

Perhaps he will come to eat it with *Kutach* – דילמא אתי למיכליה בכותה

OVERVIEW

ruled that if one baked bread in an oven which was greased with meat fat (making the bread *fleishik*), it is forbidden to eat this bread at all (even with just salt¹), out of concern that he may eat this *fleishikeh* bread together with a *milchikeh* dip – כותה.² Our תוספות reconciles this ruling with a seemingly contradictory ruling.

asks: תוספות

והימא וליכליה בכותה דהא נותן טעם בר נותן טעם³ הוא -

And it is astounding! So let him eat this bread with כותה; since it is a נ"ט בר נ"ט, it is permitted to eat them together –

offers proof that נ"ט בר נ"ט is permitted: תוספות

כדאמר בפרק כל הבשר (חולין קיא, ב ושם) דגים שעלו בקערה⁴ מותר לאוכלן בכותה -

As states in שמואל **hot fish which was placed in a plate, which was used for meat, it is permitted to eat the fish together with כותה** because the meat flavor absorbed in the fish is נ"ט בר נ"ט, similarly the bread (which contains only a נ"ט בר נ"ט of meat) should be permitted to be eaten with כותה.

answers: תוספות

ויש לומר דקאמר התם נמי צנון שחתכו בסכין אסור לאוכלו בכותה -

And one can say that אב"י also ruled there; 'a radish which was cut with a knife (which was previously used to cut meat), it is forbidden to eat it with כותה' even though the radish is a נ"ט בר נ"ט דהתירא⁵ -

ופירש רש"י⁶ משום חורפא דצנון בלע טפי מדגים ורתחים שעלו בקערה -

¹ See רש"י ד"ה אפילו.

² is a dip made from milk and moldy bread.

³ When the oven was greased with the שומן the שומן was absorbed by the oven (the שומן was into the oven). When the bread was baked in the oven, the oven expelled some of this שומן into the bread (the oven was נותן the שומן in the bread). The שומן which is absorbed in the bread is referred to as a נותן טעם בר נותן טעם (or נ"ט בר נ"ט) the taste the oven gave into the bread is derived (the son of – בר) from the שומן נותן טעם the שומן gave to the oven. In this case it is a נ"ט בר נ"ט for the שומן is כשר as is the taste of the שומן in the bread. The rule is that נ"ט דהתירא (of נ"ט בר נ"ט) is permitted to be eaten with חלב, since the taste of meat fat in the bread is very 'weak'. [See for instance] previous תוס' ד"ה ואפילו TIE 'Thinking it over' (footnote # 5).

⁴ The קערה absorbed the taste of meat (from the hot meat which was placed in the קערה), the hot fish later absorbed the taste of meat from the קערה; this fish contains only a נ"ט בר נ"ט of בשר and therefore it can be eaten with חלב.

⁵ The radish absorbed from the knife which absorbed from the meat.

⁶ The קישות. מתוקה וכו' הלכך דגים שעלו בקערה מותר לאוכלן בכותה כדאמר דאין נותן טעם; קיב, א ד"ה קישות רש"י. The הבא מן הממש אלא נותן טעם הבא מנותן טעם, דסתם קערה מקנחין אותה משומן הקרוש עליה משום מיאוס אבל לסכין פעמים שהשמוננות

And רש"י explained there that on account of the sharpness of the radish it absorbs more meat flavor than the case of the hot fish which were served in a meat plate; we see that there are differences in situations⁷ -

ולפי זה דגים שנתבשלו בקדירה אסור לאוכלן בכותח דעל ידי בישול בלעי יותר מדאי -

And so according to (interpretation of) פרש"י this, fish that were cooked in a *fleishig* pot are forbidden to be eaten with כותח, for through cooking the fish absorb more than enough meat flavor to make them *fleishig* -

וכן נמי הכא מחום התנור בלעי טפי -

And similarly here also by the bread; that the bread absorbs more meat flavor from the heat of the oven than שעלן בקערה דגים, therefore it is אסור to eat them with כותח.

anticipates a difficulty:

