

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קי"ב

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on this daf continuing the sugya of cutting sharp foods with a meat knife, looking at the difference between a radish, a turnip, and chard, and how we can sometimes nullify the taste. The Gemara then moves into a practical discussion of keeping milk and meat vessels separate, specifically whether we can place a jug of salt or vinegar next to a dairy kutach dish, and the halachos of a cold bird that fell into a dairy mixture.

Next, the Gemara discusses the status of a loaf of bread that was used to catch the drippings of roasted meat, and whether we are concerned about the blood absorbed in it. This leads to a beautiful discussion of how the different Amoraim, including Shmuel, Rav Huna, and Rava, treated such bread, and the halachos of placing a vessel under roasting meat to catch the fat.

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

עמוד א' DAF 112A

EXPLANATION

דאגב חורפיה בלע,

because on account of its sharpness, the radish absorbs the meat fat from the knife, and scraping is not enough to remove it,

STATEMENT

אבל קישות – גריר לבי פסקיה ואכיל.

but if one cut a cucumber with that knife, it does not absorb the fat to that extent; therefore, one may simply scrape the place of its cut and eat it with milk.

STATEMENT

קילחי דליפתא – שרי,

Similarly, turnip stalks cut with such a knife are permitted to be eaten with milk after scraping,

STATEMENT

דסילקא – אסירי,

but chard cut with such a knife is prohibited to be eaten with milk, because chard is sharp and absorbs the meat flavor.

STATEMENT

ואי פתה בהו דליפתא – שפיר דמי.

And if one mixed turnip stalks with them while cutting, alternating between them, it is well and permitted, because the turnip stalks nullify the meat taste in the knife.

QUESTION

בָּעָא מִינֵיהּ רַב דִּימִי מֵרַב נַחְמָן: מַהוּ לְאַנוּחֵי כַּדָּא דְמִלְחָא גַבִּי כַּדָּא דְכַמְכָּא?

Rav Dimi inquired of Rav Nachman: What is the halacha with regard to placing a jug of salt, which is used to salt meat, alongside a jug of kamka, which is a milk dish? Do we worry that some milk will fall into the salt and eventually get onto the meat?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: אָסוּר.

Rav Nachman said to him: It is prohibited to place them next to each other.

QUESTION

דַּחֲלָא מַאי?

Rav Dimi asked further: A jug of vinegar, which is also used for meat, placed next to kamka, what is the halacha?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: שְׂרִי.

Rav Nachman said to him: It is permitted.

QUESTION

וּמַאי שְׁנָא?

Rav Dimi asked: And what is the difference between salt and vinegar?

ANSWER

לְכִי תִיכּוּל עָלֶיהָ כּוֹרָא דְמִלְחָא?

Rav Nachman replied: When you eat a kor of salt on this question—meaning, when you have thought about it for a very long time—you will understand it on your own.

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא?

The Gemara clarifies: What is the reason indeed?

EXPLANATION

הָאִי – אֵיתִיחַ [לְאִיסוּרָא] בְּעֵינֵיהּ, וְהָאִי – לֵיתִיחַ [לְאִיסוּרָא] בְּעֵינֵיהּ.

In this case of the salt, the prohibited substance remains in its independent state, as the traces of kamka are visible on the salt and not nullified; but in that case of the vinegar, the prohibited substance does not remain in its independent state, since any kamka that falls in melts away and is nullified in the vinegar.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא פֶּר גּוֹזֵלָא דְנִפְל לְכַדָּא דְכַמְכָּא, שְׂרִייה רַב חִינָנָא בְּרִיחַ דְּרַבָּא מִפְּשְׁרוֹנָיָא.

There was a certain young bird that fell into a jug of kamka. Rav Chinnana, the son of Rava of Pashronya, permitted the bird to be eaten after rinsing.

STATEMENT

אמר רבא: מאן חכים למישרי כי האי גוונא, אי לאו רב חיננא בריה דרבא מפשרינא?

Rava said in praise of this ruling: Who is wise enough to permit a case like this, if not Rav Chinnana, the son of Rava of Pashronya?

EXPLANATION

קסבר: כי אמר שמואל "מליח הרי הוא פרוח", הני מילי היכא דאינו נאכל מחמת מלחו, אבל האי פותחא הרי נאכל מחמת מלחו.

He holds that when Shmuel said, "A salted food is like a hot food" regarding the laws of absorption, this applies only where the food is so salty that it cannot be eaten because of its salt; but this kutach, behold, it can be eaten despite its salt. Therefore, it is considered cold and does not transfer flavor.

STATEMENT

והני מילי חי, אבל צלי – בעי קליפה,

The Gemara adds: And this ruling that rinsing is enough applies only if the bird was raw; but if it was roasted, it requires peeling of its outer layer, because roasting makes the meat soft and more absorbent.

STATEMENT

ואי אית ביה פילי – כוליה אסור,

And if there are cracks in it, then the whole bird is prohibited, because the dairy liquid penetrates deep into the cracks.

