



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

**Salting together
with Non-kosher Meat**

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.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Why did he not tell him that it was forbidden because of Shmuel’s principle that whatever is salted is regarded as if it was hot, and whatever is pickled is regarded as if it was cooked?

The *Gemora* answers: If it would only have been on account of Shmuel’s principle, I would have thought that it applies only to the blood, but not to the juice and gravy (*which perhaps is not forbidden at all*); he therefore cites the *braisa*.

The *Gemora* attempts to refute Rava from a *braisa*, but the challenge was answered. (112b – 113a)

Salting Meat

[*Mnemonic: Meat placed; departing*] Shmuel said: Meat cannot be drained of its blood unless it has been salted very well (*covering the meat completely*) and rinsed very well (*in order to remove the salt which is saturated with blood, and in order to remove the blood which adhered to the meat’s surface*).

It was stated: Rav Huna said: One must salt the meat and then rinse it. In a *braisa* it was taught: One must rinse it, salt it and then rinse it again.

The *Gemora* notes: Indeed they are not disagreeing, for in the one case it was washed down by the butcher and in the other it was not washed by the butcher.

Rav Dimi of Nehardea used to salt meat with coarse salt and then shake it off (*because it has absorbed the blood*;

in the case of fine salt, however, there is no need to shake it off, for it would dissolve by itself).

Rav Mesharsheya said: We do not assume that the internal organs contain blood (*and they are not forbidden if cooked without salting*). This is explained as referring specifically to the rectum, the stomachs and the large intestines (*but not the heart, lung and liver*).

Shmuel said: One may not put salted meat except into a perforated vessel (*for otherwise, the meat will absorb the blood that was drawn out of it*).

Rav Sheishes used to salt each piece of meat separately.

The *Gemora* asks: But why not two together? If it is because the blood would run out of one piece and be absorbed by the other, then in one piece as well, the blood may run out of one side and be absorbed by the other side!? Indeed there can be no difference (*and one may therefore salt any number of pieces together, for while each is exuding it will not absorb*).

Shmuel said in the name of Rabbi Chiya: If a man breaks the neck bone of an animal (*after it has been slaughtered*) before the life departed from it, he thereby makes the meat heavy (*for the animal is bereft of its last energy to spurt out the blood, and the blood now remains inside the limbs of the animal*) and robs mankind (*for he is overcharging when he sells this meat, for it contains more than the usual amount of blood*), and causes the blood to remain in the limbs.

They inquired: What is the true meaning? Is it that he makes the meat heavy and thereby robs mankind by causing the blood to remain in the limbs, but for himself,

he may do so (*for he can remove the blood through salting*), or perhaps even for himself it is forbidden (*for now, no amount of salting will remove the blood that has settled in the limbs*)? The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved. (113a)

Mishna

If a man places upon the table fowl with cheese he does not thereby transgress a negative command. (113a)

Fowl with Milk

The *Gemora* infers from the *Mishna* that if he were to eat them together, he would transgress a negative command. This would prove that the meat of fowl (*cooked*) in milk is prohibited by Biblical law!

The *Gemora* deflects the proof by saying that the meaning of the *Mishna* is as follows: If a man places upon the table fowl with cheese he cannot come to the transgression of a negative command. (113a)

Mishna

It is forbidden to cook the meat of a kosher animal in the milk of a kosher animal or to derive any benefit from it; but it is permitted to cook the meat of a kosher animal in the milk of a non-kosher animal or the meat of a non-kosher animal in the milk of a kosher animal and to derive benefit from it. Rabbi Akiva says: Wild animals and fowls are not included in the prohibition of the Torah, for it is written three times: *you shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk*. This excludes wild animals,

fowls, and non-kosher animals. Rabbi Yosi HaGelili says: It is written: *you shall not eat of anything that dies of itself*, and in the same verse it is written: *you shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk*; therefore whatever is prohibited under the law of *neveilah* is forbidden to cook in milk. Now it might be inferred that a fowl, since it is prohibited under the law of *neveilah* is also forbidden to be cooked in milk; the verse therefore says: *in its mother's milk*. A fowl is excluded since it has no mother's milk. (113a)

Kid in its Mother's Milk

Rabbi Elozar said: It is written: *And Yehudah sent the kid (gedi) of the goats*. Here it was a 'kid of the goats,' but elsewhere, wherever 'kid' is stated, it includes the offspring of the cow and the ewe.

