30.8.5

Π

i

(ותו לא מידי) א 109a → 109a (משנה ב)

ז. ראשית בִּכּוּרֵי אַדְמָתְךּ תָּבִיא בֵּית ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לא תְבַשֵּׁל גָּדִי בַּחָלָב אָמוֹ: שמות כג, יט

- I משנה permissible to wrap meat and cheese in one cloth, provided they aren't touching (אביי) even though they are cold and wouldn't require peeling away the layer that touched, they'd still need to be washed off)
 - דשב״ג 2 guests (at an inn) may eat at one table, this one eating meat and the other eating cheese without concern
 - i שמואל: this is only true if they don't know each other;
 - ii Support: רשב"ג, citing רשב"ג, limits permission to "passing strangers", but not if they are joined (כתפיסה אחת)
 - iii *Question*: what if there are 2 brothers who don't allow sharing (w/each other)?
 - 1 Answer: we can't make exceptions for extraordinary circumstances (יאמרו כל הסריקין אסורין וסריקי בייתוס (יאמרו כל הסריקין אסורין וסריקי בייתוס אסורין אסורין וסריקי בייתוס אסורין א
 - 2 *Challenge*: חוה״מ permitted someone with only one garment to wash it on חוה״מ
 (a) *Answer*: in that case, the belt (on the garment being washed) proves that he only has one
 - משנה גו: if a drop of milk fell onto a piece of (cooking) meat, if it flavors that piece אסור
 - a If: he stirred the pot if it flavors the entire pot אסור
 - b Observation (אביי): the status of טעם (without substance) as redefining the flavored food must be מה"ת
 - בב״ח Argument: if it were מד״ם, why wouldn't we infer it being מה״ת from בב״ח
 - 1 And: if you were to argue that בב״ת can't be a model as it is a חידוש
 - 2 *Then*: why wouldn't we prohibit בב״ח even without flavoring?
 - ii Block (א תבשל only prohibited (by using לא תבשל) foods which are mixed via cooking (i.e. taste)
 - מין במינו when the first piece is flavored, חנ"נ, when the first piece as they are מין במינו
 - i challenge: רב is adopting מב״מ לא בטיל) but why not apply רבא and הודה and מב״מ מא בטיל and הבר אחר hut why not apply
 - ii *defense*: indeed, if the gravy were soft (liquid), we would employ it; רב is referring to a case where it is thick (מינו=)
 - 1 *however*: he must maintain that in such a case, when the איסור is exuded, it remains אסור)
 - (a) per: dispute אפשר לסוחטו אסור vs. מותר vs. מותר שמואל ור' חייא ור"ל (1st group) אפשר לסוחטו אסור (1st group) אפשר לסוחטו אסור
 - (b) challenge: אפשר לסוחטו מותר apparently holds אפשר לסוחטו אותר, per his ruling: if a piece of meat fell into a pot of meat, the meat is חנ״נ and the milk permitted; but if אפל״ס אסור, the milk should be חנ״נ
 - 2 *answer*: v. 1 only indicates a prohibition on the meat, not the milk
 - 3 *challenge*: בזית rules that if לי milk is cooked with לי meat, there are מכות for eating the mix (but not for בישול)
 - (a) rather: רב certainly holds that both are אסורים, but in this case, it fell into a boiling pot only בולע, not פולט
 - (b) Challenge: when it stops boiling, it should be (ועם בשר) and prohibit the milk
 - (i) *Answer*: circumstance where he removed it before it stopped boiling
 - iii Revisiting ¹/2 כזית of each ruling: why no מכות for cooking (if the 2 half-מצטרף are מצטרף)?
 - 1 Answer1: they are not מצטרף, but the food came from a larger pot → לוקה for eating it
 - 2 *Dissent (ילוי)*: there are also מכות for cooking together (full (צירוף)
 - (a) Support: מכות that way there are מכות for cooking, as long as it is cooked as people eat it
 - d מחלוקת תנאים *redux*: is a אפשר לסוחטו:
 - i *If*: some milk fell onto one piece (of meat)
 - 1 מינה once it flavors that piece, it becomes חנ״נ and the rest, as מינה, are all prohibited
 - 2 *חכמים*. the milk must flavor all the pieces, the gravy and dregs to prohibit
 - (a) ר׳ יהודה rules per ר׳ יהודה if he didn't cover or stir the pot; and per רמים if he did either
 - (i) *Clarification*: לא ניער ולא כסה doesn't mean that he didn't do it at all; taste wouldn't flavor rest
 - 1. Rather: means that he didn't cover/stir at beginning, but after 1 piece was flavored
 - 2. *Challenge*: in that case, the taste was absorbed but also exuded
 - a. *Must be*: that he holds אפשר לסוחטו אסור
 - 3. Implication: רי יהודה holds that even if he covered/stirred the whole time, still אסור
 - a. *However*: in that case, the one piece absorbed no more than the rest
 - b. *Rather*: לא ניער יפה יפה means he didn't do it very effectively (לא ניער יפה יפה)
 - (ii) Clarification: רבי accepts חכמים 's position when he stirred/covered must mean "the whole time"
 - 1. *Argument*: if it only meant stirred/covered at end, רי יהודה ruled like ר' יהודה in that case
 - 2. Therefore: מותר must hold that if he only stirred/covered at end מותר
 - a. *Must be*: that they hold אפשר לסוחטו מותר
 - ii *Counter (ר' אחא מדיפתי*): perhaps they agree that אפשר לסוחטו אסור, and their dispute is whether בטל is בטל si מב״מ
 - 1 Block (*רבינא*): if so, אין נראין דברי ר"י when he didn't stir (well) and אין נראין דברי ר"י when he did