



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

The Master [further] stated above: And the words of the Sages in the case where he either stirred it or covered it. What is meant by ‘either stirred it or covered it’? Should you say it means that he stirred it only later on but not at the beginning, or that he covered it only later on but not at the beginning,¹ — but in this case you have said that the words of Rabbi Yehudah are acceptable.² It must therefore mean that he stirred it straightway and [continued to do so] till the very end, or that he covered it straightway and [kept it so] till the very end; from which it follows that the Sages maintain [that everything in the pot is] permitted even though he stirred it only later on but not at the beginning, or he covered it only later on but not at the beginning. It is evident then that they hold that when the forbidden substance can be considered extracted it becomes permitted.³

¹ And in this case Rebbe is inclined to accept the lenient view of the Sages that all the pieces in the pot would neutralize the milk, for it has been extracted from the one piece and distributed evenly in the pot.

² That the entire contents of the pot are forbidden.

³ Hence we see that where the forbidden substance can be considered extracted is a matter of dispute between Tannaim.

⁴ The position would then be: all hold that the piece upon which the drop of milk fell is wholly forbidden as neveilah, but the dispute is concerning the other pieces in the pot. Rabbi Yehudah holding that the entire contents of the pot are forbidden because the forbidden piece can never be neutralized amongst other pieces, and the Sages holding that neutralization even in a mixture of homogeneous substances can take place. The attitude of Rebbe

Rav Acha of Difti said to Ravina: Why say they differ as to the law where the forbidden substance can be extracted? Perhaps all are of the opinion that even when the forbidden substance can be extracted it is still forbidden, but they differ [about the neutralization]⁴ of homogeneous substances: Rabbi Yehudah maintaining his principle that homogeneous substances cannot neutralize each other, and the Rabbis maintain theirs that homogeneous substances can neutralize each other?

The Gemara counters: This argument cannot be entertained.⁸ If you concede that the Sages in this dispute accept Rabbi Yehudah’s view concerning homogeneous substances, but they differ only as to the law in the case where the forbidden substance can be considered extracted, then the meaning of Rebbe is clear when he says: The words of Rabbi Yehudah are acceptable in this

who holds, first that when the forbidden substance can be extracted the piece is still forbidden, and secondly that neutralization cannot take place between homogeneous substances, is expressed thus: The words of Rabbi Yehudah are acceptable to me, namely, that the entire contents of the pot are forbidden, in the case where the pot was not stirred at once but only later on, for then one piece was first rendered forbidden and it would later render the entire pot forbidden. But the words of Rabbi Yehudah are not acceptable to me in the case where the pot was stirred straightway, for then the drop of milk was immediately evenly distributed among the contents of the pot. In this latter case the words of the Sages are acceptable to me, namely that the entire contents of the pot are permitted, for the apprehension lest the pot was not well stirred or well covered need not be taken into consideration.

case and the words of the Sages in that. But if you insist that all agree that even where the forbidden substance can be considered extracted it is still forbidden, but they differ concerning the law of homogeneous substances, then surely [Rebbe] should have said: The words of Rabbi Yehudah are acceptable in this but not in that!⁵ And there is no more to be said about this.

MISHNAH: The udder must be cut open and emptied of its milk; if he did not cut it open⁶ he has not transgressed the law on account of it.⁷ The heart must be cut open and emptied of its blood; if he did not cut it open he has not transgressed the law on account of it.⁸

GEMARA: Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rav: He has [not only] not transgressed the law on account of it, but it is even permitted.⁹

The Gemara asks: But have we not learned: He has not transgressed the law on account of it, which implies that there is no transgression of the law but that it is forbidden?

⁵ The view expressed there is that Rebbe agrees with Rabbi Yehudah, that the entire contents are forbidden in the case where the pot was not stirred at once, but does not agree with him in the case where it was stirred at once. If this is Rebbe's true view then he should not have mentioned the Sages at all in his statement. The fact that the Sages are mentioned in Rebbe's statement indicates that they went so far as to permit even that piece upon which the drop of milk fell, for they hold that when the forbidden substance is extracted the piece itself becomes permitted. The result of all this argument is to show that the law in the case when the forbidden substance can be considered extracted is a matter of dispute between Tannaim.

⁶ But cooked it together with all the milk it contained.

⁷ And no penalty is incurred either for cooking or eating the udder. The prohibition of 'meat in milk' applies only to milk drawn off from the living animal but not to milk found in the udder of a slaughtered animal.

The Gemara answers: Strictly it is not forbidden at all, but only because the second clause reads: The heart must be cut open and emptied of its blood; if he did not cut it open he has not transgressed the law on account of it, in which case it is true that there is no transgression of the law but clearly it is forbidden,¹⁰ the Tanna also stated in the first clause: He has not transgressed the law on account of it.

Shall we say that the following teaching supports him? It was taught: The udder must be cut open and emptied of its milk; if he did not cut it open he has not transgressed the law on account of it. The heart must be cut open and emptied of its blood; if he did not cut it open he must cut it open after it had been cooked and it is permitted [to be eaten]. Now it is only the heart that must be cut open [after the cooking], but the udder need not be cut open at all! — Perhaps the inference is: only for the heart does the cutting open [after the cooking] suffice, but for the udder

⁸ And is not liable to the penalty of kares for eating blood. According to Rashi the Mishnah is referring only to the heart of a fowl and the reason why this penalty is not incurred is because the blood contained in the heart is not as much as an olive's bulk. According to Tosafos, it refers to the heart of any animal and there is no liability because blood that has been cooked is not forbidden by the law of the Torah. The meat of the heart, says Rashi, is not rendered forbidden, for since it is smooth it does not absorb the blood.

