



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

Chullin Daf Mem Ches

- **R' Yosef bar Minyumei in the name of R' Nachman** said, if a lung is attached to the wall of the chest cavity, we don't have to be concerned that this happened due to a puncture of the lung. However, if there are blisters at the place of where it is attached, we must be concerned that this was caused by a puncture to the lung. **Mar Yehuda in the name of Avimi** said, in either case we must be concerned that this was caused by a puncture to the lung.
 - **Q:** How do we investigate (in the cases that we must be concerned according to each view) to determine if it was caused by a puncture to the lung? **A:** **Rava** said that **Ravin bar Shaba** told him, we bring a very sharp knife and cut through the place where it is attached, thereby separating the lung from the wall, and examine it. If we see something wrong with the wall we can say that it is the wall that caused them to become attached and the animal is kosher. If we don't see anything wrong with the wall we must be concerned that this happened because of something wrong with the lung and the animal is considered to be a treifa even if there is no air coming out of the lung. **R' Nechemya the son of R' Yosef** would examine the lung by inflating it and putting it into a bowl of lukewarm water to see if it bubbles.
 - **Mar Zutra the son of R' Huna the son of R' Pappi** said to **Ravina**, we learned the ruling of **R' Nechemya** regarding a different case – regarding the case of two lobes of the lung that are not next to each other, but that are attached to each other. We have learned that it is considered a treifa, but **R' Nechemya** would examine the lungs by inflating them and putting them into a bowl of lukewarm water.
 - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, it makes sense to say that **R' Nechemya** was lenient regarding the case of the lung attached to the wall, because he can say that it was an injury of the wall that made them attached. However, in the case of the attached lobes, saying it was an injury to either of them would be a problem, so how could he be lenient!? Therefore, this version of **R' Nechemya's** ruling can't be correct.
 - **Q:** How can we say that **R' Nachman** said the animal is a treifa if there were blisters there? **R' Yosef bar Minyumei in the name of R' Nachman** said that if a lung was punctured and the hole was then sealed by the wall of the chest cavity the animal is kosher!? **A:** When he said it is kosher he was referring to where the lung was punctured in a place that naturally lies against the wall and therefore became attached to the wall. When he says it is a treifa is where the puncture was not in a place that naturally lies against the wall.
 - **Ravina** said, when **R' Nachman** said the animal is kosher he is only referring to where the lung became entangled with and attached to the meat, not when it became attached to the ribs themselves. **R' Yosef** asked **Ravina**, is that to say that until it is entangled it is considered to be a hole? If so, even if it later becomes entangled it should be a treifa, because we learned that regarding a "krus shafcha" if a hole is sealed he becomes kosher, and the Braisa there suggests that a different case is excluded. Presumably the case to be excluded is a hole in the lung like our case!? **Ravina** said, the Braisa means to exclude the case of a scab on the lung that sealed a hole, which we say is not an effective seal and the animal is therefore a treifa.
 - **Q:** **R' Ukva bar Chama** asked, if the chest wall then got a hole opposite the hole in the lung that it sealed, and air now escapes to the outside, it would have to be a treifa. If so, the Mishna should have given the case of a hole in the chest

wall as a case of an animal that is a treifa!? **A:** You can ask the same question regarding the ruling of **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan**, who says that if there is a hole in the gallbladder which is sealed by the liver it is kosher. There too we should say that since if there is then a hole in the liver opposite the hole in the gallbladder the animal would be a treifa, we should also list a hole in the gallbladder as a case of treifa!? Rather, we must say that the Mishna only lists cases where a hole in the organ causes a treifa of that organ itself. That is why these cases are not listed.

