

VIII.

BAVLI HULLIN CHAPTER EIGHT

FOLIOS 103B-117B

8:1A-E

- A. Every [kind of] flesh [i.e., meat, of cattle, wild beast, and fowl] is it prohibited to cook in milk,
 - B. except for the flesh of fish and locusts.
 - C. And it is prohibited to serve it up onto the table with cheese,
 - D. except for the flesh of fish and locusts.
 - E. [104a] He who vows [to abstain] from flesh is permitted [to make use of] the flesh of fish and locusts.
- I.1** A. *Lo [from the rule of Mishnah we may deduce that mixing the flesh of] fowl [with milk] is prohibited based on the authority of the Torah.*
- B. *In accord with whose view [is this premise]? It is not in accord with the view of R. Aqiba. For if it were in accord with the view of R. Aqiba, lo he said [explicitly], “Wild beasts and fowl are not prohibited on the authority of the Torah [to be mixed with milk] [M. 8:4E].”*
 - C. *Consider the [implication of the] latter text of the Mishnah: He who vows [to abstain] from flesh is permitted [to make use of] the flesh of fish and locusts [E]. Lo [this implies that one who makes such a vow] is prohibited [to eat the flesh of] fowl.*
 - D. *This [latter text] follows in accord with the view of R. Aqiba who said, “In every instance that a messenger [has a doubt about the object of his mission and] would consult [the person who sent him about whether an item fits the description of the object he was sent for because he has sufficient grounds to do so — concerning that item we are justified to say] it is of the same category [as the item specified at the outset. The fact that the messenger had enough of a doubt to inquire shows that most people would deem the item to be subsumed under the original category.]”*
 - E. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority: He who vows not to eat vegetables is permitted to eat gourds. And R. Aqiba prohibits [him from eating gourds]. They said to R. Aqiba, “And does not a man say to his messenger, “Buy me vegetables,” to which the other replies [upon his return home], “I found only*

gourds'?" He said to them, "That is just how things are!" But would he say to him, "I found only pulse"? But gourds are in the general category of vegetables, while pulse is not in the general category of vegetables [M. **Ned. 7:1A-E**].” [Thus the latter text is in accord with the view of R. Aqiba.]

- F. *[Is it consistent to say that] the former text of the Mishnah is in accord with the view of the rabbis and the latter text is in accord with the view of R. Aqiba?*
- G. *[Yes it is consistent to say this because] said R. Joseph, “This is the method of Rabbi [Judah the Prince in redacting the Mishnah]. And he followed in accord with various Tannaite authorities. Regarding the rule concerning vows he followed in accord with the view of R. Aqiba. Regarding the rule of mixing flesh and milk he followed in accord with the view of the rabbis.”*
- H. *R. Ashi said, “All [of the Mishnah] is in accord with the view of R. Aqiba. And here is how you should state the matter: **Every [kind of] flesh [i.e., meat, of cattle, wild beast, and fowl] is it prohibited to cook in milk,** some of them [are prohibited] based on the authority of the words of the Torah and some of them [are prohibited] based on the authority of the words of the scribes, **except for the flesh of fish and locusts**, that are [prohibited] neither by the words of the Torah nor by the words of the scribes.”*

II.1 A. And it is prohibited to serve it up onto the table with cheese, [except for the flesh of fish and locusts (C-D)]:

- B. *Said R. Joseph, “We may derive from this the conclusion that [cooking] the flesh of fowl with milk is prohibited based on the authority of the Torah. Because if you concluded that it was prohibited based on the authority of the rabbis, [then that means] that the act of eating it was itself prohibited as a [rabbinic] decree. Would we then have the power to prohibit by decree serving [fowl and cheese on the same table] lest he come to eat [fowl and cheese together]? [This would amount to a rabbinic decree imposed upon another such prohibition.] And what is the source of the statement that they do not enact a [rabbinic] decree [as a precaution to prevent a person from violating another rabbinic] decree? As it was taught on Tannaite authority: **Dough offering separated [from produce that comes from] outside the Land of Israel [104b] may be eaten at the same table with a non-priest. And it may be given to any priest [not only to one who keeps the laws of purity] [M. Hal. 4:8L-M].***
- C. *Said to him Abbayye, “This is consistent [to draw this parallel to the rule of our Mishnah] if we were instructed [about this rule] concerning the case of dough offering separated [from produce that comes from] outside the Land of Israel that was now in the Land of Israel. For in that case there is reason to prohibit by decree [eating it at the same table with a non-priest] lest [he come to eat] dough offering separated [from produce that comes from] inside the Land of Israel which [a non-priest is prohibited to eat] based on the authority of the Torah. And we do not prohibit that by [rabbinic] decree. You may derive from this the conclusion [that we do not enact a rabbinic decree to prevent a person from violating another decree]. But if the case concerns [dough offering] outside the Land of Israel [the reason they do not prohibit eating it at the same table with a non-priest is] because there is no basis for making this decree. But here [in the*

case of the rule of our Mishnah] if you permit him to put fowl and cheese [on the same table] he will come to put [animal] flesh and cheese [on the same table] and will [possibly end up] eating flesh and milk [together] which is prohibited based on the authority of the Torah.”

- D. *R. Sheshet posed an objection [to the rule of Mishnah]: In the final analysis this is a case of one cold food [at worst touching] another cold food [which does not result in a forbidden mixture].*
- E. *Said Abbaye, “They made a decree [against this practice of bringing cold food to the table] lest one bring [the flesh and milk together (Cashdan: to the table)] in a boiling stew-pot [which is a forbidden mixture of milk and meat].”*
- F. But in the final analysis [a boiling stew-pot] is a secondary vessel [that is not in contact with the fire]. And [we have a principle that in regard to the law] a secondary vessel does not cook food [no matter how hot it gets. So we do not have here a case of milk cooked together with meat.]
- G. Rather [we must then say that] they made a decree [against this practice] lest one bring [the flesh and milk together (Cashdan: to the table) in a boiling stew-pot that is] a primary vessel [i.e., like a fondue pot in contact with a fire because that certainly is a prohibited means of cooking milk together with meat].

8:1F-J

- F. **“Fowl goes up onto the table with cheese, but it is not eaten,” the words of the House of Shammai.**
- G. **And the House of Hillel say, “It does not go up, and it is not eaten,”**
- H. **Said R. Yosé, “This is one of the lenient rulings of the House of Shammai and the strict rulings of the House of Hillel” [M. Ed. 4:1, 5:2].**
- I. **Concerning what sort of table did they speak?**
- J. **Concerning a table on which one eats. But as to a table on which one lays out [foods to prepare them for] cooking, one puts this [flesh] beside that [cheese] and does not scruple.**
- I.1 A.** *[It appears that the view in H of] R. Yosé is identical to that of the first Tannaite authority [of the Mishnah]. But if you wish to maintain that the difference between them is whether they may actually eat [fowl and cheese at the same table — then this is what the views would imply]: The first Tannaite authority would hold the view that they disputed about the rule of whether they may bring up [flesh and milk to the table]. With regard to whether they may eat [flesh and cheese at the same table] they did not dispute. And R. Yosé would say to him that whether they may eat is one of the rules that are classified as a leniency of the House of Shammai and a stringency of the House of Hillel.*
- B. *[But if this is your line of reasoning then consider that] lo it was taught on Tannaite authority, **R. Yosé says, “[There are] six opinions of the House of Shammai’s more lenient [rulings] and the House of Hillel’s more stringent [rulings] and this is one of them: ‘Fowl may be served up on the table together with cheese, but it may not be eaten,’ the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel say, ‘It may neither be served up with it nor eaten with it [M. Ed. 5:2 A-C].”***

C. *Lo this [argument] makes the novel point that whose view is [expressed as the view of] the first Tannaite authority? The view of R. Yosé. [And why does the Mishnah repeat the view?] Because anyone who states a matter in the name of its original author brings redemption to the world. As it states, “[And this came to the knowledge of Mordecai, and he told it to Queen Esther,] and Esther told the king in the name of Mordecai” (Est. 2:22).*

I.2 A. *Agra the father-in-law of R. Abba taught, “Fowl and cheese may be eaten without compunction.”*

B. *He taught this principle and he stated its intent: [One may eat fowl and cheese in the same meal] without washing one’s hands and without wiping one’s mouth [between eating the fowl and the cheese].*

C. *R. Isaac the son of R. Mesharshayya visited the house of R. Ashi. They brought before him cheese and he ate it. They brought before him meat and he ate it without first washing his hands.*

D. *They said to him, “But lo did not Agra the father-in-law of R. Abba teach, ‘Fowl and cheese may be eaten without compunction.’ [This implies that] fowl and cheese may be eaten, but that flesh and cheese may not be eaten [at the same meal unless one washes and wipes his mouth between eating them].”*

E. *He said to them, “This concern applies at night. But during the day, lo he can see [if his hands are clean or if there is food stuck to them].”*

I.3 A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: “The House of Shammai say he must wipe [his mouth between eating meat and cheese]. And the House of Hillel say he must wash it out.”*

B. *What does the rule that he must ‘wipe’ entail? And what does the rule that he must ‘wash’ entail?*

C. **[105a]** *If you maintain that, “The House of Shammai say they must wipe [his mouth between eating meat and cheese]” [means that] he does not have to wash it. “And the House of Hillel say he must wash it out” [means that] he does not have to wipe it, then in accord with whose view is the statement of R. Zira, “Wiping the mouth can be done only with bread”? [It is in accord with only the view of] the House of Shammai.*

D. *Rather it must be that, “The House of Shammai say he must wipe [his mouth between eating meat and cheese].” And he need not wash it out. And the House of Hillel say [he must wipe it] and he must wash it as well.*

E. *Then this is [among the] **opinions of the House of Shammai’s more lenient [rulings] and the House of Hillel’s more stringent [rulings].** Then let this be [listed among the] **opinions of the House of Shammai’s more lenient [rulings] and the House of Hillel’s more stringent [rulings in M. Eduyyot 4:5].** [And that is not possible.]*

F. *Rather it must be the case that, “The House of Shammai say he must wipe [his mouth between eating meat and cheese].” And he also must wash it out. And the House of Hillel say [he must] wash it out and he also must wipe it. One authority states one [of the requirements]. And the other authority states the other one [of the requirements]. And they do not dispute.*

I.4 A. *Reverting to the body of prior text [at C]: Said R. Zira, “Wiping the mouth can only be done with bread”?*

- B. *This concern only applies to wheat bread, but not to barley bread [because that is not effective for wiping the mouth].*
- C. *And concerning wheat bread as well this applies only to cold bread, but not to hot bread because that sticks to the roof of the mouth [and is not effective].*
- D. *And this concern applies only to soft bread, but not to hard bread.*
- E. *And the law accords with the view that all materials are effective for wiping the mouth except for flour, dates and vegetable greens.*

I.5 A. *R. Assi posed a question of R. Yohanan: “How much time must one wait between [eating] meat and cheese?”*

- B. *He said to him, “None at all.”*
- C. *[He said to him], “Is that so? Lo, did not R. Hisda say, ‘If one ate meat he is prohibited to eat cheese [right away]? If he ate cheese, he is permitted to eat meat [right away]? Rather, the question must be: How much time must one wait between [eating] cheese and meat? And the answer is, None at all.”*
- D. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing: said R. Hisda,” If one ate meat he is prohibited to eat cheese [right away]? If he ate cheese, he is permitted to eat meat [right away].”*
- E. *Said R. Aha bar Joseph to R. Hisda, “Regarding meat that is stuck between a person’s teeth — what is its status?”*
- F. *He recited concerning this, “While the meat was yet between their teeth, [before it was consumed, the anger of the Lord was kindled against the people, and the Lord smote the people with a very great plague]” (Num. 11:33). [It is called meat in the verse and that indicates its status.]*
- G. *Said Mar Uqba, “In this matter [of waiting between eating meat and milk] I cannot hold a candle to my father. Because when my father would eat meat he would wait until the same time the next day before he would eat cheese. But when I [eat meat] in that same meal I would not eat [cheese]. In the next meal I would eat [cheese].”*
- H. *Said Samuel, “In this matter [of keeping track of one’s property] I cannot hold a candle to my father. For my father would take inventory of his goods twice each day. But I take inventory [of my goods] once each day.”*
 - I. *Samuel is consistent with his view elsewhere. For said Samuel, “One who takes inventory of his goods every day will profit.”*
 - J. *Abbaye used to take inventory of his goods each day. One day he came upon his tenant farmer carrying off a bundle of wood. He said to him, “Where are you taking these?”*
 - K. *He said to him, “To the master’s house.”*
 - L. *He said to him, “The rabbis [who suggested that a person take inventory of his goods] are one step ahead of you.”*

- M. *R. Assi used to take inventory of his goods each day. He said, "Where is all the profit that Samuel spoke of?"*
- N. *One day he saw a aqueduct that had split on his property. He took his cloak, rolled it up and stuffed it [in the crack]. He shouted for help. People came and sealed it up. [In that one incident] he realized all the profit that Samuel had spoken of.*

Composite on Washing One's Hands at Dinner with Water

The issue of wiping one's mouth between eating meat and cheese provokes the inclusion of a large composite devoted to the topic of washing one's hands at dinner, with secondary interest in details of the same matter.

- I.6 A.** Said R. Idi bar Abin, said R. Isaac bar Ashian, "[Washing one's hands at dinner with] water — the first time fulfills a commandment; the last time is an obligation."
- B. *They posed a question [by way of contradiction]: "[Washing one's hands at dinner with] water — the first time and the last time are obligations; [washing in] the middle [of the dinner] is optional."*
- C. *[There is no contradiction.] When a commandment is contrasted with an optional act it is called an obligation.*
- I.7 A.** *Reverting to the body of the prior text [B]: "[Washing one's hands at dinner with] water — the first time and the last time are obligations; [washing in] the middle [of the dinner] is optional."*
- B. For the first time they wash [and let the water drip off their hands] either into a vessel or onto the ground. For the last time [they let the water drip] only into a vessel. *And some say:* They do not wash onto the ground.
- C. *What is the difference between these alternatives? The difference is [where he washes onto] a bed of cinders.*
- D. [Washing one's hands at dinner with] water — the first time they may wash either with cold or with hot water. And the last time they wash only with cold water because hot water softens up one's hands and does not remove the grime.
- I.8 A.** [Washing one's hands at dinner with] water — the first time they may wash either with cold or with hot water [D above].
- B. Said R. Isaac bar Joseph, said R. Yannai, "They taught this rule only regarding water that does not scald one's hand. **[105b]** But if the water [is so hot that] it scalds one's hand, they do not wash with it."
- C. *And there are those who teach this applies to the latter text: And the last time they wash only with cold water — but not with hot water.*
- D. Said R. Isaac bar Joseph, said R. Yannai, "They taught this only regarding water that scalds one's hand. But if the water does not scald one's hand, they do wash with it."

E. *We may derive from this the rule that regarding the first time [one washes] even if it would scald one's hand, one is permitted [to wash with it].*

I.9 A. *[Washing in] the middle [of the dinner] is optional.*

B. Said R. Nahman, "They taught that this only applies to [washing] between one cooked dish and another. But [washing] between a cooked dish and cheese is an obligation."

C. Said R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya, "Why did they say that [washing one's hands with] water the last time is an obligation? *Because there is a caustic kind of salt that can blind a person [if he does not wash it from his hand and then rubs it in his eye].*"

D. Said Abbaye, "*This [caustic salt] is so rare that only one grain is found in a kor of [ordinary salt].*"

E. Said R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi, "*[Concerning] one who measures salt, what is the rule?*"

F. *He said to him, "He does not have to [wash after doing this]."*

I.10 A. *Said Abbaye, "At first I reasoned that the reason they do not permit a person to wash and let the water go on the ground was because that pollutes [the house]. But then my master said to me that is because an evil spirit will rest upon them."*

B. *And said Abbaye, "At first I reasoned that they do not permit a person to remove anything from the table while someone is holding a cup to drink lest something occur to disrupt the dinner. But then my master said to me that it is because it may cause difficulty with vertigo [so Cashdan]. And we stated this [rule] only in a case where he removed something but did not replace it [on the table]. But if one removed something and replaced it, the rule does not apply. And we stated this rule only [in a case where he removed something and took it] beyond four cubits from the table. But where he removed it less than four cubits, the rule does not apply. And we stated this rule only [in a case where he removed something] that was essential to the dinner. But where he removed something that was not essential to the dinner, the rule does not apply."*

C. *Mar the son of R. Ashi was strict. He considered even a pestle and mortar for grinding spices essential to the meal.*

D. *And said Abbaye, "At first I reasoned that they gather up the crumbs from the floor [after dinner] on account of cleanliness. But then my master said to me that it was to make it difficult for [the spirit that causes] poverty [to act against a person]."*

E. *[This story illustrates that point.] There once was a person whom the spirit that causes poverty was following. [The spirit] could not overcome him because he was careful about gathering up the crumbs. One day [he went on a picnic and] ate his bread on the grass. Said [the spirit], "Now he will surely fall into my hands [since he cannot gather the crumbs from the grass]."* After he ate the man took a hoe and uprooted the grass and threw

[the sod] into the river. He heard [the spirit] saying, "Woe is me. For that man has expelled me from his house."

