

דף יומי • חלין • דף ק"ח

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We start off the daf finishing up the sugya from the previous daf regarding the Syrian cakes of Baitos on Pesach, and whether we are choshesh that people will try to copy his special molds. From there, we move into a major new Mishnah that deals with the classic halachos of basar b'chalav, specifically a drop of milk that falls onto a piece of meat in a pot. The Mishnah lays down the rules of when the piece itself becomes forbidden, and when the entire pot becomes forbidden based on whether the milk's flavor is narsan ta'am and whether the pot was stirred immediately.

In the Gemara, the Chachamim delve into a fundamental chakirah: is the concept of "ta'am k'ikar" (that the absorbed flavor of a forbidden food has the same status as the food itself) d'Oraisa or d'Rabbanan? We also learn the famous shittah of Rav that "chatichah na'aseth neveilah" (Chanan)—meaning that once the piece of meat absorbs the milk and becomes forbidden, the entire piece itself becomes a forbidden entity (like neveilah) and can go on to forbid the rest of the pot if there isn't enough to nullify the whole piece.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 108A

QUESTION

כל הסריקין אסורין וסריקאי בייטוס מותרין?

The Gemara asks: Are **all Syrian cakes forbidden** to be baked on Pesach because they require too much time to shape, **and the Syrian cakes of Baitos**, who was wealthy and had special molds, **permitted**? How could we rely on his special molds when others might try to copy him without molds?

ANSWER

התם, הא אמר מר בר רב אשי: איזורו מוכיח עליו.

The Gemara answers: **There**, in that case, **did not Mar, the son of Rav Ashi, say: His belt is proof for him?** In those days, a person typically had only one belt. If he wore it on a wet shirt, it proved he had no other shirt to wear. Here too, the unique shape of Baitos's cakes made it obvious to everyone that they were made with a mold, so there was no concern that others would copy him by hand.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' טיפת חלב שנפלה על החתיכה, אם יש בה פנה פנותין טעם באותה חתיכה – אסור.

MISHNAH: In the case of a **drop of milk that fell on a piece** of meat, **if there is in it enough milk to impart flavor to that specific piece** of meat, then that piece of meat is **forbidden**.

MISHNAH

ביער את הקדרה, אם יש בה בנותן טעם באותה קדרה – אסור.

If **one stirred the pot** immediately, or if the piece fell and was submerged, **if there is in it** enough milk **to impart flavor to** the contents of **that** entire **pot**, then the contents of the entire pot are **forbidden**; otherwise, the milk is batel in sixty and everything is permitted.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גמ' אמר אביי: טעמו ולא ממשו בעלמא – דאורייתא.

GEMARA: Abaye said: The principle that the **flavor** of a forbidden food **and not its substance** is sufficient to forbid a mixture **in general** is **by Torah law**, and not just a Rabbinic stringency.

EXPLANATION

דאי סלקא דעתך דרבנן, מבשר בלב מאי טעמא לא גמרינן?

As, if it enters your mind that in other prohibitions it is only **Rabbinic**, then **what is the reason we do not learn** that it is forbidden by Torah law **from** the case of **meat in milk**, where the Torah clearly forbids the absorbed flavor?

EXPLANATION

דחידוש הוא.

You might answer: We cannot learn from meat in milk **because it is a novelty**, since each ingredient is permitted on its own, and they only become forbidden when cooked together. And we cannot derive other halachos from a novelty.

EXPLANATION

אי חדוש הוא, אף על גב דליכא נותן טעם נמי!

But **if it is a novelty**, then **even though there is no imparting of flavor**, it should **also** be forbidden! Since the Torah made the prohibition depend on cooking, which is all about imparting flavor, it shows that the Torah is treating it under the standard rules of mixtures. Therefore, it is not a novelty, and we can derive from it that flavor is like substance by Torah law for all prohibitions.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רבא: דרך ... אסרה תורה.

Rava said to him: This is no proof. It is indeed a novelty, but **the Torah forbade** it only in the **manner of cooking**, and cooking by definition requires the imparting of flavor.

STATEMENT

אמר רב: כיון שנותן טעם בכתיתה, חתיכה עצמה נעשית נבלה, ואוסרת כל החתיכות כולן, מפני שהן מינה.

Rav said: **Once** the milk **has imparted flavor to the piece** of meat, the **piece itself becomes** like **nevelah**—a forbidden entity in its own right—and if it is not stirred in, **it forbids all the** other **pieces** in the pot, **because they are of its own type**, and min b'mino is not nullified.

