter of nat bar nat, the meat taste in honey is lifgam. Therefore it has not meat effect on the pareve honey. Therefore we can be lenient even to eat the honey with milk.*

Siman 95

Sif 1

This Siman discusses nat bar nat. As mentioned earlier, a food can infuse its taste into other items, food or vessels. With each transfer the taste becomes weaker. A two step transfer is called nat bar nat. Hence, if a spoon was placed into meat, the spoon is one nat. If that spoon then touches a potato, the potato is a second nat. Our sif discusses the permissibility to eat nat bar nat food of one type (for example the potato is nat bar nat (nbn) meaty), together with milk.

Our sif will discuss that there is a difference as to whether the first infusion took place through cooking, roasting, or merely by placing the pareve food on a meat/milk dish.

Fish that were cooked or roasted in a meat pot that was clean from all fats and deposits is permitted to be eaten with kutach (a milk dish). This is because the fish is not meaty, but merely nbn of meat (which is heter and therefore a weak taste of meat). If the pot was unclean, the fish must contain sixty times the grease to remain pareve.

*The **Shach** writes that we assume that the pot is clean by default, although in a case of washing pots (later) we assume that the pots were dirty (since they were presently being washed from their grease)*

***R' Akiva Eiger** writes that we assume that even if there was indeed grease, there will be sixty times the grease.*

Sif 2

An egg that was cooked in a milk pot may be eaten with chicken. If the egg was cooked with actual meat it cannot be eaten with milk dishes, and the shell does not protect the egg from becoming meaty.

Rema: Some are stringent (to assur nbn) in cases of cooking and roasting (where the infusions are greater). The custom is to be stringent initially, but permit everything b'dieved. [*the Shach cites the Maharshal that we may not be lenient in a case of roasting, even b'dieved*] In any case, the only possible stringency is not to eat the pareve food with milk, but to put it into a vessel of the other min and eat it plain is permitted. Similarly, if the pareve food was never cooked in a meat pot, but placed, while hot, into a meat plate, it may be eaten with milk (or vice versa).

Also, if the pareve food was cooked in an aino ben yomo meat pot, one can certainly eat it with milk.

However, these leniencies are only for regular foods. Sharp foods are more stringent. They do not become nat bar nats, and remain nats, so therefore they are not allowed to be eaten with milk if cooked in a meat pot- even aino ben yomo. Therefore, pepper (sharp food) that was crushed with a meat crusher (even aino ben yomo) is assur to eat with milk. A food is not considered to be sharp, however, because of a little bit of spices that are put into it, only if it is all sharp, or at the least mostly sharp.

The words of the Rema require explanation, since l'chatchila and b'dieved are unclear.

*Does he meant that one may **cook** these nbns lchatchila, or only that*

once cooked these foods may be **eaten** lchatchila. Bdieved might mean that it is not permitted to eat it.

Each case of the Rema has this question.

The **Shach** and **Taz** rule stringently. Therefore, according to the Rema:

1. Fish may not be cooked in a meat pot with the intention of placing it on a milk plate. Once cooked (with whichever intention) it may be placed on the milk plate.
2. Fish may not be placed on a meat plate with the intention of eating it with milk. Once placed (with whichever intention) it may be eaten with milk.
3. Fish cooked in a meat pot (ben yomo) may not be eaten with milk. If mixed with milk, (bdieved) the mixture may be eaten. [even according to the Mechaber that the food cooked in a meat pot may be eaten with milk, one may not cook in the meaft pot with the intention of eating with milk].s
4. Whether one can cook fish in an aino ben yomo meat pot with the intention of eating it with milk is a dispute between Gra (lenient) and Chochmas Odam (stringent), however all agree that once cooked (with whichever intention) the fish may be eaten with milk. [There are those that learn that the Gra is stringent and the Chochmas Odam is lenient in a case where you have no other pot to use or borrow.]

The **Taz** raises an interesting point. The Halacha in YD Siman 116 is that one may not eat fish and meat together because of a danger. (It is not clear what the danger is.) If so how may one cook the fish in

*the meat pot. In fact, in Sif 1, there was mention of fish being cooked in a meat pot that contained meat grease?! **Taz** writes that perhaps fish was just used as an example here, because it is a common pareve food, and the SA was only concerned with nbn, not danger. He concludes however, that the danger would only occur if the pot had actual meat (or grease) but we are not concerned if the pot was clean, causing nbn meat into the fish.*

*The **Shach** rules an additional stringency. In the case of food that was cooked in a meat pot that is permitted to be eaten on a milk plate, how is one going to transfer the food from the pot to the plate? If he pours it directly, then that is a case of Irui. The Rema rules in Sif 3 that even if hot water was poured from a meat pot (ben yomo) to a milk pot (hot and ben yomo) then the water becomes assur! Therefore concludes the **Taz**, we must be stringent and only place the food from pot to plate without pouring it directly.*

Sif 3

This sif discusses a scenario in which a clean meat pot is placed inside a larger clean milk pot that is filled with hot (yad soledes) water. There is a fundamental disagreement between the Mechaber and Rema as to how two opposite nbn tastes react when they meet with each other. According to the Mechaber the tastes maintain their separate nbn tastes. According to the Rema, they mix in the water and become nbn of issur immediatley.

