



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf

V'HAROTEV

- **Q:** What is the "rotev" (gravy) referred to in the Mishna? **A: Rava** said it is the fat that rises to the top of the gravy. **Abaye** said the fat would have food tumah on its own, without combining with the meat. Rather, he says the Mishna refers to the fluid that is discharged by the meat that then congealed.
 - **Q:** Why must it refer to where this fluid congealed? Even if it did not congeal it should combine for food tumah, as **Reish Lakish** said that the fluid that is discharged by vegetables combines with the vegetables for purposes of combining for the size that would make one chayuv for eating it on Yom Kippur!? **A:** Regarding Yom Kippur one is chayuv for eating anything that will put his mind at ease, and this fluid can do so. With regard to tumah there must be a true combination and that can only happen if the fluids congeal.

V'HAKIPAH

- **Q:** What is the "kipah" (sediment) that the Mishna refers to? **A: Rabbah** said, it is the small pieces of meat that fall to the bottom of the pot. **Abaye** said, those pieces would have food tumah on their own, without combining with the meat!? Rather, **R' Pappa** said, it refers to the spices that are in the pot.
- A Braisa says, if one hardened blood by cooking it and ate it, or if one melted cheilev and drank it, he would be chayuv.
 - **Q:** Now when he hardens the blood he makes it more significant, and so it makes sense that he would be chayuv. But, why is he chayuv when he melts the cheilev? The issur is to "eat" cheilev, so why would he be chayuv when he melts it down and drinks it!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk regarding cheilev says "nefesh", which comes to include one who drinks cheilev as well.
 - A Braisa says that one would be chayuv kares for swallowing dissolved chametz, but would not fulfill his matzah obligation by consuming matzah in this way.
 - **Q:** Now, we can understand why he would not be yotzeh the mitzvah of matzah this way, because it is not "lechem oni". But, why is he chayuv kares for eating liquefied chametz? The Torah says it is assur to *eat* chametz and this is not eating chametz!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk regarding eating chametz says "nefesh", which comes to include one who drinks liquefied chametz as well.
 - A Braisa regarding the eating of a neveila of a kosher bird says, if one dissolved it by fire and then swallowed it he becomes tamei. If it dissolved in the sun and he the swallowed it he remains tahor.
 - **Q:** When he drinks the liquid he should not become tamei, because the pasuk says that one becomes tamei by *eating* the neveila!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk regarding the eating of this neveila bird says "nefesh", which comes to include one who drinks the neveila as well.
 - **Q:** If so, why is it different when it dissolves in the sun!? **A:** When it dissolves in the sun it spoils.
 - All three cases (cheilev, chametz, and neveila of a kosher bird) are necessary. If the Torah had only written regarding cheilev we could not learn chametz from it, because cheilev is more stringent in that it never had a time when it was mutar, and we could not learn neveila from it, because cheilev is more stringent in that it makes one chayuv kares. If the Torah had only written chametz we could not learn cheilev from it, because chametz is more stringent in that there is no exception to its issur, and we could not learn neveila from it, because chametz is more stringent in that it makes one chayuv

kares. If the Torah had only written regarding neveila we could not learn out the other two, because neveila is more stringent in that it gives off tumah. We also can't learn any one of these from the other two. We can't learn neveila from the other two, because the other two carry a kares penalty. We can't learn chametz from the other two, because the other two never had a period of permissibility. We can't learn cheilev from the other two, because the other two have no exception to their rule – the exception to the rule of cheilev is that the cheilev of a chaya is mutar for people to eat.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk of “hatemei'im” teaches that even the liquids of the sheratzim are assur. Why do we need this pasuk? Why can't we learn this from cheilev, chametz, and neveila? **A:** If we would have learned from those we would have said that even the sheretz only gives off tumah when it is the size of a kezayis. Therefore, it needs its own pasuk to teach that even the size of a lentil will give off tumah.
 - **Q:** Why can't we learn the others from sheretz? **A:** We would say that sheratzim are more stringent in that they give off tumah even if only the size of a lentil.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that the liquid that comes from tevel, chadash, hekdesch, shevi'is, and kilayim are all just like the items themselves. How do we know this? We can't learn from all the other instances taught above, because those issurim all become assur automatically on their own, without a person's involvement!? **A:** We learn it from bikkurim, as was taught in a Braisa that the word “tavi” in the pasuk teaches that if one brought grapes as bikkurim and pressed them into wine he is yotzeh.
 - **Q:** Bikkurim are more stringent than those since it requires the person who brings it to read a parsha and to place them by the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** Rather, we learn them from terumah, which itself is compared by the pasuk to bikkurim.
 - **Q:** Terumah is more stringent than those items in that one is chayuv misah and a chomesh for eating terumah!? **A:** We will learn it from terumah and bikkurim together.
 - **Q:** They are both more stringent in that one is chayuv misah and a chomesh for eating terumah and bikkurim!? **A:** We will learn it from either terumah and one of the earlier sources (cheilev, chametz, neveila, or sheratzim) or from bikkurim and one of the earlier sources.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a non-Kohen eats date honey, apple cider, or vinegar of unripe grapes, or other fruit juices (except for wine and oil) of terumah, **R' Eliezer** says he is chayuv to pay for the principal of what he ate and for a chomesh. **R' Yehoshua** says he is patur. What is the point of machlokes? **A:** **R' Eliezer** holds that when we learn something from another place we do so entirely. Therefore, since we learn terumah from bikkurim to teach that the liquids that come from them are like the fruits themselves, we learn further that just as by bikkurim this applies to all fruit juices, the same is true for terumah. **R' Yehoshua** says that we learn the first rule from bikkurim, but then say that we limit it to the rules of terumah, and just as the rule is that the only liquids that can be made into terumah are wine and oil, so too with respect to liquids that come from terumah fruits they are only treated like the terumah itself if they are wine or oil.
 - The Mishna that says one may not bring bikkurim in liquid form unless it is wine or oil, follows the view of **R' Yehoshua**, who says this is the case for terumah, and then learns bikkurim from terumah.
 - The Mishna that says one does not get malkus for drinking juice of orlah unless it is wine or oil, follows the view of **R' Yehoshua**, who says this is the case for terumah, and then learns bikkurim from terumah, and then learns orlah from bikkurim through a gezeira shava on the word “pri”.