



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Chullin Daf Kuf

V'CHEIN CHATICHA SHE' NEVEILA...

- **Q:** Why don't we say that the assur pieces become batul in the majority of the mutar pieces? If you will say it is because they are chashuv and therefore don't become batul, that only works according to the view that something which is *typically* sold by count does not become batul (which is the way **Reish Lakish** explains the view of **R' Meir** in a Mishna), but according to the view that only things that are *always* counted don't become batul (which is the way **R' Yochanan** explains the view of **R' Meir** in a Mishna), why wouldn't the animals become batul (pieces of meat are not always sold by count)!? **A:** A slice of meat and fish is different, because it is something that is fit to be served to guests, and that is why it does not become batul.
- It is necessary for the Mishna to teach us that the gid hanasheh does not become batel and that the meat and fish do not become batul. If we only had the case of gid we would say it is not batul because it is a berya. If we only had the case of the meat and fish we would say they don't become batul because they are fit to be served to guests. Therefore, we need both cases.
- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** darshened, if a piece of neveila or non-kosher fish was cooked in a pot of kosher meat, it only makes the kosher meat assur if the non-kosher piece imparts flavor into the gravy, the sediment (the small pieces of meat and spices on the bottom of the pot) and the pieces of meat. **Rav** then announced that even if the assur item only imparts flavor into the kosher meat, that kosher meat becomes like a piece of neveila itself and then makes all the other kosher pieces to become assur since they are like-kind to it.
 - **Q: R' Safra** asked **Abaye**, **Rav** says his ruling according to the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says that like-kind items are not batul. If so, why did he say that the neveila has to impart flavor into the kosher meat to make everything assur? The neveila meat itself is like-kind to the kosher pieces of meat and should therefore make them assur without having imparted flavor!? **A: Abaye** said, we are discussing a case where he first removed the original neveila piece from the pot before putting in the other kosher pieces into the pot. It is only when the taste goes into the kosher piece that we say that it itself takes on the status of a piece of neveila and then makes the rest of the pot assur as well. **A2: Rava** said, we can even be discussing where the neveila piece was not removed. The reason it is only assur when it imparts flavor into the kosher pieces (even though it is of like-kind) is because in the pot there are things of like-kind (the pieces of meat) and things of not like-kind (the meat and the gravy). In such a case we say that we view it as if the like-kind has been removed and only the not like-kind remains and can make the assur thing batel. However, if there is flavor from the neveila in the other meat, that other meat itself becomes neveila and therefore does not become batel.

MISHNA

- The issur of gid hanasheh applies to kosher animals, but not to non-kosher animals. **R' Yehuda** says it also applies to non-kosher animals. **R' Yehuda** said, the gid hanasheh was made assur for Yaakov's sons, and at that time non-kosher animals were mutar for them! They said to him, the issur of gid hanasheh was not given until Har Sinai, but the Torah just wrote it in the appropriate place.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Gemara assumes that **R' Yehuda** holds that one who eats the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal would be oiver for eating a non-kosher animal and for eating a gid hanasheh. Based on this the Gemara asks, does **R' Yehuda** hold that one issur can take effect upon another issur? A Braisa says, that **R' Yehuda** says that the issur of neveila does not take effect on a non-

kosher bird that dies, because it was already assur as being a non-kosher bird!? You can't say that **R' Yehuda** holds that giddim don't have taste and therefore one who eats the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal will not be chayuv for eating a non-kosher animal, because in a Braisa **R' Yehuda** clearly says that one who eats the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal is chayuv two sets of malkus, whereas **R' Shimon** says he is entirely patur. How is it that he holds that the issur of gid hanasheh takes effect on the issur of the non-kosher animal? **A: R' Yehuda** holds that giddim do have a taste, but he also holds that the issur of gid hanasheh already applies to a fetus. Therefore, the issur of non-kosher and the issur of gid hanasheh take hold at the same time. That is why they both take effect.

- **Q:** A Mishna clearly says that **R' Yehuda** says that the issur of gid hanasheh does *not* apply to a fetus!? **A:** That is only true for the fetus of a kosher animal, based on the pasuk of "kol...babiheima...tocheilu". However, with regard to a non-kosher animal, the issur of gid hanasheh does apply to a fetus.
 - **Q:** How can you say that the issur of non-kosher and the issur of gid hanasheh take effect at the same time? A Mishna says, a nazir must shave his head and complete the process of a tamei nazir if he becomes tamei from a meis or a kezayis of flesh from a meis. The Gemara asks, if he becomes tamei from even a kezayis, why do we even need to say that he becomes tamei from the whole meis? The Gemara answers that **R' Yochanan** said, the words "a meis" are needed to teach that he becomes tamei and subject to the process from a fetus whose limbs are not yet fully attached with sinews and are therefore not given the halachic status of "limbs". However, since it is a complete meis, the nazir would become tamei from it even if it has less than a kezayis of flesh. This shows that the limbs are created before the sinews, which means that the issur of non-kosher takes effect before the issur of gid hanasheh!? **A:** Although the issur of non-kosher takes effect first, the issur of gid hanasheh is more stringent, in that it even applies to Bnei Noach, and therefore it takes effect on top of the issur of non-kosher.
 - This can be supported from the fact that in the Mishna **R' Yehuda** says as his reason that the issur of gid hanasheh applied to the sons of Yaakov even before Matan Torah (when they had the status of Bnei Noach).
- **Q:** Why does **R' Shimon** in the Braisa say that he is not chayuv even one malkus? If he says that an issur can take effect on top of another issur, he should be chayuv two sets of malkus. If he holds that it does not, he should at least be chayuv for eating non-kosher. If he holds that giddim have no taste, he should be chayuv for the issur of gid hanasheh!? **A: Rava** said, he holds that giddim don't have flavor (so there is no issur for eating non-kosher if one eats them). However, he holds that the issur of gid hanasheh does not take effect based on the pasuk. The pasuk says "ahl kein lo yochlu Bnei Yisrael es gid hanasheh", which teaches that the issur of gid hanasheh only applies when the gid is assur but the meat is mutar. This excludes a non-kosher animal, where the gid *and* the meat are assur.