(In a case in which a) meat pot was washed in a milk basin with hot water that is yad soledes; even if both pots are ben yomo, since this is a case of nbn dheteira. This only holds true if the owner is certain that pots were free of grease or fats [*it also must be a vessel which is possible to be cleaned easily.*] If there were fats or grease then we require that the water contain sixty times the amount of all of it combined. [*the Shach notes that if the greasy one was the pot that was the ben yomo, and the other pot was aino ben yomo, the greast pot is permitted. However if the aino ben yomo was greasy, that fact negates the aino ben yomo-ness*]

[the Shach writes that even according to this lenient ruling of the Mechaber, one should not initially place the meat pot into the water of the milk basin, since that causes nbn lchatchila. (This is unclear, since according to the Mechaber one even eat the milky water with meat. Perhaps the Shach means that one should not place water into the milk basin if both pots were already together)]

Rema: There are those the are stringent and prohibit the pots even if there is no residue of fats on it. We can only be lenient if one of

the pots are not ben yomo (and then nbn disura cannot occur). In any case the custom is to prohibit the water lchatchila.

This stringency is only in a case where the pots were together in the water at the same time. If they were only there consecutively, or in a Kli Sheni, then all is permitted. [*The Taz notes that in 94:5 the Rema ruled stringently about a similar case. He answers that in that case there is an additional factor of maaris ayin to be concerned with.*]

The reasoning for this Rema is because we are concerned that the pots touched each other directly. In that case, there is no nbn transfer, but rather a direct transfer. Alternatively, we are concerned that the milk and meat nat tastes combined in the water and became nbn disura immediately. The Mechaber assumes that the tastes each entered the water (on a separate track) and turned the water into nbn dhiteira.

If water was poured from a meat pot onto a milk pot, the ruling is the same as if they were placed into water together. [*The food however, would remain permitted to eat (by itself-S.D.) Shach*]

(However) If one pours water onto meat and milk pots together, all is fine, since pouring is not as severe as soaking (*because the hard vessel will not absorb taste because of pouring*).

The Shach and Taz both argue on this leniency of the Rema. The Shach writes that we consider pouring as effective as soaking, but we can be lenient in case of necessity.

If one finds a meat dish with his milk dishes it is permitted, we do not assume that they were washed together in a manner which would

transfer the taste. [*This is based on a sefek sefeika: perhaps it was not washed together at all, and even if it was, maybe it was not ben yomo .Taz*]

Sif 4

The past few sifim discussed two vessels of the opposite type whos tastes transferred to each other. This sif will discuss how adding a vile ingredient to the mixture will mask the tastes, blocking any possible transfers.

It appears to me that if ash was placed into the water before the meat plate was added to (the milk plate) even if there was grease on the pot, all is permitted. This is because the ash will add vile taste to the mixture.

*The **Shach** and **Taz** both question the accuracy of this ruling, which is not found in any of the classic sources. In fact, if this is true, then one can kasher a ben yomo pot by adding ash to the water as it boils. Why then, do the authorities grapple with a possible way to do it then? **Shach***

*Additionally, the Mechaber in Siman 87, questions whether it is possible to use a non kosher bowl to shampoo hair- shampoo is vile? **Taz.***

Sif 5,6,7

One should not place a vessel with Kutach (milky) next to salt, but next to vinegar is permissible.

*The **Shach** and **Taz** explain this ruling: if the milk food falls into salt, it will not be batul (since it does not mix with the salt) and the salt may be placed with meat. In vinegar, however, it will be batul, so we are not concerned.*

Rema: This is only if the vessels were open, and anyway, b'dieved all is permitted, and we do not suspect that milk actually fell in.

It is permitted to place meat and milk into one box together (*since one will be careful to keep them separate. **Shach** and **Taz***)

Rema: There are those that are strict in this case (*if the containers were open. **Shach***), and this is proper if there is no specific need to do otherwise.

Salt that was placed into a meat container may subsequently be used with milk.