- F. *And said Abbayye, "At first I reasoned that they do not permit a person to drink the froth [on a beverage] because it is revolting. But then my master said to me that it was because it causes respiratory inflammation [Jastrow: Catarrh]."*
- G. *If one drinks it it causes respiratory inflammation. If one blows it away it causes a headache. If one brushes it off it causes poverty. What is the solution? Let it settle by itself.*
- H. *[The cure] for the respiratory inflammation caused by wine is beer. For that caused by beer, it is water. For that caused by water there is no cure. And about this they say, "The poor get poorer."*
- I. *And said Abbayye, "At first I reasoned that they do not permit a person to eat a vegetable from a bunch that was tied by the grower because it looks like gluttony (Cashdan). But then my master said to me [one avoids the practice] to make it difficult for sorcery [to affect a person]."*
- J. *R. Hisda and Rabbah bar R. Huna were going off on a ship. A certain matron said to them, "Take me along with you." They did not take her along. She cast a magical spell and seized the ship. They cast a magical spell that released the ship. She said to them, "What can I do to you? For you do not wipe with a potsherd. And you do not kill a louse that is on your clothes. And you do not eat a vegetable from a bunch that was tied up by the grower."*
- K. *And said Abbayye, "At first I reasoned that they do not permit a person to eat a vegetable that fell on the tray because it is revolting. But then my master said to me that doing that causes bad breath."*
- L. *And said Abbayye, "At first I reasoned that they do not permit a person to sit under a drain pipe because filthy water comes out of it [from people on the roof]. But then my master said to me that [they do not sit there] because demons are frequently in that place."*
- M. *There once were some movers transporting a barrel of wine. They paused to rest and placed it under a drain pipe. It burst. They brought [the barrel] before Mar bar R. Ashi. He brought out horns and exorcised the demon. It came before him. He said to it, "Why did you do this [i.e., break the barrel]?" It said to him, "What then should I have done? They put it down on my ear!" He said to it, "What were you doing in a public place? You are the deviant. Go and pay [for the damages you did]." It said to him, "I will consider the matter. Give me some time and I will pay." He gave it some time. When the time elapsed it refused to pay. He said to it, "Why did you not perform within the time you were given?" It said to him, "We have no right to take from anything that is tied up or sealed or measured out or counted out. We must wait to find something that was forsaken [such as the barrel placed under the drain pipe]."*
- N. *And said Abbayye, "At first I reasoned that they pour off water from the mouth of a ewer because of the debris [floating on the surface of the water]. But then my master said to me that they did it on account of water contaminated [by demons at the surface]."*

- O. *There was a demon in the house of R. Pappa who went to draw water from the river. It was delayed in returning. When it came back they asked it, "What delayed you?" It said to them, "I waited for the contaminated water to flow away [before I drew water for you]." [106a] Just then he saw that they were pouring off water from the mouth of the ewer [before drinking from it]. It said, "Had I known that you were accustomed to do this I would not have been delayed [waiting for the contaminated water to flow off]."*

- I.11 A.** *When R. Dimi came [from Israel to Babylonia] he said, "[On account of not washing with] water — the first time, they fed swine's flesh [to a person. Rashi: A storekeeper would sell properly slaughtered to Jews and cook it for them and feed it to them. But if a Gentile came into his store he would feed him carrion. One time a Jew came to eat and did not wash before eating. The storekeeper thought he was a gentile and accordingly fed him swine's flesh.] [On account of not washing] the last time, a woman was taken from her husband. [Rashi: Because a man did not wash after eating, swindlers were able to steal money from his wife. When he found out, according to the story in two versions, he either killed or divorced her (cf. b. Yoma 83b).]*
- B. *When Rabin came [from Israel to Babylonia] he stated [another version of the tradition], "[On account of not washing with water —] the first time, they fed carrion [to a person]. [On account of not washing] the last time, they killed a person.*
- C. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Your mnemonic is: R. Dimi came and divorced her. Rabin came and killed her."*
- D. *R. Abba taught one from this [first version] and one from this [second version], the harsher of both. [Rashi: From the first, that he ate swine's flesh as that involves two prohibitions. From the second, that he killed her.]*

[The passage at b. Yoma 83b is as follows: *And further, R. Meir and R. Judah and R. Yosé were going along the way. Now R. Meir was precise about learning names, while R. Judah and R. Yosé were not precise about learning names. When they came to a certain place, they asked for a place to stay, which they were given. They said to [the innkeeper], "What is your name?" He said to them, "Kidōr." He said, "That name [ki-dor = that is a generation] leads to the inference that he is wicked, for it is said, 'For a generation that is unstable are they' (Deu. 32:20)." R. Judah and R. Yosé deposited their purses with him, but R. Meir did not do so. Rather, he went and put it on the grave of the man's father. The man saw a vision in his dream, which said, "Go, take the purse lying at the head of this man [me]." The next day he said to them, "This is what was shown to me in my dream." They said to him, "A dream that comes on the Sabbath night has no substance." R. Meir went and waited there all day long and then he took the purse with him. In the morning the others said to the man, "Give us our purses." He said to them, "There was never any such transaction." Said to them, "Why didn't you pay close attention to his name?" They said to him, "Why didn't the master say a thing to us?" He said to them, "I regarded the matter of the name as just suspect, but I didn't regard it as an established fact." They took the host into a shop and gave him some wine; they saw lentils on his moustache. They went to his wife and told her as a sign of earnest that*

he had eaten lentil soup, and they got their purses from her and took them back. He went and killed his wife. That is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: On account of neglect of the washing of hands before meals, someone ate pork, on account of the neglect of washing hands after meals, someone was killed.]

- I.12** A. *It was stated:* [Concerning washing the first time before eating with:] Water heated over a fire —
- B. Hezekiah said, “They do not wash their hands with it.”
- C. And R. Yohanan said, “They do wash their hands with it.”
- D. Said R. Yohanan, “I asked Rabban Gamaliel the son of Rabbi who ate [unconsecrated foods] in purity [about this matter]. And he said to me that all the great rabbis of the Galilee did [wash with hot water].
- E. [Concerning washing before eating with:] water from the hot springs of Tiberias —
- F. Hezekiah said, “They do not wash their hands with them. But they do dip their hands in it.”
- G. And R. Yohanan said, “His whole body he may dip in them. But not his face, hands and feet.”
- H. *Let us now consider this matter:* If he may dip his whole body in them, [then it is logical that] his face, hands and feet *most certainly [he may dip]*.
- I. *Said R. Pappa, “[Water from a hot springs] in their place of origin, they all agree that it is permitted [to wash or dip in them]. If he took them away [from their origin at the hot springs] in a bucket, they all agree that it is prohibited [to wash with that water]. Over what case did they dispute? Where he diverted [the water] into a trench. One authority holds the view that we do prohibit by decree [washing with water in] a trench on account of [the possibility that he would then wash with water from] a bucket. And the other authority holds the view that we do not prohibit that by decree.”*
- J. *This accords with a Tannaite dispute [as follows]:* Concerning water that was rendered unfit for drinking even by cattle — when that is in vessels it is unfit [for use for washing]. [But] when it is in the ground [in a pool] it is fit [for washing]. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “Even with that [water] in the ground, he may dip his whole body in it. But not his face, hands and feet.”
- K. *Let us now consider this matter:* If he may dip his whole body in them, [then it is logical that] his face, hands and feet *most certainly [he may dip]*.
- L. *Rather it must be where he diverted [the water] into a trench. One authority holds the view that we do prohibit by decree [washing with water in] a trench on account of [the possibility that he would then wash with water from] a bucket. And the other authority holds the view that we do not prohibit that by decree.*
- I.13** A. Said R. Idi bar Abin, said R. Isaac bar Ashian, “[They instituted the ritual of] washing one’s hands for unconsecrated foods to maintain adherence [to the ritual of washing for] heave-offering. And moreover [they instituted it] on account of fulfilling a commandment.”
- B. *What is the commandment he fulfills?*

- C. Said Abbayye, "It is a commandment to heed the words of the sages."
- D. Raba said, "It is a commandment to heed the words of R. Eleazar b. Arakh. *As it is written*: "Any one whom he that has the discharge touches without having rinsed his hands in water [shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the evening]" (Lev. 15:11). Said R. Eleazar b. Arakh, "This serves as a source of proof upon which the sages rest their assertion that the obligation to wash one's hands before eating is based on the authority of the Torah."
- E. Said Raba to R. Nahman, "*What is to be derived from what is written, 'Without having rinsed his hands in water'? Lo, does that mean that if he rinsed them, they are clean? Lo, he must immerse them [for them to be clean]. Rather here is how you should state the matter: [The way the verse states the matter allows us to suggest that regarding] another person who did not rinse, [his hands] are unclean.*"
- I.14** A. Said R. Eleazar, said R. Oshaia, "They only stated [an obligation] to wash one's hands for fruit on account of concern for cleanliness."
- B. *You may reason based on this that there is no obligation [to wash hands for fruit]. Lo, there is a commandment [that one fulfills by doing it].*
- C. Said Raba to him, "There is no obligation and no commandment. Rather it is optional."
- D. *And in this he disputes the view of R. Nahman.* For said R. Nahman, "One who washes his hands before eating fruits is just trying to be ostentatious."
- E. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, "I was standing before R. Ammi and R. Assi. They brought before them a basket of fruit and they ate from it. And they did not wash their hands [before eating]. And they did not give me any. And each one recited the blessing [after eating] by himself."*
- F. *We derive from this three [rules]. We derive from this that there is no [obligation] to wash one's hands for fruit [before eating it]. And we derive from this that they do not [designate one person to] invite [the others to recite the blessings after eating] for fruits. And we derive from this that two people who ate together are commanded to separate [to recite the blessings after eating by themselves].*
- G. *There is a Tannaite teaching that accords with this view: Two who ate together have an obligation to separate [and recite the blessings after the meal by themselves]. Under what circumstances? Where the two of them were scribes. But if one was a scribe and the other was a boor, the scribe recites the blessings and the boor fulfills his obligation [through the recitation of the other].*
- I.15** A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: [Concerning the ritual of] washing one's hands for unconsecrated foods, [one must wash them] up to the [second finger] joint. For heave-offering, [106b] [one must wash them] up to the [third finger] joint [Cashdan: the junction of the phalanges and the metacarpus]. [Concerning washing from the laver] for sanctification of the hands and feet in the Temple, [one must wash them] up to the [wrist] joint.*
- B. And any substance [stuck to the skin] that interposes with regard to immersion of one's body [in a *miqveh* thus rendering the act invalid], interposes also with regard

to the washing of one's hands and the sanctification of one's hands and feet in the Temple.

- C. Said Rab, "[One must wash] up to here [the second finger joint] for unconsecrated foods. Up to here [the third finger joint] for heave-offering."
- D. And Samuel said, "Up to here [the third finger joint] for both unconsecrated foods and for heave-offering, according to the more stringent alternative."
- E. And R. Sheshet said, "Up to here [the second finger joint] for both unconsecrated foods and for heave-offering, according to the more lenient alternative."
- F. *Said Bar Hadaya, "I was standing before R. Ammi and he said, 'Up to here [the third finger joint] for both unconsecrated foods and for heave-offering, according to the more stringent alternative.'"*
- G. *And you cannot maintain that R. Ammi said this because he is a priest. Because lo, R. Meyasha the grandson of R Joshua b. Levi, he was a Levite, and he said, "Up to here [the third finger joint] for both unconsecrated foods and for heave-offering, according to the more stringent alternative."*

I.16 A. Said Rab, "A person may wash both his hands in the morning and rely on this washing so that it remains effective the entire day."

- B. Said R. Abina to the residents of **[107a]** the valley of Arabot, "*People like you for whom water is not commonly available may wash your hands in the morning and rely on them [that this washing remains effective] the entire day.*"
- C. *There are those that say [the rule applies] in a time of duress, yes, but in a time of no duress, no [it does not apply]. And this is in dispute with the view of Rab.*
- D. *And there are those that say [the rule applies] even in a time where there is no duress as well. And that is identical to the view of Rab [A].*

I.17 A. *Said R. Pappa, "In an irrigation ditch, they do not wash their hands because the flow is not the direct result of human force. [People pour into the ditch vessels of water. It then flows through the field on its own power.] But if one is close to the one who pours where [the water] flows on account of [direct] human force, [at that place] they may wash their hands [with the water flowing in the ditch]."*

- B. *And if the pail [used for drawing the water from the river and pouring it into the ditch] was punctured so that the liquid was streaming [from the pail at the same time both into the ditch and into the river] then it links them and one may dip his hands into it [i.e., into the water of the ditch, and for the purposes of washing the hands that would be deemed an effective immersion in the water of the river].*
- C. And said Raba, "A vessel punctured with a hole large enough to receive water through it — they do not wash their hands with [water poured out of] it."
- D. And said Raba, "A vessel that does not have a quarter-log [of liquid] — they do not wash their hands with [water poured out of] it."
- E. *Is that so? Lo, did not Raba say, "A vessel that does not hold a quarter-log — they do not wash their hands with [water poured out of] it?" Lo this implies that if it holds [a quarter-log it may be used for washing] even if it does not have [that much water in it when he pours it on his hands to wash them].*

F. *This is not a valid question. This [rule that one have a quarter-log] applies to one person [who must have the minimum amount to begin with]. And this [rule that the washing is effective with even less than a quarter-log] applies to two people [who wash consecutively from the same container that had a quarter-log in it to begin with. When the second one washes there is less than the required amount. Nevertheless the washing is effective.]*

G. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority: [To render hands clean] a quarter-log of water do they pour for hands, for one, also for two [M. Yad. 1:1A-C].*

I.18 A. *Said R. Sheshet to Amemar, “Are you fussy about the condition of the container [that you use for washing your hands, that it not be damaged]?”*

B. *He said to him, “Yes.”*

C. *“About the appearance [i.e., the clarity, of the water]?”*

D. *He said to him, “Yes.”*

E. *“About the quantity [of water, that there be a quarter-log]?”*

F. *He said to him, “Yes.”*

G. *There are those that say [there is another version of this tradition]: This is what [Amemar] said to him, “About the condition of the container and about the appearance [of the water] we are fussy. About the quantity, we are not fussy.”*

H. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority: [To render hands clean] a quarter-log of water do they pour for hands, for one, also for two [M. Yad. 1:1 A-C].*

I. *But this is not a valid comparison. There [in Yad.] the circumstance is different. [The washing for the second person is valid] because the remaining [water for washing the hands of the second person] comes from a quantity that [originally] was sufficient to render the hands clean.*

I.19 A. *R. Jacob of Nehar Pegod set a standard for a washing vessel that it hold a quarter-log. R. Ashi in Husal set a standard for a wine pitcher that it hold a quarter-log.*

B. *And said Raba, “The stopper of a barrel that one adapted [to use as a vessel for washing] — they may wash their hands with water poured from it.”*

C. *There is a Tannaite teaching that accords with this: A stopper that one made for a utensil — they pour out water from it for [washing their] hands. The waterskin and the tub, [even though they are broken down] if he adapted them — they pour out from them water [for washing] the hands. The sack and the basket, even though they hold [liquid] — they do not pour out water from them for [washing] the hands [T. Yad. 1:6 A-C].*

I.20 A. *They posed a question: What is the rule concerning whether one may eat [without washing one's hands by holding the food] with a napkin? Do we suspect that perhaps he touched [the food] or not?*

- B. *Come and take note: When they gave R. Sadoq food that was less than an egg's bulk, he would take hold of it with a napkin and eat it outside of the Sukkah [on the Sukkot festival] and he would not recite after eating it [the blessings over the meal, cf. b. Suk. 26a]. Is it not [fair to assume] that it is the case that lo, if there was an egg's bulk he would have to wash his hands [before eating and holding it in a napkin would not be enough]?*
- C. *[No.] Perhaps [the text implies only] if there was an egg's bulk he would have to eat in it a Sukkah and that he would have to recite over it the blessing [after eating].*
- D. *Come and take note: Samuel found Rab eating [holding his food] with a napkin. He said to him, [107b] "Do we permit this practice?" He said to him, "I have little patience [to go and wash first]."*
- E. *When R. Zira departed [to go to the Land of Israel] he found R. Ammi and R. Assi eating with pieces of goat skins wrapped around their hands like gloves (Jastrow). He said, "Could two such great men as you misinterpret [the precedent we have based on the actions of] Rab and Samuel? Lo [Rab said], "[I did this because] I have little patience."*
- F. *He [Zira] neglected that which R. Tahlifa bar Abimi said: "Said Samuel, 'They permitted [eating with] a napkin [wrapped around one's hand for a person who did not wash] for those [priests] who eat heave-offering. But they did not permit [eating with] a napkin [without washing one's hands] for those who eat [unconsecrated food] in a state of cleanness.'" And R. Ammi and R. Assi were priests.*

I.21 A. *They posed a question: Must a person who is eating by being fed by another person wash his hands or not?*

- B. *Come and take note: R. Hamnuna bar Sehora was attending R. Hamnuna. He cut him some meat and he ate it. He said to him, "If you were not R. Hamnuna, I would not have fed you [without seeing you wash first]." What is the basis for this statement? Is it not that [we can be sure that] he is careful and did not touch the food?*
- C. *No. It is that he is conscientious and [we can be sure that] he previously had washed his hands.*
- D. *Come and take note: For said R. Zira, said Rab, "A person should not put a morsel [of bread] into the mouth of a servant unless he knows that he washed his hands. And the servant recites the blessing for each cup [of wine that he drinks]. But he does not recite a [separate] blessing for each morsel that he eats."*
- E. *And R. Yohanan said, "He recites a blessing for each morsel [that he eats]."*
- F. *Said R. Pappa, "This makes perfect sense according to both Rab and R. Yohanan. There is no contradiction [between their views]. This one [Rab states the rule for a lavish meal] where there is an important person present. [The servant is sure that he will receive more morsels.] And this one [R. Yohanan states the rule for an ordinary meal] where there is no important person present. [The servant is not*

sure that he will receive another morsel.] But lo it states, "Unless he knows that he washed his hands." [This must then be the general practice for anyone who feeds another person.]

