



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Yud Gimmel

- **R' Mari bar Rachel** salted meat of a shechted animal with meat of an animal that was a treifa in a keili with holes. He went to **Rava** to ask whether the shechted meat was mutar to eat. **Rava** said, a Braisa says that a pasuk teaches that the juices of a sheretz are assur as well. This teaches that the juices of treifa meat are also assur, and therefore these juices make the shechted meat assur as well (because the meat absorbs the treifa juice more easily than blood, and can even absorb it while it is still discharging its own fluids).
 - **Q:** Why didn't **Rava** base his reason on **Shmuel**, who said that something that is salted is like something that is hot? **A:** Without the Braisa we would not know that the juices of a piece of treifa meat are assur. Once we have established the juice as being assur we can use **Shmuel** to teach that the shechted meat absorbs these juices.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a kosher fish was salted with a non-kosher fish, it is mutar. Presumably this is referring to where both fish are salted. We see that since the kosher fish is discharging its own juices at that time, it won't absorb the juices of the non-kosher fish. This refutes **Rava**!? **A:** The case is where only the kosher fish was salted and the non-kosher fish was not (and therefore, the non-kosher fish is not discharging anything).
 - **Q:** The later part of that Braisa says, if the kosher fish was salted and the non-kosher fish was not, it is mutar. This suggests that the earlier part of the Braisa is discussing where they are both salted!? **A:** This later part of the Braisa is explaining what the first part of the Braisa is talking about. In fact, we must say that this is the understanding of the Braisa. If we say that the first part of the Braisa is discussing where they were both salted and still the fish is mutar, there would be no need for the Braisa to then say that when only the kosher fish was salted it is mutar. That would be obvious! Rather, it must be that the second part of the Braisa is explaining the first part of the Braisa.
 - The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. It may be that the first part of the Braisa is discussing where they were both salted, and although it is no chiddush, the second part discussed where only the kosher fish was salted just to make it clear that the first part is talking about where both were salted. Without the second part we would have explained the Braisa to be discussing where only the kosher fish is salted and it is in that case that they are mutar. We would then say that if they were both salted it would be assur.
 - **Q:** The last part of this Braisa says, if the non-kosher fish was salted and the kosher fish was not, it is assur. This implies that if they were both salted it would be mutar!? **A:** It may be that the Braisa uses this case only to parallel the earlier case of where the kosher fish was salted and the non-kosher fish was not. It was not meant to imply that when both are salted it is assur.
- **Shmuel** said, meat does not fully drain its blood unless it is salted very well and is then rinsed very well.
 - **R' Huna** said we salt the meat and then rinse it. A Braisa says the meat is rinsed, then salted, and then rinsed again. The Gemara says they don't argue. **R' Huna** is discussing meat that was already rinsed at the butcher, and the Braisa is referring to meat that was not rinsed at the butcher.
 - **R' Dimi** of Neharda'ah would salt meat with thick salt and would then shake off the salt.

- **R' Mesharshiya** said, we do not assume that there is blood in the innards (and if it was cooked without salting it is therefore mutar). The Gemara identifies the "innards" as the rectum, the stomachs, and the large intestine.
- **Shmuel** said, we put salted meat only on a keili with holes.
 - **R' Sheishes** would salt only one piece of meat at a time.
 - The Gemara says, the reason he wouldn't do two is for concern that blood would go from one to the other. That same concern exists when salting one piece – that the blood will go from one part to the other!? Rather, there is no difference between salting one piece or many pieces.
- **Shmuel in the name of R' Chiya** said, if one shechted an animal and then broke its neck before it died, he makes the meat heavy (the blood doesn't rush out anymore) and he therefore steals from people (he is selling meat that weighs more, and meat is sold by weight) and he causes the blood to be absorbed in the limbs.
 - **Q:** Does **Shmuel** mean to say that this is assur because he is cheating people, but for himself that would be mutar, or does he mean to say that for the person himself it would be assur as well? **TEIKU**.

MISHNA

- If one brings up bird meat and cheese onto a table, he is not oiver on a lav.

GEMARA

- The Mishna implies that one who *eats* bird meat and cheese together *would* be oiver a lav. We see that the Mishna holds that bird meat with dairy is assur D'Oraisa!
 - This is not correct. Rather, say that the Mishna means, if one brings up bird meat and cheese onto a table, he cannot even come to be oiver on a lav (since even eating them is not assur D'Oraisa).

