

30.7.9

99b (ושאין מינו רבה עליו ומבטלו) → 100b (כיצד משערין) →

- I Analysis of last clause in 'משנה ד': use ratio of meat to turnips
- a Clarification (ר' הונא): use meat with turnip heads as ratio
- b Note: our משנה is contrary to ר' ישמעאל בנו של ריב"ב – who rules that אין בגידין בנ"ט – which is the הלכה
- i Note: ר' אמאי בגידין בנ"ט, against ר' חנינא and ר' חנינא
- II משנה ה (which is printed with משנה ד on צו):
- a If: a גיד is cooked among other (permissible) גידין (i.e. במינו) –
- i If: he can recognize the offensive one (and take it out) – it only prohibits the others בנ"ט
- 1 If not: all are forbidden
- (a) Challenge: why not allow it to be ברוב
- (b) Answer: since it is a complete piece (בריה) it cannot be nullified
- 2 In any case: the gravy is forbidden if there is נ"ט
- b Same: applies to נבלה or piece of טמא
- i Challenge: why isn't the piece (of meat or fish) ברוב
- 1 Answer: if we read (in ערלה ג:) anything which is ever counted out (is מקדש בכל שהוא), we understand, as such pieces are sometimes sold as units; but if we read (ibid) anything which is always counted out - why not בטל?
- 2 However: in this case, since it is a חתיכה הראויה להתכבד בה – a "piece worthy of serving to guests" – not בטל
- ii Justification: of both גיד and pieces (of נבלה and fish)
- 1 If: we only learned about גידין, we would think that they aren't בטל since they are בריה
- 2 And if: we only learned about חתיכה, we would surmise that they aren't בטל as they are חתיכה הראויה להתכבד בה
- (a) Therefore: both examples are needed
- III חנה בר בר חנה's ruling, רב's reaction and the subsequent discussion
- a Ruling: the דג טמא (or נבלה) only prohibits the pot if it flavors the gravy, dregs and other pieces
- i דב: publicly declared – once the offending piece flavored a neighboring piece (of היתר), that becomes חנינ
- 1 And: that, in turn, prohibits all the other pieces as מב"מ
- 2 Analysis (רב ספרא לאביי): רב seems to be following יהודה ר' who rules that מב"מ is never nullified
- (a) If so: he should prohibit even without נתינת טעם
- (b) Answer (אביי): in this case, he pulled out the offending piece (and its gravy) before putting in the rest
- (c) Answer (רבא): even without establishing the case as קדם וסלקו (he pulled out the offending piece first)
- (i) It could still: be defended as a rule of מינו+something else (the spices and gravy)
1. And: the rule is – מין במינו ודבר אחר, we "erase" the מינו as if it isn't there and allow the דבר אחר (which is not מינו) to nullify it by majority, which would only work if we didn't employ חנינ
2. However: by employing חנינ, the gravy etc. aren't enough to nullify it → אסור