



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

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

MISHNAH. If a drop of milk fell on a piece of meat¹ and it imparted a flavor into that piece,² it³ is forbidden. If the pot was stirred,⁴ then it is forbidden only if [the drop of milk] imparted a flavor into [all that was in] the pot.

GEMARA: Abaye said: In all cases wherever the flavor [of a forbidden substance is perceptible] but not the substance it self,⁵ [the mixture is forbidden] by Biblical law.⁶ For should you say that it is forbidden by Rabbinic law only, and the reason why we may not draw any conclusions from the case of ‘meat in milk’ is that it is an anomaly,⁷ then by reason of that anomaly [the mixture of meat and milk should be forbidden] even though the one does not impart a flavor in the other!⁸

¹ That was in a pot boiling on the fire.

² I.e., the piece was not sixty times as much in bulk as the drop of milk.

³ The piece of meat.

⁴ As soon as the drop of milk fell into the pot the pot was stirred so that the flavor of the milk was distributed equally among everything that was in the pot.

⁵ Where the forbidden substance was, after a time, removed from the mixture, so that there is only the flavor of the forbidden substance under consideration.

⁶ The principle is derived from the law of ‘meat in milk’, for in that case, after the two substances were cooked together, even though they have been removed from each other, they are forbidden because of the flavor of the other which each absorbed.

Rava said to him: The Torah has expressed this prohibition by the term ‘cooking’.⁹

Rav said: As soon as it [the drop of milk] imparted a flavor to the piece of meat, that piece becomes forbidden like neveilah, and it in turn renders all the other pieces forbidden,¹⁰ for they are of like kind.¹¹

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Mari said to Ravina: Let us consider: Rav in this statement of his evidently follows the view of Rabbi Yehudah, who holds that like-kinded substances can never neutralize each other; but must we say that he disagrees with Rava? For Rava said: Rabbi

⁷ For each substance separately is permitted but in a mixture each is forbidden; moreover, this law is peculiar for the mere cooking together of these substances is also forbidden.

⁸ Whereas our Mishnah forbids the mixture only where the flavor of the milk is perceptible.

⁹ The prohibition of ‘meat in milk’ is expressed in the Torah three times by the term ‘cooking’, and cooking signifies the imparting of a flavor from one substance to the other.

¹⁰ Even though the other pieces in the pot are together more than sixty times the volume of the piece upon which the milk fell.

¹¹ The rule ‘it is forbidden’ in the first clause of our Mishnah accordingly means that all that is in the pot is forbidden; for Rav evidently is in agreement with Rabbi Yehudah that homogeneous substances cannot neutralize each other.

Yehudah is of the opinion that where one kind is mixed with a like kind and also with a different kind, you disregard the like kind as if it were not there, and if the different kind is more [than the forbidden substance] it will neutralize it!¹² — He replied. Had it fallen into thin broth this would have been the case, but here we must suppose that it fell into thick broth.¹³

The Gemara analyzes: Then what is his view? If he holds that when the forbidden essence can be considered extracted it becomes permitted,¹⁴ why should the piece of meat be deemed as neveilah?¹⁵ One must say that he holds that even when it is considered extracted it is still forbidden. And indeed it was so reported: Rav, Rabbi Chanina and Rabbi Yochanan hold that even when it can be considered extracted it is still forbidden; Shmuel, Rabbi Shimon bar Rebbe and Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish hold that when it is considered extracted it becomes permitted.

¹² In our Mishnah, therefore, according to this view, even though the one piece is rendered forbidden as neveilah, and the other pieces in the pot are to be disregarded for they are of like kind, the broth, if there is sufficient of it, should neutralize the forbidden piece, for broth and meat are different kinds.

¹³ And this is regarded as being of the same kind as meat.

¹⁴ The contention is that when a substance, rendered forbidden because it had absorbed the essence of a forbidden matter, is cooked together with other permitted food, the forbidden essence is considered as extracted from the original substance and distributed equally among the contents of the pot; so that if there is enough in the pot to neutralize the quantity of forbidden essence it will all be permitted, even the original substance which was rendered forbidden. In other words, the substance, which is forbidden because of the forbidden essence that it absorbed, is not regarded as neveilah and forbidden absolutely for all time, but it is even possible for it to become permitted once again when cooked with other substances.

The Gemara asks: Is Rav then of the opinion that even when it can be considered extracted it is still forbidden? But it has been reported: If an olive's bulk of meat fell into a pot of milk, the meat, says Rav, is forbidden¹⁶ but the milk is permitted. Now if you maintain that [Rav holds] even when it is considered extracted it is still forbidden, why is the milk permitted? Isn't the milk¹⁷ as neveilah?¹⁸

The Gemara answers: I still maintain, that Rav holds that even when it can be considered extracted it is still forbidden, but there¹⁹ it is exceptional, for the verse states: You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk, from where it is clear that the Torah forbade the kid only and not the milk.²⁰

The Gemara asks: But does Rav hold that the Torah forbade the kid only and not the milk? But it has been reported: If a person cooked half an olive's bulk of meat with half an olive's bulk of milk,²¹ he incurs lashes, says

¹⁵ Surely the drop of milk which originally fell on this piece would in the course of further cooking be extracted from it and distributed equally among all the pieces in the pot, so that this piece too should be permitted!

