

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Cooking a thigh that contains the gid hanasheh (cont.)

The Gemara responds to the challenge to Shmuel's ruling that if the thigh was roasted rather than cooked one may eat the meat until he reaches that gid hanasheh.

The assertion that if cheilev is roasted it permeates that entire piece of meat is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava notes that he used to be troubled by a Beraisa but in light of a ruling of R' Yochanan it is now understood.

2) Mixtures

Rava observes that Chazal gave different ways to determine whether a mixture is prohibited and explain when we employ each method.

A related incident is cited.

Ravina's ruling in this incident is successfully challenged.

R' Chanina explains how we calculate sixty parts against a prohibited substance.

R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan also presents a method of calculating whether a prohibited substance imparts flavor into a mixture.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Nachman discusses the nullification of various substances.

R' Yitzchok the son of R' Mesharshiya sets the guidelines for an udder.

A related incident is presented.

3) Egg

The implication of R' Nachman's ruling that an egg imparts flavor is challenged. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Asking a non-Jew to taste the questionable food

אמר רבא מריש הוה קא קשיא לי הא דתניא קדרה שבשל בה בשר לא בשל בה חלב, ואם בשל בנוותן טעם וכו'.

The halacha is that if a pot was used for meat, it may not then be used to cook milk. If it was used for milk, we must determine whether the amount of milk used in the pot and absorbed into its walls is enough to leave "a taste." Rava states that this halacha originally was puzzling to him. How are we able to determine whether the amount of milk in this meat pot still provides enough to contribute a taste in the pot? It is obviously prohibited for a Jew to taste any food cooked in this pot, as it may be contaminated with enough milk to create a "meat and milk" mixture.

Yet, after hearing the ruling of Ravin b. R' Adda, Rava realized the solution to his dilemma. Ravin taught that if a non-kosher fish falls into a pot where meat is being cooked, a non-Jewish cook should be summoned and asked to taste the food. If he reports that the taste of the forbidden food is able to be detected or not, we trust him and the food is either prohibited or permitted. Rava understood that in our case, as well, we summon a non-Jew and he is the one who tastes from the pot and he informs us whether the milk taste is still noticeable.

The non-Jewish cook is called a "kefeilah." Rashi explains that he is a baker, while the Aruch translates this word to refer to a cook. Toras Chaim explains that according to Rashi, the reason we trust the non-Jew is that we present the question to him innocently, in a general conversation, without his realizing that we are going to be relying on his word for halachic purposes. In this case, we do not think that the non-Jew will intentionally lie, as he is not aware that we are listening to his statement for any practical purpose. This is why we may ask a baker, who is not necessarily an expert in cooking. Aruch, however, holds that the basis for trusting the non-Jew is precisely because we tell him that his word is very important to us, and he is therefore afraid that his very reputation as a cook is dependent upon his expert testimony. He is especially careful to be accurate because he is a cook, and he does not want to be quoted having said something unreliable.

Tosafos and Rashba also note that the services of a professional cook are sought out, it is not due to his special talent of tasting the contribution of the milk, as we are trying to find a taste that even a regular person can detect. Rather, we consult with a professional cook because we need to rely upon him being trustworthy, and this is where his reputation is at stake.

Rambam (Hilchos Ma'achalos Asuros 15:6) is more lenient, as he does not mention the need to consult with a professional cook or butcher. He allows the tasting to be done by any non-Jew. Beis Yosef explains that Rambam understood the Gemara's call for a "butcher" was due to his most likely being available, but any non-Jew may be trusted to say if there is a taste of milk. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
As a zechus for a רפואה שלימה for
מרים אורית בת דבורה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
Rabbi and Mrs. Michael Glassenberg
in memory of their father
ר' משה בן ר' ארי' לייב, ע"ה

