



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

Chullin Daf Nun Beis

NISHTABRU ROV TZALOSEHA

- A Braisa says, the following combinations would make up “the majority of the ribs” – 6 ribs from one side and 6 from the other, or 11 ribs from one side and one on the other.
 - **Ze'iri** said, the breaks in the ribs must be on the upper half of the ribs towards the spine.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the breaks must take place in the large ribs that have marrow.
- **Ulla** said, **Ben Zakai** said that if the ribs became uprooted from their attachment to the spine, the animal is a treifa if even a majority of just one side of the ribs became uprooted. With regard to broken ribs, the animal only becomes a treifa if a majority of both sides are broken. **R' Yochanan** said, in either case we need a majority of both sides of ribs.
 - **Rav** said, if a rib was uprooted together with its vertebrae, the animal is a treifa.
 - **R' Kahana and R' Assi** asked **Rav**, what if the ribs on each side of a vertebrae became detached but the vertebrae remained in place? **Rav** said, this is essentially the same as an animal that got cut in half and the animal is therefore certainly a neveila.
 - **Q: Rav's** case where the rib was uprooted together with its vertebrae is the exact same case and should also be a neveila!? **A: Rav** was talking about a case where the rib and half the vertebrae were detached.
 - **Q: This** would mean that **R' Kahana and R' Assi** were asking about a case where only the rib was uprooted, but the vertebrae was not, and **Rav's** response was that it is a neveila. How can this be, when **Ulla** said that **Ben Zakai** said that if the ribs became uprooted from their attachment to the spine, the animal is a treifa if even a majority of just one side of the ribs became uprooted. With regard to broken ribs, the animal only becomes a treifa if a majority of both sides are broken. We see that two ribs alone would not make the animal into a treifa, and definitely not into a neveila!? **A: Rav** would say, **Ben Zakai** is talking about where the uprooted ribs are not opposite each other on the opposite side of the animal. **R' Kahana and R' Assi** are talking about where they are, and this case is worse.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** said, in either case we need a majority of both sides of ribs, and that has to mean that there were some uprooted or broken ribs that were opposite other ribs that are uprooted or broken. We see that even though that is so, it is only a treifa, and not even a neveila, if there is a majority!? **A: R' Yochanan** was talking about a case where the rib detached from the vertebrae, but the vertebrae remained in place. **R' Kahana and R' Assi** were talking about where the vertebrae became detached as well.
 - **Q: Based** on this, the case of **R' Kahana and R' Assi** is essentially the case of **Rav**!? **A: They** must have not heard of **Rav's** ruling.
 - **Q: If** so, they should have asked about the case where only one rib was uprooted with part of the vertebrae!? **A: By** asking for a ruling in a case where two ribs were uprooted they felt they could get an answer to the question of where only one was uprooted as well. Because, if **Rav** would answer strongly that the animal is assur, they would know that he is doing so as if to

say – “Of course it is assur, because if even only one rib became detached it would be assur!”. By answering them that the case of two detached ribs is essentially the case of an animal being cut in half, that was a strong answer and they understood that even in the case of one detached rib and part of the vertebrae it would also be assur.

- **Rabbah bar R’ Shila in the name of R’ Masna in the name of Shmuel** said, if a rib is uprooted from its base, or if the majority of the skull is crushed, or if most of the meat that covers the keres was imperfect, the animal is a treifa.
 - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** says elsewhere that an animal is a treifa when even one vertebrae is removed. This necessarily means that two ribs are removed. We see that one rib alone is not enough!? **A:** Our ruling of **Shmuel** is discussing where the rib was uprooted but the vertebrae was not, whereas the other ruling of **Shmuel** was where the vertebrae was missing but the rib was not.
 - **Q:** How is it that a vertebrae can be missing without the rib that is attached to it missing as well? **A:** That case refers to the lower vertebrae, which don’t have ribs attached.
 - **Q: R’ Yirmiya** asked, did **Shmuel** refer to most of the height of the skull or to most of the circumference of the skull? **TEIKU.**
 - **Q: R’ Ashi** asked, did **Shmuel** mean that most of the meat that covers the keres were torn or that most was removed? **A:** The Mishna said that a tear in the “outer keres” makes the animal a treifa and **R’ Yose the son of R’ Chanina** said the “outer keres” is the meat that covers the keres. We see that a tear in most of this meat will make the animal a treifa.
 - This is not a valid answer, because **Shmuel** holds that the “outside keres” is the area that does not have a wool-like material on the inside, and does not refer to the meat that covers the keres.