- G. *[No, that is not a valid conclusion.] The case of a servant is different because he is working [and may not remember to wash].*

I.22 A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: A person [eating at a meal] should not feed a morsel to the servant, whether he is holding the cup in his hand or the householder is holding the cup in his hand, lest some misfortune occur at the dinner. And the servant who did not wash his hands is prohibited to put a morsel into his mouth.*

I.23 A. *They posed a question: Must a person who is feeding another person wash his hands or not?*

- B. *Come and take note: The House of Menasheh taught, Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "[On the Day of Atonement when it is prohibited to wash,] a woman may wash one hand in water and give the bread to her young child. They said concerning Shammai the Elder that he did not want to feed [his child] with one hand [because he did not want to wash at all on the Day of Atonement]. And they decreed that he [wash and] feed [his child] with both hands." [These rules prove that a person who feeds another must wash.]*

- C. *Said Abbayye, "There [they wash] on account of the demon Shibta [who endangers those who eat without washing at all (Jastrow)]."*

- D. *Come and take note: Samuel's father found him crying. He said to him, "Why are you crying?" [He said,] "Because my master hit me." "Why [did he hit you]?" He told me, 'You fed my son and did not [first] wash your hand.' " "And why did you not wash?" He said to him, "If he is eating why should I wash?" He said to him, "It is not sufficient that he does not know the law. But he also hits you!"*

- E. *And the law is: A person who is eating by being fed by another person must wash his hands. A person who is feeding another person does not have to wash his hands.*

8:2

A. **A man ties up meat and cheese in a single cloth,**

B. **provided that they do not touch one another.**

C. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Two guests eat on one table, this one meat, and that one cheese, and they do not scruple."**

I.1 A. *And if they do touch one another what difference does it make? It is [a case of] one cold food [that touches] another cold food [and that does not result in a forbidden mixture].*

- B. *Said Abbayye, "We may concede that [a layer] does not need to be peeled [away at the place where the meat and cheese touched]. It does need to be washed off [at that place]."*

II.1 A. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Two guests eat on one table, this one meat, and that one cheese, and they do not scruple.":**

- B. *Said R. Hanan bar Ammi, said Samuel, "They taught this only where [the two guests in C] do not know each other. But where they know each other, it is prohibited [for them to eat meat and cheese at the same table]."*
- C. *It also was taught in this regard on Tannaite authority: [Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says,] "Two who came into an inn, this one coming from the north, and that one coming from the south — this one eats his piece of meat, and that one eats his cheese and they do not scruple [M. 8:2C]." One must [conclude]: They prohibited [meat and cheese on one table] only when they [the people eating the food] all were a single group [T. 8:5A-C].*
- D. *Must you conclude that it be a single group? Rather even if it appears to be a single group [eating together it is prohibited].*

- II.2** A. *Said R. Yemar bar Shalmaya to Abbaye, "If there were two brothers who were angry at each other [sitting at the same table, one eating meat and the other cheese] what is the law? He said to him, "Will they say that this is a horse of a different color?" [Lit.: All the fancy cakes are prohibited (on Passover because they may become leaven) but the fancy cakes of Boethus are permitted? See b. Pes. 37a. Because the brothers are angry at one another, that does not make them strangers.]*
- B. *But according to your logic, lo that which said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "One who has only one cloak is permitted to wash it on the intermediate days of the festival. Will they say that [108a] this is a horse of a different color? [Lit.: all the fancy cakes are prohibited (on Passover because they may become leaven) but the fancy cakes of Boethus are permitted? See b. Pes. 37a. Because he has only one cloak, may he wash it?]*
 - C. *There [the case is different]. Lo, said Mar bar R. Ashi, "[The fact that he washes] his belt [along with his cloak] demonstrates [that this is an exceptional case and not the rule].*

8:3 A-B

- A. **A drop of milk which fell on a piece [of meat], if it is sufficient to impart flavor to that piece [of meat] — it is prohibited.**
 - B. **[If] one stirred the pot, if there is in it sufficient [milk] to impart flavor to that [entire] pot[‘s contents], it [the contents of the pot] is prohibited.**
- I.1** A. *Said Abbaye, "[We may derive from the biblical prohibition of a mixture of milk and meat that any mixture that contains] the flavor [of a prohibited ingredient] but not the substance [of the ingredient] is consistently prohibited based on the authority of the Torah. For if you concluded that [such a mixture was prohibited only] on the authority of the rabbis. And on what basis would we not derive [that such a mixture was prohibited based on the rule prohibiting a mixture of] meat and milk? Because it is a unique concept [that the mixture of two permitted substances should be prohibited]. But if we accept that this is a unique concept, then even when there is no flavor imparted [by milk in the meat] it also should be prohibited!"*
- B. *Said to him Raba, "The Torah prohibited [meat and milk] that are cooked together. [Through cooking one substance usually imparts flavor to the other.]*

- I.2** A. Said Rab, “As soon as [the milk] imparts flavor to the piece [of meat], the piece itself takes on the status of carrion. It in turn renders prohibited all the other pieces [in the pot] because they are of the same classification. [The principle is that items of the same classification do not nullify one another in a mixture. Therefore all the pieces of meat are prohibited on the basis of the presence of that one piece.]”
- B. *Said Mar Zutra the son of R. Mari to Rabina, “What is the case? In accord with whose view does Rab state the matter? In accord with R. Judah, who said that [a mixture of one prohibited item with other permitted] items of the same classification does not nullify [the one item]. Let us say that this is in disagreement with the view of Raba.*
- C. *“For said Raba, ‘[For] any [mixture that consists of] a prohibited item with other permitted items of the same classification and with items of a different classification, you can disregard the [other items of] the same classification [and treat them] as if they are not there. Then the items of the different classification will form a majority [and outnumber the prohibited item] and nullify it.’”*
- D. *He [Rabina] said to him, “If the [circumstance is that the prohibited item] fell into [a mixture in] thin gravy, this is the present case [i.e., of a mixture as described in C]. But in this case we are dealing with [an item that] fell into a [mixture in] thick gravy. And in accord with what principle does he [Rab] reason? If he reasons in accord with the principle that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is nullified, leaving the mixture itself] permitted, then why does the piece [of meat] itself [onto which milk fell] take on the status of carrion?*
- E. *“Rather it must be that he reasons in accord with the principle that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] prohibited.”*
- F. *As it was stated: Rab and R. Hanina and R. Yohanan said that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] prohibited.*
- G. *Samuel and R. Simeon bar Rabbi and Resh Laqish said that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is nullified, leaving the mixture itself] permitted.*
- H. *But does Rab hold the view that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] prohibited? But lo it was stated: An olive’s bulk of meat that fell into a pot of milk — Said Rab, “The meat is prohibited. But the milk is permitted.”*
- I. *And if he holds the view that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] prohibited, [108b]*

then why is the milk permitted? Does not the milk have the status of carrion?

- J. *Rab consistently reasons in accord with the view that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] prohibited. But here [the case of a mixture of meat and milk] is different. Because Scripture says, “You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk” (Exod. 23:19). [That implies] that the Torah prohibited the kid but not the milk.*
- K. *But does Rab reason in accord with the view that the Torah prohibited the kid but not the milk? Lo it is stated: **[Concerning a mixture of] half-an-olive’s-bulk of meat and half-an-olive’s-bulk of milk that he cooked together — said Rab, “He incurs the punishment of stripes on account of eating. But he does not incur the punishment of stripes on account of cooking it. [The minimum quantity for liability to punishment for the violation is an olive’s bulk.] [Cf. T. Mak. 4:7.]** But if you concluded that the Torah prohibited the kid but not the milk, why does he incur the punishment of stripes for eating it? It is only half of the minimum quantity [needed for liability for the violation of the prohibition]. But without exception Rab reasons in accord with the view that the milk [of the mixture of meat and milk] is also prohibited [by the Torah]. Accordingly here [in the case Rab refers to in H] what are we dealing with? The case in question is one where [the meat] fell into a boiling pot [of milk]. [The meat] will surely absorb [from the milk] but it will not egest [any flavor back into the milk].*
- L. *But finally when [the meat] cools down it will egest [flavor back into the milk]. [This is not a concern because the case we refer to is one where] he went ahead and removed [the meat while the pot was boiling].*

I.3 A. *Reverting to the body of the prior text [II.1 K]: [Concerning a mixture of] half-an-olive’s-bulk of meat and half-an-olive’s-bulk of milk that he cooked together —*

- B. *said Rab, “He incurs the punishment of stripes on account of eating. But he does not incur the punishment of stripes on account of cooking it. [The minimum quantity for liability to punishment for the violation is an olive’s bulk.]*
- C. *But any way you wish to look at the matter [he should incur the punishment]. If [the quantities of meat and milk] combine [to constitute the minimum quantity], he should incur the punishment of stripes for cooking it. And if [the quantities of meat and milk] do not combine, he should not be subject to the punishment of flogging even for eating it.*

- D. *But it is consistent to hold the view that they do not combine [to constitute the minimum quantity. But [the case where he ate half-an-olive's-bulk of meat and half-an-olive's bulk of milk refers to a circumstance where the quantities] came from a large pot [of meat and milk that was cooked together where the smaller quantities were already prohibited. Eating them would constitute a violation subject to the punishment of flogging.] [The case of cooking a half quantity of milk and a half quantity of meat is a different circumstance and would not result in a violation subject to the punishment.]*
- E. But Levi said [the rule of Rab at B should conclude], "Also, he does incur the punishment of stripes on account of cooking it."
- F. *And in this regard Levi taught that it was taught on Tannaite authority: **Just as they are subject to the punishment of flogging for eating it, so they are subject to the punishment of flogging for cooking it. And how much cooking do they speak of? Cooking from which others [gentiles] may eat on account of his having cooked it [T. Mak. 4:7 D-E].***
- I.4 A.** *And the principle itself that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance] can be extracted [from the item that contained it] is the subject of a Tannaite dispute [as follows]: **A drop of milk which fell on a piece of meat — R. Judah says, "If there is sufficient [milk] to impart a flavor to that piece of meat, that piece itself takes on the status of carrion and renders prohibited [in a mixture] all of the other pieces because they are of the same classification." And sages say, "[It is not prohibited] unless it imparts flavor to the gravy and the froth and the pieces [i.e., to that entire pot]."** Said Rabbi, "The opinion of R. Judah appears preferable when one has not stirred [the pot] and has not covered [the pot], and the opinion of sages appears preferable when one has stirred [the pot] and covered [the pot]" [T. 8:6].*
- B. *What does it mean, **When one has not stirred [the pot]***

and has not covered [the pot]? If you say it means he has not stirred it at all and has not covered it at all, [under those circumstances the meat] would absorb [the milk] but it would not egest it. [Why would the other pieces be prohibited?]

- C. *So rather it means, One has not stirred it at the start [of the cooking]. But one has stirred it at the finish. And one has not covered it at the start. But one has covered it at the finish. Then why [would anything be prohibited]? What was absorbed [at the start] was egested [at the finish].*
- D. *He reasons in accord with the view that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] prohibited.*
- E. **[109a]** *We may derive from this the conclusion that R. Judah reasons in accord with the view that if one stirred it from start to finish and if one covered it from start to finish, [all the contents are] prohibited.*
- F. *Why is this the case? Lo [because he stirred it up, each piece of meat absorbed so little that it was as if it had] absorbed nothing at all. It makes sense to say that he did not stir it very well and he did not cover it very well.*

[The milk would be absorbed in sufficient quantity in a piece of meat and that would render prohibited the rest of the meat.]

- I.5 A.** Said the master [consider the following, A above]: **The opinion of sages appears preferable when one has stirred [the pot] and covered [the pot] [T. 8:6].** *What does it mean, stirred [the pot]? And what does it mean, covered [the pot]? If you say it means that one stirred it at the finish, but did not stir it at the start and [that it means] that one covered it at the finish, but did not cover it at the start, lo it was stated, The opinion of R. Judah is preferable in these [circumstances].*
- B. *Rather [it must mean] that one stirred it from start to finish and that he covered it from start to finish. We may derive the conclusion that the sages reasoned in accord with the view that if one stirred it at the finish but did not stir it at the start, or if one covered it at the finish, but did not cover it at the start, [the contents are] permitted.*
- C. *It seems logical to conclude that [sages] reasoned in accord with the view that [when it is cooked in a mixture, a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that contained it is treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is nullified, leaving the mixture itself] permitted [II.1 G, above].*
- D. *Said R. Aha from Difti to Rabina, "On what basis do you conclude that the dispute hinges on [a principle regarding whether or not a prohibited substance] can be extracted? Perhaps regarding [the issue of a prohibited substance that] can be extracted [from the item that*

contained it, when it is cooked in a mixture, is not treated as if it entered the mixture on its own and is not nullified, leaving the mixture itself] according to all [parties in the dispute] prohibited.