QUESTION

אמר ליה מר זוטרא בריה דרב מרי לרבינא: מכדי רב כמאן אמר לשמעתיה? כרבי יהודה, דאמר מין במינו לא בטיל,

Mar Zutra, the son of Rav Mari, said to Ravina: Now consider, in accordance with whom did Rav state his halakha? It must be in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda, who said that a type of food mixed with its own type is not nullified.

QUESTION

לימא פליגא אדרבא? דאמר רבא: קסבר רבי יהודה, כל שהוא מין ומינו ודבר אחר – סלק את מינו כמי שאינו, ושאינו מינו רבה עליו ומבטלו.

If so, shall we say that Rav disagrees with that which Rava said? As Rava said: Rabbi Yehuda holds that in any mixture that is composed of a forbidden type, its own type which is permitted, and another substance which is permitted, we say: Remove its own type and view it as if it is not there, and then the permitted substance that is not of its own type (the gravy) is greater than it and nullifies it. Why doesn't the gravy in the pot nullify the forbidden piece of meat according to Rav?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אי דנפל פרוטב רבה – הכי נמי, הכא במאי עסקינן – דנפל פרוטב עבה.

Ravina said to him: If it fell into thin gravy, indeed so, the gravy would nullify it. But here we are dealing with a case where it fell into thick gravy, which is considered the same type as the meat, so there is no "other substance" to nullify it.

QUESTION

ומאי קסבר? אי קסבר אפשר לסוחטו מותר, חתיכה אמאי נעשית נבלה?

The Gemara asks: And what does Rav hold regarding the principle of whether a piece of meat that absorbed forbidden taste can be squeezed out? If he holds that an item that is possible to squeeze out and remove its forbidden taste becomes permitted, then the piece of meat itself why should it become nevelah? The milk inside it should just diffuse into the rest of the pot and be nullified!

ANSWER

אלא קסבר אפשר לסוחטו אסור.

Rather, he must hold that an item that is possible to squeeze out remains forbidden, because the piece itself became a forbidden entity.

STATEMENT

דאיתמר: רב ורבי חנינא ורבי יוחנן דאמרי: אפשר לסוחטו – אסור,

As it was stated in a dispute: Rav, and Rabbi Chanina, and Rabbi Yochanan say: An item that is possible to squeeze out remains forbidden,

STATEMENT

שמואל ורבי שמעון בר רבי וריש לקיש דאמרי: אפשר לסוחטו – מותר.

while Shmuel, and Rabbi Shimon the son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and Reish Lakish say: An item that is possible to squeeze out becomes permitted.

QUESTION

וסבר רב אפֿשר לְסוּחֶטוֹ אָסוּר? וְהָאִיתָמַר: כְּזִית בָּשָׂר שֶׁנִּפְל לְתוֹךְ יוֹרָה שֶׁל חֶלֶב, אָמַר רַב: בָּשָׂר אָסוּר וְחֶלֶב מוּתָר,

The Gemara asks: **And does Rav really hold** that an item that is **possible to squeeze out** remains **forbidden**? But was it not **stated**: If an olive-bulk of meat fell into a large vat of milk, and there was enough milk to nullify the meat's flavor, Rav said: The meat is forbidden, but the milk is permitted?

QUESTION

וְאִי סָלָקָא דְעֵתָהּ אֶפְשָׁר לְסוּחֶטוֹ אָסוּר,

And if it enters your mind that Rav holds that an item that is **possible to squeeze out** remains **forbidden**, then why is the milk permitted? The meat should become a forbidden entity, and in turn forbid the milk!

עמוד ב' DAF 108B

QUESTION

חֶלֶב אֲמַאי מוּתָר? חֶלֶב נִבְלָה הוּא!

The Gemara asks: But why is the **milk permitted** in the case of the pot? Surely the **milk** that was absorbed in the meat and then expelled **is** like **neveilah**, a forbidden substance in its own right, and since it is mixed with its own kind, it should not be nullified!

ANSWER

לְעוֹלָם קָסְבַּר רַב אֶפְשָׁר לְסוּחֶטוֹ אָסוּר, וְשֵׁאֲנִי הֵתֵם דְּאָמַר קָרָא "לֹא תִבְשֹׁל גִּידִי בַחֲלֵב אִמּוֹ" – גִּידִי אֶסְרָה תוֹרָה, וְלֹא חֶלֶב.

The Gemara answers: **Actually, Rav holds** that an item that can be wrung out is forbidden, meaning the absorbed taste does become neveilah. **But it is different there** in the case of the pot of milk, as the verse says, "You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk" — which implies that only the **kid**, meaning the meat, the Torah forbade, but not the **milk**. The milk itself does not become a forbidden entity.