STATEMENT

ואי מתפל בתבלין – כוליה אסור.

And if it was seasoned with spices, then the whole bird is prohibited, because the spices soften the meat and make it highly absorbent.

STATEMENT

אמר רב נחמן, אמר שמואל: כפר שחתה עליה בשר – אסור לאכלה,

Rav Nachman said that Shmuel said: A loaf of bread upon which one cut roasted meat is prohibited to be eaten, because the blood discharged from the meat is absorbed into the bread.

STATEMENT

והני מילי דאסמיק,

And this ruling that the bread is forbidden applies only if the meat is red with blood;

STATEMENT

והני מילי דאבריה,

and this ruling applies only if the blood passed through the bread from one side to the other;

STATEMENT

וְהָנִי מִיָּלִי דְאֶסְמִכְיָהּ, אֲכָל קָלִישְׁתָּא – לִית לָן בֵּהּ.

and this ruling applies only if the liquid is **thick** and viscous; but if it is **thin** and runny, we have no problem with it, and the bread is permitted.

STATEMENT

שְׁמוּאֵל שָׂדִי לִיָּה לְכַלְבִּיָּהּ, רַב הוֹנָא יְהִיב לִיָּה לְשַׁמְעִיָּהּ.

The Gemara relates: **Shmuel would throw** such a loaf **to his dog**, holding it to be completely forbidden; but **Rav Huna would give it to his attendant** to eat.

OBJECTION

מָה נִפְשָׁךְ? אִי שָׂרִי – לְכוּלִי עֲלֵמָא שָׂרִי, אִי אֶסִיר – לְכוּלִי עֲלֵמָא אֶסִיר!

The Gemara asks: **Whichever way you look at it**, Rav Huna's behavior is difficult! **If it is permitted, it is permitted for everyone**, and Rav Huna should be allowed to eat it; **and if it is prohibited, it is prohibited for everyone**, and he should not feed it to his attendant!

RESOLUTION

שְׂאֵנִי רַב הוֹנָא דְאֶנִּינָא דַּעֲתִיָּהּ.

The Gemara answers: The bread is indeed permitted, but **Rav Huna is different**, as **his mind is delicate** and he was personally repulsed by the blood-stained bread, so he gave it to his attendant.

STATEMENT

רָבָא אָכִיל לִיָּה, וְקָרִי לִיָּה "חֲמַר בָּשָׂר".

And **Rava would eat it**, and he would call the red juice "**meat wine**," enjoying its taste.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן, אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: אֵין מְנִיחִין כְּלִי תַּחַת בָּשָׂר עַד שֶׁיִּכָּלֶה כָּל מַרְאֵה אֲדָמוּמִית שָׁבוּ.

Rav Nachman said that Shmuel said: One may not place a vessel under roasting **meat** to catch the dripping fat **until all appearance of redness in it has ceased**, lest blood drip into the vessel.

QUESTION

מָנָא יָדְעִינָן?

The Gemara asks: **How do we know** when the redness has ceased?

ANSWER

מַר זוּטְרָא מִשְׁמִיָּה דְרַב פָּפָא אָמַר: מִשְׁתַּעֲלָה תִּמְקָתוֹ.

Mar Zutra said in the name of Rav Pappa: From when its smoke rises, which shows that all the moisture and blood have dried up and only fat is burning.

OBJECTION

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אָשִׁי: וְדִלְמָא תַתָּאָה מְטָא, עֵילָאָה לָא מְטָא?

Rav Ashi challenged this: But perhaps the bottom part of the meat closest to the fire has reached that stage, but the upper part has not reached it yet, and will still drip blood?

RESOLUTION

אֵלָא אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: לִית לִיה תְּקַנְתָּא, אֵלָא מִשְׁדָּא בִּיה תְּרִיתִי גְלִילִי מִלְּהָא,

Rather, Rav Ashi said: There is no remedy to permit collecting the drippings except to throw into the vessel two lumps of salt, which will draw out and isolate any blood that falls in.

עמוד ב' DAF 112B

STATEMENT

וּמִשְׁפִּייה.

And when emptying the receptacle, he should tilt it gently to pour the fat into another vessel without it mixing with the blood.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה רַב אַחָא בְּרִיה דְּרַב אִיקָא לְרַב אֲשִׁי: וּמִי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל הֲכִי?

Rav Acha, the son of Rav Ika, said to Rav Ashi: And did Shmuel really say this, that once the meat's ruddiness has dissipated it is permitted to place a receptacle underneath it?

OBJECTION

וְהָאָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: כֹּכַר שְׁחַתָּה עָלֶיהָ בֶּשֶׂר אָסוּר לְאָכְלָהּ!

But didn't Shmuel say: A loaf of bread upon which one cut roasted meat is prohibited to eat because of the blood that is expelled? Apparently, Shmuel holds that meat contains blood even after it has finished roasting!