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** asked **Shmuel**, what is the halacha if we find blisters on the lungs? **Shmuel** said it is kosher. **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said, I also say so, however the talmidim say that **R' Masna** said that if the blister is filled with pus it is a treifa and if it is filled with clear fluid it is kosher! **Shmuel** said, that is referring to a blister on the kidney.
 - **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef** tried to get **R' Yirmiyya** to buy lungs with blisters on them in the marketplace (to see if he held in practice that this would be kosher). **R' Yirmiyya** first tried to make an excuse that he had no money with him, but then admitted that he wouldn't eat it, because although **R' Yochanan** would send such animals for a ruling to **R' Yehuda the son of R' Shimon**, who said they are kosher, **R' Yochanan** himself held they were not kosher.
 - **Rava** said that he saw **R' Nachman** walk in the market and pass by people who were selling lungs with large blisters and he said nothing to them. **R' Ami** and **R' Assi** also did not say anything to people selling lungs with blisters in the market of Teverya.
- If a needle was found in the lung of an animal (and there is no hole that can be found), **R' Yochanan**, **R' Elazar**, and **R' Chanina** said the animal is kosher, and **Reish Lakish**, **R' Mani bar Patish**, and **R' Shimon ben Elyakim** said it is a treifa.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that the second group holds that a lung that has an internal deficiency is considered to be deficient and is therefore a treifa (and a metal needle in the lung eats away at the lung so that there is certainly some that is missing), and the other group holds that such a deficiency is not considered to be a deficiency at all? **A:** It may be that all would agree that such a deficiency is not considered to be a deficiency. The machlokes is that the first group holds that we can assume that the needle entered through the kaneh and made its way into the lung (without having to puncture anything) whereas the second group holds that we must assume that the needle was eaten and made its way through the veshet and into the lung, thereby making the animal a treifa.
 - There was once an actual case of this that was brought to **R' Ami**. He thought to say it is kosher. **R' Yirmiyya** (or **R' Zrika**) asked, our Mishna says that if a lung is punctured or deficient the animal is a treifa. What is meant by a deficient lung? It can't mean that it was deficient from the outside, because that is a case of a punctured lung!? Rather, it must mean that it was deficient internally, and we see that an internal deficiency is considered to be a deficiency and makes the animal a treifa!? They then sent this lung to **R' Yitzchak Nafcha**, and he also thought to say that it was kosher. **R' Yirmiyya** (or **R' Zrika**) asked him the same question. The lung was then sent back to **R' Ami**. The talmidim said to him, we have the first group of Rabanim that said that such a lung is kosher!? **R' Ami** said, they were dealing with an intact lung that could be checked for a hole. The lung that is in front of us has already been cut and therefore cannot be checked.
 - **Q:** This suggests that if the lung was intact and no hole was found it would be kosher. However, **R' Nachman** has said that a bronchial tube that was punctured is a treifa, so even if we can assume that the needle came in through the kaneh, its passage through the bronchial tube should make it a treifa!? **A:** He only said that at a place of the bronchial tube that is right next to another bronchial tube, because it cannot heal itself there. However, anywhere else on the tube it can heal and therefore would not make the animal a treifa.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Nachman** says regarding a hole in the intestines that if it is in a place that is next to another part of the intestine it is kosher, because that helps it seal the hole. If so, why are bronchial tubes that are next to each other different? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, you can't compare

different treifos to each other. We find that cutting an animal in one place kills it and in another place it does not. Therefore, cases of treifos can't be compared to each other.

- A needle was once found in the primary bronchial tube of an animal. It was brought in front of the second group of these Rabanim. They did not say it was kosher, in accordance with their opinion, but they also did not say it was assur. The reason is, since it was found in the primary bronchial tube it is likely that it got there by entering from the kaneh (not by puncturing through the veshet and the lungs).
- There was a needle found in a piece of the liver of an animal. **Mar the son of R' Yosef** thought to say it is a treifa. **R' Ashi** said to him, if it was found in a piece of meat you would surely not say it is a treifa, so why is the liver any different (it doesn't become a treifa from a puncture)!? Rather, **R' Ashi** said, we examine the needle. If the blunt end of the needle is sticking out of the liver, that means that it entered the liver with the sharp side and likely came from the veshet, thereby making the animal a treifa. If the pointed side is sticking out of the liver, we can assume that it entered the liver by way of coming in through the kaneh, and therefore the animal is not a treifa. However, this is only true if it is a large needle (which is very blunt on the non-pointed end). If it was a small needle, no matter which way the needle was pointing, we must be concerned that it entered the liver from the outside and is therefore a treifa.
 - **Q:** Why is this case different than the case of a needle found in the "beis hakosos" stomach, where we say that if it is through both walls it is a treifa, and we don't examine to see which way the needle is sticking out!? **A:** In that case, since there is food and drink that come into the beis hakosos it is possible that they push the needle out even by way of its blunt end.
 - There was once a needle found in the large blood vessel of the liver. **Huna Mar the son of R' Idi** said it was a treifa and **R' Ada bar Menyumei** said it was kosher. They asked **Ravina** and he told them, "Take away the coat of the one who said it is a treifa" (as payment for declaring it a treifa incorrectly).
 - There was a date pit that was found in the gallbladder of an animal. **R' Ashi** said that **R' Kahana** said that this definitely came through the tubes (rather than by puncturing through, because it is too blunt to puncture). Even though the pit is too big to leave through the blood vessels we can still say that it came in that way, because we say that the animal's movements slowly pushed it through the blood vessels. Now, this is true for a date pit, which is very blunt. An olive pit would be different, because it is sharp and may have punctured the organ.