MISHNA

- Meat of a kosher animal with milk of a kosher animal is assur to be cooked together and is assur b'hana'ah. Meat of a kosher animal with milk of a non-kosher animal, or meat of a non-kosher animal with milk of a kosher animal, is mutar to be cooked together and is mutar b'hana'ah. **R' Akiva** says, meat of a chaya and of a bird are not assur with milk D'Oraisa – the pasuk says "lo sivashel gedi bachaleiv imo" three times, which excludes meat of a chaya, of a bird, and of a non-kosher animal. **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk says "lo sochlu kol neveila" and afterwards says "lo sivashel gedi bachaleiv imo", which teaches that only meat that could become assur as neveila is assur with milk (which includes the meat of a chaya). We would think that this includes meat of a bird as well. The pasuk therefore says "bachaleiv imo", which excludes birds, since they don't have milk.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the pasuk of "gedi" (goats) includes other animals as well? **A: R' Elazar** says, the pasuk says "vayishlach Yehuda es gedi ha'izim". This teaches that only when the Torah follows "gedi" with "izim" does it refer exclusively to goats. However, when the word "gedi" is used alone, it refers even to cows and sheep.
 - **Q:** Maybe instead learn from the pasuk that the word gedi only refers to goats? **A:** There is another pasuk that says "v'eis oros gedaye ha'izim", which teaches that this refers to goats only because the pasuk also says "ha'izim". However, if gedi is stated alone it refers to other animals as well.
 - **Q:** Why can't we learn from this pasuk that the word gedi only refers to goats? **A:** We now have two pesukim teaching the same thing, and when we have two pesukim teaching the same thing we don't learn from them to other places.
 - **Q:** There is a view which says we do learn to other places even when we have two pesukim saying the same thing!? **A:** The pesukim each say "**ha'**izim", which teaches that only in these pesukim is "gedi" limited to goats.
- **Shmuel** said, "gedi" comes to include the cheilev in the issur of basar b'cholov, "gedi" comes to include the meat of an animal that died without shechita, and the third "gedi" (the pasuk is

written three times) comes to include the meat of a fetus found in a shechted animal in the issur. Also, “gedi” comes to exclude blood from being in the issur, “gedi” comes to exclude the placenta from this issur, and “gedi” comes to exclude the meat of a non-kosher animal from this issur. The words “bachaleiv imo” come to exclude the milk of a male animal, “bachaleiv imo” come to exclude the milk of a shechted animal, and “bachaleiv imo” come to exclude the milk of a non-kosher animal.

- **Q:** The word “gedi” is written 3 times and yet we used it for 6 drashos!? **A: Shmuel** holds that an issur takes effect on another issur, and therefore the inclusion of cheilev and of meat of an animal that died without shechita are learned without need for an extra pasuk. Also, blood and a placenta are not meat of an animal, but are rather discharge of the animal, and a pasuk is therefore not needed for them either. This leaves two extra pesukim (one is for the basic issur of meat with milk) – one comes to include the meat of a fetus and the other comes to exclude the meat of a non-kosher animal.
 - **Q:** Does **Shmuel** really hold that an issur can take effect on another issur? We find that **Shmuel in the name of R’ Eliezer** said, the pasuk regarding a tamei Kohen who eats terumah says “umeisu bo ki yichaliluhu”, which also teaches that if this Kohen ate tamei terumah he would not be chayuv misah (because one issur will not take effect on another issur)!? **A:** We can say that normally he holds that it does take effect and it is only there that he holds that it does not, because the pasuk uses the exclusionary word of “umeisu **bo**”. We can also say that normally he says one issur does not take effect on another, but regarding basar b’cholov the word “gedi” teaches that it does. We can also say that his view regarding basar b’cholov is his own view, and his view regarding terumah is the view of his rebbi, **R’ Eliezer**.
- **Q:** **R’ Achdevai bar Ami** asked **Rav**, what is the halacha if one cooked meat in milk of an animal that has never given birth yet (is it not called “imo” and therefore the issur doesn’t apply to such milk)? **A: Rav** said, since **Shmuel** said that “bachaleiv imo” comes to exclude the milk of a male, we can learn that only a male is excluded, since it can never become a mother, but a female is included even if it is not yet a mother since it can become a mother.
- If one cooked cheilev with milk, **R’ Ami** and **R’ Assi** argue – one says he would get malkus and the other says he would not.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that the one who says he would get malkus says one issur can take effect on another issur, and the one who says he would not get malkus holds that an issur does not take effect on another issur? **A:** It may be that all say that an issur does not take effect on another issur, and therefore for eating cheilev cooked with milk all would agree that he would not get malkus (because the cheilev was already assur before being cooked with milk). The machlokes is only regarding the cooking itself. The one who says he would get malkus holds that there is no issur of cooking cheilev and therefore the issur of cooking it with meat takes effect. The one who says he does not get malkus holds that the issur of eating meat and milk is written in terms of “cooking” to teach that if one would not get malkus for eating the mixture he would also not get malkus for cooking the mixture. **A2:** We can also say that all agree that he would get malkus for cooking cheilev in milk. The machlokes is regarding the eating of this cooked cheilev. The one who says he does not get malkus holds that since it is already assur we cannot have the issur of basar b’cholov take effect on top of it. The view that says that he does get malkus holds that the issur of eating meat and milk is written in terms of “cooking” to teach that if one would get malkus for cooking it he would also get malkus for eating it. **A3:** We can also say that they are not arguing at all – one is stating that there is malkus for cooking it and the other is stating that there is no malkus for eating it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that piggul, nossar, and tamei that were cooked with milk carry the malkus penalty. We see that the issur of basar b’cholov takes effect on top of other issurim!? **A:** The Tanna of this Braisa holds regarding all issurim that one issur takes effect on another issur.