



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

### Chullin Daf Nun Gimmel

- **R' Ashi** asked, do other non-kosher birds (other than the neitz and the gass) have the ability to make something a treifa by clawing it? **R' Hillel** said, when I was by **R' Kahana** he said that other non-kosher birds do have that ability.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna specifies the neitz bird, which would suggest that other birds do not!? **A:** The Mishna singles out the neitz bird, because it is different in that its clawing can even make a bird of like size into a treifa, whereas the other birds can only do so to smaller birds. **A2:** The Mishna singles out the neitz bird, because it is different in that its clawing can even make a bird of a larger size than it into a treifa, whereas the other birds can only do so to birds that are at most of equal size to them.
- **R' Kahana in the name of R' Simi bar Ashi** said, the clawing of a fox does not have the ability to make an animal into a treifa.
  - **Q:** **R' Dimi** once said that it happened that a fox clawed a sheep and the **Rabanan** said that the sheep became a treifa from that!? **A:** **R' Safra** said, it was actually a cat that clawed, not a fox.
  - **Another** version is that **R' Kahana in the name of R' Simi bar Ashi** said, the clawing of a fox does have the ability to make an animal into a treifa. The Gemara then asked that **R' Dimi** once said that it happened that a fox clawed a sheep and the **Rabanan** said that the sheep did not become a treifa from that!? **R' Safra** answered, it was actually a dog that clawed, not a fox.
  - **R' Yosef** said, we have a kabbalah that a dog does not have the ability to make something a treifa through its clawing.
- **Abaye** said, we have a kabbalah that only the clawing of the front feet can cause the victim to become a treifa, but not of the back feet. Also, only the nails cause it to become a treifa, not the teeth. Also, it only becomes a treifa when the animal clawed with intent to do so. Also, only a live animal's clawing can make the victim into a treifa.
  - **Q:** Once he said that without intent the clawing does not create a treifa it seems unnecessary to say that after death the clawing doesn't create a treifa!? **A:** The case is where the attacking animal stuck its claw into the victim and the claw was then chopped off. **Abaye** is teaching that this "dead" claw cannot make a treifa. We would have thought to say that it gave off poison as soon as it was put into the victim. He therefore teaches that the poison is only put into the victim when the claw is pulled out of the victim.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, if a lion went among the oxen and one of the oxen is later found with a nail of a lion in its back we are not concerned that the ox was clawed by the lion. The reason is, that we say that most lions claw and a minority don't. When an animal claws, it is not normal for its nail to fall out. Therefore, we will say that the ox got the nail in its back by rubbing against a wall in which the lion's nail became detached.
  - **Q:** We should instead say that most oxen rub against walls and a minority don't. When an animal rubs against a wall it is not normal for it to get a nail in its back. Therefore, we should assume that it got the nail in its back by having been clawed by the lion!? **A:** There is logic to say each way, which makes the ox a "safek drusa". **Rav** follows his own view that we are not concerned for an animal that is only a safek drusa.
    - **Abaye** said, this is only true if the nail was found in its back. However, if the mark of a nail was found in its back, we would have to be concerned. Also, even when a nail is found in the back, we are only not concerned for clawing if it was a moist claw (which don't usually fall off). However, if it was a dried out claw, we would have to be concerned. Also, even when it is moist we are only not

concerned when it is one nail that is found in the back. However, if there are 2 or 3 we would have to be concerned if they are in a row, like they are on the paw of the animal.