¹⁶ Because of the milk that it absorbed.

¹⁷ That milk which was first absorbed by the meat and later discharged in the rest of the milk in the pot.

¹⁸ So that when it mixes with the rest of the milk we have here a mixture of homogeneous liquids which, according to Rav can never neutralize each other.

¹⁹ In connection with the prohibition of meat in milk.

²⁰ Rav contends that whenever meat and milk are cooked together in any proportion whatsoever, it is only the meat that is forbidden and not the milk.

²¹ An olive's bulk of liquid is that amount of liquid displaced from a brimming bowl by an olive.

Rav, if he eats it, but does not incur lashes for cooking it. Now if you maintain that [Rav contends that] the Torah forbade the kid only and not the milk, why should he incur lashes for eating it? There was only half the [minimum] quantity!²²

The Gemara answers: Rather we must say that Rav holds the view that the milk is also forbidden, but in this case²³ we must suppose that [the olive's bulk of meat] fell into a boiling pot, in which case it will absorb all the time and not discharge at all.²⁴

The Gemara asks: But eventually when [the boiling] subsides it will discharge [the milk which it had absorbed]!

The Gemara answers: By then he had already removed it.

The text [stated above]: If a person cooked half an olive's bulk of meat with half an olive's bulk of milk, he incurs lashes, says Rav, if he eats it, but does not incur lashes for cooking it.

The Gemara asks: But say what you will, if the two²⁵ combine [to make the prohibition], then he should also

²² The minimum quantity of a forbidden substance to render one liable to lashes is an olive's bulk. Here the only forbidden substance is the meat and there is only half an olive's bulk of it.

²³ Namely, where an olive's bulk of meat fell into a pot of milk.

²⁴ The milk absorbed by the meat will not be given out so long as the pot is boiling, consequently it will not affect the rest of the milk in the pot.

²⁵ The meat and the milk.

²⁶ Wherein large quantities of meat and milk were cooked together. To take out of this pot half an olive's bulk of meat and

incur lashes for cooking it; and if they do not combine, then he should not incur lashes even if he ate it!

The Gemara answers: Really they do not combine, but this is a case where each [half an olive's bulk] came from a large pot.²⁶

Levi, however, said: He also incurs lashes for cooking it. Moreover, Levi taught so in a Baraisa: Just as he incurs lashes for eating it he incurs lashes for cooking it. And of what kind of cooking did they speak? Of such cooking as others²⁷ would eat from it.

With regard to the law where the forbidden essence is considered extracted,²⁸ there is a dispute between Tannaim. For it was taught: If a drop of milk fell on a piece of meat, as soon as it imparted a flavor to the piece, the piece itself is forbidden as neveilah, and it will in turn render all the pieces [in the pot] forbidden, for they are of like kind: these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. But the Sages say. [It is not forbidden at all] until it imparts a flavor to the broth, the sediments and the pieces.

Rebbe said: The words of Rabbi Yehudah are acceptable in the case where he²⁹ neither stirred nor covered [the

half an olive's bulk of milk and eat them certainly renders one liable to lashes. But to cook half an olive's bulk of meat with half an olive's bulk of milk does not, according to Rav, render one liable to lashes. So that the two rulings given by Rav refer to different cases.

²⁷ Non-Jews.

²⁸ Whether the original piece which contained the forbidden essence becomes now permitted or not.

²⁹ The person who was looking after the pot. By stirring or covering the pot the forbidden substance is distributed equally among the entire contents of the pot.

pot], and the words of the Sages in the case where he either stirred it or covered it.

Now what is meant by ‘neither stirred nor covered’? Should you say it means that he did not stir it at all, or that he did not cover it at all, then this piece will indeed have absorbed [the drop of milk] but will not at any time have given it out; [wherefore then are the other pieces forbidden?] And if it means that he did not stir it straightway but only later on, or that he did not cover it straightway but only later on, wherefore [are any of the pieces forbidden]? True, this piece had absorbed [the drop of milk] but it has also given it out! — He is of the opinion that even when the forbidden substance can be considered extracted it is still forbidden.³⁰

The Gemara asks: It follows then from this that Rabbi Yehudah holds that [the entire contents of the pot] are forbidden even though he stirred it straightway [and continued to do so] till the very end, or covered it straightway [and kept it so] till the very end. But why should this be so? The one [piece] has not absorbed any more [than the others]?

The Gemara answers: Perhaps he did not stir it so well or he did not cover it so well.

DAILY MASHAL

Words of Torah at the Table

To observe the mitzvah to speak words of Torah at the table, some have the custom to say at the end of the meal “*mayim acharonim* is an obligation” so they have both words of Torah and a reminder. Apropos, people recount that when a pupil of the Vilna Gaon remarked at his mentor’s table that words of Torah should be mentioned, the Gaon told him, “You already observed the mitzvah by that very saying.”

³⁰ Once a piece of meat has absorbed a forbidden substance it becomes absolutely forbidden as neveilah and will at once render all the pieces in the pot forbidden, no matter how much

there is in the pot besides this; for it can never be neutralized since this is a case of a forbidden piece among permitted pieces, or a mixture of homogeneous substances.