26.5.6

68a (ואמר עולא מחלוקת שהשביח ולבסוף פגם)  $\rightarrow 69a$  (ואמר עולא מחלוקת שהשביח ולבסוף פגם)

וּ וְכָל בֶּגֶד וְכָל עוֹר אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה עָלְיו **שִׁרְבַת זְרְע** וְכַבַּס בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד הָעָרֶב: *ויקרא טו:יז* 2. אֵלֶה הַטְמֵאִים לָכֶם בְּכָל הַשָּׁרֶץ כָּל הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהֶם **בְּמֹתֶם** יִטְמָא עַד הָעָרְב: *ויקרא יא:לא* 

- I Continuation analysis of dispute נטל"פ regarding נטל"פ
  - a אילא: dispute only in case where the offending food first enhanced, then fouled taste
    - i But: if its first contact fouled the היתר food, all agree that it is מותר
    - ii Challenge (י"ע wine ברייתא wine אסור wine אסור ברייתא wine (י"ע) that fell into lentils or vinegar into beans אסור
      - 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 ייחק. 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 היקו) or is dispute in both? תיקו
    - ii Support (מרם ''ש ''א '''): yeast of חולין that leavened, then yeast of תרומה fell in ר"ש אסור 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: תרומה Past, 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 in 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 מבח above (extra שבח 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 לכתחי)
          - (ii) Suggestion: perhaps this is answered as did משביח to עולא to משביח it was first משביח (cold beans/lentils)
            - 1. Rejection: no one disagrees in such a case it's אסור לכו"ע
            - 2. Conclusion: disagreement is in case of פוגם לכתחילה (even there ב"מ forbids)
- II Analsysis of ברייתא justification of 3 clauses (תרומה/חולין) yeast falling together; one after the other, wine on lentils etc.)
  - a שיפא. teaches that they even disagree in case of fouling at first contact (מימ) still prohibits)
  - b מציעא (when they fell in in sequence): if it first enhanced then fouled all agree that it is אסור
  - c אסור is obviously שבח, as there the first contact was שבח
    - Answer (אביי): teaches us the extreme nature of ר"ש's position:
      - 1 Reconstruction: ר"ש said to "- what caused the dough (with double yeast) to rise quicker איסור
      - 2 שנח response: just as the שבח was caused by both, so too the מותר was due to both ( $\rightarrow$  מותר was due to both)
      - 3 Challenge: איסור should allow היתר to join היתר and prohibit
        - (a) Answer: ר"ש is consistent he even holds that איסור doesn't combine with איסור to prohibit:
        - (b) ערלה: מעילה ד:ו and כלאי הכרם מצטרף are לשעור) לשעור) dissents
- III Case: mouse fell into mead and דב prohibited
  - a Students to רב :ד' ששת holds that נטל"פ אסור (!)
  - b אי הי he agrees that נטל"פ מותר; 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, שכ"ז should also be מטמא when dried out which it isn't (people avoid it in all cases)
      - 1 Rather: the תורה calls it שכבת זרע (v. 1) must be capable of הזרעה (moist)
        - (a) Similarly: says במותם (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 (נטל"פ מותר but unclear why דב prohibited the mead (above)
    - i Perhaps: because he holds נטל"פ אסור (but we reject that) or because he holds that a rat is משביח טעם (?)
  - e Case: ר' כהנא banned vinegar after rat fell in
    - i ה' אשי. in that case, it was in littlepieces; concern that someone may eat the rat itself
    - ii תבינא suggested that it be measured against 100 no worse than תרומה (suggestion be like תבלי תרומה)
    - iii Some: suggested we use 50, but the consensus is to measure איסורים בתורה against 60 times as in all איסורים