



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

Chullin Daf Nun Aleph

HEMSES UBEIS HAKOSOS

- A Braisa says, if a needle was found in the thickness of the beis hakosos, if it is only sticking out of the wall on the inside it is kosher, but if it is sticking out on both sides it is a treifa. If blood is found on it we can know that it happened before shechita (and is therefore a treifa), and if no blood is found on it we can know that it happened after shechita (and is therefore kosher). If a scab formed over the wound we can know that it happened at least 3 days before the shechita (and if the animal was purchased in these days the purchaser can get a refund from the seller). If there was no scab, the wound may have happened after the purchase and we would say "hamotzi meichaveiro alav haraya" (and the purchaser can't demand a refund).
 - **Q:** All over we say that a puncture makes it a treifa even if we don't find blood, so why is this different? **A:** In other cases of punctures there is nothing for the blood to cling to. Here, since there is a needle, the blood can cling to it and we can therefore make a judgment based on whether there is blood or not.
 - **R' Safra** told **Abaye** that **R' Avira** came from EY and said that a case of a needle found in the thickness of the beis hakosos only sticking out of the wall on the inside was brought before **Rebbi** and he paskened that it was a treifa. **Abaye** went to **R' Avira** who explained that the case was that **Rebbi** looked at the outside of the wall and found a drop of blood opposite where the needle was on the inside. He said that it must have come from a hole through the outside wall as well and that is why he said it was a treifa. Upon hearing these details, **Abaye** said this is not a chiddush, because this is what our Mishna says as well.

NAFLAH MIN HAGAG

- **R' Huna** said, if a person left an animal on a roof and came back and found it on the ground we don't have to be concerned that it fell off and is injured to the point of being a treifa, rather we assume that it went down on its own and is not a treifa.
 - **Ravina** had a goat that jumped from a roof through a skylight into the room below to get some food that it saw there. He asked **R' Ashi**, "Do we say that the reason for **R' Huna's** view is that an animal that comes down from a roof can at least grab onto the walls somewhat and that is why it does not become a treifa, but in the case of jumping through a skylight there are no walls for it to grab onto and therefore it becomes a treifa, or do we say that the reason **R' Huna** says it is not a treifa is because we say that an animal will not jump unless it feels it can do so safely, and therefore, even in the case of skylight we can say that it is not a treifa?" **R' Ashi** told him that it is based on the second reason, and therefore even in this case the animal is not a treifa.
 - **R' Chaviva** had a sheep that was dragging its back legs (they were paralyzed). **R' Yeimar** said, the sheep just has a cramp and is therefore not an issue of treifa. **Ravina** asked, maybe its spinal cord was cut and it therefore is a treifa!? They examined the animal and it was found to have a cut spinal cord. The Gemara said, even so, the halacha still follows **R' Yeimar**, that one need not be concerned for a cut spinal cord in this case, because cramps are something that is common and a cut spinal cord is not.
 - **R' Huna** said, with regard to male rams that constantly butt heads with each other, we need not be concerned that they have caused each other injury that would result in treifa. This is so even if they seem to always be in pain, because we assume that the pain is due to a fever. However, if they fell to the ground we would have to be concerned that they have become a treifa.
 - **R' Menashe** said, regarding the rams that are stolen and thrown over the fence by the thieves, we do not need to be concerned that they become a treifa, because the thieves

throw them so that they land on their sides, which allows them to get up and run away with them. However, if the thieves decide to return the animals and throw them back over the fence we would have to be concerned that they become a treifa. Now, that is only where they returned them out of fear, but if they returned them in order to do teshuva, we can assume that they did so carefully.