ANSWER

שְׂאֵנִי הֵתֵם, דְּאֵגַב דִּוְחָקָא דְסַכִּינָא פְּלִיט.

Rav Ashi replied: It is different there, as due to the pressure of the knife the meat expels more blood, but under normal circumstances, no more blood is emitted.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: דְּגִים וְעוֹפוֹת שְׁמֵלְחָן זֶה עִם זֶה – אָסוּרִין.

Rav Nachman says: Fish and birds that one salted together, the fish are prohibited for consumption due to the blood they absorb from the birds.

QUESTION

הִיכִי דְמִי? אִי בְּכָלִי שְׂאֵינֹו מְנוּקָב – אֲפִילוּ עוֹפוֹת וְעוֹפוֹת נְמִי אֲסִירִי,

The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of this ruling? If they were placed in an unperforated vessel, in which the blood emitted will pool, then even if one salted birds and birds together they should also be prohibited, as the blood expelled from one bird will be absorbed by the other.

QUESTION

אי בכלי מנוקב – אפילו דגים ועופות נמי שרי.

And if the case involves a **perforated vessel**, out of which the blood can flow, **then even fish and birds** salted together should also be permitted!

ANSWER

לעולם בכלי מנוקב, ודגים משום דרפוי קרמייהו קדמי ופלטי, ועופות קמיטי, בתר דנתיחי דגים פליטי עופות, והדר בלעי מיניה.

The Gemara answers: **Actually**, the ruling is referring to a **perforated vessel**. And the **fish** are prohibited because **their skin is soft**, and therefore when they are salted they **expel** their blood **first**, whereas the skin of **birds is hard**. After the fish finish expelling their blood, the **birds expel** their blood, and then the fish **absorb** blood from them.

STATEMENT

רב מרי בר רחל אימלח ליה בשר שחוטת בהדי בשר טרפה, אתא לקמיה דרבא.

The Gemara relates: **Meat of a slaughtered animal was salted for Rav Mari bar Rachel together with meat of a tereifah**, in a perforated vessel. **He came before Rava** to ask whether the kosher meat was prohibited, as perhaps it would not have absorbed flavor while itself expelling blood.

RULING

אמר ליה: "הטמאים" – לאסור צירן, ורוטבן, וקיפה שקלון.

Rava **said to him**: The verse states, "**the unclean**" to teach us to **prohibit their juice** emitted by salting, and **their gravy**, and **their spices** with which they are cooked. Even while the kosher meat is emitting its blood, it still absorbs the juices of the non-kosher meat.

SUMMARY

The Gemara first clarifies that chard is sharp and absorbs meat flavor from a knife, but turnip stalks can nullify this taste. We learn that a salt jug cannot be placed next to dairy kamka because the dairy residue remains visible and un-nullified on the salt, whereas vinegar is permitted because any dairy that falls in melts away. Regarding a raw bird that fell into cold kamka, Rav Chinnana permits it after rinsing because Shmuel's rule that "salted is like hot" only applies to food so salty it is inedible. The daf then details the halachos of bread that absorbed juices from roasted meat, explaining that it is only forbidden if the juice is thick, red blood that penetrated through the bread. Finally, the Gemara discusses catching dripping fat from roasting meat, with Rav Ashi ruling that one must place two lumps of salt in the vessel to isolate any blood, and explains that a knife exerts pressure which expels blood that would not otherwise drip out.

The Gemara is bothered by a contradiction in how the Amoraim treated the bread that absorbed the red juices of roasted meat. Shmuel threw it to his dog, holding it to be completely forbidden. Rav Huna, however, gave it to his attendant. The Gemara asks: if it is forbidden, how could he feed it to his attendant? And if it is mutar, why didn't Rav Huna eat it himself? The teretz is beautiful: the bread was indeed halachically mutar, but Rav Huna was an "anin da'as", he had a delicate, sensitive nature, and was personally repulsed by the sight of the red juice. Rava, on the other hand, ate it with joy, calling it "meat wine."

Look at the deep yesod Chazal are teaching us here. The Torah has objective halachos, what is kosher and what is treif, what is assur and what is mutar. But within the boundaries of the Shulchan Aruch, Hashem created different people with different natures, temperaments, and sensitivities. Rav Huna was not acting out of a fake, self-righteous chumra; he was simply being honest with his own delicate nature. Rava was not being lenient or disrespectful; he was genuinely enjoying the mutar juices of the meat. Both were acting l'shem Shamayim, completely aligned with who they were.

In our own avodas Hashem, we often look at others and think we have to copy their exact path, or we judge ourselves harshly because we don't feel the same way they do. If someone else is comfortable with something that makes you uneasy, or if someone else has a stringency that doesn't fit your level, remember Rav Huna and Rava. Hashem wants your honest avodah, built on the unique neshama and nature He gave you, within the boundaries of halacha.

Today, when making a decision in your personal conduct or stringencies, do not just copy what others are doing. Ask yourself honestly what fits your current spiritual level and your natural temperament, and serve Hashem with your own genuine neshama.