



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Ches

MISHNA

- If a drop of milk fell onto a piece of meat that was cooking in a pot, if the drop of milk imparts taste into that piece of meat, it is assur. If he stirred the pot as soon as the drop fell in, then if the drop imparts a flavor into the entire pot it is assur.

GEMARA

- **Abaye** said, the taste from something that is assur, even without the substance, is assur D'Oraisa. If it would only be D'Rabanan, we should learn from basar b'cholov that it is D'Oraisa. If you will say that we can't learn from basar b'cholov because it is a chiddush (they are two mutar things that become assur when they are combined, and the Torah even says it is assur to simply cook them together), then we should say that basar b'cholov is assur even if there is no taste at all (and yet the Mishna says that it is only assur when there is taste). Rather, it must be that it is not considered to be a chiddush (since we find that kilayim is made of a combination of two mutar things, and the act of planting is assur there just as the act of cooking is assur for basar b'cholov). Since it is not a chiddush, we can learn from basar b'cholov to other issurim that taste is assur even without substance. **Rava** said, it may be that basar b'cholov is considered to be a chiddush, and the reason why it is only assur when there is taste is because the Torah writes that it is assur to "cook" them together, which teaches that they must be there in a significant enough amount to impart a taste.
- **Rav** said, when the Mishna says that if the drop of milk imparts taste into that piece of meat, "it" is assur, it means that the piece that gets the flavor of the milk becomes assur and becomes like a piece of neveila itself, and that piece then makes all the other pieces assur since they are of like-kind to this assur piece.
 - **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** said to **Ravina**, **Rav** must say this following the view of **R' Yehuda** who says that like-kind things do not become batel to each other. Shall we say that he argues on **Rava**, who says that **R' Yehuda** holds that when there are 2 like-kind things and one thing that is not like-kind we view one like-kind as if it is not there and the unlike-kind then makes the other batel? **Ravina** said, you would be correct if the case was where it was a thin gravy. However, the case of our Mishna is where it is a thick gravy made up of pieces of meat, and therefore is considered to be a like-kind.
 - It must be that **Rav** holds that even if assur taste can be squeezed out it remains assur, because if he holds that it would become mutar, why would the piece that had the milk on it become assur like neveila?
 - In fact, we find that **Rav**, **R' Chanina**, and **R' Yochanan** all say that even when it is possible to squeeze out the assur flavor, the thing remains assur. **R' Shimon bar Rebbi and Reish Lakish** say that it would become mutar.
 - **Q:** Does **Rav** really hold that it would remain assur? We have learned that if a piece of meat falls into a pot of milk, **Rav** says that the meat is assur but the milk is mutar (when there is enough milk to be mevatel the taste of the meat). Now, if **Rav** holds that even if the taste can be squeezed out it is assur, the milk should be treated as neveila, so why is it mutar!? **A:** **Rav** holds that even when the taste can be squeezed out it remains assur. The reason why the milk is mutar is because the pasuk says "lo sivasheil gedi bachaleiv imo", which suggests that it is the meat that is assur, not the milk.
 - **Q:** Does **Rav** really hold that it is only the meat that is assur and not the milk? We have learned that if one cooked a half kezayis of meat with a half kezayis of milk, **Rav** says that one would get malkus for eating the

full kezayis but not for the cooking. Now, if he holds that there is no issur on the milk, why would he get malkus for eating the combined kezayis when there is only a half kezayis of meat!? **A:** Rather, **Rav** holds that the milk is also assur. The reason **Rav** said in that case that the milk is mutar is because the case was where the pot was boiling, and so the meat can only absorb, but not discharge, flavor.

- **Q:** When it stops boiling, the meat will give off its flavor into the milk!? **A:** The case is where the person removed the meat before the pot stopped boiling.
- **Q:** Why would **Rav** say that one would get malkus for eating the full kezayis but not for the cooking? If the two half kezaysim combine, he should get malkus for the cooking as well, and if they don't, he should not get malkus for the eating either!? **A:** He holds that they don't combine, and the case is where these half kezaysim came from a large pot with more than a kezayis to each.
- **Levi** argues on **Rav** and holds that in the case of the 2 half kezaysim the person would get malkus for the cooking as well. **Levi** taught so in a Braisa as well, and added that in order to be chayuv for cooking, it must be fully cooked.
- Whether or not absorbed flavor can be squeezed out or something is a subject of machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if a drop of milk falls on a piece of meat, **R' Yehuda** says, if the milk gives flavor into the meat, the piece of meat becomes assur like neveila and makes all the other pieces of meat assur since they are of like-kind. The **Chachomim** say, it only becomes assur if the milk gives flavor into the gravy, the sediment, and the pieces of meat. **Rebbi** said, the view of **R' Yehuda** seems correct when the pot was not stirred or covered, and the view of the **Chachomim** seems correct when the pot was stirred or covered. Now, what is meant when he says that the pot was not stirred or covered? It can't mean that it wasn't stirred or covered at all, because in that case the piece of meat that has the milk does not give off that flavor into any of the other pieces, so why does it make them assur!? It also can't mean that it was stirred or covered in the beginning but was not stirred or covered at the end, because the same way the meat absorbed the milk it then discharged that flavor! Rather, it must be that **Rebbi** holds like **R' Yehuda** that even when we squeeze out the flavor, the thing remains assur.
 - **Q:** This would mean that **R' Yehuda** holds that even when it is stirred or covered the entire time it is assur. Why should that be? In such a case it never absorbed the flavor at all!? **A:** He is concerned that it was not sufficiently stirred or covered.
 - **Rebbi** said that the view of the **Chachomim** seems correct when the pot was stirred or covered. Now, what is meant when he says that the pot was not stirred or covered? It can't mean that it was stirred and covered only at the end (after the milk was absorbed into the piece) but not in the beginning, because we said that in that case **Rebbi** follows the view of **R' Yehuda**! Rather, it must mean that he stirred and covered the pot the entire time. This would mean that the **Chachomim** hold that even when it is just stirred or covered at the end it would still be mutar. We see that they hold that when the assur flavor is squeezed out the thing becomes mutar. Based on this Braisa we see that whether or not squeezing out of assur flavor makes the thing mutar is subject to a machlokes Tanna'im.