



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Tes Vuv

- In the previous Gemara **R' Ashi** said that “lo sochal kol to'eiva” teaches that anything that is assur is assur to be eaten and assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** If so, something that was made on Shabbos should be assur to be eaten (and yet we learned that it is mutar for other people)!? **A:** The pasuk regarding Shabbos says “ki kodesh hee lachem”, which teaches that it is only Shabbos that is kodesh, but the things made (illegally) on Shabbos are not.
 - **Q:** If so, when someone plows with an ox and a donkey, or if one threshes with a muzzled animal the produce should be assur to be eaten and b'hana'ah!? **A:** If the product of something made on Shabbos, which is more stringent, is mutar, then certainly the product of these issurim are mutar as well.
 - **Q:** If so, the product of kilayim seeds should be assur to be eaten and b'hana'ah!? **A:** Since the pasuk regarding kilayim of the vineyard says “pen tikdash”, which teaches that it is assur b'hana'ah, this also teaches that kilayim of regular seeds are not assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that kilayim of the vineyard is assur to be eaten and b'hana'ah, whereas the kilayim of seeds are only assur to be eaten? **A:** The pasuk makes a hekesh between kilayim of animals and kilayim of seeds. This teaches, that just as the product of kilayim of animals is mutar to be eaten, the same is true for the product of kilayim of seeds.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the product of kilayim of animals is mutar? **A:** Since the Torah said it is assur as a korbon, it must be that it is mutar for regular consumption.
 - **Q:** If so, when a mother and its offspring are shechted on the same day they should be assur to be eaten and b'hana'ah!? **A:** Since the Torah said that something that is premature is assur as a korbon, it must be that it is mutar for regular consumption.
 - **Q:** The mother of the mitzvah of “shiluach hakein” should be assur to be eaten and b'hana'ah since the Torah says it may not be taken!? **A:** The Torah would not say to send away the mother if it was assur and would then cause an unknowing person who captures it to do something wrong by unknowingly eating it.
- **Reish Lakish** said, how do we know that basar b'cholov is assur to be eaten and b'hana'ah? The pasuk regarding Korbon Pesach says “ahl tochlu mimenu nah uvasheil mevushal”. There was no need to write “mevushal”. It is written to teach that there is another cooking which is assur to you like this one – this refers to the cooking of meat and milk. **R' Yochanan** asked, why do you need this pasuk as a source? Do you not like the source given by **Rebbi** who learns this from a pasuk regarding a passul korbon? **Reish Lakish** said, from that pasuk we would only know that it is assur to be eaten, not that it is also assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** How does **Rebbi** learn that basar b'cholov is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** He learns a gezeira shava between basar b'cholov and znus, which teaches that just as znus is assur b'hana'ah, the same is true for basar b'cholov.
- In the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** they taught, the Torah says three times “lo sivashel gedi bachaleiv imo” – one teaches that it is assur to be eaten, one teaches that it is assur b'hana'ah, and one teaches that it is assur to cook them together.
- A Braisa says, **Isi ben Yehuda** says, we learn that basar b'cholov is assur to be eaten from a gezeirah shava from treifa. We learn that it is assur b'hana'ah from a kal v'chomer: if orlah, which does not come about through an aveirah, is assur to benefit from, basar b'cholov, which is done through an aveirah, surely will be assur b'hana'ah. **Isi ben Yehuda** continues, you may try to refute this kal v'chomer by saying that orlah never had a time that it was permitted (which is

why it is assur b'hana'ah), but milk and meat were permitted before they were cooked!? To that we can answer that chametz was permitted before Pesach and yet it is assur b'hana'ah on Pesach! You may try to ask that chametz carries a kares penalty (which may be why it is assur b'hana'ah), but basar b'cholov does not!? To this we can answer that kelayim of the vineyard does not carry the kares penalty and yet it is assur b'hana'ah!

- **Q:** Why does he need the gezeira shava at all? Why can't he learn it all from orlah and say that orlah, which does not come about through an aveirah, is assur to be eaten and assur b'hana'ah, then basar b'cholov, which is done through an aveirah, surely will be assur to be eaten and assur b'hana'ah!? **A:** We can refute this kal v'chomer from the case of one who plows with an ox and a donkey, or one who threshes with a muzzled animal, in which case an aveira was done and yet the product of the aveira is mutar to be eaten and b'hana'ah.
- **Q:** Why does he use kilayim of the vineyard to refute the premise that kares is what makes it assur? Why can't he refute it based on orlah and then darshen a tzad hashavah? **A: R' Ashi** said, we cannot darshen a tzad hashava from orlah and chametz, because we would refute it by saying that neveila is assur to be eaten and yet it is mutar b'hana'ah.
 - **Q: R' Mordechai** asked **R' Ashi**, we say in the name of **Reish Lakish** that a tzad hashava can only be refuted from within, not from outside cases!? If so, why didn't he darshen a tzad hashavah between orlah and chametz? **A:** It is because the tzad hashavah can be refuted by saying that chametz and orlah are different in that they both grow from the ground.
 - **Q:** Even by introducing the case of kelayim of the vineyard the tzad hashavah can be refuted by saying that kelayim is different in that it grows from the ground!? **A: R' Mordechai** said to **R' Ashi**, **Reish Lakish** has said that we may refute a true mah hatzad with even the smallest of refutations. However, this is not a true mah hatzad, because we have introduced an additional category. This type of analogy can only be refuted if there is a true leniency or stringency that is different.
 - **Q:** We can refute the comparison to all three (orlah, chametz, and kelayim) by saying that they all grow from the ground!? **A: R' Mordechai** said to **R' Ashi**, **Reish Lakish** has said that when learning one thing from one thing we may only refute with a true stringency or leniency. When learning one thing from two things we may refute with any difference that we find. When learning one thing from 3 things, if we learn with a tzad hashavah we can refute with any difference. If not, we may only refute with a stringency or leniency.
- **Q:** Why didn't **Isi ben Yehuda** ask, that kelayim of the vineyard is more stringent because it never had a moment of permissibility, which can't be said of meat and milk!? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** says, it must be that kilayim only becomes assur from when it takes root, but until then it is permissible. Once taking root, the entire plant that was placed in the vineyard becomes assur.
 - **Q: R' Shmaya bar Ze'ira** asks, a Mishna seems to say that only the new growth that occurs in the vineyard is assur, but the original plant that was moved into the vineyard is not!? **A: Abaye** said, there are 2 pesukim, one which seems to say it is assur upon planting and one that seems to say only new growth is assur. Therefore, if seeds are planted in a vineyard, it becomes assur at the time of rooting. If a plant is replanted in a vineyard, only the new growth is assur.
- Our Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon ben Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon** who says in a Braisa that we learn a gezeira shava from treifa to basar b'cholov which teaches that just as a treifa is only assur to be eaten and is mutar b'hana'ah, the same is true for basar b'cholov.