HALACHA Highlight

Tasting a prohibited food

Have an Aramean cook taste it

If a prohibited substance becomes mixed into a permitted substance of a different kind (מין בשאינו מינו), for example, some cheilev gets mixed into a pot of meat, one should give a gentile some of the mixture to taste it. If the gentile says that he does not detect the taste of the cheilev or even if he says that he detects the taste of the cheilev but it is a spoiled taste the mixture is permitted¹. Taz² cites Drishah who notes that since it is prohibited for a Jew to taste the mixture to determine whether it has a cheilev taste we can infer that if one purchases meat from a butcher and it is not known whether the meat was salted or not it is prohibited to taste the meat with one's tongue. Taz disagrees and contends that merely tasting something with one's tongue to determine whether it is prohibited or not is permitted. The reason why it is necessary for a gentile to taste the meat that has cheilev mixed in is that a mere taste with one's tongue would not have been sufficient and it is necessary to actually eat it in order to determine whether the cheilev gives taste to the mixture.

Teshuvos Tzemach Tzedek³ was asked whether it is permitted to taste soap that contains prohibited ingredients to de-

ליטעמיה קפילא ארמאה

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does one determine whether a non-kosher substance imparted taste to a mixture ?

2. How does one determine whether terumah has imparted taste to chullin ?

3. Explain: מליח הרי הוא כרותח.

4. What foods impart the strongest taste ?

termine whether it requires more salt. He answered that although Rabbinically one is not permitted to eat prohibited foods that have a spoiled taste (פגום), that Rabbinic injunction is limited to one who will actually eat the prohibited food. One who will merely taste the prohibited food that is spoiled does not even violate a Rabbinic injunction. It seems from his answer that the same halacha would apply to any Rabbinically prohibited food and one is permitted to taste that food even if it involves putting the food in one's mouth rather than just tasting it with one's tongue. ■

¹ שו"ע יו"ד סי' צ"ח סעי' א'
² ט"ז שם סק"ב.

³ שו"ת צמח צדק (הקדמון) סי' מ"ז. ■

STORIES off the Daf

Sixty Times What?

"דליכא קפילא בששים..."

Erev Shabbos is a very rushed time for many people, and it is paramount to get everything done as soon as possible. This is why Ezra forbade doing one's wash on Erev Shabbos—it is an exhausting and time-consuming chore that can leave little energy for the remaining Shabbos preparations. It is therefore no surprise that many errors in kashrus occur on Erev Shabbos. One woman accidentally cooked meat that had not been salted. The salt removes blood that is forbidden, but this woman had been in such a rush that she forgot to salt the meat altogether. Instead of rectifying

this, however, she boiled up a pot of water and vegetables and tossed in the meat. Although the rest of the stew was the majority, the meat was not a sixtieth of the total volume which is the usual requirement to nullify something forbidden in a mixture.

When this question was brought to various sages they permitted it. As Rabbeinu Yerucham records, "This was permitted for a few reasons. Firstly, our sages tell us that unsalted meat cast into a very hot pot of boiling water is permitted. Although we do not know how to do this process today, it is possible that this woman's pot was hot enough and that the meat did not exude blood. Another reason to permit was since it is not the meat which is forbidden, but merely the blood absorbed in the meat. Although there wasn't sixty times volume in rela-

tion to the unsalted piece of meat, the Raavad holds that we can assess how much exuded from the meat and if there is sixty times this amount in the pot the prohibited substance is nullified. In this case there was sixty times the blood that exuded."¹

But the Beis Yosef, zt"l, took issue with this reasoning. "In Chullin 97 we find that if there is no non-Jewish expert to taste the prohibited mixture and determine if it has a forbidden taste, there must be sixty times the forbidden substance to permit. It is very difficult to explain this to mean sixty times what exudes from the forbidden into the mixture: who can tell how much has exuded?"² ■

¹ רבינו ירוחם, נתיב ט"ו, אות כ"ה
² ב"י, סי' צ"ב, בבדק הבית ■

