



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H

- A Braisa says that one who cooks meat in whey is not chayuv.
 - This supports **Reish Lakish**, who explains a Mishna which says that whey is like milk, to mean that is so regarding it making something muchshar l'kabel tumah, not for purposes of basar b'cholov.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "bachaleiv imo". How do we know that it is equally assur to cook the meat in milk of a cow or sheep? We darshen a kal v'chomer – if there is no issur of breeding with its mother and yet there is an issur to cook its meat in its mother's milk, then certainly with respect to a cow or sheep, where there is even an issur of kilayim, cooking in their milk is certainly assur. The pasuk therefore says "bachaleiv imo" a second time to teach that the goat's meat is even assur to be cooked in the milk of a cow or sheep.
 - **Q:** We darshened the kal v'chomer to teach this, so why does the Braisa then say the pasuk teaches it!?
A: R' Ashi said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted by saying that cooking in its mother's milk is assur because it is assur to shecht it and its mother on the same day. But, the cow and sheep could be shechted on the same day as this goat and therefore maybe cooking in their milk is not assur. That is why the Braisa said that we have the pasuk to teach that it is assur.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "bachaleiv imo". How do we know that it is equally assur to cook the meat in milk of its older sister? We darshen a kal v'chomer – if it is assur to be cooked in the milk of its mother, which may be in the same group of animals for purposes of maaser (if they are born in the same year), then certainly it may not be cooked in the milk of its older sister which is not in the same group of animals for purposes of maaser! The pasuk therefore says "bachaleiv imo" a third time to teach that the goat's meat is even assur to be cooked in the milk of its older sister.
 - **Q:** We darshened the kal v'chomer to teach this, so why does the Braisa then say the pasuk teaches it!?
A: R' Ashi said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted by saying that cooking in its mother's milk is assur because it is assur to shecht it and its mother on the same day. But, the older sister could be shechted on the same day as this goat and therefore maybe cooking in their milk is not assur. That is why the Braisa said that we have the pasuk to teach that it is assur.
 - **Q:** How do we know that it is also assur to cook the meat in the milk of its younger sister that is in the same group of animals for purposes of maaser? **A:** We will learn it from a tzad hashava between the milk of its mother and the milk of its older sister. If we try to learn it from the mother we will say that is different because it may not be shechted on the same day. However, we will say that the older sister shows that that is not what makes it assur, because it too may be shechted on the same day. We will then try to learn it from the older sister, but will say the older sister is different since it is not in the same group of animals for maaser purposes. However, we will say that the mother is and yet cooking in its milk is assur. The tzad hashava is that we have meat that is assur to cook in milk, and we can therefore also include the milk of the younger sister.
 - **Q:** Why can't we also learn that it is assur to cook meat in the milk of the older sister with a tzad hashava between the milk of the mother and the milk of a cow and sheep? **A:** In fact we can. Rather, the third "bachaleiv imo" is needed for the drasha of a Braisa. The Braisa says, how do we know that it is equally assur to cook meat of an animal in its own milk? We can darshen a kal v'chomer – the halacha of "oso v'es beno" does not apply to two offspring of the same mother but does apply to an offspring (which is the product of a mother) and its mother, so the issur of cooking meat in milk, which does apply to milk of sibling offspring will certainly also apply to the milk of the mother (which is also a product of the mother) and its own meat! The pasuk therefore says "bachaleiv imo" a third time to teach that the animal's meat is even assur to be cooked in its own milk.
 - **Q:** We darshened the kal v'chomer to teach this, so why does the Braisa then say the pasuk teaches it!? **A: R' Achdevai bar Ami** said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted, because we find a case where the products of a mother may be assur to each other

even though the product is mutar with the mother – where a female horse has a male horse son and a female mule daughter, where the halacha is that the offspring are assur as kilayim but the son and the mother are not.

- **Q:** It is the zerah of the father that causes that issur and can't be compared to our case. For if a female horse has a male mule as a son and a female mule as a daughter, the products (offspring) of the mother would be mutar to each other and assur to the mother!? If so, the kal v'chomer is not refuted, so why do we need the pasuk!? **A:** Rather, **Mar the son of Ravina** said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted based on the case of a non-Jewish maid who has a son who is a non-Jewish slave and a daughter who was freed and is therefore a full-fledged Yid. This would be the case where the two products of the mother are assur to be together, but the product (the son) and the mother are mutar to each other. Therefore, although the meat of a goat is assur in its mother's milk (the meat and milk are both products of the mother), it may be that the meat of an animal would not be assur in its own milk (only the milk is a product of the animal). This is why we need the pasuk.
 - **Q:** It is the "get shichrur" (the emancipation document) that causes the issur and therefore can't be compared to our case! For, if the mother had been freed and the son and daughter had not been freed, the result would be that the two products are mutar to each other and the product and the mother are assur to each other!? **A:** Rather, **R' Idi bar Avin** said, the kal v'chomer can be refuted based on the case of kilayim of planting seeds – the seeds of different species are assur even though they come from the same mother ("mother earth") and yet each seed may be planted alone with its mother earth.
 - **Q:** The different seeds only become assur through the mother earth! They don't become assur if simply placed into a keili!? This cannot refute the kal v'chomer, so why is the pasuk needed!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, we would ask that two products of a mother (the meat of the offspring and the milk of the mother) are two separate bodies, but the meat and milk of the mother itself are one body, and that's why we may think that they don't become assur when cooked together. That is why we need the pasuk of "bachaleiv imo" to teach that it would be assur.
- **R' Ashi** said, how do we know that meat cooked with milk is assur to be eaten? The pasuk says "lo sochal kol to'eiva", which teaches that anything that Hashem made assur is included in "lo sochal". How do we know that it is also assur b'hana'ah? We learn it as taught by **R' Avahu in the name of R' Elazar**, who says that anyplace that the Torah simply writes "one shall not eat...", it includes an issur hana'ah as well, unless the Torah specifically permits having hana'ah like it does by "neveilah", where it permits it to be given to a "ger" (goy who keeps the 7 mitzvos) and permits it to be sold to a regular goy.
 - A Braisa says that **R' Meir** holds it may be given or sold to either a ger or a goy. **R' Yehuda** says it may only be given to a ger or sold to a goy (not visa-versa).
 - **R' Yehuda** says the word "oy" in the pasuk comes to separate and teach that it is either given to a ger or sold to a goy. **R' Meir** says the word "oy" comes to teach that it is preferable to give it to a ger rather than sell it to a goy. **R' Yehuda** says we don't need a word to teach us this preference, because since there is a mitzvah to help sustain a ger it is logical that it is preferable to give it to a ger rather than sell it to a goy.