- We have learned that **Rav** says we are not concerned in the case of a safek drusa and **Shmuel** says that we are.
  - All agree that if it is a safek whether the attacking animal even entered among the possible victims, we can assume that it did not enter at all. If an animal was definitely clawed, but it is a safek whether it was done by a cat or by a dog, we can assume that it was done by a dog. If a lion was found to be sitting quietly among the oxen, we can assume that it did not claw any of them. If the lion ripped off the head of one of them, we can assume that he thereby let out his anger and did not claw any of the others. If the lion was roaring and the oxen were heard groaning, it means they are each scared of the other and there is no concern that the lion clawed. The machlokes is where the lion was quiet and the oxen were groaning. **Shmuel** holds the oxen are groaning because the lion must have been clawing and **Rav** holds that they are groaning out of fear.
  - **Ameimar** said we pasken that we are concerned for a safek drusa. **R' Ashi** asked him, how do you disregard the view of **Rav**? **Ameimar** said, I do not agree with his ruling. We can also answer that **Rav** retracted his view and held like **Shmuel**. We see this from an incident where a basket full of safek drusa birds were brought to **Rav** for a ruling and he sent them to **Shmuel** for a ruling. **Shmuel** took them, strangled them, and threw them into the river. Now, if **Rav** didn't retract his view, instead of sending them to **Shmuel** he should have paskened that they are mutar!
    - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. If **Rav** did retract, instead of sending them to **Shmuel**, why didn't he just pasken that they are assur? Rather, the reason he sent it to **Shmuel** was that he was in a place that was under the jurisdiction of **Shmuel**, and therefore we can't prove what **Rav** actually held.
    - **Q:** Why did **Shmuel** have to strangle them? Why couldn't he simply throw them into the river to drown? **A:** He was afraid that they would be able to save themselves and emerge alive.
    - **Q:** Why couldn't he let them live and see if they survived for 12 months (which would prove that they were not a treifa)? **A:** People may accidentally eat them during the 12 month period.
    - **Q:** Why couldn't he just sell them to a goy? **A:** He may come to sell them to a Yid.
    - **Q:** Why couldn't he strangle them and throw them into the garbage? **A:** We can ask why couldn't he throw them to the dogs? The reason he didn't is because he wanted to publicize that safek drusa are assur.
  - There was a duck that belonged to **R' Ashi** which went into the reeds and came out with blood on its neck. **R' Ashi** said, just as we said when it is safek whether a dog or cat did the clawing we may say that it was a dog, so too here, where it is a safek whether this happened on the reeds or from the clawing of a cat, we may assume that it happened from the reeds.
- [An animal that is a drusa must be checked to see if poison has been injected into the animal.] The sons of **R' Chiya** said, an animal that is a drusa needs to be examined all around the insides for signs of poisoning. **R' Yosef** said, this ruling was actually already stated by **Shmuel in the name of R' Chanina ben Antignas**.
  - **Q:** **Ilfa** asked, does an animal become a drusa when it is clawed at the place of its simanim? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, this was already addressed by a ruling of **R' Chanan bar Rava in the name of Rav** who said that a drusa must be examined around all of the insides and even in the simanim.
  - **Q:** **Ilfa** asked, how much do simanim have to be detached in order to be considered a treifa? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, this was already taught in a ruling of **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of Shmuel**, which said that the majority must be detached.
  - **Q:** **R' Ami** asked, what is the halacha if an animal's flesh began to decay at the place of the clawing? **A:** **R' Zeira** said, this was already taught in a ruling of **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav**, which said that a clawed animal is only a treifa if the flesh of the area of the insides begins to redden. If the flesh begins to decay, we view it as if it is not there.

- **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** explained that “decayed” for this purpose refers to flesh that a doctor would cut away to allow for the healing of healthy flesh.
- **R' Nachman** said, an animal punctured by a thorn is only a treifa if it punctured all the way into the body cavity. A drusa is a treifa if the flesh around its insides becomes reddened. **R' Zvid** taught that **R' Nachman** said, a drusa is a treifa if the flesh around its insides becomes reddened, and if it was clawed at the simanim it becomes a treifa if the simanim themselves become reddened.
  - **R' Pappi** said that **R' Bibi bar Abaye** asked, a hole of any size in the veshet makes the animal a treifa, and therefore a red spot of any size on the veshet that was clawed will also make it a treifa. With regard to the kaneh it is only a treifa if there is a hole the size of an issar. How large of a red spot from a drusa on the kaneh would make it a treifa? He then answered that even a red spot of any size will make it a treifa. The reason is that the poison from clawing continues to spread and will eventually make a hole the size of an issar in the kaneh.