QUESTION

וסבר רב גְּדִי אֶסְרָה תוֹרָה וְלֹא חֶלֶב? וְהָאִיתָמַר:

The Gemara challenges: **And does Rav really hold** that only the **kid** the Torah forbade, but not the **milk**? But surely it was **stated** in a dispute:

STATEMENT

חֲצִי זֵית בָּשָׂר וְחֲצִי זֵית חֶלֶב שֶׁבִשְׁשָׁלָן זֶה עִם זֶה, אָמַר רַב: לֹקֶה עַל אֲכִילָתוֹ, וְאִינוּ לֹקֶה עַל בִּשּׁוּלוֹ.

If half an olive-bulk of meat and half an olive-bulk of milk were cooked together, Rav says: One is flogged for eating it, because they combine to form a full shiur of forbidden food, but he is not flogged for cooking it, because he did not cook a full shiur of meat and milk.

OBJECTION

וְאִי סָלָקָא דְעֵתָהּ גִּידִי אֶסְרָה תוֹרָה וְלֹא חֶלֶב, אֲאָכִילָה אֲמַאי לֹקֶה? חֲצִי שִׁיעוּר הוּא!

And if it should enter your mind to say that only the **kid** the Torah forbade, but not the **milk**, then for eating it, why is he flogged? It is only **half a shiur** of forbidden meat that he ate, since the milk is not forbidden!

RESOLUTION

אָלאַ, לְעוֹלָם קָסֶבֶר רַב חֵלֶב נָמִי אָסוּר, וְהָכָא בְּמֵאֵי עֲסָקִינוּ? כְּגוֹן שֶׁנִּפְל לְתוֹךְ יוֹרֶה רוֹתַחַת, דְּמִבְּלַע
כֶּלֶע, מִפְּלֵט לֹא פְלֵט.

Rather, actually Rav holds that the **milk is also forbidden**. And here, in the case where Rav permitted the pot of milk, with what are we dealing? For example, where the piece of meat fell into a **boiling pot** of milk, where the meat only absorbs the milk, but it **does not expel** any of its absorbed taste back into the pot while it is boiling.

QUESTION

סוף סוף כי נִיֵּיחַ, הֵדָר פְּלִיט!

The Gemara asks: **Ultimately, when** the pot **cools down**, it will **expel** the forbidden taste back into the milk!

ANSWER

כְּשֶׁקָדָם וְסִיֵּקוּ.

The Gemara answers: We are dealing with a case **where he went ahead and removed** the meat before the pot cooled down.

STATEMENT

גּוֹפֵא: חֲצִי זֵית בָּשָׂר וְחֲצִי זֵית חֵלֶב שֶׁבִשְׁלָן זֶה עִם זֶה, אָמַר רַב: לֹקֵחַ עַל אֲכִילָתוֹ, וְאִינוּ לֹקֵחַ עַל
בִּשּׁוּלוֹ.

The Gemara returns to the **text itself** quoted above: If **half an olive-bulk of meat and half an olive-bulk of milk were cooked together**, Rav says: **One is flogged for eating it, but he is not flogged for cooking it**.

QUESTION

מָה נִפְשָׁר? אִי מִצְטָרְפִין – אֲבִשּׁוּל נָמִי לִילְקִי, אִי לֹא מִצְטָרְפִין – אֲאָכִילָה נָמִי לֹא לִילְקִי.

The Gemara asks: **Whichever way you want to look at it**, this is difficult! If they **combine** to form a shiur, then for **cooking it** also let him be flogged! And if they do not combine, then for **eating it** also let him not be flogged!

ANSWER

לְעוֹלָם לֹא מִצְטָרְפִי, וּבָבָא מִיּוֹרָה גְּדוּלָּה.

The Gemara answers: **Actually, they do not combine** on their own. **But** Rav is dealing with a case **where** this half-olive-bulk of meat and half-olive-bulk of milk **came from a large pot** where a full shiur of meat and milk had already been cooked together and became forbidden, so they are already a single forbidden entity.

STATEMENT

וְלֵוִי אָמַר: אִף לֹקֵחַ עַל בִּשּׁוּלוֹ, וְכֵן תַּנִּי לֵוִי בְּמִתְנִיתֵינוּ: כָּשֶׁם שֶׁלֹּקֵחַ עַל אֲכִילָתוֹ כִּף לֹקֵחַ עַל
בִּשּׁוּלוֹ,

And Levi said: He is even flogged for **cooking it**, because they do combine. And so Levi taught in his Braisa: Just as he is flogged for **eating it**, so he is flogged for **cooking it**.

EXPLANATION

ובאי זה בשול אמרו? בבשול שאחרים אוכלין אותו מחמת בשולו.