The reason that there is no concern is because the salt was never infused with meat taste.

Rema: Here also, those that are strict are praiseworthy.

Siman 96

Sif 1

This sif discusses the unique stringencies of sharp foods.

Radishes or beets that were cut with a ben yomo clean, or even not ben yomo dirty meat knife should not be eaten with milk until a netilah worth is removed from the vegetable, or until one tastes it and reckons that there is no meat taste. (According to the **Taz**, we do not rely on this tasting nowadays at all. According to the **Shach**, the **Rema** would permit the tasting to allow the food b'dieved, since this tasting is done by a Jew, and not a gentile.)

*The Talmud mentions that vegetable called Chiltis is very sharp, and can absorb taste even from a non ben yomo utensil if cooked or pressured (cutting or piercing) by the utensil. Additionally the sharpness can cause the absorbed taste to spread throughout the entire vegetable. Other sharp vegetables can only be affected by ben yomo or dirty knives and will only spread a netilah. (Cutting hot meat only requires a klipa because the heat causes the infusion to spread out over the whole piece of meat allowing for bitul bshishim. Here, however, the sharpness only causes the sharp vegetables (except for Chiltis) to spread the infusion until a netilah, not allowing for bitul. The **Rema**, rules like the **Sefer Hatrumah** that all sharp vegetables are similar to Chiltis and will also absorb taste throughout the entire vegetable even from a aino ben yomo utensil if there is pressure (**Rashi** adds an additional reason: We assume that any given knife contains grease). If there is no pressure, however, then the transfer of taste does not occur. **Taz** and **Shach***

Some are stringent to say that even a clean aino ben yomo knife will impart its taste in the vegetable.

*(and this is how to rule, with all vegetables. **Shach**)*

If the vegetables were cooked with milk without removing a netilah (or tasting to ascertain that there is no meat taste) then the milk must contain sixty times the amount of meat that was in the knife blade (that touched the vegetable). This is also the ruling if the vegetable was cut with a non-kosher knife. *[this is because the **Mechaber** rules that we do not apply Chanan by other issurim.*

The outcome is as follows:

Whether the radish was cut with a meat or non kosher knife, if it was cut once, a netilah is required, and if diced, all of it becomes infused.

However, if subsequently mixed with milk foods, the onion cut with the non kosher knife would need sixty times a netilah if cut once, and sixty times its entirety if diced. A onion cut with a meat knife would only need sixty times the amount in the knife

Also, in the case of a meat knife, we can permit the vegetable as well if it became batul (because efshar l'sochto is permitted by heter.)

*The **Taz** writes that since we don't know how much of the knife touched the vegetable we must assume that the entire knife did, and we do not trust the assumption of the cutter, since he was not particularly attentive to it. The **Pri Megadim** points out that we generally do believe the cutter if he says that he is certain that only a part of the knife blade entered the vegetable.*

Rema: If the vegetable was diced with the knife, the milk must then contain sixty against the whole vegetable.

Some say that if the vegetable was cut with a non kosher knife (as

apposed to a meat knife) then the whole vegetable becomes assur (not just a netilah). [*this is because we hold that we do say Chanan by other issurim.*]

Some say that even if the vegetable was cut with a meat knife, that taste is transferred to the entire vegetable, and not just a netilah. This is indeed the custom lchatchila, but bdieved we can rely on a netilah.

This is all if the actual vegetable was cut, but if the growth on top was cut, there is no problem.

If there is any question as to whether a vegetable was cut with a non kosher knife at all in the first place, then we can be lenient.

The Shach explains that this leniency applies to all vegetables other than radishes and Chiltis. This is because we :

a) do not know if the knife was ben yomo.

b) are not sure whether other vegetables are indeed sharp foods.

However radishes are assumed to be sharp foods so therefore...

We are lenient to purchase cut radishes from the gentiles, for we assume that the cut was made by a hoe or a shovel and not by a knife at all (*and even if they were cut by a knife, it may not have been ben yomo. Shach*).

Even if they were cut by a knife, we can still purchase them and remove a netilah. (*even though we usually rule that lchatchila the taste spreads throughout the entire radish, since there are no other sources of radishes, that is equivalent to a bdieved situation, in which we permit the food after a netilah is taken off.*)

Sif 2

This sif will discuss which other vegetables besides for Chiltis may be considered sharp.

If one cut garlic, onions, horseradish, or other similar sharp foods, or vinegary fruits or (*heavily- **Shach***) salted fish, their rule is similar to that of radishes.

Rema: In any event, we are accustomed to be lenient and purchase sharp ginger jelly from the gentiles, since they are either cut with knives that are used only for those vegetables, or they are not cut at all, but uprooted.