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if someone hit an animal with a stick along the length of the animal, but the stick only made contact with the head and the tail, or if the stick made contact all along the entire spine, we do not need to be concerned that the animal becomes a treifa (the blow is evenly distributed and not strong enough at any point on the body to make it a treifa). However, if the stick makes contact with only half the animal's back, we do have to be concerned. Also, if the stick has protrusions, then even if it extended along the entire back we would have to be concerned. Also, if he hit the animal across the width of its back, we would have to be concerned.
- **R' Nachman** said, we do not need to be concerned that the womb injures the offspring in such a way as to make it a treifa.
 - **Rava** told **R' Nachman**, we can bring you a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says that even a baby who is one day old can become tamei as a zav if he sees two discharges. Now, the halacha is that one only becomes a zav if the discharge is not due to some illness or condition. If a baby who was just through the womb would be considered to have been through a trauma that can possibly even render him a treifa we would not make him tamei as a zav based on a discharge! It must be that the womb is not considered to put a baby through such trauma.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof. The Braisa may be referring to a baby that was born through a Caesarean section.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from another Braisa. The Braisa says that a calf born on Yom Tov may be shechted that Yom Tov. This seems to support **R' Nachman**, that a newborn animal may be eaten! **A:** Here too, the Braisa may be referring to a baby that was born through a Caesarean section.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from another Braisa. The Braisa says that if an animal bechor is born with a mum on Yom Tov, it may be shechted on Yom Tov. Now, this can't be referring to an animal that was born through a Caesarean section, because such an animal does not have the kedusha of a bechor anyway! **A:** This is not a valid proof, because the case may be where the newborn made an effort to stand, which shows that it is not a treifa. However, it may be that in any other case we must be concerned that the animal is a treifa.
- **R' Nachman** said, the shochet's throwing of the animal to the ground in preparation of shechita does not lead to concern that the animal is made a treifa.
 - There was once an ox that made sounds like a treifa when it was thrown down. **R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsah** ate from the meat of that animal. He explained that **Rav** said, the animal digs into the ground when it is being pushed down and therefore ends up falling from a place not high off the ground.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if after falling from a height the animal stood up, it does not need to live for 24 hours to prove that it is not a treifa, but we would still have to examine the internal organs after shechita to make sure there was no other form of treifa from the fall. If the animal walked after the fall, we would even not have to examine the internal organs. **R' Chiya bar Ashi** said, in either case we would have to examine the internal organs. **R' Yirmiya bar Acha in the name of Rav** said, if the animal stretched out its leg in an attempt to stand up, then even if it didn't stand up that is enough. If it lifted its back leg to walk, even if it didn't walk, it is considered as if it walked. **R' Chisda** said, if it even moved in an effort to get up it is considered to have stood up even if it did not.
- **Ameimar in the name of R' Dimi of Neharda'ah** said, when we say that an animal that suffered a fall requires examination of the internal organs, that means that it requires an examination of the intestines and other stomach organs. **Mar Zutra** told him that **R' Pappa** said all the internal organs in the body of the animal must be examined.
 - **Huna Mar** the grandson of **R' Nechemya** asked **R' Ashi**, do the simanim have to be examined as well? **R' Ashi** said, the simanim are considered to be strong with regard to a fall and would therefore not have to be checked.

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a bird hit the surface of water with force, if it then swam for at least a distance equal to its length, we can assume that it is not a treifa. However, this is only where it swam upstream, not where it swam downstream. If it is stationary water, swimming in either direction is sufficient. If there were pieces of wood going downstream and the bird swam downstream and moved ahead of the wood, it is also sufficient.
 - If a bird fell onto a piece of material that was stretched out tightly above the ground, we are concerned for it becoming a treifa. If the material was not stretched out tightly we are not concerned. If the material was folded, we are not concerned even if it was tightly stretched. If it flew into a net that had knots that were close together, we are concerned. If they were not close together, we are not concerned. If it fell onto bundles of flax we are concerned. If it fell onto the side of the bundle we are not concerned. If it fell on a bundle of reeds we are concerned. If it fell onto flax that was beaten and combed, we are not concerned. If it was beaten but not combed, we are concerned. If the beaten and combed flax was put into bundles and the bird fell on the bundle, we are concerned because of the knots. If it fell onto the broken stems of the flax that was beaten, we are concerned. If they were broken into very small pieces, we are not concerned. If it fell onto the fibers found under the bark of a palm tree, we are concerned. If it fell onto the fibers after they were separated into strips, we are not concerned. If it fell onto ashes that were sifted, we are concerned, but if it was not sifted we are not concerned. If it fell onto fine sand we are not concerned, but if it fell onto thick sand we are concerned. If it fell onto dust of the road we are concerned. If it fell onto a bundle of straw, we are concerned, but if it was straw that was not made into a bundle, we are not concerned. If it fell onto wheat or things like it, we are concerned. If it fell onto barley or things like it, we are not concerned. Falling onto any type of beans, except for "tilsan", will not lead to concern. If it fell onto "chimtzei" (which are smooth) there is no concern, but if it fell onto "chiftzei" (which are not round) there is a concern. The general rule is: anything that is slippery and therefore moves when pressed, does not lead to concern if a bird fell onto it. Anything that is not slippery would lead to concern.
 - If a bird got stuck to a board with glue and began to fly away and then fell to the ground along with the board, **R' Ashi** said the bird is mutar and **Ameimar** said it is assur.
 - All agree that if only one wing got stuck to the glue it would be mutar (it can soften its fall enough to alleviate any concern). The machlokes is where both wings were stuck to the glue – **R' Ashi** says it can still soften the blow with its wingtips, whereas **Ameimar** says it has no way of softening the blow and is therefore assur.
 - **Others** say that all agree that if both wings were stuck to the glue it would become assur. The machlokes is where only one wing got stuck to the glue – the machlokes being whether it can fly even somewhat with only one wing.
 - The Gemara paskens that if it became stuck with both wings it is assur, and if it became stuck with one wing it is mutar.