⁹ To be eaten; for the milk that was withdrawn from a slaughtered animal is at most forbidden to be cooked with meat by the Rabbis only, and here since the milk was absorbed and confined within the udder there is not even a Rabbinic injunction against eating it.

¹⁰ For although there can be no liability to any punishment for eating the blood in the heart of a fowl for the reason stated, namely that it is less than an olive's bulk, there nevertheless lies a prohibition even where there is less than an olive's bulk, and it would certainly not be permitted to be eaten.

the cutting open [after the cooking] would not be sufficient.¹¹

Others report the passage as follows: Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rav: He has not transgressed the law on account of it, but it is forbidden [to be eaten]. Shall we say that [our Mishnah] supports him? It reads: He has not transgressed the law on account of it, which implies, no doubt, that there is no transgression of the law but that it is forbidden! — Strictly it is not even forbidden, but only because the second clause reads: The heart must be cut open and emptied of its blood; if he did not cut it open he has not transgressed the law on account of it, in which case there is no transgression of the law but clearly it is forbidden, the Tanna also stated in the first clause: He has not transgressed the law on account of it.

Come and hear: The udder must be cut open and emptied of its milk; if he did not cut it open he has not transgressed the law on account of it. The heart must be cut open and emptied of its blood; if he did not cut it open, he must cut it open after it had been cooked and it is permitted [to be eaten]. Now only the heart must be cut open [after the cooking] but the udder need not be cut open at all! — Perhaps the inference is: only for the heart does the cutting open [after the cooking] suffice, but for the udder

¹¹ And there is good reason for this distinction. As the heart is smooth and hard even in cooking the blood would not penetrate into it; the udder, on the other hand, is soft and spongy, and in cooking, the milk would penetrate into it, and it would be impossible to remove it.

¹² The milk found in the stomach of a calf is regarded as ordinary milk, accumulated in a particular place, to which the prohibition of 'meat in milk' applies, whereas the milk in the udder cannot be said to be collected inside but is absorbed in every part of the udder and therefore the prohibition of 'meat in milk' does not apply.

¹³ The udder.

the cutting open [after the cooking] would not be sufficient.

It was taught in agreement with the first version of Rav's view: If the udder was cooked with its milk it is permitted; if the stomach [of a sucking calf] was cooked with its milk it is forbidden. And wherein lies the distinction between the two? In the one the milk is collected inside, in the other it is not collected inside.¹²

How should one cut it¹³ open? — Rav Yehudah replied: One must cut it lengthwise and widthwise and press it against the wall.

Rabbi Eloazar once said to his attendant: Cut it up for me¹⁴ and I will eat it. What does he teach us? Is it not [a clear statement in] our Mishnah? — He teaches us that it is not necessary to cut it both lengthwise and widthwise.¹⁵ Or [he teaches us that this would be sufficient even for cooking] in a pot.¹⁶

Yalta¹⁷ once said to Rav Nachman: Observe, for everything that the Divine Law has forbidden us it has permitted us an equivalent: it has forbidden us blood but it has permitted us liver; it has forbidden us intercourse during menstruation but it has permitted us the blood of purification;¹⁸ it has forbidden us the fat of cattle but it has

¹⁴ Before you roast it.

¹⁵ But cutting it in one direction would be sufficient.

¹⁶ By cutting it lengthwise and widthwise and by pressing it out against the wall it is permitted to cook it in a pot together with other meat.

¹⁷ Rav Nachman's wife.

¹⁸ In the period of purification after childbirth, intercourse is permitted even though the woman may be suffering from a discharge of blood. Moreover, the blood of virginity is permitted which is the equivalent of the blood of menstruation.

Avraham Observed the Separation between Meat and Milk

Chazal's dictum is well known (Yoma 28b, etc.): "Avraham observed the whole Torah, even *'eiruvei tavshilin*." Some comment that this doesn't mean *'eiruvei tavshilin* but *tavshilim me'urbavim* (mixed foods). That is, he didn't eat meat mixed with milk or even milk after meat but only milk and then meat, as we are told: "...he took butter and milk" and later "the calf that he made" (*Da'as Zekeinim miBa'alei HaTosfos, Vayeira*).

permitted us the fat of wild animals; it has forbidden us pork, but it has permitted us the brain of the shibbuta;¹⁹ it has forbidden us the girutha²⁰ but it has permitted us the tongue of fish; it has forbidden us the married woman but it has permitted us the divorcee during the lifetime of her former husband; it has forbidden us the brother's wife but it has permitted us the levirate marriage; it has forbidden us the non-Jewess but it has permitted us the beautiful woman⁵ [taken in war]. I wish to eat meat in milk, [where is its equivalent?] Thereupon Rav Nachman said to the butchers: Give her roasted udders.

The Gemara asks: But have we not learned: The udder must be cut open?

The Gemara answers: That is only when [it is to be cooked] in a pot.²¹

The Gemara asks: But does it not state [in the Baraisa above]: If [the udder was] cooked, which implies that only after the act it is permitted but not in the first instance?²²

The Gemara answers: Indeed, it is even permitted in the first instance, but only because [the Tanna of the cited Baraisa] desired to state the second clause viz., If the stomach was cooked with its milk it is forbidden, in which case it is not permitted even after the act, he stated in the first clause too 'if it was cooked'.

¹⁹ A kind of fish the brain of which has the same taste as pork. According to some it is the mullet, according to others the sturgeon.

²⁰ A type of bird.

²¹ Rav Nachman apparently accepts the view stated in the second version of Rav that the udder is forbidden if cooked without having been cut open.

²² How then did Rav Nachman permit his wife to eat the udder roasted, and in the first instance too?