Sif 3

Spices that were crushed in a meat mortar (ben yomo) are not permitted to be eaten with milk.

Rema: Some say that even a non ben yomo meat mortar will render the spices unfit to be eaten with milk.

*The **Shach** and **Taz**, both mention that the Mechaber in several places agrees that even a non- ben yomo knife will impart its taste into a sharp food.*

Sif 4

Lemon juice that was brought by gentiles, and salted fish that was brought by the gentiles in barrels are permitted...

Rema: ...Since the gentiles bring many at one time, and even if some of the first (*lemons*) were prohibited by the non kosher knives, those are *batul* in the rest of the lemons that were cut afterwards which are not assur since the taste of the knife was already spent on the first few (*lemons*). Therefore they are all permitted.

This is why some places have the custom to purchase cut cabbage from the gentiles as well.

Some are stringent and do not purchase them, and one should not change his custom. However, items which are definitely not sharp, like apples or dry turnips, are permitted, just as lemons were permitted, and one should not change the custom.

*The **Taz** comments that those who are stringent by cabbage will also be stringent by lemons, since they both have the same reasonings. [He also notes (parenthetically) that if one was cutting a fruit and cut a worm that was nesting inside of it, one need only remove a klipa from the fruit.]*

*The **Shach** writes that the Rema is of the opinion that lemons are not as sharp as radishes etc., and therefore not only does the grease of the non kosher knife rub off with the first few cuts (which later become *batul*), but so does the infused taste.*

*He notes that there are several reasons to be lenient **b'dieved** by lemons:*

- 1. Perhaps the non jew used a new / designated knife for the*

lemons

2. *Perhaps aino ben yomo knives cannot impart taste, even to sharp foods*
3. *Perhaps only radishes are considered sharp*
4. *Even without all this, only the first few cuts would be prohibited, and would soon become batul in the rest.*

Sif 5

If one cuts cucumbers with a meat knife, he may eat them with milk provided that he scrapes the edge (where the cut was made). If he had cut a turnip (lefes) before he cut the cucumber then he doesn't even need scraping, and a mere rinse would suffice.

In fact, even if he had cut a (sharp) radish after cutting the turnip, the rule would be the same, since the unique taste of the turnip will nullify the (meat) taste of the knife.

Rema: The knife would have to strike the turnip before each cut to the other vegetable.

***Shach** and **Taz** comment that rinsing does not work by wet/juicy vegetables, and then we would require scraping (greidah) which is even less than klipa.*

*The **Shach** writes that it is assur lchatchila to rely on the cleaning via cutting the turnip.*

Siman 97

Sif 1

This Sif will discuss the prohibition of baking meat or dairy bread. Since bread is generally considered to be pareve, Chazal were fearful to allow bread (and according to some, any food generally accepted as pareve) to be either meat or milk.

One cannot knead dough with milk, since one may come to eat the bread with meat. If one did knead milk into dough, the entire loaf is prohibited, even to be eaten alone.

If, however, only a small amount of milky bread was baked, or if it (even a large amount) was baked in a unique shape, then it is permitted.

Similarly, one cannot bake bread in an oven whose walls were coated with (meaty) fats or oils, and the above rules do apply.

The Taz writes that we are concerned not only for bread, but even if spices were cut with a meat crusher (rendering them nats) they, and the crusher, are prohibited since spices are assumed to be pareve.

Rema: (Since it is permitted to bake a small amount) we have the custom to make milky breads for the holiday of Shavuot, and meat breads for Shabbos, especially since these are also identifiable by shape.

Certainly, milk danishes and meat knishes are permitted, since it is clear what they are.

However, one should not bake regular bread together with these knishes or danishes at the same time, since they might leak, and render the bread either milky or meaty. Even if the knishes or danishes are in a pan, the custom is to be stringent (*because of the Halacha of Shtai Kedeiros- Two pots should not touch one another even without a liquid medium lchatchila. Taz*)

The Taz and Shach both write that even if we see that leak did not reach the bread, it is still prohibited because the oven is now considered a meat/milk oven. If there were baked consecutively but not together then it is all permitted.

Sif 2

A meat oven can not be used for bread until kashered by libun from the inside.

Sif 3

Bread baked with roasting meat, or fish baked with meat in one small oven is not permitted to be eaten with milk. If it was baked in a large oven with a vent on top it is permitted. Also, if one of the foods were covered it is permitted.

This is because the reicha- the smell of the meat entered the bread. Even though reicha is permitted bdieved, since the bread can be eaten without the milk, eating it is considered lchatchila.