## 26.5.11

73a (משנה ח) → 74a (מעוטי איסור הנאה ולא דבר שבמנין)

- ו משנה ח': basic of תערובות איסור בהיתר
  - a יין נסך prohibits with the smallest amount
    - If: wine (of איסור) fell into wine; or water into water איסור בכל שהוא (no ביטול)
    - ii But if: wine fell into water or vice-versa only prohibits if taste of איסור is perceptible in mix
    - iii Rule: מין במינו (מב"מ) no מין בשאינו מינו (מבשא"מ) (מבשא"מ) if the taste is felt (מב"מ) –"
- II Ruling by ר' יותנן (brought by יותני): if someone is pouring יי"ג into a cistern even all day, each drop that falls in is בטל
  - a Challenge: משנה rules that יי"ג prohibits at any amount
    - Defense: our משנה is referring to a case where יי"נ even though eventually there's more אסור, still אסור, היתר
  - b Challenge: next clause in our משנה if wine falls into water, אסור בנ"ט (we don't say אסיר בטיל)
    - Isn't this: a case where יי"ג fell into permitted water?
    - ii Rejection: case is where proper wine fell into prohibited water
      - 1 If so: "water" in משנה is always מים אסורים, in which case the inverse case water into wine (ננ"ט) refutes ד' יוחנן
        - (a) Defense: don't make "water" consistently אסור, rather the "base liquid" is אסור and the "falling" liquid מותר
  - c Moidifed version (brought by בטל si f he pours from a small flask, each drop is בטל
    - i Caveat: only if it is from a small flask, with a light stream; but a barrel, with a strong stream אסור
- III מצא מין את מינו וניעור regarding ר' יוחנן (report from רבין
  - a If: יי"ג fell into בור of permissible wine and a flask of water fell in
    - i *Then*: we ignore the permissible wine, allowing the water to nullify the יי"ג
    - ii Caveat (יוחנן in r' שמואל בר יהודה): only if water fell in first
      - 1 But: if wine fell in first מצא מין את מינו וניעור and all wine is considered אסור
    - iii Note: some read this as comment on יין ביין משנה prohibits with any amount
      - 1 יי"ג and water nullifies יין של היתר and water nullifies יין של היתר and water nullifies יי"ג מיונג שמואל בר יהודה בשם ר' יוחנן
    - iv Question: how do those who read this as comment on משנה differ from those who read as comment on רבין?
      - 1 Answer: those who read it as comment on משנה don't require water to fall in first
  - b Related discussion/dispute: if יי"ג and water fell into a בור
    - i if it "grew" יין של היתר) באיסור (יי"ג if אסור, אסור, ווו'"ג if אסור, אסור, אסור, וווקיה; fell last) מותר
    - ii *ר' יוחנן:* even if it "grew" מותר באיסור
    - iii Suggestion (ר' זירא): perhaps הייוחנן/חזקיה replicates תרומה re: חולין and חולין leaven in dough:
      - 1 If: there was חולין-leaven and חולין-leaven, neither of which was enough to leaven the dough on its own and they both fell in and leavened:
        - (a) א"ז. whichever was last defines the status (כחזקיה?)
        - (b) תכמים. in no case is it prohibited until the תרומה-leaven is enough by itself (כר"י)?)
      - 2 Rejection: אביי noted that the dispute is only in case he removed the תרומה first
        - (a) Therefore: חזקיה (in this proposed alignment) follows neither opinion
    - iv Rather: dispute is whether we apply רואין imagining היתר wine to be absent, generating מבשא"מ
      - 1 Challenge: ד' יוחנן was asked about a parallel situation and didn't have an answer:
        - (a) Situation: if he took הרומה—wine and mixed with הולין—wine and then put into water is it 2.
      - 2 Answer: at that point, he hadn't formulated a position; he subsequently did
      - 3 *Proof*: חולין ruled that if חולין mine are mixed, then go into water we ignore the חולין and allow the water to nullify the הרומה wine
- IV Analysis of "rule" at end of משנה; dispute רב ושמואל/ר"י ור"ל regarding מב"מ of ביטול
  - a בכל שהוא prohibit at מב"מ if ב"ט prohibit at מב"מ prohibit at בכל שהוא בכל שהוא בכל שהוא מב"מ (ב"ט ב"מ הי"ט בבייתא
    - i In which case: "rule" of our משנה implies extension from יי"נ to all איסורי
  - b ברייתא (בכל שהו מב"מ) טבל and יי"ג and יי"ג except for בנ"ט מבשא"מ ה whether איסורים.) (ברייתא (בכל שהו
    - i in which case "rule" of our משנה implies extension to טבל alone
    - ii question: why is טבל singled out (along with י"י)?
      - 1 Answer: since the entire pile of wheat could be exempted with one wheat-stalk; 1 is also enough to prohibit
      - 2 Note: מב"ט only prohibits מב"מ מב"מ only prohibits מב"ט only prohibits מין בשאינו מינו
- V משנה ט: list of those items that generate איסור with the smallest measure (i.e. no ביטול)
  - a נזיר, אנורע, staked pelts, ע"ז, שור הנסקל, birds of a נזיר, מצורע's hair, first-born donkey, בב"ח, the "sent" goat and חולין, that were slaughtered in the עורה
    - i Clarification: items on list are both איסורי הנאה and דבר שבמנין else, they are omitted from list
      - 1 Note: parallel list in ערלה ג:ז covers others which are omitted here