

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Eating meat and dairy at the same table (cont.)

Abaye's ruling that two brothers who do not get along may not share a table is defended.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the halacha if a drop of milk falls onto a slice of meat or into a pot that contains meat.

### 3) Food flavor

Abaye infers from the Mishnah that the taste of a forbidden food without its substance is Biblically prohibited.

Rava rejects this inference.

### 4) Drop of milk on a slice of meat

Rav maintains that the drop of milk renders the slice prohibited and thereby causes that slice of meat to prohibit the other slices in the utensil.

Mar Zutra the son of R' Meri and Ravina discuss the background to Rav's statement.

The Gemara decides that Rav must also follow the opinion that even when it is possible to squeeze out the prohibited flavor it is prohibited.

The disagreement regarding the principle of whether prohibited taste could be squeezed out is recorded.

The premise that Rav maintains that even if prohibited taste is squeezed out the piece is prohibited is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 5) Meat and dairy

Rav rules that if half an olive's volume of meat and half an olive's volume of milk are cooked together one is liable for eating meat and milk but not for cooking meat and milk.

Rav's position is clarified.

Levi dissents and maintains that one is liable for cooking as well.

### 6) Squeezing out prohibited taste

The Gemara teaches that Tannaim dispute whether it is possible to squeeze out prohibited taste.

The Gemara begins to analyze the Baraisa in order to clarify what Rabbi meant when he limited R' Yehudah's ruling to when he did not stir or cover the pot. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Its taste and not its substance—a universal Torah concept*

אמר אבבי טעמו ולא ממשו בעלמא דאורייתא

The Mishnah taught that if a drop of milk falls onto a piece of meat, if the flavor of the milk is discernable in the meat, the piece of meat is prohibited due to the law not to eat meat and milk together. As Rashi explains, this would be the case if the piece of meat does not have sixty times the volume of the milk which fell upon it. If the taste of the milk is not detectable, due to its being too small, the meat is permitted.

Abaye derives a general rule from the halacha of our Mishnah. We have a concept called "טעמו ולא ממשו—the taste of an item, without its substance." This refers to a situation where a prohibited item became mixed with permitted food, and the prohibited item was then removed, but not before imparting some of its taste into the permitted food. In our Mishnah, this is illustrated where drops of milk fell onto a piece of meat, but its substance has blended into the piece or the entire pot and it is no longer discernable.

The fact is that we know that the Torah definitely prohibits a blend of milk and meat, and the application of this halacha is where the prohibited item was removed, i.e. meat fell into a pot of hot milk being cooked, and the meat was then removed. The explanation of this is that the taste which the milk and meat impart into each other makes the respective pieces prohibited. It cannot be referring to where one ate a piece of meat and some cheese together where both are intact, because this is not prohibited by the Torah. The three verses in the Torah referring to this law teach us that milk and meat are only prohibited when cooked together.

The statement of Abaye is that although "taste without substance" is the Torah's view as illustrated regarding milk and meat, we understand that the Torah then applies this Torah concept further to other cases of prohibited foods which combine with permitted food, where the prohibited item was then removed. Abaye's comment is that if we assume that the Torah only applies this concept regarding milk and meat and to no other case of prohibited foods, the reason for its being limited would be that milk and meat is unique, and the argument is that milk and meat are each independently permitted, and it is only their combination that becomes prohibited. This is in contrast to other prohibited items, which are intrinsically prohibited. Yet, if the case of milk and meat was indeed unique, Abaye points out that the Mishnah would prohibit it even without milk contributing its taste into the meat, but our Mishnah explicitly only prohibits when the milk has imparted its taste. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
Mr. and Mrs. George Bornstein  
In honor of the birth and Bris  
of their grandson

## HALACHAH Highlight

### *Kashering large utensils*

כגון שנפל לתוך יורה ורתחת דמבלע בלע מפלט לא פלט

*For example, it fell into a boiling pot where the meat absorbed but it did not discharge*

The Gemara relates that when a piece of meat falls into a pot of boiling milk the meat absorbs the taste of the milk and the meat becomes prohibited but that prohibited taste is not discharged back into the milk. The principle that while a food is in a pot of boiling liquid the food does not discharge its taste has relevance in another area of halacha as well. Rishonim discuss kashering a utensil in water that is not sixty times the volume of the utensil. Seemingly, the kashering process should be ineffective. Whatever prohibited taste that one extracts from the utensil that is being kashered should immediately become reabsorbed by the utensil and should therefore remain non-kosher. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> maintains that when kashering a utensil in water that is not sixty times the volume of the utensil the kashering is ineffective if the utensil is ben-yomo (lit. "son of the day" meaning that it had been used for non-kosher within the past 24 hours). When the Torah instructed the Jewish People to kasher the utensils that were taken from Midian those instructions were relevant for utensils that were small enough that they could be kashered in water that was sixty times its volume.

Ramban<sup>2</sup> finds this explanation untenable. The pasuk instructs the Jews that any utensil that cannot be kashered

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What happens to a pot of meat if a drop of milk falls onto a slice of meat?  
-----
2. Explain אפטר לסוחר מותר.
3. What happens to the milk when a piece of meat falls into a pot of boiling milk?  
-----
4. What is the point of dispute between Rav and Levi?  
-----

with fire should be kashered in water. How then could it be that these instructions were only relevant to small utensils rather than large utensils? Furthermore, how could it be that instructions for kashering large utensils were not given? Ritva<sup>3</sup> answers that large utensil could indeed be kashered. In the event that a gentile professional cook were to taste the water and say that the water does not contain a prohibited taste the utensil would be considered kashered. Additionally, since according to the Torah nullification takes place in a simple majority the prohibited taste becomes nullified when it is extracted into the larger quantity of water and as such the utensil is kashered. It is only Rabbinically that we do not assume the prohibited taste to be nullified. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה שנפל לתוך.

2. רמב"ן לסוגייתינו.

3. ריטב"א לסוגייתינו. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### *A Novel Solution*

טפת חלב שנפלה על החתיכה

Today's daf discusses the halachos of inadvertent mixtures of milk and meat.

Although in our times we are blessed with much abundance—some might even say an overabundance—it was not always the case. In Yerushalayim there were times when securing even a simple livelihood was quite hard. Making a simchah in such times was exceedingly difficult. Every penny scraped together to pay for the food was almost impossible to muster up again.

When a couple was slated to get mar-

ried, people went out of their way to make sure nothing went wrong with the food. Unfortunately, on one occasion some of the contents of a container of milk spilled into the main dish for a wedding. The people carefully weighed and measured what remained in the jug. They also evaluated how much had spilled on the floor. Unfortunately, it came out that there was quite a bit more than a sixtieth of the meat dish, clearly forbidding the food. That meant that there would be nothing substantial to eat at the wedding.

But then the hosts realized that they could ask Rav Shmuel of Salant, zt"l—perhaps he would be able to find a reason to permit the food. They rushed over and asked him to rule in this diffi-

cult case. Unlike his usual practice Rav Shmuel told them to return later. When they came back for a psak he ruled the food was permitted.

Although some of the scholars tried to figure out how it could be all right, no one could understand. How could the rav disregard the halachah?

When the group asked Rav Salant why it was permitted, his brilliant reply astounded all present. "As soon as you left, I asked the milkman to reveal how much water he mixes into the milk. When he told me, I worked it out and there is just under a sixtieth of actual milk in the mixture!"<sup>1</sup> ■

1. הפותח שער, ע"י סיג. ■