- E. *“And here the dispute hinges on [the view of the parties regarding] the principle [of nullification in a mixture of items] of the same classification. And R. Judah is consistent with his own opinion on that issue. For he said that [prohibited] items of the same classification [in a mixture with permitted items] are not nullified. And the sages are consistent with their opinion. For they said that [prohibited] items of the same classification [in a mixture with permitted items] are nullified.”*
- F. *What then is the interpretation of this matter? If you say that it makes sense to maintain the sages reason regarding the principle [of nullification in a mixture of items] of the same classification, that here they reason in accord with the view of R. Judah [that the items are not nullified], and accordingly they dispute over [the principle of whether or not a prohibited substance] can be extracted, this is in accord with what Rabbi said, **“The opinion of R. Judah appears preferable in this matter [when one has not stirred (the pot) and has not covered (the pot)], and the opinion of sages appears preferable in this matter [when one has stirred (the pot) and covered (the pot)]”** [T. 8:6, cited above at II.3 A].*
- G. *But if you say that [it makes sense to maintain regarding the principle of whether or not a prohibited*

*substance] can be extracted, that all parties agree that [a circumstance where this principle is applied] is prohibited, and here they dispute over the principle [of nullification in a mixture of items] of the same classification, then this statement, **The opinion of R. Judah appears preferable...** should also state where it does not appear preferable.*

H. *And there is nothing further to say about this matter.*

8:3 C-H

- C. **The udder:**
- D. **one cuts it open and takes out its milk.**
- E. **[If] he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account.**
- F. **The heart:**
- G. **One cuts it open and takes out its blood.**
- H. **[If] he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account.**
- I.1 A. **[109b]** Said R. Zira, said Rab, “[One who eats the udder] **does not transgress on that account** and he is permitted [to eat it to begin with].”
- B. *Lo, we taught, **He does not transgress on that account.** [This implies that if he already ate it,] he has not transgressed, lo, there is a prohibition [against eating it to begin with].*
- C. *It is logical to conclude also that there is no prohibition [against eating the udder]. But [they taught this rule for the udder for the sake of balance with the rule for the heart] because it was necessary to teach in the latter text of the Mishnah: **The heart: One cuts it open and takes out its blood. [If] he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account [F-H].** There [regarding the rule for the heart] he does not transgress [if he ate it without removing the blood]. Lo, there is a prohibition [against eating it to begin with]. [Accordingly, the Mishnah-passage] taught also in the former text, **he does not transgress on that account [E].***
- D. *Let us say this text supports the present assertion: **The udder of a nursing cow: one cuts it open and takes out its milk. [If] he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account. The heart: one cuts it open and takes out its blood. If he cooked it, he cuts it open after it is cooked [T. 8:8].***
- E. *[The text informs us that] the heart needs to be cut open [if he wants to eat it after it is cooked]. But [this implies that] the udder does not need to be cut open [if he wants to eat it after it is cooked].*
- F. *But perhaps for the heart it is effective to cut it up [to remove the blood after it is cooked]. But for the udder it is not effective [to cut it after it is cooked to remove the milk so that he may eat it].*

- G. *And there are those who say [there is another version of the preceding text, A-F]: Said R. Zira, said Rab, “[One who eats the udder] **does not transgress on that account** and he is prohibited [to eat it to begin with].”*
- H. *Let us say this text supports the present assertion: **He does not transgress on that account.** [This implies that if he already ate it,] he has not transgressed, lo, there is a prohibition [against eating it to begin with]. It is logical to conclude also that there is no prohibition [against eating the udder]. But [they taught this rule for the udder for the sake of balance with the rule for the heart] because it was necessary to teach in the latter text of the Mishnah: **The heart: One cuts it open and takes out its blood. [If] he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account [F-H].** There [regarding the rule for the heart] he does not transgress [if he ate it without removing the blood]. Lo, there is a prohibition [against eating it to begin with]. [Accordingly, the Mishnah] taught also in the former text, **he does not transgress on that account [E].***
- I. *Come and take note: **The udder of a nursing cow: one cuts it open and takes out its milk. [If] he did not cut it open, he does not transgress on that account. The heart: one cuts it open and takes out its blood. If he cooked it, he cuts it open after it is cooked [T. 8:8].***
- J. *[The text informs us that] the heart needs to be cut open [if he wants to eat it after it is cooked]. But [this implies that] the udder does not need to be cut open [if he wants to eat it after it is cooked].*
- K. *But perhaps for the heart it is effective to cut it up [to remove the blood after it is cooked]. But for the udder it is not effective [to cut it after it is cooked to remove the milk so that he may eat it].*
- L. *There is a Tannaite teaching that accords with the first version of the rule of Rab: **An udder which one cooked in its milk is permitted. A maw which one cooked [in its milk] — one is liable [T. 8:9 A-B].***
- M. *And what is the difference between this case [of the udder] and that case [of the maw]? In this case [of the maw there is milk that issued from another animal] collected inside [the maw]. But in this case [of the udder there is no milk that issued from another animal] collected inside [the udder].*

I.2 A. *How does one cut it?*

- B. *Said R. Judah, “He cuts it across its length and width and presses it against the wall [to squeeze out the milk].”*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar to his servant, “Cut it for me and I will eat it.”*
- D. *What novel point does this make? It is taught explicitly in the Mishnah [that one may do this].*
- E. *Lo this makes the novel point that [to be permitted to eat it] one does not need to cut it across its length and width and press it against the wall.*

I.3 A. *Said Yalta to R. Nahman, “It is the fact that, for everything that the Torah prohibited, it permitted something [equivalent] in its place. (1) It prohibited [eating an animal’s] blood. But it permitted [us to eat its] liver. (2) [It prohibited intercourse during the issue of] menstrual blood. [But it permitted intercourse*

during the issue of] blood of purification [i.e., that flows after initial intercourse with a virgin or after childbirth]. (3) [It prohibited eating] the fat of beasts. [But it permitted eating] the fat of wild animals. (4) [It prohibited eating meat of] the swine. [But it permitted eating] the brain of the mullet fish (Cashdan: or sturgeon). (5) [It prohibited eating] the moor-hen. [But it permitted eating] the tongue of a fish. (6) [It prohibited relations with] a married woman. [But it permitted relations with] a divorced woman [even] during the life of her husband. (7) [It prohibited relations with one's] brother's wife. [But it permitted relations with] a levir [i.e., the brother's wife after he dies with no issue]. (8) [It prohibited relations with] a Samaritan woman. [But it permitted relations with a captive woman] who was attractive.

- B. "I for my part now crave [to eat a recipe made from] meat and milk. [What is the equivalent for that?]"
 - C. R. Nahman said to his butchers, "Roast an udder for her on a spit."
 - D. But lo we taught the matter [that one may eat the udder if], **One cuts it open**. This applies to where he cooks it in a pot. But lo, it was taught, **If he cooked it** [cf. T. 8:8, cited above at I.1 C]. [This implies that] if he already [cooked it], then yes, [he may eat it]. But [to cook it] to begin with, no [one may not eat it].
 - E. And because the last text [of T. 8:9] had to teach the rule regarding the **maw which one cooked [110a] in its milk**, that is prohibited [I.1 L above], for even if he already [cooked it] nevertheless he may not [eat it], it taught also in the first text regarding an **udder which one cooked**.
- I.4 A.** When R. Eleazar went up [to the Land of Israel] he found Ziri. He said to him, "Is there a Tannaite authority here who taught Rab the rule regarding the udder?" ("[One who eats the udder] **he does not transgress on that account** and he is prohibited [to eat it to begin with]" [I.1 F].) They [the people of that place] pointed out R. Isaac bar Abdimi.
- B. He [Isaac] said to him [Eleazar], "I did not teach him anything about the udder. But Rab found an open valley and erected a fence around it." [Rab enacted the rule on his own authority to counteract the lax observance of the prohibitions against mixing meat and milk.]
 - C. For when Rab came to Tattlepush he heard a woman asking her friend, "How much milk do I need to cook a litra (six egg bulks) of meat?" He said, "Did they not learn that [mixing] meat and milk is prohibited?"
 - D. He stayed over there and prohibited to them [even] udders [so that they would learn the prohibition].
 - E. R. Kahana taught in accord with this version.
 - F. R. Yosé bar Abba taught [this version]: "I taught this matter regarding the case of an udder from a suckling cow [that is especially filled with milk]." And because of the keen insight of R. Hiyya he taught it to him regarding an ordinary udder. [He expected that R. Hiyya would understand that it applied to an udder from a suckling cow. But Rab did not understand that was the case.]

I.5 A. *Rabin and R. Isaac bar Joseph came to the house of R. Pappi. They brought before them a dish containing the [meat of an] udder. R. Isaac bar Joseph ate it. Rabin did not eat it.*

B. *Said Abbaye, "Rabin you childless one. Why did you not eat it? What do we have here? R. Pappi's wife is the daughter of R. Isaac Nappaha. And R. Isaac Nappaha always did the right thing. If she had not heard about this [that it was permitted] in her parents' home, she would not have done this [i.e., served it at the meal]."*

I.6 A. *In Sura they did not eat the udder. In Pumbedita they did eat the udder.*

B. *Rami bar Tamri, who was also [known as, or the father-in-law of] Rami bar Dikuli from Pumbedita came to Sura on the eve of the Day of Atonement. Everyone [of the residents] took the udders of their animals and threw them away. He went and took them and ate them. They brought him before R. Hisda [for a judgment]. He said to him, "Why did you do this?" He said to him, "I am from the place of R. Judah where we eat it."*

C. *He said to him, "But do you not hold in accord with the principle that they impose upon a person [who travels from one place to another] the strict rules of the place whence he originated and the place to which he has come." He said, "I was outside of the boundary [of the city] when I ate it [and therefore was not subject to your stringent rule]." [Hisda said to him,] "[If you were outside the town,] how did you broil them?" He said to him, "[I made the fire to broil them] with dried kernels [of grapes]."*

D. *[Hisda asked,] "But perhaps they [the kernels] came from grapes used to make wine to be poured out for idolatrous purposes." [A person may not derive any benefit from such grapes.] He said to him, "They [the grape kernels that I used] were more than twelve months old [and therefore completely dried out and no longer prohibited even if they were from such grapes]."*

E. *[Hisda asked,] "But perhaps they [the kernels] came from grapes that were stolen." He said to him, "[I could tell that] the owners had given up hope of [recovering them]. Shoots had already sprouted through them [they had been lying there so long]."*

F. *He [Hisda] saw that he did not have on his tefillin. He said to him, "On what basis do you not put on your tefillin?" He said, "I have an intestinal disorder. And said R. Judah, 'One who suffers from an intestinal disorder is exempt from the obligation to put on tefillin.'"*

G. *He [Hisda] saw that he did not have on his fringes [on the corners of his garment]. He said to him, "On what basis do you not have fringes?" He said to him, "This is a borrowed cloak [that I am wearing]. And R. Judah said, **[110b]** 'A borrowed cloak during the first thirty days is exempt from [the rule that one put on its corners] fringes.'"*

H. *Meanwhile they brought in [to Hisda's court] a person who did not honor his father and mother. They tied him up [so as to administer stripes to him]. He [Rami] said to them, "Let him go. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: For every positive command whose reward is specified along with it [in the Torah], an earthly court has no authority over it." [Exo. 20:12 specifies: "Honor your father*

and your mother, that your days may be long in the land which the Lord your God gives you.”]

- I. *He [Hisda] said to him, “I see what keen insight you have.” He said to him, “If you are ever in the neighborhood of [the school of] R. Judah come in and I will show you really keen insight.”*
- I.7 A.** *Said Abbayye to R. Safra, “When you journey there [to the land of Israel], ask them: With regard to liver, what do you do with it [to prepare it for eating]?”*
- B. *When he got there he found R. Zeriqa [and he asked him]. He said to him, “I once cooked [i.e., boiled] it for R. Ammi and he ate it.”*
- C. *When he [Safra] came back to him [and told him this Abbayye] said to him, “I did not raise any question about prohibiting the liver itself. I raised a question about whether the liver could render prohibited other [pieces of meat cooked together with it in the same pot].”*
- D. *But what difference is there [between these two issues]? About prohibiting the liver itself you did not raise a question because it was taught on Tannaite authority: **[Liver renders other foods forbidden, but] itself is not rendered forbidden [M. Ter. 10:11 G].***
- E. *Whether the liver could render prohibited other [pieces of meat cooked together with it in the same pot] you also should not raise as a question because it was taught on Tannaite authority: **Liver renders other foods forbidden, but itself is not rendered forbidden, for it imparts [flavor] but does not absorb [flavor] [M. Ter. 10:11 G-H].***
- F. *He said to him, “Perhaps there the case refers to a liver that is prohibited [such as a liver from a terefah animal (Rashi)].” **[111a]** And [it is prohibited] because of the fat [from the animal that is on the liver].*
- G. *What then is the rule regarding the blood [that comes from the liver]?*
- H. *When he [Safra] again journeyed [to Israel] he found R. Zeriqa. He said to him, “This [matter of the status of the blood of a liver] also should be no question. For I and Yannai the son of R. Ammi called on the house of Judah the son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi. And they served us the windpipe along with [the organs] appended to it [i.e., the lung, heart and liver, all cooked together]. And we ate it.”*
- I. *By way of contradiction to this R. Ashi raised a question. And some say it was R. Samuel from Zeruqinia: “But perhaps [in the case in H] the opening of the windpipe was outside of the pot [when they cooked the dish, and the blood ran out of the pot through the pipe.]”*
- J. *Another possible explanation is that [the liver before it was cooked with the other organs] was first scalded [in boiling water to seal in the blood]. As was the case of R. Huna who used to scald [liver] in vinegar. And R. Nahman used to scald [liver] in boiling water.*
- K. *R. Pappa reasoned before Raba in accord with the view that the vinegar [itself that was used for this purpose] is prohibited [because it contains some of the blood from the liver].*

- L. *He said to him, "If the vinegar itself is prohibited, it [the liver] too should be prohibited. For what [blood that] it egests [into the vinegar] it will again absorb."*
- I.8 A.** *Rab bar Sheba called upon the house of R. Nahman. They brought before him boiled liver and he did not eat it. They said to him [Nahman], "There is a member of the house of Rab inside who does not eat. And who is he? Rab bar Sheba." R. Nahman said to them, "Make him eat."*
- B. *This accords with a Tannaite dispute: R. Eliezer says, "The [blood from a] liver renders [food cooked with it in a pot] prohibited. But it itself does not become prohibited because it egests [blood] but does not absorb it." R. Ishmael the son of R. Yohanan b. Beroqa says, "[Blood from] a seasoned [liver] renders [food cooked with it] prohibited and it itself becomes prohibited. [The spices soften the liver so that it will reabsorb the blood.] [Blood from] a boiled [liver] renders [food cooked with it] prohibited and it itself becomes prohibited. [The boiling softens the liver so that it will reabsorb the blood.]"*
- C. *Raba bar R. Huna called upon the house of Raba bar R. Nahman. They brought before him three seahs of glazed pastries. He said to them, "How did you know that I was coming?" They said to him, "Are you more important than [the Sabbath? We prepared the pastries for the Sabbath.] For it is written, '[If you turn back your foot from the Sabbath, from doing your pleasure on my holy day,] and call the Sabbath a delight [and the holy day of the Lord honorable; if you honor it, not going your own ways, or seeking your own pleasure, or talking idly]' (Isa. 58:13)."*
- D. *Meanwhile he found there a certain liver that had an artery attached that was saturated with blood. He said to them, "Why did you prepare this [liver for eating? The blood in the artery renders it prohibited.]" They said to him, "How then shall we prepare it?" He said to them, "Cut it across its length and width. [And place it on the fire] with the cut side facing down."*
- E. *And this concern applies to a liver. But regarding [the fluid in] a spleen [with regard to the law we deem that to have the status of] ordinary fat. [So if cooked in a pot, it does not render prohibited the other foods cooked with it.]*
- F. *This accords with [the practice of] Samuel. They prepared for him a cooked dish with spleen on the day that he would have [bloodletting] done to him.*
- I.9 A.** *It was stated: [Broiling] liver on top of meat is permitted [because] the blood slides off. [Broiling] spleen on top of meat is prohibited. What is the basis for this? The fat [in the liquid that exudes] adheres and penetrates (Jastrow).*
- B. *R. Dimi from Nehardea taught the reverse. [Broiling] spleen on top of meat is permitted. What is the basis for this? The fat [in the liquid that exudes from meat] of a slaughtered animal is prohibited [only] on the authority of the rabbis. [Broiling] liver on top of meat is prohibited [because] the blood [is prohibited] on the authority of the Torah.*
- C. *Meremar expounded, "[With regard to broiling] the law is in accord with the following: Both for liver and for spleen — if it is [broiled] under a piece of meat,*

it is permitted. If it is [broiled] on top of a piece of meat — after the fact, yes [you may eat it]. To begin with, no [you may not eat the meat].”

