



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

Absorptions from the Milk Dip

Chizkiyah quotes Abaye ruling that fish put in a meat utensil may be eaten with milk dip, while radish sliced with a meat knife may not be eaten with milk dip.

The *Gemora* clarifies that only radish is prohibited, as it absorbs more due to its sharpness, but if gourds that were sliced with a meat knife, the surface of the cut may simply be scraped, and the rest eaten with milk dip. If one sliced stalks of turnip, they may be eaten with milk, but sliced beets may not be. However, if one sliced turnips in between slices of the beets, this removes the meat flavor, and the subsequent beets may be eaten with milk.

Rav Dimi enquired of Rav Nachman: May one place a jar of salt close to a jar of a milk dip? [*Perhaps we should be concerned that some of the milk dip will fall unknowingly into the salt and the salt will be used to salt meat?*] He replied: It is forbidden.

He inquired further: And what about a jar of vinegar (*which is common to be added to meat*)? He replied: It is permitted.

Rav Dimi asked: What is the difference between the two?

He replied: If you will measure for me a *kor* of salt (*as payment, I will then explain it to you*). And what is the difference? In the case of the salt, the forbidden substance (*the milk dip – due to its thick nature*) is discernible (*and therefore it is not nullified*); in the case of the vinegar, it is not discernible (*and therefore the milk will become nullified*). (111b – 112a)

Blood Absorptions

A young (*slaughtered*) pigeon once fell into a jar of milk dip, and Rav Chinana the son of Rava of Pashronya permitted it. Rava remarked: Who, except Rav Chinana the son of Rava of Pashronya, is so wise as to permit such a thing? For he is of the opinion that when Shmuel said: Whatever is salted is regarded as hot - that applies only to the case of food that was salted so much that it cannot be eaten because of it, but this milk dip can be eaten together with the salt that is in it.

This, however, only applies in the case of a raw pigeon, but if it was roasted, it would require to be peeled; and furthermore, if there were cracks in it, it would be entirely forbidden; and likewise, if it was seasoned with spices, it would be entirely forbidden.

Rav Nachman said in the name of Shmuel: A loaf of bread upon which one cut roasted meat may not be eaten (*for it absorbs the blood oozing from the meat*),

but only if the meat was red (*due to bruising while it was alive, for then, the roasting will not remove all of its blood*), and only if the blood penetrated through the bread (*to the other side*), and only if the liquid which exuded from the meat was thick, but if it was thin, then it does not concern us. Shmuel would throw the loaf of bread to the dogs. Rav Huna used to give it his attendant.

The *Gemora* asks (*on Rav Huna*): Either way (*it is not understandable*)! If it is permitted, it should be permitted to all, and if it is forbidden, it should be forbidden to all!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Huna was different, for (*although he ruled that the loaf is permitted*) he was fastidious (*in his eating habits*). Rava used to eat it and called it 'meat wine.'

Rav Nachman said in the name of Shmuel: One may not place a vessel beneath meat that is roasting (*in order to collect the fat drippings*) until all the redness of the meat has gone (*for until then, there is still blood in there*).

How does one know this (*when this point has been reached*)? Mar Zutra answered in the name of Rav Pappa: When the column of smoke rises (*it indicates that all the blood has been drawn out*).

Rav Ashi asked: Perhaps the lower half of the meat has been roasted (*to that point*) and the upper half has not?

Rav Ashi therefore said: There is no other way (*to determine if the meat is completely roasted, which would allow one to place the vessel underneath*) but to cast into the vessel two lumps of salt (*which will cause*

the blood to be drawn towards it) and to gently pour off the fat (*into another vessel*).

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ikka asked to Rav Ashi: But did Shmuel really say so (*that after the red liquid has been drained from the meat, it is permitted to place a vessel underneath it to catch the fat*)? Hasn't Shmuel stated that a loaf of bread upon which one cut roasted meat may not be eaten?

The *Gemora* answers: It is different in that case for the blood exudes only by reason of the pressure of the knife.

Rav Nachman said: If fish and fowl were salted together, they (*the fish, for the blood that is exuded from the fowl will be absorbed by the fish*) are forbidden.

The *Gemora* seeks to clarify the case: What are the circumstances here? If the vessel in which they were salted was not perforated, then fowl with other fowl would also be forbidden (*for the blood which exuded from one piece will be absorbed by the other – since it has no place to drain*); and if the vessel was perforated, then even fish with fowl should be permitted (*for the blood will drain through the perforations*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Indeed, the vessel was perforated, but fish, having a soft skin, very quickly exude their blood (*and juices*), whereas fowl are shriveled (*and slowly exude their blood and juices*); consequently, the fowl is exuding blood long after the fish have ceased to do so, so that the fish will absorb from the fowl.

It happened to Rav Mari bar Rachel that slaughtered meat had been salted together with *tereifah* meat (*in a*

perforated vessel). [The kosher meat does not absorb the blood from the other, just as it would not absorb from a different piece of meat. This is because it is “busy” exuding its own blood. The question is if it absorbs the juices from the other piece of meat.] He came before Rava who recited to him the following *braisa*: It is written (regarding *sheratzim*): The contaminated ones. This signifies that the juice and the gravy and the sediment of these are forbidden. [And therefore in the case of the *tereifah* meat being salted with slaughtered meat, while it is true that one will not absorb blood from the other because each is discharging it, each will however absorb the juice from the other, so that the slaughtered meat would be rendered forbidden on account of the juice of the other. For it is easier to absorb juice than blood.] (112a – 112b)

DAILY MASHAL

The chicken rescued from the garbage: As we’ve come this far, we cannot miss out an ingenious remark attributed to the Gaon of Teplik, Rabbi Shimshon Aharon Polanski zt”l, who served as the Rabbi of the Beis Yisrael neighborhood in Yerushalayim many years ago. Once he was brought a chicken that had been cooked with some *treifah*. As the Ashkenazim are accustomed not to rely on a gentile to taste the chicken and say if the taste of the *treifah* is felt therein, it was obvious that no one could benefit from the chicken. However, to everyone’s surprise, the Gaon ruled to give a piece of the chicken to a gentile to taste it. When he was informed that the gentile said that he didn’t feel any unusual taste, the Gaon ruled to give a piece of the chicken to a Sephardic Jew, who is allowed to eat the chicken after the gentile’s tasting as according to *Shulchan ‘Aruch*, we can rely on a gentile’s tasting in our

era as well. Therefore, after the Jew eats some of the chicken and declares that it has no unusual taste, the Ashkenazi owner of the chicken will also be allowed to eat it as a Jew tasted it and declared that it had no foreign taste (*Meor HaShabas*, II, p. 535; as we said, this ruling is “attributed” to the Gaon of Teplik but the rumor is not established enough to rely on it as a halachic ruling).