And for what degree of cooking did they say he is liable? For cooking that others, meaning non-Jews, would eat because of its cooking, which is the level of Ma'achal Ben Derusai.

STATEMENT

ואפשר לסוחרטו עצמו – תנאי היא, דתנאי:

The Gemara notes: And the question of an item that can be wrung out itself is a dispute between Tannaim, as it is taught in a Braisa:

BRAISA

טפת חלב שנפלה על החתיכה, כיון שנתנה טעם בחתיכה – החתיכה עצמה נעשית נבלה, ואוסרת כל החתיכות כולן מפני שהן מינה, דברי רבי יהודה.

If a drop of milk fell on a piece of meat, once it gives taste to the piece, the piece itself becomes neveilah, a forbidden entity, and it forbids all the other pieces in the pot because they are its own kind and min b'min is not nullified. This is the words of Rabbi Yehuda.

BRAISA

וחכמים אומרים: עד שתתן טעם ברוטב ובקיפה ובחתיכות.

And the Sages say: The drop of milk does not forbid the pot until it gives taste to the gravy, and to the sediment, and to the pieces altogether, because we look at the whole pot as one mixture.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי: נראין דברי רבי יהודה בשלא נייער ושללא כסה, ודברי חכמים בשנייער וכסה.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: The words of Rabbi Yehuda seem correct in a case where he did not stir and did not cover the pot, and the words of the Sages seem correct in a case where he stirred and covered it.

QUESTION

מאי "לא נייער ולא כסה"? אי לימא לא נייער כלל, ולא כסה כלל – מבליע בלע, מבליט לא פליט.

The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of "he did not stir and did not cover"? If we say he did not stir at all and did not cover at all, then the piece only absorbs the milk, but it does not expel it! If so, why should the other pieces be forbidden even according to Rabbi Yehuda?

QUESTION

ואלא, לא נייער בתחלה אלא בסוף, ולא כסה בתחלה אלא בסוף, אמאי? הא בלע והא פליט!

Rather, must we say that he did not stir at the beginning but only at the end, and did not cover at the beginning but only at the end? If so, why are the other pieces forbidden? Behold, it absorbed and behold, it expelled the milk, so the milk should be nullified in sixty times its amount throughout the pot!

ANSWER

קסבר אפשר לסוחרטו אסור.

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi **holds that an item that can be wrung out is forbidden**. Once the first piece absorbed the milk, it became neveilah, and even though the milk was later expelled and nullified, the piece itself remains forbidden and forbids the rest of the pieces.

SUMMARY

The Gemara analyzes the source for ta'am k'ikar, debating whether we can derive it from basar b'chalav, which is a chiddush since both ingredients start out permitted. We then have a deep shakla v'tarya on Rav's shittah of chatichah na'aseth neveilah, exploring how this fits with Rabbi Yehuda's view on min b'mino and whether we can apply the rule of "efshar l'sochto asur" (that a piece which absorbed forbidden taste remains forbidden even if the taste is squeezed out). The daf concludes with a challenge to Rav's view from a case of meat falling into a vat of milk, leading to a discussion on whether the Torah's prohibition of basar b'chalav applies equally to the milk as it does to the meat.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The yeshivish kop is always drawn to the famous machlokes in our sugya: is "efshar l'sochto asur" or "mutar"? If you have a piece of meat that absorbed a drop of milk, and you can theoretically squeeze that milk right back out, does the meat become a forbidden entity in its own right, what Rav calls "chatichah naasis neveilah", or does it go back to its permitted state? Rav holds that once the forbidden taste enters, the piece itself is transformed. It becomes a d'var issur, and even if you squeeze it out, that status remains.

Think about what this means in our own avodas Hashem. A person sometimes thinks, "I can indulge in this questionable behavior, or let a coldness enter my heart just for a moment, and then I'll just 'squeeze it out' and go right back to how I was before." We think we can touch the issur and remain completely unaffected once we walk away. But the Torah is teaching us a deep yesod: when you let something improper enter your system, it doesn't just sit there passively. It changes you. It reshapes your spiritual reality, making you a different person who now has to deal with that spiritual residue.

But the true chiddush of this yesod is that it works even stronger in the direction of kedushah. When you sit down to learn a blatt Gemara, or when you do a chesed with another Yid, that holy influence doesn't just pass through you and leave you the same. It transforms you. You become a "chatichah of kedushah", a vessel that has absorbed the sweetness of Torah and mitzvos, and that elevated status stays with you throughout the entire day.

Today, before you do a mitzvah or learn Torah, take ten seconds to realize that this act is going to permanently elevate who you are. Let that kedushah sink in and transform you.