- D. *R. Ashi called upon the house of Rami bar Abba his father-in-law. He saw the son of Rami bar Abba [111b] was broiling, on a spit, liver on top of meat. He said, “How arrogant is this rabbi. Concerning which case did the rabbis state the matter [that it is permitted to eat liver broiled in this manner]? Only after the fact [if the meat had already been prepared in this fashion]. But to begin with did they state [that it is permitted to do this]?”*
- E. *And if there is a pan underneath to catch the drippings, then even where the meat is on top of the liver it is prohibited [to prepare the meat in this manner]. [The blood of the liver will drip into the pan and he will eat it.]*
- F. *And why is this [rule] different from [the rule] for blood from [any] meat? The blood from meat sinks [to the bottom of the pan and he can pour off the fat to eat it and leave behind the blood]. The blood from the liver floats [on top of the pan and he cannot pour off the fat without also taking some blood with it (Cashdan)].*

I.10 A. *Said R. Nahman, said Samuel, “The knife that he used for slaughtering — he is prohibited from using it to cut any scalding hot foods. [What is the rule regarding the use of this knife to cut] cold foods? There are some that say that it must be washed [first before it is used to cut cold foods]. And there are some that say that it does not have to be washed [first].”*

B. *Said R. Judah, said Samuel, “On the platter on which one salted meat [to remove the blood], it is prohibited to eat scalding hot foods.”*

C. *And Samuel is consistent with his opinion elsewhere. For said Samuel, “[With regard to the rules of mixtures of foods] salting is equivalent to scalding and pickling is equivalent to boiling.”*

D. *When Rabin came [from the Land of Israel to Babylonia he said]: Said R. Yohanan, “[With regard to the rules of mixtures of foods] salting is not equivalent to scalding and pickling is not equivalent to boiling.”*

E. *Said Abbaye, “This rule of Rabin has no authority. For there was once a dish in the house of R. Ammi that was used for salting meat. And he broke it [so that they would not use it again. This implies that it had absorbed blood as if it was heated in the dish.]”*

F. *What is the case? R. Ammi was a student of R. Yohanan [and should have followed in accord with his view]. On what basis then did he break the dish? Must it not be that he heard the rule from R. Yohanan himself that he said, “[With regard to the rules of mixtures of foods] salting is equivalent to scalding?”*

I.11 A. *R. Kahana the brother of R. Judah sat in session before R. Huna. And he sat and stated, “On the platter on which one salted meat [to remove the blood], it is prohibited to eat scalding foods [as in B above]. But [with regard to] a radish that one cut with a knife [that was used for cutting meat], it is permitted to eat it in a milk concoction.”*

B. *What is the basis for this distinction?*

- C. *Said Abbaye, "This one [the radish cut with a knife used for meat] absorbed a permitted substance [i.e., the residue of the meat that he cut]. And this one [the platter used for salting] absorbed prohibited substance [i.e., the blood]."*
- D. *Said Raba, "What difference does it make if it absorbed a permitted substance? In the final analysis this permitted substance [of the radish containing the residue of the meat, by combining with milk in the concoction], results in a prohibited mixture [of milk and meat] and he will come to eat a prohibited substance!"*
- E. *Rather said Raba, "[The distinction between the two cases of the radish and the platter is as follows:] This one [the radish] he can taste [to see if it tastes like meat]. And this one [the meat on the platter] he cannot taste [to see if it tastes like blood]. [Tasting blood is prohibited.]"*
- F. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, "One may let a gentile chef taste it. For is it not taught on Tannaite authority: **[As regards] a pot in which one cooked meat — he should not [thereafter] cook in it dairy. (Text here omits: [If he cooked in it] dairy, he should not [thereafter] cook in it meat.)** [Text here adds:] But if one cooked [food in any of these prohibited ways] — lo, this [i.e., what has been cooked second] is prohibited if [the food that was cooked first] imparted to it flavor. **[If he cooked in it] heave-offering, he should not [thereafter] cook in it unconsecrated produce. But if one cooked [food in any of these prohibited ways] — lo, this [i.e., what has been cooked second] is prohibited if [the food that was cooked first] imparted to it flavor [T. Ter. 8:16].***
- G. *"And we say it makes perfect sense that regarding [a mixture of] heave-offering one may give it to a priest to taste it. But who can taste [a mixture of] meat and milk? And we said regarding this that one may give it to a [gentile] chef to taste it. Here too let him give it to a [gentile] chef to taste it."*
- H. *[Raba answered,] "Here then it must be that we uphold the view [that one cannot eat meat from a platter that might have imparted to it blood] where there is no [gentile] chef [present to taste it]."*

I.12 A. *It was stated: Hot fish served on a platter [used for meat] —*

- B. *Rab said, "It is prohibited to eat them in a milk concoction."*
- C. *And Samuel said, "It is permitted to eat them in a milk concoction."*
- D. *Rab said it is prohibited [because he reasons that the platter] imparts flavor [of meat to the fish].*
- E. *Samuel said it is permitted [because he reasons that the platter] imparts flavor [of the meat to the fish and] that in turn imparts flavor [to the milk concoction]. [We are not concerned with a second remove of flavor.]*
- F. *And the view of Rab is not based on an explicitly stated rule. Rather it is derived from a general principle. For Rab called upon the house of R. Shimi bar Hiyya, his grandson. He had pain in his eyes. They prepared for him a salve on a dish. After that they brought him cooked food on it [the dish]. He detected taste of the salve [in the cooked food]. He said, "See how far it [the dish] imparts flavor."*
- G. *But the cases are not completely analogous. That case [of the salve] is different. For it is very bitter [and goes further to impart flavor].*

I.13 A. *R. Eleazar was attending Mar Samuel. They brought before him fish on a platter [used for meat] and he ate them in a milk concoction. He served some to him [Eleazar] but he did not eat it. He [Samuel] said to him, "They served this to your master [i.e., to Rab] and he ate it. And yet you do not eat it?"*

B. *He [Eleazar] came before Rab and said to him, "Has the master retracted his opinion?" He [Rab] said to him, "May mercy come upon the offspring of Abba bar Abba [i.e., Samuel] if he were to have given me anything [to eat] contrary to my view [of the law]." [Rab did not retract his view and the incident never occurred (Rashi).]*

I.14 A. *R. Huna and R. Hiyya bar Ashi were sitting. One was on one side of the ferry to Sura and the other was on the other side of the ferry. They brought to one master fish on a platter [used for meat] and he ate them in a milk concoction. They brought to the other master figs and grapes in the middle of the dinner and he ate them and did not recite a separate blessing for them. One master said to his companion, "You oaf! Would your master do that?" And the other master said to his companion, "You oaf! Would your master do that?"*

B. *[Interpret the matter as follows:] One master said to his companion, "I reason in accord with the view of Samuel." And the other master said to his companion, "I reason in accord with the view of R. Hiyya."*

C. *For taught R. Hiyya, "[If one recited the blessing over] the bread he exempts thereby every kind of food [from a separate blessing at the dinner]. [If one recited the blessing over] the wine he exempts thereby every kind of drink [from a separate blessing, b. Ber 41b]."*

I.15 A. *Hezekiah [said] in the name of Abbaye, "The law accords with the view that hot fish served on a platter [used for meat] — it is permitted to eat them in a milk concoction. A radish that one cut with a knife [that was used for cutting meat], it is prohibited to eat it in a milk concoction."*

B. *But this concern applies to a radish. [112a] Because of its sharp taste it absorbs [flavor from other foods]. But [for mild foods such as] cucumbers [that were cut with a knife used for meat] he scrapes away a layer from the place where it was cut and eats it [in a milk concoction].*

C. *[If they were cut with a knife used for meat] stalks of turnips are permitted [to be eaten in a milk concoction]. Stalks of beets are prohibited. If he cut together with [the beets some] turnips, it is perfectly acceptable.*

I.16 A. *R. Dimi posed a question of R. Nahman, "What is the rule about putting a jar of salt next to a jar of milk concoction?" He said to him, "It is prohibited." [Some of the concoction may fall into it.]*

B. *[He asked,] "What is the rule about [putting a jar of] vinegar [next to a jar of milk concoction]?"*

C. *He said to him, "It is permitted."*

D. *[He asked,] "And what is the difference [between these cases]?"*

E. *[He said to him,] "If you go and measure for me a kor of salt [I will tell you]."*

F. *“What is the basis [for making a distinction between salt and vinegar]? In this case [of milk concoction that falls into salt] the prohibited substance is visible. In this case [of milk concoction that falls into vinegar] the prohibited substance is not visible.”*

I.17 A. *There was a fledgling that fell into a jar of milk concoction. R. Hinnena the son of Raba from Pashrunia permitted [the eating of the food even though the concoction was salty (Rashi)].*

B. *Said Raba, “Who is smart enough to permit such a case if not R. Hinnena the son of Raba from Pashrunia? For he reasoned that when did Samuel say, ‘[With regard to the rules of mixtures of foods] salting is equivalent to scalding’?”*

C. *This principle applies only where [the salted solution] is so salty that it is inedible. But this milk concoction is salty but still edible. And this concern [to permit eating the fledgling that fell into the milk concoction] applies only to a raw one. But if a roasted [fledgling fell in, before one eats it, its outer layer all around] must be peeled off. And if [the fledgling] had slits in it, the whole mess is prohibited. And if it had been preserved with spices, the whole mess is prohibited. [In both instances the bird will absorb the milk concoction.]*

I.18 A. *Said R. Nahman, said Samuel, “A loaf [of bread] that he sliced meat upon — it is prohibited to eat it [because the bread absorbs blood from the meat].”*

B. *And this concern applies where [the meat] was red. And this concern applies where [the blood] soaked through [the bread]. And this concern applies where [the liquid that exudes] is thick. But where it is thin [i.e., runny], this concern does not apply.*

C. *Samuel would throw [such bread] to the dogs. R. Huna would give it to his servant. But any way you wish to look at this matter [Huna’s rule is not logical]. If it is permitted, it is permitted to everyone. And if it is prohibited, it is prohibited to everyone.*

D. *[The explanation for his rule is that] R. Huna held a different view because he had a tormented personality.*

E. *Raba would eat [such bread] and call [the liquid in it], “Wine from meat.”*

I.19 A. *Said R. Nahman, said Samuel, “They do not place a receptacle [to collect the dripping fat] under [roasting] meat until the red color is gone from it [visibly indicating that the blood has drained out].*

B. *How can one tell [that the meat has reached this stage]?*

C. *Mar Zutra in the name of R. Papa said, “When it starts to smoke [indicating that the fluid that drips out onto the coals is fat and not blood].”*

D. *R. Ashi raised an objection, “Perhaps the bottom part [of the meat opposite the heat of the coals] will be roasted before the top part [of the meat] is roasted.” Rather said R. Ashi, “There is no solution [to the problem of collecting in a receptacle the fat that drips from the roasting meat without also collecting blood*

that drips from the meat]. Rather he must throw into [the receptacle to absorb the blood] two lumps of salt. [112b] And then he may pour off [the fat].”

- E. *Said R. Aha the son of R. Iqa to R. Ashi, “Did Samuel say this [i.e., that after the red color is gone from it, the drippings are permitted]? Did not Samuel say, ‘A loaf [of bread] that he sliced meat upon — it is prohibited to eat it [because the bread absorbs blood from the meat]’?”*
- F. *[You can explain] that case is different, because on account of the pressure from the knife [as he cuts the meat] it egests [blood into the bread].”*

I.20 A. *Said R. Nahman, “Fish and fowl that he salted with each other are prohibited.” [The fish absorb the blood that comes out of the fowl.]*

- B. *What is the circumstance? If [he salts them together] in a vessel that is not perforated [to allow the fluids to drain out], then even [if he salts] fowl with other fowl, it should be prohibited. If [he salts them together] in a vessel that is perforated, then even fish and fowl [salted together] should be permitted.*
- C. *Invariably [the case is that he salted them together] in a perforated vessel. And fish [absorb the blood] because they have thin outer membranes. They egest [their fluids] first. And fowl have a denser consistency. After the fish finish [egesting fluids] the fowl continue to egest their fluids. And then [the fish] in turn absorb [the blood] from them.*
- D. *R. Mari bar Rachel once salted properly slaughtered meat together with terefah meat. He came before Raba [for a decision as to the law]. He said to him, “[The verse says] ‘These are unclean [to you among all that swarm; whoever touches them when they are dead shall be unclean until the evening]’ (Lev. 11:31). This specification prohibits [also] the fluids and gravy and froth from them.” [Even if one piece of meat does not absorb blood from another when they are salted together, the proper meat will absorb other prohibited fluids from the terefah meat.]*
- E. **[113a]** *But why did he not say this was [prohibited] based on the view of Samuel? For said Samuel, “[With regard to the rules of mixtures of foods] salting is equivalent to scalding and pickling is equivalent to boiling.”*
- F. *But if I based this on the view of Samuel I would have reasoned that this concern applies to blood only but not to other fluids or gravy. It comes to make the novel point here [in the verse that other fluids and gravy easily may be absorbed to render prohibited the meat that is being salted].*
- G. *They posed a question: **A clean fish that was salted with an unclean fish... is permitted [cf. T. Ter. 9:2 A].** Is it not the case that he was salting both of them? [Then by analogy proper meat that was salted with terefah meat should be permitted.]*
- H. *No. The case in question must be one where the clean one was salted and the unclean one was unsalted.*
- I. *But lo from what was taught on Tannaite authority at the end of the text: **[As regards] a salted clean fish [which one pickled] with an unsalted unclean fish, [the clean fish is permitted] [T. Ter. 9:2 D],** we may derive the inference that the first text dealt with two salted fish.*

- J. *[Alternatively we may explain the last text] comes to specify the details [of the first]: **A clean fish that was salted with an unclean fish... is permitted.***
- K. *What are the circumstances? The clean one was salted and the unclean one was unsalted. Here too it makes more sense. For if you reason in accord with the view that the first text deals with a case where the two [fish] are salted, then let us consider the matter. Two salted fish... are permitted. Is it necessary to specify that where the clean one is salted and the unclean one is unsalted [that it is permitted]? [This is self-evident.]*
- L. *If we accept this logic then the Tannaite authority of the last text does not specify [the circumstances] to clarify the first text. You should not maintain that the first text deals with a case where the clean fish is salted and the unclean fish is unsalted [it is permitted]. But where the two are salted, it is prohibited.*
- M. *It teaches us in the last text that where the clean fish is salted and the unclean fish is unsalted [it is permitted]. We may derive the inference that in the first text it deals with two fish that are salted, and even so it is permitted.*
- N. *Come and take note from the very last text: **[As regards] a salted unclean fish [which one pickled] with an unsalted clean fish, [the clean fish], that alone is prohibited.** But if the two of them are salted, it is permitted.*
- O. *But on account of having taught in the first text the case of a clean fish that was salted with an unclean fish that was unsalted, it taught also in the last text the case of an unclean salted fish and a clean unsalted fish. [A mnemonic is given here.]*

I.21 A. Said Samuel, "Meat only escapes [the prohibited status given it by] its blood if one salts it very well and one washes it very well."

- B. *It was stated: R. Huna said he salts it and he washes it.*
- C. *In a Tannaite teaching it was taught: He washes it and salts it and washes it.*
- D. *And there is no dispute between these views. Here [where he washes and salts] it had been rinsed in the butcher shop. Here [where he washes and salts and washes] it had not been rinsed in the butcher shop.*
- E. *R. Dimi from Nehardea used to salt meat with coarse salt and shake it off [before washing it].*

I.22 A. Said R. Mesharshayya, "We make no presumption about the presence of blood in the intestines [of an animal]." [Accordingly they do not need to be salted.]

- B. *Interpret this to mean: the rectum, small intestines and the coil of the colon (Cashdan).*
- C. Said Samuel, "They place salted meat only on top of a perforated vessel [so the blood will run off]."
- D. *R. Sheshet salted each piece by itself (Jastrow).*
- E. *Why did he not salt two together?*
- F. *Perhaps what is egested by one piece will be absorbed by the other. For one piece as well [we should be concerned].*

- G. *Perhaps what is egested by one side of the piece will be absorbed by the other.*
- H. *In fact it makes no difference [whether one salts each by itself or many pieces together].*

I.23 A. Said Samuel in the name of R. Hiyya, “He who breaks the neck bone of a beast [after slaughtering it but] before its life ceases [i.e., while it still shows signs of reflex actions], lo he causes its meat to become heavy, he commits an act of theft [because he will sell it by weight], and he causes [excess] blood to be absorbed in its limbs.”