UDRUSAS HAZE’EIV

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, with regard to an animal that was attacked and clawed, it is a treifa if the attacking animal is the size of a wolf or larger. With regard to a bird, it is a treifa if the attacking bird was the size of a netz or larger.
 - **Q:** What does the first part of the statement (regarding animals) come to exclude? It can’t mean to exclude the clawing of a cat, because the fact that the Mishna says “the clawing of a wolf” it is obvious that the smaller cat would be excluded!? You can’t say that the Mishna means to teach that a wolf can even make a larger animal than it into a treifa by clawing it, and the Mishna does not mean to teach that a cat can’t kill with its clawing, because **R’ Yehuda** in the Mishna says that a wolf can only make a treifa by clawing a small animal and a lion can make a treifa by clawing a large animal. We have learned that **R’ Binyamin bar Yefes in the name of R’ Ila’a** said that **R’ Yehuda** is explaining the view of the **T”K**, not arguing on it. If so, the **T”K** said “wolf” to exclude a cat, so why did **Rav** have to teach this to us? **A:** **Rav** would argue with **R’ Binyamin** and would say that **R’ Yehuda** *does* in fact argue with the **T”K**. **A2:** Although the Mishna means to exclude a cat, we would have thought that the Mishna says “wolf”, since that is the usual case. However, a cat’s clawing can also make a treifa. **Rav** therefore teaches to explain that this is not so.
- **R’ Amram in the name of R’ Chisda** said, a cat or “nemiya” can make a baby goat or a baby lamb into a treifa by clawing it. A weasel can make a bird into a treifa by clawing it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a cat, a neitz, and a nemiya only make a treifa if they puncture a vital organ of the victim. This suggests that they can’t make a treifa with a simple clawing!? [**Q:** Our Mishna says that a neitz can make a treifa by clawing!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to a bird that is clawed by a neitz.] **A:** **R’ Chisda** will follow another Braisa which says that **Beribi** says, a cat’s clawing can make the victim animal into a treifa if the victim animal had people who were trying to save it (this infuriates the cat and gives its clawing the ability to kill).
 - **Q:** It once happened by **R’ Kahana** that a chicken was being chased by a cat and ran into a room, and the door closed preventing the cat from going in. The cat clawed the door and poison was later found on the door. We see that even

where there was no one trying to save the chicken the cat has the ability to kill with poison!? **A:** Saving itself is just like having someone else to try to save it. This also infuriates the cat and gives it the ability to kill.

- The **Rabanan**, who say that a cat can't kill, hold that it does have poison, but the poison cannot kill.
- **A:** We can also say that the first Braisa that says a cat, a neitz, and a nemiya can only make a treifa when they puncture an organ, follows the view of **Beribi**, who says that they can't kill unless someone is trying to save the victim.
- **R' Kahana** asked **Rav**, can a cat make a treifa by clawing? He answered, even a weasel can make a treifa by clawing. Another time he asked, can a weasel make a treifa by clawing? He answered, even a cat can't make a treifa by clawing. Another time he asked, do a cat and weasel have the ability to make a treifa by clawing? He answered, a cat does have the ability, but a weasel does not.
 - The answers are not contradictory. When he first said that even a weasel can make a treifa, he was referring to when it clawed a bird. When he said that even a cat can't make a treifa, he was referring to where it was a large sheep that was clawed. When he said that a cat can make a treifa but a weasel cannot, he was referring to where it was baby goats and lambs that were clawed.