



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

Chullin Daf Beis

MESECHTA CHULLIN

PEREK HAKOL SHOCHTIN -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- All may shecht and their shechita is valid, except for a cheireish, shoteh, and katan, because they may ruin the shechita. However, if any of them shechted while others were watching them, the shechita is valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says "all may shecht", which suggests that this is even l'chatchila, and then says "and their shechita is valid", which suggests that it is only valid b'dieved!?
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, is it true that whenever it says "hakol" it means l'chatchila? A Mishna says "hakol mamirin" – all can do temurah, both men and women. That clearly can't mean l'chatchila, because a pasuk says that it is a lav to do temura!? **A:** That Mishna explains itself and immediately says, it is not that one *may* do temura, but just that if one does, it is effective and he will get malkus. However, in our Mishna where this is no further explanation, it would suggest that it is even l'chatchila!
 - **Q:** Another Mishna says "hakol" – all may make an erech vow or be the subject of an erech vow, and may make a neder or be the subject of a neder. Are we to say that that may be done l'chatchila? There are pesukim which imply that it is not good for one to make a neder. There is also a Braisa where **R' Meir** clearly says that one should not make a neder, and **R' Yehuda** says it is good to make a neder of "harei zu" but not "harei alai"! Clearly then, the Mishna does not mean it is l'chatchila even though it says "hakol"!?
 - **Q:** How can you say that "hakol" does not suggest l'chatchila? The Braisa says "hakol chayavim b'succah" and "hakol chayavim b'tzitzis", and that certainly means l'chatchila!? **A:** When "hakol" is followed with "chayavim" it certainly means l'chatchila. However, where, like in our Mishna, it is not, it does not mean l'chatchila.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says "hakol" – all do semicha, both men and women. You can't say that doesn't mean l'chatchila, because the pasuk says that semicha should be done!? **A: R' Acha** said, there are times when "hakol" means l'chatchila and times when it does not. There is no reason to say that the "hakol" in our Mishna means l'chatchila, and therefore you can't ask your question.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** explained, the fact that the Mishna says "and their shechita is valid", which implies b'dieved, it must mean that "hakol" is l'chatchila, because there would be no reason to twice say that something is b'dieved. If so, we have a contradiction between these two statements in the Mishna!? **A: Rabbah bar Ulla** (gives the first of a number of answers to explain the Mishna and) says, when the Mishna says "hakol shochein" it means to say that even a tamei person shechting an animal of chullin may be done l'chatchila.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** The case is regarding chullin that was prepared on the level of tahara needed for kodesh, which the Tanna of our Mishna holds is like kodesh. The Mishna is saying that he may shecht this animal even l'chatchila and must be careful not to make the meat tamei.

- **Q:** How would such a shechita be done? **A:** They would bring him a long knife to shecht with, so that he does not touch the meat.
- The Mishna should then be understood as saying, a tamei person should not shecht actual kodashim, but if he did (b'dieved) and says that he is certain that he did not touch the meat, the shechita is valid. The Mishna then continues and says, however a cheireish, shoteh, and katan should not even shecht a regular chullin animal even b'dieved, because we are concerned that they will not do the shechita properly (they will do "shehiya" – they will pause during the shechita, "hadrasa" – they will press down with the knife instead of cutting with the sharpness of the blade in a slicing motion, or "chalada" – have the knife covered during the shechita).
- **Q:** When the Mishna then says "if any of them shechted while others were watching them..." who is it referring to? It can't be referring to cheireish, shoteh, and katan, because then it should say "if *they* shechted", since we have just discussed them!? It also can't refer to a tamei person who shechted chullin, which was the subject of the first part of the Mishna, because we have already said that he may do so even l'chatchila!? It also can't refer to a tamei person who shechted kodesh, because we said that as long as he is certain that he did not touch the meat it is valid, even without others watching him!? **A:** Rather, it is referring to the case of the tamei who shechted kodesh, but the case is that the shochet is no longer here to ask whether he is certain that he did not touch the meat. In this case we say that if others saw him shecht and say that he did not touch the meat, the shechita is valid as well.
- **Q:** The Gemara asks, this halacha that if a tamei person shechts kodesh the shechita is valid is already taught in another Mishna is Mesechta Zevachim!? **A:** Our Mishna is the main place that teaches this halacha. The Mishna in Zevachim is teaching regarding other pessulim and therefore adds the case of tamei along with them. **A2:** We can also say that the other Mishna is the main place that teaches this halacha, and our Mishna teaches it since it is already teaching the case of a tamei who shechts chullin.
- **Q:** The tamei person of the Mishna is tamei from what? If he himself touched a meis he is an "av hatumah" and should make the knife tamei as an av hatumah as well, which should then make the meat tamei!? **A:** Rather, it must be that he became tamei from touching a sheretz. **A2:** We can also say that he was tamei from touching a meis and shechted with a sharpened reed (which is something that is valid to use for shechting) which is not metal, and does not become tamei.