The *Gemora* asks: And might we not derive the rule from there (*that gedi refers only to a kid of goats*)?

The *Gemora* answers: There is another verse (*regarding Rivkah and Yaakov*) which says: *And with the skins of the kids of the goats*. Here it means the kid of goats, but elsewhere, wherever 'kid' is stated without specification, it includes the offspring of the cow and the ewe.

The *Gemora* asks: And might we not derive the rule from there (*that gedi refers only to a kid of goats*)?

The *Gemora* answers: No, because we have here two verses which teach the same thing, and one may not draw any conclusions from two verses which teach the same thing (*and therefore, we derive the opposite that it only applies where it is stated explicitly; this teaches*

us that whenever gedi alone is mentioned, it refers to other animals as well).

The *Gemora* asks: This is well according to the one who maintains that one may not draw conclusions from such verses, but what can be said according to the one who maintains that one may draw conclusions from such verses?

The *Gemora* answers: There are here two exclusionary particles, for the Torah (*in both places*) could have written 'goats,' and yet, it wrote 'the goats'.

[*It is written, 'you shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk' three times in the Torah.*] Shmuel said: 'Kid' includes *cheilev*, and 'kid' includes *neveilah* (if someone cooked the forbidden fat of an animal, or a piece of *neveilah*, in milk and ate it, he would be liable twice: for eating *cheilev* or *neveilah*, and for eating meat cooked in milk; the novelty of this ruling is that Shmuel is of the opinion that the prohibition of 'meat in milk' can be superimposed upon the existing prohibition of *cheilev* or *neveilah*), and 'kid' includes the fetus (*that the meat of a fetus is regarded as meat and the prohibition of 'meat in milk' applies to it*). 'Kid' excludes the blood (*which is not regarded as meat*), and 'kid' excludes the placenta, and 'kid' excludes the non-kosher animal. 'In its mother's milk' and not in the milk of a male (*if it so happened that a male developed udders and had milk*), and 'in its mother's milk' and not in the milk of a slaughtered animal, and 'in its mother's milk' and not in the milk of a non-kosher animal.

The *Gemora* asks: But is not the term 'kid' written only three times, yet we have expounded it six times!?

The *Gemora* answers: Shmuel holds the view that a prohibition can be superimposed upon an existing prohibition, so that the application of the prohibition of 'meat in milk' to *cheilev* and also to that of *neveilah* is derived from one verse; blood is excluded because it does not come under the term '*kid*'; the placenta is excluded because it is a mere excretion. Two verses remain - one to include the fetus and the other to exclude a non-kosher animal.

The *Gemora* asks: Does Shmuel hold that a prohibition can be superimposed upon an existing prohibition? Surely Shmuel has said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: How do we know that if an impure *Kohen* eats impure *terumah* that he is not liable to be killed? The verse says: *And they will die because of it, for they have profaned it.* This excludes *terumah* that had already been profaned (*impure*).

The *Gemora* answers: You may say, if you will, that in all cases a prohibition can be superimposed upon an existing prohibition, but it is different there, for the Torah expressly excluded it by the expression: *and they will die because of it, for they have profaned it.* Alternatively, you may say that in all cases Shmuel is of the opinion that a prohibition cannot be superimposed upon an existing prohibition, but it is different here, for the Torah expressly included it by the expression '*kid*.' Or alternatively, you may also say that here it is his own opinion, and the other is the opinion of his teacher.

Rav Achadvoi bar Ami inquired of Rav: What is the law if one cooked meat in the milk of a female goat that had not nursed its young (*but has milk due to its being in the late stages of pregnancy*)?

