



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

Rav Shemayah bar Ze'ira raised the following objection: [We have learned:] If a man carried a perforated plant-pot [sown with cereals] through a vineyard and [what was in] it increased by a two-hundredth part,¹ it is forbidden. Now only if it increased [by a two-hundredth part] is it [forbidden], but if it had not increased, it would not² [be forbidden]. — Abaye answered: There are two texts: It is written: Lest the growth be forfeited,³ and it is also written: The seed [which you have sown].⁴ How can we explain this? Thus, if they were sown originally [in the vineyard, they are forbidden] as soon as they have taken root, if sown [elsewhere] and brought [into the vineyard], if they increased [a two-hundredth part] they are [forbidden], but if they had not increased they would not [be forbidden].

Our Mishnah is not in accordance with the following Tanna, for it has been taught: Rabbi Shimon ben Yehudah says on behalf of Rabbi Shimon: Meat cooked in milk is forbidden as food but is permitted for general use, for it is written: For you are a holy people [to the Lord your God.... You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk]; while elsewhere it is written: And you shall be holy men to me; [therefore you shall not eat any meat that is torn in the field; you shall cast it to the dogs]. Just as there it is forbidden as food but is permitted for

¹ During the time the pot was in the vineyard. A perforated pot draws nourishment from the soil of the vineyard, and so there is an increase in the plant by reason of the vineyard. Here there were in the pot one hundred and ninety-nine parts of permitted growth to one part forbidden, hence the whole is forbidden. But if they were in the proportion of two hundred to one the entire growth in the pot would be permitted.

general use, so here too it is forbidden as food but is permitted for general use.

The Mishnah had stated: Rabbi Akiva says: wild animals and fowls etc.

The Gemara asks: But haven't these been applied to Shmuel's interpretations?

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva is of the opinion that a prohibition can be superimposed upon an existing prohibition; therefore no specific verse is necessary [to show that the prohibition of meat in milk applies to] forbidden fat or [to the meat of an animal] that died of itself; moreover [the prohibition naturally applies to] an embryo [for it] is as an ordinary kid; consequently all the expressions are superfluous and serve therefore to exclude wild animals, fowl and nonkosher animals.

The Mishnah had stated: Rabbi Yosi HaGelili says: it is written: you shall not eat of anything etc.

What is the difference between the views of Rabbi Yosi HaGelili and Rabbi Akiva? — The difference between them is as regards undomesticated animals: Rabbi Yosi HaGelili holds

² It is evident from this that the diverse kinds sown (even after they have taken root) are not forbidden, but only if there was an increase in the one by reason of the other.

³ This implies that only the new growth is forbidden.

⁴ This implies that the entire plant is forbidden.

that undomesticated animals are prohibited Biblically, whereas Rabbi Akiva holds that undomesticated animals are prohibited Rabbinically. Or, you may say, the difference between them is as regards fowls: Rabbi Akiva maintains that undomesticated animals and fowls are not included in the prohibition of the Torah but are prohibited Rabbinically, whereas Rabbi Yosi HaGelili maintains that fowls are not even prohibited by the Rabbis.

There is also [a Baraisa] taught to the same effect: In the place of Rabbi Eliezer they used to cut wood [on the Sabbath] to make charcoal in order to forge an iron instrument.⁵ In the place of Rabbi Yosi HaGelili they used to eat fowl's meat cooked in milk.

Levi once visited the house of Yosef the fowler, and was served with a peacock's head cooked in milk and said nothing to them about it. When he came to Rebbe [and related this]. Rebbe said to him: Why did you not excommunicate them? He replied: Because it was the place of Rabbi Yehudah ben Beseirah and I imagine that he must have expounded to them the view of Rabbi Yosi HaGelili who said: A fowl is excluded since it has no mother's milk.

MISHNAH: The rennet [of an animal] of an idolater or of a neveilah is forbidden. If a man curdled milk with the skin of the abomasum of an animal [that was validly slaughtered]; if it imparted its flavor [to the milk], it is forbidden. The rennet of a kosher animal which had suckled from a tereifah animal is forbidden; the rennet of a tereifah animal which had

⁵ Sc. the circumcision knife. Rabbi Eliezer is of the opinion that, since the performance of the mitzvah of circumcision supersedes the Sabbath, all the necessary requisites such as the making or preparation of the knife, or the kindling of fire

to obtain warm water etc. may also be performed on the Sabbath.