- B. *They posed a question concerning this: How do you wish to state the matter? [Does he] cause its meat to become heavy and commits an act of theft because he causes [excess] blood to be absorbed in its limbs? [And is this prohibited because he steals from others?] But if he prepared the animal for his own consumption, he has acted in a perfectly acceptable way. [When he salts it he will remove the excess blood.] Or perhaps even if he prepared the animal for his own consumption is it prohibited [for him to break the neck bone]? [When he salts it he will not remove the excess blood.] The question stands unresolved.*

8:3I

I. **He who serves up fowl with cheese on the table does not transgress a prohibition.**

I.1 A. *Lo, one who eats it does transgress a prohibition. You may derive from this that [eating] the meat of fowl with milk is prohibited on the authority of the Torah. [We know this is not the case.]*

- B. *It makes sense [accordingly] to say [that the Mishnah implies], **He who serves up fowl with cheese on the table does not** come close to **transgressing a prohibition.** [Even if he eats it he does not violate a prohibition.]*

8:4

- A. **(1) The meat of clean cattle with the milk of a clean cattle—**
- B. **it is prohibited to cook [one with the other] or to derive benefit [therefrom].**
- C. **(2) The meat of clean cattle with the milk of an unclean cattle,**
- (3) the meat of unclean cattle with the milk of clean cattle—**
- D. **it is permitted to cook and permitted to derive benefit [therefrom].**
- E. **R. Aqiba says, “A wild beast and fowl [are] not [prohibited to be mixed with milk] by the Torah.**
- F. **“For it is said, ‘You will not seethe a kid in its mother’s milk’ (Exo. 23:19, 34:26, Deu. 14:21) — three times, [for the purpose of] excluding [from the prohibition of milk and meat] (1) the wild beast, (2) the bird, (3) and unclean cattle [=C].”**
- G. **R. Yosé the Galilean says, “It is said, ‘You will not eat any sort of carrion’ (Deu. 14:21), and it is said, ‘You will not seethe the kid in its mother’s milk’ (Deu. 14:21) —**
- H. **“[The meaning is this:] What is prohibited on the grounds of carrion [also] is prohibited to be cooked in milk.**

- I. “Fowl, which is prohibited on the grounds of carrion, is it possible that it is prohibited to be seethed in milk?”
- J. “Scripture says, ‘In its mother’s milk’ — excluding fowl, the mother of which does not have milk.”

I.1 A. *What is the source of these assertions? Said R. Eleazar, “Scripture says, ‘When Judah sent the kid [of the goats — gdy h’zym — by his friend the Adullamite, to receive the pledge from the woman’s hand, he could not find her]’ (Gen. 38:20). [113b] Here it says, ‘Kid of the goats [gdy h’zym].’ Lo wherever it says just plain, ‘Kid’ it implies that even [the young of] a cow or a sheep are subsumed [by the term].”*

B. *But why not learn by inference from this verse [that ‘kid’ refers only to the young of a goat]? In another verse it is written, ‘And the skins of the kids of the goats [she put upon his hands and upon the smooth part of his neck]’ (Gen. 27:16). Here it specifies, ‘The kids of the goats.’*

C. *Lo wherever it specifies just plain ‘Kid’ it implies that even [the young of] a cow or a sheep are subsumed [by the term].*

D. *But why not learn by inference from this verse [that ‘kid’ refers only to the young of a goat]?*

E. *These constitute two concurrent scriptural references [i.e., two verses that serve the same purpose]. And from two concurrent scriptural references we do not derive any inference.*

F. *This settles the matter according to one who holds the view that we do not derive any inference [from such verses]. But according to one who holds the view that we do derive inferences [from such verses] what can you say?*

G. *[You should derive from the verses the conclusion that just plain ‘kid’ means only the young of a goat]. [In those verses] there are two exclusionary usages: ‘goats’ [constitutes one exclusionary usage] and ‘the goats’ [constitutes the second].*

I.2 A. *Said Samuel, “(1) [The word] ‘kid’ includes [in the prohibition against cooking meat and milk together] forbidden fats [from an animal]. (2) [The word] ‘kid’ includes [in the prohibition against cooking meat and milk together carrion meat from] an animal that died. [The word] ‘kid’ includes [in the prohibition against cooking meat and milk together meat from] a foetus [of an animal]. (3) [The word] ‘kid’ excludes [from the prohibition against cooking meat and milk together] blood [from an animal]. (4) [The word] ‘kid’ excludes [from the prohibition against cooking meat and milk together] the afterbirth [of an animal]. [The word] ‘kid’ excludes [from the prohibition against cooking meat and milk together meat from] an unclean animal.*

B. *“(1) ‘In its mother’s milk’ (Exo. 23:19, 34:26, Deu. 14:21) [implies] not the milk of a male animal. (2) ‘In its mother’s milk’ [implies] not the milk of an animal that was slaughtered. (3) ‘In its mother’s milk’ [implies] not [the milk] from an unclean animal.”*

C. *Lo the word ‘kid’ is written three times. Yet we derive it from these six inferences.*

- D. *Samuel reasons in accord with the principle that one prohibition can apply [to a substance] on top of another prohibition [that already applies to it]. And the prohibition of fats and of [meat from an animal] that died derive from the same verse [and are counted as one prohibition]. Blood also [is excluded from the prohibition without explicit reference] because it is not subsumed under the term 'kid.' The afterbirth also [is excluded from the prohibition] because it is [with regard to the law no more than] waste matter.*
- E. *Lo this leaves us two [verses to use for exclusions]. One includes the foetus. One excludes an unclean animal.*
- F. *But does Samuel reason in accord with the principle that one prohibition can apply on top of another prohibition? But lo did not Samuel say in the name of R. Eleazar, "What is the basis for concluding that an unclean priest who ate unclean heave-offering is not subject to the death penalty? Because it says, '[They shall therefore keep my charge, lest they bear sin for it] and die thereby when they profane it: [I am the Lord who sanctify them]'" (Lev. 22: 9). This excludes [from the punishment] one who is already profaned [i.e., unclean]."*
- G. *If you prefer [you can maintain that] in general [Samuel reasons in accord with the principle] that one prohibition can apply on top of another prohibition. But there [regarding the unclean priest] the rule is different because it says [explicitly in the verse], "And die thereby."*
- H. *And if you prefer [you can maintain that] in general Samuel reasons in accord with the principle that one prohibition cannot apply on top of another. But here [regarding milk and meat] the Torah stated the inclusionary word 'kid.'*
- I. *And if you prefer [you can maintain that] this one [rule regarding milk and meat] is his view. And this one [rule regarding the unclean priest] is the view of his master [Eleazar].*

I.3 A. *R. Ahadaboy bar Ammi posed a question to Rab, "[Concerning a case where] one cooked [meat] in the milk of a young goat that had never suckled any young, what is the law?"*

- B. *He said to him, "Since it was necessary for Samuel to state that "In its mother's milk" [implies] not that from the milk of a male animal [I.2 B] [it is logical to conclude that milk from] a male animal never falls into the category of mother. But this [young goat] since it [potentially] does fall into the category of mother, it is prohibited [to cook meat with its milk]."*

I.4 A. *It was stated: [Concerning the case of] one who cooks forbidden fat with milk [there is a dispute between] R. Ammi and R. Assi.*

- B. *One says he incurs the penalty of stripes.*
- C. *And one says he does not incur the penalty of stripes.*
- D. *Let us say that they dispute with regard to [a principle of law]. The authority who holds the view that he incurs the penalty of stripes reasons in accord with the principle that one prohibition can apply on top of another prohibition. And the authority who holds the view that he does not incur the penalty of stripes reasons in accord with the view that one prohibition cannot apply on top of another prohibition.*

- E. *No [this is not a valid explanation of the dispute]. They all agree that one prohibition cannot apply on top of another prohibition. Regarding one who eats [this mixture] they all agree and there is no dispute. He does not incur the penalty of stripes [for eating milk and meat. He is liable to punishment only for eating forbidden fat]. Over what then do they dispute? [Over the penalty he incurs] for cooking [the fat with milk].*
- F. *The authority who holds that he incurs the penalty of stripes [for cooking fat and milk reasons that by cooking it he has violated only] one prohibition. [There is no concern whether one prohibition applies on top of another until he eats it.] And the authority who holds that he does not incur the penalty of stripes [reasons] that for a specific purpose the Torah expressed the prohibition against eating [milk and meat] in terms of cooking. [One of the times the Torah says “You will not seethe” prohibits eating milk and meat.] **[114a]** [This style of expression implies that] wherever he would not incur the penalty of stripes for eating [the mixture], he does not incur the penalty of stripes for cooking it either.*
- G. *And there are those who say that with regard to cooking [fat and milk together] they all agree that he incurs the penalty of stripes. Over what then do they dispute? [Over the penalty he incurs] for eating [the fat with milk].*
- H. *The authority who holds that he does not incur the penalty of stripes [for eating fat and milk reasons that by eating it he has violated only one prohibition]. For lo, [we reason in accord with the principle that] one prohibition does not apply on top of another. And the authority who holds that he does incur the penalty of stripes [reasons] that for a specific purpose the Torah expressed the prohibition against eating [milk and meat] in terms of cooking. [One of the times the Torah says “You will not seethe” prohibits eating milk and meat.] [This style of expression implies that] wherever he would incur the penalty of stripes for cooking [the mixture], he incurs the penalty of stripes for eating [the mixture].*
- I. *And if you prefer [another possibility is] that one master refers to one case and the other master refers to another case and there is no dispute. [One says he may incur the penalty of stripes for cooking and the other says he does not, for eating.]*
- J. *They posed a question: **He who cooks [meat] in the juice of milk [i.e., whey] is free [of liability to punishment]. [T. text: He who does so in the milk of a male is free.] Blood that one cooked in milk — he is free. The bones and sinews and horns and hooves that one cooked in milk — he is free. That which is refuse, remnant, or unclean [of consecrated meat] that one cooked in milk — he is liable on their account because of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness [T. 8:10].***
- K. *That Tannaite authority [in T.] reasons in accord with the principle that one prohibition does apply on top of another prohibition.*
- L. **He who cooks [meat] in the juice of milk [i.e., whey] is free [of liability to punishment]:** this supports the view of Resh Laqish. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority, [With regard to the rules of uncleanness] whey is like milk. And sap is like oil [M. **Makhshirin 6:5E-F**]. Said Resh Laqish, “They taught this rule only with regard to [the capacity of these*

liquids to] render seeds susceptible to uncleanness. But with regard to [the prohibition against] cooking meat and milk, whey is not like milk.

I.5 A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “In its mother’s milk” — [based on this phrase] all I would know is [that it is prohibited to seethe the kid in the milk of its mother, a goat]. What is the source of the assertion [that it is prohibited to cook meat] in the milk of a cow or sheep?
- C. You may derive this as follows from an inference *a fortiori*. What is the case regarding the mother? It is not prohibited to mate her [i.e., any female goat] with him [i.e., any male goat]. Yet it is prohibited to cook [meat from a goat in goat’s milk]. Concerning a cow or sheep which are prohibited to mate [of those species] with him [i.e., with a goat], is it not logical that it is prohibited to cook [goat’s meat with their milk]? It comes to teach us, “In its mother’s milk.” [By mentioning the phrase a second time, it teaches that it is prohibited to cook it in any milk.]
- D. *But lo, why do we need to derive this from a verse? Lo, we have reached this point [by logical inference].*
- E. *Said R. Ashi, “[You need to derive it from a verse] because you could say that the basis of the logical argument is flawed. Where do you derive the inference [a fortiori]? From a comparison [of other animals] with the mother. [But you could argue another issue.] What is the case with regard to the mother? It is prohibited to slaughter her [on the same day] along with the offspring. You may say regarding a cow [that the rule is more lenient, not stricter]. For it is not prohibited to slaughter it [on the same day] along with the [calf] offspring. It comes to teach us, “In its mother’s milk.” [By mentioning the phrase again it teaches that it is prohibited to cook it in any milk.]*

I.6 A. *Another Tannaite teaching: “In its mother’s milk” — [from this verse] all I would know is that [it is prohibited to seethe it in] its mother’s milk. What is the source of the assertion [that it is prohibited to cook meat] in the milk of its older sister? [The reference here is either to one of the goats counted for tithing the year before, or to cows, i.e. larger animals of another species.]*

- B. You may derive this as follows from an inference *a fortiori*. What is the case regarding the mother? She may enter into the pen together [with the kid] to be counted for tithing. Yet it is prohibited to cook [meat from a goat in goat’s milk]. Concerning its older sister which may not enter into the pen together [with the kid, either because it was counted for tithes in the previous year or because it is of another species, depending on the interpretation], is it not logical to conclude that it is prohibited to cook [goat’s meat with the milk of that animal]? It comes to teach us, “In its mother’s milk.” [By mentioning the phrase a second time, it teaches that it is prohibited to cook it in any milk.]
- C. *But lo, why do we need to derive this from a verse? Lo, we have reached this point [by logical inference].*
- D. *Said R. Ashi, “[You need to derive it from a verse] because you could say that the basis of the logical argument is flawed. Where do you derive the inference [a fortiori]? From a comparison [of other animals] with the mother. [But you could argue another issue.] What is the case with regard to the mother? It is prohibited to slaughter her [on the same day] along with the offspring. You may say*

regarding its older sister [i.e., from the past year, or a cow, that the rule is more lenient, not stricter]. For it is not prohibited to slaughter it [on the same day] along with the [kid] offspring. It comes to teach us, “In its mother’s milk.” [By mentioning the phrase again it teaches that it is prohibited to cook it in any milk.]

- I.7 A.** *We have found a basis for [prohibiting the milk of] its older sister. What is the source of the assertion [that it is prohibited to cook meat] in the milk of its younger sister? [The reference here is either to one of the goats counted for tithing the next year, or to sheep, i.e. smaller animals of another species.]*
- B. *You may derive this as follows from [a consideration of] both [the rules regarding the mother and the older sister]. From which will you deduce this? If you try to deduce it from [the rules relating to the mother you may argue] what is the case regarding the mother? It is prohibited to slaughter her [on the same day] along with the offspring.*
- C. *Let the [rules regarding] the older sister prove the matter. What is the case regarding the older sister? She may not enter into the pen together with it [i.e., with the kid, either because it was counted for tithes in the previous year or because it is of another species, depending on the interpretation, is it not logical to conclude that it is prohibited to cook goat’s meat with the milk of that animal]?*
- D. *Let the [rules regarding the] mother prove the matter. So we find ourselves trapped in a logical circle. The distinctive trait that pertains to the one is not the same as the distinctive trait that applies to the other. And the generative quality of the other is not the same as the generative quality of the one. But then, the generative trait that pertains to them all is that they are all sources of meat, and one is prohibited to cook that together with milk. So I shall introduce the matter of the younger sister that is also a source of meat and one is prohibited to cook that together with milk.*
- E. *If this is the case you may derive the rule for the older sister from [a consideration of] both [the rules regarding the mother and the younger sister].*
- F. *That is a proper inference. But if this is so then why do we need the verse to specify, “In its mother’s milk?”*
- G. *We need it to teach us [another rule] that was taught on Tannaite authority.*
- H. *“In its mother’s milk” — [from this verse] all I would know is that [it is prohibited to seethe it in] its mother’s milk. [114b] What is the source of the assertion [that it is prohibited to cook meat] in its own milk? You may derive this as follows from an inference a fortiori.*
- I. *What is the case [regarding this law]? It was not prohibited to slaughter the offspring with other offspring on the same day. It was prohibited to slaughter the offspring with the mother on the same day. In a case where it was prohibited to cook the offspring with other ‘offspring’ [(lit.: produce) here taken to mean the milk] is it not logical to conclude that it was prohibited to cook the ‘offspring’ [i.e., the milk of the kid] with the mother? It comes to teach us, “In its mother’s milk.” [By mentioning the phrase again it teaches that it is prohibited to cook it in any milk.]*
- J. *But lo, why do we need to derive this from a verse? Lo, we have reached this point [by logical inference].*