He replied: Since it was necessary for Shmuel to state that the expression '*in its mother's milk*,' and not in the milk of a male, it is evident that only a male is excluded, for it cannot become a mother, but in the milk of this female goat, since it will become a mother, it is forbidden. (113a – 113b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Salting Frozen Meat

One of the actions required to render meat kosher for eating is salting. After slaughtering, examination and *nikur* (removing the forbidden parts), the meat should be salted "very well", as our Gemara says. We should mention that some say (*Beis Yosef, Y.D. 69, os 19; Da'as HaGeonim*) that the salt does not extract **all** the blood but causes that all the blood which could come out during cooking comes out with the salt, while any blood that doesn't come out is not forbidden as the blood forbidden to eat is that which exudes from the limbs. Some disagree (see *Pri Megadim* in the preface to *Hilchos Melichah, s.v. Ha'ikar hasheini* in the name of the Rashba) and maintain that salting removes all the blood and that the blood which comes out later is merely juice resembling blood. According to all opinions, unsalted meat which was cooked is forbidden because the blood exudes from it during cooking and becomes forbidden blood and then becomes absorbed back into the meat.

The tradition we hold, that salted meat does not exude blood during cooking, concerns meat and salt in their natural state but any change in their nature or in their conditions of storage needs examination as to if it can disturb the traditional formula, that salted meat does

not exude blood during cooking. This issue arose prominently when frozen meat began to be exported and the *poskim* expanded on the matter, as follows.

We mustn't salt three-day-old meat: We already learn about changes in the meat which can limit the salt's influence from the Geonim's ruling (*Teshuvos HaGeonim*, cited in the *Tur*, Y.D. 69) that it doesn't help to salt meat that stayed for three days since slaughtering as the blood has dried and the salt cannot draw it out and, during cooking, it will again become liquid, come out of the meat, return to it and forbid it. This instruction was ruled as halachah (*Shulchan 'Aruch*, Y.D. 69:12). The Rashbash (Responsa, 561) adds that it can also be proved from the Gemara (Kesubos 76b), which asserts that a wound forms a scab (i.e. the blood dries) after three days (see Responsa *Yabia' Omer*, Y.D., II, 4 and VII, 4 concerning differences between the case and the proof).

Is frozen meat kept exactly as it was? When the *poskim* were asked to rule on frozen meat, the question was if freezing meat preserves it in its exact condition as it was before freezing. This question was always topical in cold countries where meat could be frozen in winter (see *'Aroch HaShulchan*, *ibid*, S.K. 79) and it arose prominently with the marketing of frozen food from one continent to another, including meat slaughtered abroad that was frozen without *nikur* or salting. As many days passed since the slaughtering till the salting, the question arose if the meat could be salted.

Most of the great *poskim* in the last 80 years expanded on this question and opinions differ. Many permit salting this meat as in their opinion as soon as it is frozen, its condition is preserved as it was at the time of freezing

and the blood doesn't dry. Therefore, when it is defrosted, we have meat in the state of an animal slaughtered just a day ago and it is allowed to salt and eat it (*'Aroch HaShulchan*, *ibid*, and see Responsa *Seridei Eish*, II, 14).

Some *poskim* wanted to forbid salting defrosted meat due to the suspicion that during the freezing some changes occurred in the meat, though hardly felt, and how do we know that the salt can extract all the blood from this meat which underwent unnatural processes? (See Responsa *Yaskil 'Avdi*, I, Y.D. 3, and see *Minchas Ya'akov*, 14, cited in *Baer Heiteiv*, 69, S.K. 8).

We emphasize that many people (see Responsa *Shevet HaLevi*, II, 25) try to avoid meat salted after freezing also because of other problems involved in freezing (see Responsa *Yaskil 'Avdi*, *ibid*), including that the freezing could close the blood vessels and prevent the blood from being drawn out by the salt (see an expansion of the topic in Vol. 257 in the article "Plucking feathers according to halachah"). As for the halachah, HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Feinstein zt"l ruled (Responsa *Igros Moshe*, Y.D., I, 27) that, as a first preference, one should avoid such but, *bedieved* - after the fact, one may rely on the lenient opinions, providing that the meat was completely frozen and became hard as a rock.