⁶ It does not mix with the other fluids in the stomach of the tereifah animal, but remains separate and distinct and is therefore permitted.

suckled from a kosher animal is permitted, because it [the rennet] remains collected inside.⁶

GEMARA. But isn't the rennet [of an animal] of an idolater neveilah?⁷ — Rav Huna answered: We are dealing here with the case of a kid that was bought from an idolater,⁸ and we apprehend that it suckled from a tereifah animal.⁹

The Gemara asks: But do we apprehend that it suckled from a tereifah animal? Behold it has been taught: One may buy eggs from idolaters and need have no fear lest they are of birds that were neveilah or tereifah!

The Gemara answers: Say, rather, we apprehend lest it suckled from a nonkosher animal.

And why is it that we do not apprehend [suckling] from a tereifah animal but we do apprehend [suckling] from a nonkosher animal? — Because tereifah animals are not common while nonkosher animals are.

The Gemara asks: If these are common, then even with regard to our own [kids] we should be apprehensive?

The Gemara answers: With regard to our own, since we keep away from nonkosher animals, and whenever we see them together we separate them, the Rabbis imposed no restriction as a precaution; with regard to theirs, however, since they do not keep away from nonkosher animals, and whenever they see them together they do not separate them, the Rabbis imposed a restriction as a precaution.

⁷ It is assumed that the meaning is of an animal slaughtered by an idolater.

⁸ Which was slaughtered by a Jew.

⁹ And therefore the Mishnah states that the milk found in the abomasum of the kid is forbidden.

Shmuel answered: They are to be taken as one thus: The rennet of an animal slaughtered by an idolater is neveilah [and therefore forbidden].

But how could Samuel have said so? Behold Shmuel has stated: The reason for forbidding the cheese of idolaters is because they curdle it with the skin of the stomach of a neveilah. This implies, does it not, that the rennet is permitted? There is no contradiction here. This [sc. our Mishnah] was taught before he [Rabbi Yehoshua] retracted, the other after he retracted.¹⁰

The Mishnah had stated: The rennet of a kosher animal which had suckled from a tereifah animal is forbidden; [the rennet of a tereifah animal which had suckled from a kosher animal is permitted, because it [the rennet] remains collected inside].

The Gemara asks: But doesn't the first clause state: The rennet [of an animal] of an idolater or of a neveilah is forbidden!?¹¹

Rav Chisda answered: In the first clause it would appear that one is eating neveilah,¹² but here [in the final clause] the animal has been slaughtered.

Rava said to him: But is this not all the more reason [to forbid it]? For if in the case of neveilah, which is a loathsome matter, and if you were to permit its rennet, one would not come to eat of its meat, you say it is forbidden; is it not then all the more reason to forbid the rennet of a tereifah animal which

had been slaughtered, for if you were to permit it one would come to eat of its meat?

Rather, said Rav Yitzchak in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: There is no contradiction here. This [the first clause was taught] before he [Rabbi Yehoshua] retracted; the other [the final clause] after he retracted; [the first clause, however, of] our Mishnah was allowed to stand.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: One may curdle [milk] with the rennet of a neveilah, but not with the rennet of an animal slaughtered by an idolater. Thereupon Rabbi Shimon bar Abba said before him: This is, is it not, in accordance with the view of Rabbi Eliezer who maintains that the thoughts of an idolater are usually directed towards idolatry? — He replied: Of course. According to whom else could it be? When Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak came [from Eretz Yisroel] he reported in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: One may curdle [milk] with the rennet both of a neveilah and an animal slaughtered by an idolater for we are not concerned with the view of Rabbi Eliezer. The law is: One may not curdle [milk] with the skin of the abomasum of a neveilah, but one may with the rennet of a neveilah, and also with the rennet of an animal slaughtered unto idolatry. ([One may also curdle milk] with the rennet of a validly slaughtered animal which had suckled from a tereifah animal, and certainly with the rennet of a tereifah animal which had suckled from a valid animal, because the milk that is collected within is considered as mere refuse.)

¹⁰ It was Rabbi Yehoshua who originally suggested that the rennet of a neveilah animal was forbidden; subsequently he retracted this. Now our Mishnah which, according to Shmuel's interpretation, suggests that the rennet of a neveilah is forbidden is obviously the view of Rabbi Yehoshua before he retracted; whereas Shmuel's statement as regards the cheese of idolaters follows the later view of Rabbi Yehoshua.

¹¹ And according to this, the rennet of a tereifah animal which had suckled from a kosher animal should also be forbidden. Can there be any distinction between the rennet of a neveilah and of a tereifah?

¹² If one were allowed to eat the rennet of a neveilah. Strictly, however, it is permitted. For it is not regarded as part of the neveilah but merely collected in its stomach.