ולפירוש אחר שפירש הקונטרס⁸ שם דצנן אסור לפי שפעמים שהשמנונית קרוש על הסכין -

However, according to the other interpretation of רש"י there, who explained that the radish is אסור (not [only] because it is a דבר חריף, but rather) since occasionally the fat of the meat is congealed on the knife -

ואינו ניכר ואיכא בצנן טעם בשר ממש -

And the שמנונית is not noticeable (while cutting the radish), so there is an actual taste of meat in the radish; it is not a ט"ט בר ט"ט but rather a regular טעם בשר; according to this פרש"י -

קשה⁹ הכא כיון שנתקנה התנור יפה או הוסק פעם אחרת אמאי אסור לאוכלו בכותח -

There is a difficulty here, since the oven was properly cleaned or it was heated another time after it was used for meat (before it was used to bake this bread), why is it forbidden to eat this bread with כותח since there is only a ט"ט בר ט"ט of בשר?!

answers:

קרוש עליו ואינו ניכר וכשחותך בצנן הוי נותן טעם הבא מן הממש, ועוד דמשום חורפיה בלע טפי מדגים הרותחים ואגב דוחקא דסכינא פליט פרש"י. Our is now referencing the (underlined) end of פרש"י.

⁷ The rule of ט"ט בר ט"ט (according to this answer) is limited to the case of דגים שעלו בקערה where the hot fish was merely placed in a plate which was used with hot meat (the fish was not cooked in a meat utensil), however if the fish was cooked in a *fleishig* pot, the rule of ט"ט בר ט"ט would not apply, since by actually cooking the fish in the pot it absorbs more meat flavor from the pot. The same applies to the bread which was baked in the oven that it absorbs more. Tosfos derives that there are different levels and rules of ט"ט בר ט"ט from the ruling of אב"י that the היתר of ט"ט does not apply to a דבר חריף, so Tosfos concludes that it also does not apply to a cooking or baking situation.

⁸ is now referencing the italicized section of רש"י in footnote # 6. According to this explanation, there are no different levels of ט"ט בר ט"ט, but rather all ט"ט בר ט"ט situations are the same, whether it was cooked or merely placed in a כלי בשר or whether it was a דבר חריף in all cases להתירא ט"ט בר ט"ט may be eaten with milk. The reason שחתכו אסור לאכלו בכותח is because of the שמנונית הסכין as Tosfos mentions.

⁹ See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

ויש לומר דשומן שעל החרס אינו יכול לקנח¹⁰ יפה:

And one can say; that it is not possible to completely wipe off the שומן from the earthenware oven, therefore here too it is not considered a נ"ט בר נ"ט.

SUMMARY

Something is not considered a נ"ט בר נ"ט if the (second) נ"ט was through actual cooking or baking but not merely through heat absorption (and it is [certainly] not a נ"ט בר נ"ט if it was in contact with the congealed meat fat)

THINKING IT OVER

1. answers that it is not possible to wipe off completely the שמנונית from the oven.¹¹ This seems to answer only part of the question; it does not (seemingly) explain why the bread should not be permitted with כותה if the oven was reheated (as תוספות asked)?¹²

2. Why cannot we answer second question¹³ by assuming that the two פירושים of רש"י are not in disagreement, but rather they complement each other. רש"י is saying that a נ"ט בר נ"ט is מותר only if it meets two conditions; a) there is no ממשות (like the שמנונית on the knife), and b) it is not a דבר חריף (or its corollary¹⁴ that it was not cooked or baked in a בשר pot).¹⁵ However if it is missing one of these conditions it is אסור לאכלו בכותה even if it is a נ"ט בר נ"ט.¹⁶ Therefore in our case the bread is אסור בכותה, since it is missing one of these conditions (it was baked בשרי). This would seemingly answer תוספות question!

¹⁰ See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

¹¹ See footnote # 10.

¹² דבר שמואל and מהר"ם חלאווה ד"ה דאין טשין (ל, ב).

¹³ See footnote # 9.

¹⁴ See footnote # 7.

¹⁵ Therefore only שעלו בקערה are מותר since they were not cooked בשרית and they are not a דבר חריף.

¹⁶ Therefore אסור לאכלו בכותה is צנן שחתכו בסכין since it is a דבר חריף.