

26.5.6

68a → (וכן כל איסורין שבתורה) 69a → (ואמר עולא מחלוקת שהשביח ולבסוף פגם)

1. וְכָל בָּגֵד וְכָל עוֹר אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה עָלָיו שְׂכֶבֶת זָרַע וְכַבֵּס בְּמֵיִם וְטָמֵא עַד הָעֶרְבִי: וִיקְרָא טוֹי.
2. אֵלֶּה הַטָּמְאִים לָכֶם בְּכָל הַשָּׂרֵץ כָּל הַנִּגַּע בָּהֶם בְּמָתָם יִטָּמֵא עַד הָעֶרְבִי: וִיקְרָא יֹאֵלֹא.

I Continuation analysis of dispute ר'מור"ש regarding נטל"פ

- a dispute only in case where the offending food first enhanced, then fouled taste
 - i But: if its first contact fouled the food, all agree that it is מותר
 - ii Challenge (ר' חני) - wine (י"נ) that fell into lentils or vinegar into beans – אסור, and ר"ש permits
 - 1 Note: this is a case of פוגם מעיקרא and (ר"מ) disputes
 - 2 Defense (עולא): case is where the beans were cold and he heated them – השביח ולבסוף פגם
- b dispute is in case where the offending food fouled the taste from the start
 - i Question: does he limit the dispute to that case (and ר"ש agrees that אסור פגם ולסוף) or is dispute in both? תיקו (השביח ולסוף פגם אסור)
 - ii Support (ר' עמרם): yeast of חולין that leavened, then yeast of תרומה fell in – אסור; ר"ש permits
 - 1 Note: in this case, it was פוגם from the start, and they dispute here.
 - 2 Block: even the "overleavened" bread gains, as it can be used as a starter bread for others
 - iii Rather: if yeast and yeast, each of which was sufficient to leaven, fell together into the dough – אסור
 - 1 And: ר"ש permits
 - 2 All agree: if the תרומה fell first – אסור
 - 3 But: if the חולין fell first, then the תרומה – dispute
 - (a) Observation: here, the case is פוגם מתחילה and they still disagree
 - (b) Suggestion: perhaps this could be answered as did ר"ז above (extra חימוץ is a שבח as it can be used to start other breads)
 - (i) Rejection: סיפא - wine that falls into lentils or vinegar into beans – and they still disagree (פוגם לכתח)
 - (ii) Suggestion: perhaps this is answered as did עולא to ר' חנא – it was first משביח (cold beans/lentils)
 1. Rejection: no one disagrees in such a case – it's אסור לכרע
 2. Conclusion: disagreement is in case of פוגם לכתחילה (even there ר"מ forbids)

II Analysis of ברייתא – justification of 3 clauses (yeast falling together; one after the other, wine on lentils etc.)

- a סיפא: teaches that they even disagree in case of fouling at first contact (ר"מ still prohibits)
- b מציעא (when they fell in in sequence): if it first enhanced then fouled – all agree that it is אסור
- c ד"ש: is obviously אסור, as there the first contact was שבח
 - i Answer (אב"י): teaches us the extreme nature of ר"ש's position:
 - 1 Reconstruction: ר"ש said to רבנן – what caused the dough (with double yeast) to rise quicker – איסור
 - 2 ר"ש's response: just as the שבח was caused by both, so too the פגם was due to both (→ מותר)
 - 3 Challenge: ר"ש should allow איסור to join היתר and prohibit
 - (a) Answer: ר"ש is consistent – he even holds that איסור doesn't combine with איסור to prohibit
 - (b) ר"ש dissents (לשעור) מצטרף כלאי הכרם and ערלה מעילה ד:.

III Case: mouse fell into mead and רב prohibited

- a (!) נטל"פ אסור רב ד' ששת holds that אסור
- b ד' ששת: he agrees that מותר נטל"פ; a rat is an exception as it is disgusting and people avoid it, yet the תורה banned it
 - i Challenge: if so, it should be מטמא wet or dried out (only מטמא while still moist) (people avoid it in any case)
 - ii Counter: if so, שכי' should also be מטמא when dried out – which it isn't (people avoid it in all cases)
 - 1 Rather: the תורה calls it שְׂכֶבֶת זָרַע (v. 1) - must be capable of הזרעה (moist)
 - (a) Similarly: says במוותם (v. 2 - must be as moment of death – not dried out)
- c Challenge: it isn't מאוס – kings eat it
 - i Answer: that is a fieldmouse; domestic rats are מאוס
- d Final ruling (רבא): נטל"פ מותר – but unclear why רב prohibited the mead (above)
 - i Perhaps: because he holds נטל"פ אסור (but we reject that) or because he holds that a rat is טעם משביח (?)
- e Case: ר' כהנא banned vinegar after rat fell in
 - i ד' אשי: in that case, it was in littlepieces; concern that someone may eat the rat itself'
 - ii דבינא suggested that it be measured against 100 – no worse than תרומה (suggestion – be like תרומה)
 - iii Some: suggested we use 50, but the consensus is to measure איסור against 60 times – as in all בתורה