- K. *Said R. Ahadaboy bar Ammi, "It is on account of the possibility of saying that [a counter-argument based on the case of mating] a horse that is the offspring of a mare with its brother, a mule, will prove persuasive. For [in that case] the offspring [horse] is prohibited to mate with the other offspring [mule]. But it is permitted to mate the offspring [horse] with the mother [mare]."*
- L. *[But this is not analogous to our concern.] There it is the result of the seed of the [two separate] sires [that the horse and mule] are not deemed to be a case of offspring mixing with other offspring [of the same category].*
- M. *For lo, [a counter-argument based on the case of mating] a he-mule that is the offspring of a mare with its sister, a she-mule, will prove persuasive. For [in that case] the offspring [she-mule] is permitted to mate with the other offspring [he-mule]. But it is prohibited to mate the offspring [he-mule] with the mother [mare].*
- N. *But said Mar the son of Rabina, "It is on account of the possibility of saying that [a counter-argument based on the case of mating] a slave, the offspring of a maid-servant, with his sister, a freed maid-servant, will prove persuasive. For [in that case] the offspring [slave] is prohibited to mate with the other offspring [freed maid-servant]. But he is permitted to mate with [a woman who has the status of maid-servant as does] his mother."*
- O. *[But this is not analogous to our concern.] There it is the result of the writ of manumission [that they may not mate].*
- P. *For lo, [a counter-argument based on the case of mating] a slave, the son of a freed maid-servant, with his sister, a maid-servant, will prove persuasive. For [in that case] the offspring [slave] is permitted to mate with the other offspring [maid-servant]. But he is prohibited to mate with [a woman who has the status of maid-servant as does] his mother.*
- Q. *But said R. Idi bar Abin, "It is on account of the possibility of saying that [a counter-argument based on the case of mixing] diverse kinds of seeds will prove persuasive. For [in that case] the offspring [plant] is prohibited to be mixed with the other offspring [plant]. But the offspring [plant] is permitted to be mixed with the mother [plant]."*
- R. *[But this is not analogous to our concern.] There it is only by virtue of [planting in] the mother [earth] that the offsprings may not be mixed. For lo, wheat and barley may be [mixed together] in a jug and that is not prohibited.*
- S. *Rather said R. Ashi, "It is on account of the possibility of saying [by way of counter-argument against the preceding] that what is the case regarding [mixing] one offspring [the milk] with another offspring [the kid]? They are two distinct bodies. You may say regarding [mixing] the offspring [milk] with the mother [that is permitted because] they are of one body. On account of this you need a verse [to teach you the rule]."*
- I.8 A.** *Said R. Ashi, "What is the source for the prohibition against eating meat [cooked] with milk? As it says, 'You shall not eat any abominable thing' (Deu. 14: 3). [This means that] everything I have declared abominable for you is prohibited to eat."*
- B. *[Based on this interpretation of the verse] I conclude only that [it is prohibited] to eat [meat cooked with milk]. What is the source [for the prohibition against] deriving benefit [from such a mixture]?*

- C. *It is in accord with the view of R. Abbahu.* For said R. Abbahu, said R. Eleazar, “Anyplace it says, ‘One shall not eat,’ ‘You shall not eat,’ [or] ‘They shall not eat,’ it implies both a prohibition against eating it and a prohibition against deriving benefit from it unless scripture specifies [that one may derive benefit from it] in the manner that is specified for carrion [that one is permitted] to give it to an alien or to sell it to an idolater.” [The verse states: “You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; you may give it to the alien who is within your towns, that he may eat it, or you may sell it to a foreigner; for you are a people holy to the Lord your God. You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk” (Deu. 14:21).]
- D. *As it was taught on Tannaite authority:* “You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; you may give it to the alien who is within your towns, that he may eat it, or you may sell it to a foreigner; [for you are a people holy to the Lord your God. You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk]” (Deu. 14:21). Based on this I derive only that one may give it to an alien or sell it to an idolater. What is the source for [permission] to sell it to an alien? It comes to teach, “You may give it to an alien... or you may sell it...” What is the source for [permission] to give it to an idolater? It comes to teach, “You may give it... or you may sell it to a foreigner.” “It turns out that to both an alien and an idolater you may either sell it or give it,” the words of R. Meir.
- E. R. Judah says, “The words must be interpreted literally [to permit only] giving it to an alien or selling it to an idolater.”
- F. *What is the basis for the view of R. Judah? [He argues that] if you were to reason in accord with the view stated by R. Meir, then the Torah should have written,* “You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; you may give it to the alien who is within your towns, that he may eat it, *and* you may sell it...” What does “or” imply? *You may derive from this that* the words must be interpreted literally [to permit only] giving it to an alien ‘or’ selling it to an idolater.
- G. And R. Meir will say to you [by way of counter-argument] that this word “or” tells you that giving it to an alien takes precedence over selling it to an idolater.
- H. And R. Judah [will say to you by way of counter-argument that] to tell you that giving it to an alien takes precedence over selling it to an idolater, you do not need a verse. *That conclusion may be derived from logical inference.* This [alien] you are commanded to sustain. This [idolater] you are not commanded to sustain.
- I. [A mnemonic is given.] *Consider now: [115a] food prepared on the Sabbath should be prohibited [to eat]. For lo I declared it abominable to you. Scripture says [to rule this out], “[You shall keep the Sabbath,] because it is holy for you; [every one who profanes it shall be put to death; whoever does any work on it, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is a Sabbath of solemn rest, holy to the Lord; whoever does any work on the Sabbath day shall be put to death]” (Exo. 31:14-15). It is holy, but the food prepared on it is not holy [i.e., prohibited].*

- J. [Concerning] one who plows with an ox and an ass [yoked together] or who muzzles a cow and threshes with it, let these [products that result from the prohibited acts] be prohibited. *For lo I declared it abominable to you. Let us consider this matter. What is the case with regard to the Sabbath? [Performing prohibited] preparations is a severe matter yet [the products that result] are permitted. For these [actions of plowing or threshing that are less severe], it is more logical to conclude [that the products that result are permitted].*
- K. [Concerning one who sows] mixed kinds of seeds [in one field], let these [plants that grow] be prohibited. *For lo I declared it abominable to you. Since the Torah stated explicitly regarding mixed kinds in a vineyard, “[You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed,] lest the whole yield be forfeited to the sanctuary, [the crop which you have sown and the yield of the vineyard]” (Deu. 22: 9). [And this has been interpreted], “Lest the whole yield be burned by fire.” We may derive from this that [the plants that result from] mixed kinds of seeds are permitted.*
- L. *But it makes sense to maintain that [the results] of mixed kinds in a vineyard are prohibited both for eating and for deriving any benefit. Mixed kinds of seeds are prohibited for eating but are permitted for deriving other benefits. [Scripture] juxtaposed [the rules prohibiting mixed kinds of seeds] to [the rules prohibiting] mixed kinds of animals. As it is written, “[You shall keep my statutes.] You shall not let your cattle breed with a different kind; you shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed; [nor shall there come upon you a garment of cloth made of two kinds of stuff]” (Lev. 19:19). What is the case regarding your cattle? That which results from [mixing the kinds] is permitted. So even with regard to [sowing mixed kinds of seeds in] your field. That which results from [mixing the seeds] is permitted.*
- M. *And what is the source of the rule itself regarding [the permission to use the products from] mixed kinds of cattle? [It is logical to argue that] since the Torah prohibited mixed kinds for high purposes [i.e., sacrifice in the Temple], we may derive that [mixed kinds] are permitted for an ordinary use.*
- N. *[Concerning one who slaughtered on the same day] the mother and its offspring, let these be prohibited. [It is logical to argue that] since the Torah prohibited an animal slaughtered at an improper time for high purposes [i.e., the Temple], we may derive that [an animal slaughtered at the wrong time] is permitted for an ordinary use. [The issue for the mother and offspring is that they were slaughtered on the same day, i.e., at the wrong time in relation to each other.]*
- O. *[Concerning one who did not] send [the mother bird] away from the nest [before taking the young], let these [young and the mother] be prohibited. The Torah did not say that one should send it away to lead a person to stumble [into sin by eating the mother bird not knowing that it had been sent away from the nest].*

- I.9** A. Said Resh Laqish, “*What is the source for the prohibition against eating meat [cooked] with milk? As it says, ‘Do not eat any of it raw or boiled with water, [but roasted, its head with its legs and its inner parts]’ (Exo. 12: 9). Now it did not have to teach us, ‘With water.’ What does it come to teach us [by adding], ‘With water’? To inform you that there is another kind of boiling that is [prohibited] like this is [prohibited]. And what is that? It is [the boiling together of] meat and milk.*”
- B. Said to him R. Yohanan, **[115b]** “*Do you reject as implausible that which Rabbi taught [as follows]?*”
- C. “[Only be sure that you do not eat the blood; for the blood is the life, and you shall not eat the life with the flesh. You shall not eat it; you shall pour it out upon the earth like water.] You shall not eat it; [that all may go well with you and with your children after you, when you do what is right in the sight of the Lord]’ (Deu. 12:23-25). [This last repetition is superfluous.] Scripture speaks here of the prohibition of meat cooked with milk. You may say, does scripture speak of meat and milk? Or does scripture refer only to one of all the other prohibitions of the Torah?
- D. “You may say, go and learn [the correct interpretation] based on [one of] the thirteen principles of hermeneutics: [this is an example of] a matter that is inferred from the subject of its context. What is the subject that scripture speaks of [in this verse]? [It makes reference to] two categories [i.e., blood and meat. But Rashi interprets: invalid Holy Things that were redeemed fall into two categories. They are permitted for consumption like unconsecrated animals but prohibited from work or shearing like Holy Things.] So too here [in this phrase of the verse the reference is to the prohibition of meat and milk —] two categories.”
- E. [Resh Laqish replies:] *If I had [derived the prohibition only] from this [verse] I would have reasoned that this concern applies [to prohibit] eating [meat cooked with milk]. But that to derive benefit [from the mixture] — there was no [prohibition]. It comes to make the novel point [based on the extra language in the verse regarding the Paschal lamb, cited above in A that benefit is prohibited].*
- F. *And according to Rabbi, what is the source for [the prohibition against] deriving benefit [from the mixture]?*
- G. *He derives the inference from this:* It is stated here, “[You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; you may give it to the alien who is within your towns, that he may eat it, or you may sell it to a foreigner;] for you are a people holy to the Lord your God. [You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk]” (Deu. 14:21). And it is stated further, “[None of the daughters of Israel shall be a Temple prostitute;] none of the sons of Israel shall be a Temple prostitute” (Deu. 23:17). [Based on the commonality of the word *qdsh* that occurs in both verses you may conclude that the same laws apply to both instances.] What is the case there? [The verse prohibits] deriving benefit [from a prostitute]. So too here [the verse prohibits] deriving benefit [from the mixture].
- I.10** A. [Another source for deriving the prohibition against selling meat cooked with milk]: The House of R. Eliezer taught: “You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; you may give it to the alien who is within your towns, that he may eat it, or you may sell it to a foreigner; for you are a people holy (*qdsh*) to the Lord your God. You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk” (Deu. 14:21). [Scripture implies

that] if you sell it [i.e., meat of carrion], you should not first cook it [in milk] and sell it [because that is prohibited].

- B. The House of R. Eliezer taught: [The Torah states,] “You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk” (Exo. 23:19, 34:26, Deu. 14:21) three times. One for the prohibition of eating; and one for the prohibition of deriving benefit [from the mixture]; and one for the prohibition of cooking.
- C. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:* Issi b. Judah says, “What is the source for the rule that meat cooked with milk is prohibited? It is stated here, ‘For you are a people holy to the Lord your God. [You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk]’ (Deu. 14:21). And it is stated further, ‘You shall be people consecrated (*qdsh*) to me; therefore you shall not eat any meat that is mangled by beasts in the field; [you shall throw it to the dogs]’ (Exo. 22:31). [Based on the commonality of the word *qdsh* in both verses you may conclude that the same laws apply to both instances.] What is the case there? [The verse] prohibits it. So too here [the verse] prohibits it.”
- D. I infer from this only [that it is prohibited] to eat it. What is the source for the rule [that it is prohibited] to derive benefit from it? This may be inferred *a fortiori*. What is the case regarding *orlah*-produce? No transgression was committed with it [and] it is prohibited to derive benefit from it. Regarding meat cooked with milk where a transgression was committed [by cooking it together] is it not logical to deduce that it be prohibited to derive benefit from it?
- E. But what is the case regarding *orlah*-produce [that makes it different with regard to the law from meat and milk]? There never was a time when it was valid. [The nature of the prohibition of] leaven on Passover will prove the matter. For [like meat and milk] there was a time when it was valid and [yet] it is prohibited to derive benefit from it.
- F. [But you may object to the comparison of the prohibitions of leaven on Passover and milk and meat on the following grounds:] What is the case regarding [the prohibition of] leaven on Passover? [Violation of] it entails the punishment of extirpation. [Hence that prohibition is more stringent. Violation of the prohibition of meat and milk entails only the punishment of stripes.]
- G. [The nature of the prohibition of] mixed kinds grown in a vineyard will prove the matter. For [violation of that prohibition] does not entail the punishment of extirpation and [yet] it is prohibited to derive benefit from it.
- H. *Why then do I need to derive [the prohibition] from an inference based on the same language in two verses? Let us derive it all from an inference a fortiori from the rule for orlah-produce [as follows].*
- I. What is the case regarding *orlah*-produce? No transgression was committed with it [and] it is prohibited both to eat it and to derive benefit from it. Regarding meat cooked with milk where a transgression was committed [by cooking it together] is it not logical to deduce that it be prohibited both to eat it and to derive benefit from it?
- J. [You cannot make this argument because you can counter it as follows.] [The nature of the prohibitions for] one who plows with an ox and an ass [yoked together] or one who muzzles the mouth of a cow and threshes with it will prove the matter. For [like meat and milk] a transgression was committed [when he

performed the acts]. But they permitted [benefit to be derived from the violation]. [Hence we should be permitted to derive benefit from meat cooked with milk.]

- K. Why do I need to say that [the nature of the prohibition of] mixed kinds grown in a vineyard will prove the matter. It makes sense to say that [the nature of the prohibition of] *orlah*-produce will prove the matter.
- L. *And we find ourselves trapped in a logical circle until we infer [the nature of the prohibition of meat cooked with milk] from the common elements [of all the rules].*
- M. *Said R. Ashi, "[You could not have concluded this] because you could have said, [the nature of the prohibition of] carrion-meat will prove the matter. For it is prohibited to eat it and [yet] it is permitted to derive benefit from it."*
- N. *Said R. Mordecai to R. Ashi, "This is what we stated in the name of Resh Laqish, 'In all instances of logical inferences derived [inductively] from common characteristics [of the law in different cases] we may refute them from arguments based on only those cases [i.e., the prohibitions of leaven on Passover or of orlah-produce]. We may not refute them based on additional cases [i.e., the prohibition of carrion].'"*
- O. *If this is the case then [as we said above] let us infer [the nature of the prohibition of meat cooked with milk] from the common elements [of all the rules].*
- P. [We cannot do this because] *one could refute the reasoning as follows: What is the element common to them [i.e., that differentiates leaven and orlah-produce]? They grow in the ground. [Meat and milk do not].*
- Q. *If this is the case then on this basis also we could refute the objection from the case of mixed kinds grown in a vineyard [by arguing that the case is different because] they grow in the ground [and meat and milk do not].*
- R. *Said R. Mordecai to R. Ashi, "This is what we stated in the name of Resh Laqish, 'In all instances of logical inferences derived [inductively] from common characteristics [of the law in different cases] we may refute them from just any [arguments]. In all instances of inferences derived [deductively] from [statements such as], 'No, if you state the rule applies in this matter will you state that it applies in that matter?' we may refute them based on [another deductive argument such as an argument] a fortiori, but not on the basis of just any [argument at all].'"*
- S. *Then one could refute the reasoning as follows: What is common to all of them [i.e., that differentiates leaven, orlah-produce and mixed kinds in a vineyard from meat and milk]? They grow in the ground.*
- T. *Said R. Mordecai to R. Ashi, "This is what we stated in the name of Resh Laqish, **[116a]** 'In all instances of logical inferences derived [associatively] one case from one other, we may refute the inference based on a less severe or more severe [characteristic in one of the cases] but we may not refute them based on just any [argument]. In all instances of logical inferences derived [associatively] one case from two others, we may refute the inference based on just any [argument]. In all instances of logical inferences derived [associatively] one case from three others, if the logical inferences would continue in a circular fashion until it leads us to*

infer [the nature of one element] from the common elements [of all the rules], we may refute the inference based on just any [argument]. But if not, we may refute the inference based on a less severe or more severe [characteristic in one of the cases] but we may not refute them based on just any [argument].”

- U. *But then one could refute the reasoning as follows: But what is the case regarding mixed kinds grown in a vineyard [that makes it different with regard to the law from meat and milk]? There never was a time when it was valid.*
- V. *Said R. Ada bar Ahavah, “[Since we do not raise that objection] that means that mixed kinds growing in a vineyard become prohibited after they have taken root. And there was a time when they were valid before they took root.”*
- W. *R. Shemaiah bar Zeira posed an objection: **He who carries a perforated pot [containing another kind] through the vineyard — if [while he carried the pot through the vineyard] it [the seeds of the other kind] increased in size by [one] two-hundredth — it is prohibited [it sanctifies the vines] [M. Kil. 7:8 D-F].** [We may infer from this that even though mixed kinds had taken root] if it increased, yes [it is prohibited]. If it did not increase, no [it is not prohibited].*
- X. *Said Abbaye, “There are two clauses written concerning this: it is written, ‘You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the whole yield be forfeited to the sanctuary’ (Deu. 22: 9); and it is written [in the continuation of the verse], ‘The seed which you have sown and the yield of the vineyard’ (Deu. 22: 9). Lo, what is the implication [of the verse]? Concerning seed that is already planted [the prohibition takes effect] when it takes root. Concerning seed that was planted elsewhere and brought into the vineyard, if it increased, yes [the prohibition takes effect]. If it did not increase, no [it does not take effect].*

I.11 A. *Our Mishnah-passage is not in accord with the view of this Tannaite authority. As it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, “Meat that was cooked with milk is prohibited for eating but it is permitted to derive benefit from it. As it says, ‘[You shall not eat anything that dies of itself; you may give it to the alien who is within your towns, that he may eat it, or you may sell it to a foreigner;] for you are a people holy to the Lord your God. [You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk]’ (Deu. 14:21).*

B. *“And it is stated further, ‘You shall be people consecrated to me; [therefore you shall not eat any meat that is mangled by beasts in the field; you shall throw it to the dogs]’ (Exo. 22:31). [Based on the commonality of the word *qdsh* in both verses you may conclude that the same laws apply to both instances.] What is the case there [regarding carrion]? It is prohibited for eating but it is permitted to derive benefit from it. So too here [regarding meat and milk] it is prohibited for eating but it is permitted to derive benefit from it.”*

II.1 A. *R. Aqiba says, “A wild beast and fowl [are] not [prohibited to be mixed with milk] by the Torah. For it is said, ‘You will not seethe a kid in its mother’s milk’ (Exo. 23:19, 34:26, Deu. 14:21) — three times, [for the purpose of] excluding [from the prohibition of milk and meat] (1) the wild beast, (2) the bird, (3) and unclean cattle” [M. 8:4 E-F]. Lo, we employed these [verses as the basis for the inferences above at 113b] of Samuel.*

- B. *R. Aqiba reasons in accord with the principle that one prohibition can apply on top of another prohibition. [Therefore he does not need the verses for the special cases of meat cooked with milk.] [Meat of] forbidden fats or of an animal that died do not require a verse [to prohibit the mixture if they are cooked with milk]. [He deems] a foetus to have the status of a regular kid. All the [verses] are extraneous [according to his view and can be used to] exclude a wild beast, fowl and an unclean animal [from the rules prohibiting the cooking of meat and milk].*

III.1 A. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “It is said, ‘You will not eat any sort of carrion’ (Deu. 14:21), and it is said, ‘You will not seethe the kid in its mother’s milk’ (Deu. 14:21) — [The meaning is this:] What is prohibited on the grounds of carrion [also] is prohibited to be cooked in milk. Fowl, which is prohibited on the grounds of carrion, is it possible that it is prohibited to be seethed in milk? Scripture says, ‘In its mother’s milk’ — excluding fowl, the mother of which does not have milk” [M. 8:4 G-J].

- B. *What is the matter in dispute between R. Yosé the Galilean and R. Aqiba?*
- C. *The matter in dispute is the wild beast. R. Yosé the Galilean reasons that [meat of] a wild beast is prohibited [with milk] based on the authority of the Torah. R. Aqiba reasons that [meat of] a wild beast is prohibited [with milk] based on the authority of the rabbis.*
- D. *Another possibility, if you prefer: The matter in dispute is fowl. R. Aqiba reasons that [meat of] a wild beast and of fowl is not prohibited [with milk] based on the authority of the Torah. Lo, based on the authority of the rabbis they prohibited it. R. Yosé the Galilean reasons in accord with the view that [meat of] fowl is not prohibited [with milk] even based on the authority of the rabbis.*
- E. *There is a Tannaite teaching that accords with this view [b. Shab. 130a]: In the locale of R. Eliezer on the Sabbath they would cut wood to heat charcoal to forge iron [to make a circumcision knife, since in his view it was permitted to do everything that was required in connection with the rite]. In the locale of R. Yosé the Galilean, they would eat fowl [chicken] meat with milk.*
- F. *Levi visited the house of Joseph the fowler. They served him the head of a peacock cooked in milk. He did not eat it. When he came before Rabbi, he said to him, “How come you did not excommunicate them?”*
- G. *He said to him, “It was the locale of R. Judah b. Beterah, and I thought, maybe he expounded for them [the rule] in accord with the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, who said, ‘Excluding fowl, the mother of which does not have milk’ [M. Hul. 8:4 J].”*

8:5

- A. **[The milk in] the stomach of [a beast slaughtered by] a gentile [which is carrion, M. 1:1], and that [in the stomach of] carrion — lo, this is prohibited.**
- B. **He who curdles [milk] in the skin of the stomach of a valid[ly slaughtered beast], [116b] if it is sufficient to impart a flavor — lo, this [cheese] is prohibited.**
- C. **A valid beast which sucked from a terefah beast — [the milk in] its stomach is prohibited.**

- D. A terefah beast which sucked from a valid beast — [the milk in] its stomach is permitted,
- E. [in both cases (C, D)] because [the milk remains] collected together in its intestines.

I.1 A. *Is not the stomach of [a beast slaughtered by] a gentile [itself] carrion?*

- B. *Said R. Huna, “Here we are dealing with a case where one purchased a kid from a gentile. And we are concerned that perhaps it suckled milk from a terefah-animal.”*
- C. *And are we concerned that perhaps it suckled milk from a terefah-animal? For lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: They purchase eggs from any source [b.: from a gentile] and do not scruple lest they are of carrion- or terefah-birds [T. 3(4):24].*
- D. *Rather it makes sense to maintain that we are concerned that perhaps it suckled milk from an unclean animal.*
- E. *But what difference is there between [the case of] a terefah-animal, about which we are not concerned and [the case of] an unclean animal, about which we are concerned? A terefah-animal is atypical. An unclean animal is typical.*
- F. *But if it is typical, then even with regard to our own [animal’s stomach] we ought to be concerned [that it suckled from an unclean animal].*
- G. *[No.] We segregate [our clean animals] from them. And when we see them together, we separate them. [For us] the rabbis did not decree [that we be concerned that our clean animal suckled from an unclean animal]. They [i.e., gentiles] do not segregate [clean animals] from them [unclean ones]. And when they see them together, they do not separate them. [For them] the rabbis did decree [that we be concerned that their clean animal suckled from an unclean one].*
- H. *And Samuel said, “[The Mishnah-passage] taught one rule: The stomach of [a beast] slaughtered by a gentile is carrion.”*
- I. *And did Samuel in fact say this? Lo, said Samuel [b. A. Z. 35a-b], “Why did they prohibit the cheese of a gentile? Because they curdle it in the skin of a stomach of carrion.” Lo, [this means that the milk in] the stomach itself is permitted.*
- J. *This is not a contradiction. This one [i.e., our Mishnah-passage, states R. Joshua’s rule] before he recanted [his view]. This one [i.e., b. A. Z. 35a-b, states R. Joshua’s rule] after he recanted.*

II.1 A. *A valid beast which sucked from a terefah beast — [the milk in] its stomach is prohibited. A terefah beast which sucked from a valid beast — [the milk in] its stomach is permitted, [in both cases (C, D)] because [the milk remains] collected together in its intestines [M. 8:5 C-E]. But lo, this was taught in the first text of the Mishnah-passage: [The milk in] the stomach of [a beast slaughtered by] a gentile [which is carrion, M. 1:1], and that [in the stomach of] carrion — lo, this is prohibited. [It appears to be repetitious.]*

- B. *Said R. Hisda, “In [the case in] the first text of the Mishnah-passage it looks like he is eating carrion. In this text it was slaughtered.”*

- C. *Said to him Raba, "Is it not logical to argue that [there is a contradiction here]? What is the case regarding [milk in the stomach of] carrion? It is repulsive to him — and if you have permitted [consumption of the milk in] its stomach he will not come to eat [its flesh]. [Nevertheless] you have stated not [to consume the milk]. [Is it not logical to argue that with regard to] a terefah-animal that was slaughtered — and if you have permitted [consumption of the milk in its stomach] he will come to eat [its flesh] — most certainly [you must state that it is prohibited]?"*
- D. *Rather said R. Isaac, said R. Yohanan, "This is not a contradiction. This one [i.e., the first text of the Mishnah-passage, states R. Joshua's rule] before he recanted [his view]. This one [i.e., the second text, states R. Joshua's rule] after he recanted. And the [original rule of the] Mishnah-passage was not revised."*
- II.2** A. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, "They may curdle milk in the stomach of carrion. But they may not curdle milk in the stomach of an animal that was slaughtered by a gentile."*
- B. *R. Simeon bar Abba stated before him, "In accord with whose view is this? In accord with the view of R. Eliezer who said, 'The ordinary deliberation of a gentile [e.g., when he slaughters an animal] is to commit an act of idolatry.'"*
- C. *He [Hiyya] said to him, "[Of course!] Could it be in accord with the view of anyone else?"*
- D. *When R. Samuel bar Isaac came [from Israel, he stated contrary to Hiyya in A,] said R. Yohanan, "They may curdle milk both in the stomach of carrion and in the stomach of an animal that was slaughtered by a gentile. For we are not concerned with the words of R. Eliezer."*
- E. *And the law is in accord with the view that they may not curdle milk in the skin of the stomach of carrion. But they may curdle milk in the stomach of carrion and in the stomach of an animal that was slaughtered by a gentile.*
- F. *[Some versions omit:] [And they curdle milk] in the stomach of a **valid beast which sucked from a terefah beast** — and certainly in the stomach of a **terefah beast which sucked from a valid beast**. On what basis? The milk aggregated there has the status of common waste matter.*

8:6

- A. **A more strict rule applies to fat than to blood, and a more strict rule applies to blood than to fat.**
- B. **A more strict rule applies to fat:**
- C. **For as to fat: [117a] (1) the laws of sacrilege apply to it. And (2) they are liable on its account to the laws of refuse, remnant, and uncleanness,**
- D. **which is not the case with blood, for [the law forbidding] blood applies to cattle, a wild beast, and a bird, whether unclean or clean.**
- F. **But [the prohibition of] fat applies only to a clean cattle alone.**
- I.1** A. *What is the source of these assertions [that the law of sacrilege applies to fat]? Said R. Yannai, "As scripture stated: 'Just as these are taken from the ox of the sacrifice of the peace offerings, [and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of burnt offering]' (Lev. 4:10). And what [rule] did we learn from, 'The ox of the*

sacrifice of the peace offerings'? Behold this comes to teach us a rule [about another case] and it turns out that it derives a rule from another source."

- B. [Scripture] juxtaposes the ox of the sacrifice of the peace offerings to the bull of the anointed High Priest. What is the case regarding the bull of the High Priest? It is subject to the laws of sacrilege. So too the ox of the sacrifice of the peace offerings is subject to the laws of sacrilege.
- C. Said to him R. Hanina, "Do you reject as implausible that which Rabbi taught?" [As follows:] "[And the priest shall burn them on the altar as food offered by fire for a pleasing odor.] All fat is the Lord's" (Lev. 3:16) includes the portions offered on the altar from Lesser Holy Things as subject to the laws of sacrilege.
- D. *Said Abbaye, "It is necessary to state both verses. For if the Torah had written only the rule for fat I would have reasoned that fat is [subject to sacrilege]. The caul and the two kidneys are not [subject to sacrilege]. The Torah accordingly stated, 'Just as these are taken.' And if the Torah had written only, 'Just as these are taken,' I would have reasoned that the fat of the fat-tail that is not present in the ox is not [subject to sacrilege]. The Torah accordingly stated, 'All fat [is the Lord's].'"*
- E. *Said R. Mari to R. Zebid, "If the fat-tail is called fat [i.e., referred to with the same word that means forbidden fat (Lev. 7:25)], let it be prohibited for eating."*
- F. *He said to him, "Pertaining to your claim scripture said, '[Say to the people of Israel, You shall eat no] fat, of ox, or sheep, or goat' (Lev. 7:23). [This means only] something that is identical in the ox, sheep and goat [excluding the fat-tail]."*
- G. *And R. Ashi said, "It is called, 'The whole of its fat-tail' (Lev. 3:9, Rashi). It is not called just plain 'fat'."*
- H. *But on this basis should we infer that it is not subject to sacrilege? Rather it is preferable to explain in accord with R. Zebid.*

II.1 A. Which is not the case with blood, [for the law forbidding blood applies to cattle, a wild beast, and a bird, whether unclean or clean. But the prohibition of fat applies only to a clean cattle alone] [M. 8:6 D-F]. What is the source of these assertions [that blood is not subject to sacrilege]?

- B. *Said Ulla, "Scripture stated, '[For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it] for you [upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life]' (Lev. 17:11). [This means] it belongs to you [and is not subject to sacrilege]."*
- C. *The House of R. Ishmael taught: "[For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar] to make atonement [for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life]" (Lev. 17:11). [This means] I gave it to you to make atonement and not to be subject to sacrilege.*
- D. *And R. Yohanan said, "Scripture said, '[For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for] it is [the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life]' (Lev. 17:11). [This means] 'it is' [in the same status] prior to the atonement as it is after the*

atonement. What is the case after the atonement? It is not subject to sacrilege. So too prior to the atonement, it is not subject to sacrilege.”

- E. [But you may object] *it makes sense to say* ‘it is’ [in the same status] after the atonement as it is prior to the atonement. What is the case before the atonement? It is subject to sacrilege. So too after the atonement, it is subject to sacrilege.
- F. [But this is not possible because we have a principle]: There is no article whose obligation has been fulfilled [i.e., its ritual has been performed] that is subject to sacrilege [cf. b. Suk. 49b].
- G. And is there none? But lo [consider the case of the ritual of] carrying the ashes [from the altar]. For even after its obligation has been fulfilled, it is subject to sacrilege. *As it is written*, “[Then he shall take off his vestments and put on other garments. And he shall take up the ashes to which the fire has reduced the burnt offering on the altar,] and place them beside the altar” (Lev. 6: 3).
- H. [This instance is not a valid counter-example to the stated principle] because [the rules concerning] carrying the ashes and the priestly vestments are two distinct topics that make one point [i.e., both the ashes and the vestments must be put away permanently and cannot be used again]. And [the hermeneutical principle is] we do not derive [any generalization] from two distinct topics that make one point.
- I. *This would settle the matter in accord with the view of the rabbis who say [regarding the priestly vestments that], “[Then Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments which he put on when he went into the holy place,] and shall leave them there” (Lev. 16:23) — this teaches us that they must be put away for good.*
- J. *But in accord with the view of R. Dosa who said [that the verse means] he should not use them on another Day of Atonement [but that one can make other use of them] what can you say? [The two topics do not make one point; the principle does not apply; the instance serves as a valid counter-example to the assertion of E!]*
- K. [This instance is not a valid counter-example to the stated principle] because [the rules concerning] carrying the ashes and the heifer whose neck is broken are two distinct topics that make one point [i.e., both the ashes and the heifer must be put away permanently and cannot be used again, cf. Deu. 21: 1-9 regarding the rite of the heifer]. And [the hermeneutical principle is] we do not derive [any generalization] from two distinct topics that make one point.
- L. *This would settle the matter in accord with the authority who holds the view that we do not derive [any generalization] from two distinct topics that make one point. But in accord with the authority who holds the view that we do derive [a generalization] from two distinct topics that make one point, what can you say? [The instance serves as a valid counter-example to the assertion of E!]*
- M. *[You can respond that even in accord with that latter authority, this instance is exceptional.] Two [117b] exclusionary usages were written [regarding these matters]. Here [regarding the ashes] it was written, “And place them [beside the altar]” (Lev. 6: 3) [i.e., only “them”]. And there [regarding the heifer] it is written, “Whose neck was broken” (Deu. 21: 6) [i.e., limiting it to this one].*

- II.2** A. *And why to I need three phrases [in Lev. 11:17 to serve as exclusions] concerning blood?*
- B. *One excludes [the blood of Holy Things] from the rules for a remnant [of a sacrifice]. And one excludes it from the rules of sacrilege. And one excludes it from the rules of uncleanness [that pertain to Holy Things].*
- C. But [to exclude it] from the rule of refuse, you do not need a verse. *As it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: **Whatever has that which renders the offering permissible [for offering or eating], whether for man or for the altar they are liable because of [transgression of the law of] refuse [M. Zeb. 4:3 H]. And the blood renders itself permissible.*** [Rashi: Something else does not render it permissible. It therefore does not come under the law of refuse.]