



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

Chullin Daf Nun Daled

- **R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa** said in front of **R' Nachman** that an animal that was a drusa must be examined throughout the internal organs of the main cavity of the body for poison. **R' Nachman** said, **Rav** would say that it must be examined from the "spoon", which must refer to the skull, to the thigh.
 - When **R' Chiya bar Yosef** went to EY he met **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** who said that an animal that was a drusa must be examined throughout the internal organs of the main cavity of the body for poison. **R' Chiya bar Yosef** said, **Rav** would say that it must be examined from the "spoon", which must refer to the skull, to the thigh. **Reish Lakish** did not know who **Rav** was. **R' Yochanan** reminded him who he was, and how, when he was in EY, he was from the greatest talmidim there (even greater than **R' Yochanan** himself). **Reish Lakish** then remembered who **Rav** was, and that **Rav** had given a psak that if after a shechita we find that the kaneh was detached from the jaw, but we don't know if the detachment happened before the shechita or after, we can assume that it is kosher, because a proper shechita can't be done on a dislodged kaneh. **R' Yochanan** argued on that psak and said that we must cut the kaneh in another place and compare the cut to the previous one.
 - **R' Nachman** said, we only say that a shechita couldn't have been done to a detached kaneh if the shochet did not grab onto the simanim when doing the shechita. If he did, it is possible for the shechita to have been done to a detached kaneh.

ZEH HAKLAL

- The "general rule" comes to include the 7 forms of treifos that are taught by the Amora'im, but which are not mentioned in a Mishna or Braisa.
- The people of **Yosef** the Hunter would hit an animal with a stick or an arrow on the gid hanasheh, which would cause it to die. They asked **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** whether an animal hit in that manner would be deemed a treifa. He said, you can't add more treifos to those that we have as a kabbalah from the **Rabanan**.
 - The people of **R' Pappa bar Abba** the Hunter would hit an animal on the kidney, which would cause it to die. They asked **R' Abba** whether an animal hit in that manner would be deemed a treifa. He said, you can't add more treifos to those that we have as a kabbalah from the **Rabanan**.
 - **Q:** We see that the animals hit in this way would die, so how can we say they are not a treifa? **A:** We have a kabbalah that if they would be given a medicine after these injuries they would be able to heal.

MISHNA

- The following animals would be kosher: if its kaneh had a hole or if it was split [How much could be missing without making it a treifa? **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said up to the size of an Italian issar]; if the skull had something missing but the membrane was not punctured; if the heart was punctured, but not all the way to the cavity within; if the spinal column was broken but the spinal cord was not; if the liver was removed but a kezayis remained; if there was a puncture between the hems and the beis hakosov; if the spleen was removed; if the kidneys were removed; if the lower jaw was removed; if the uterus was removed; and if the lung was shriveled by the Hands of Heaven (i.e. from the animal being scared of a natural phenomenon, like thunder or lightning). With regard to an animal whose skin came off entirely because of a medical condition or from work, **R' Meir** says it is kosher and the **Rabanan** say it is passul.

GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan** said, that when the previous Mishna said "*these* are treifos" it is meant purposely, to exclude certain things as not being a treifa. **Reish Lakish** said, when our Mishna says "*these* are kosher" it is meant purposely, to exclude certain things as not being kosher.
 - They would argue in the case of **R' Masna**, who said that if the ball of the thigh popped out of place it is a treifa. **R' Yochanan** would say that the first Mishna means to exclude this case from being considered a treifa. **Reish Lakish** would say that our Mishna means to exclude this case from being considered as kosher.
 - **Rava** argues with **R' Masna** and says the animal would be kosher. However, if the ligament tore, it would be a treifa.
 - The Gemara paskens that even if the ligament tore it would be kosher, unless the ligament decayed.

AHD KAMAH TECHSAR...

- **Ze'iri** said, for those who have seen an Italian issar, the size is the same as the dinar of Kurdina'ah, which is the same size as the small peshita coins which are found in Pumbedisa. **R' Chana** the moneychanger said that **Bar Nafcha** once came looking for a dinar of Kurdina'ah to use to measure for a possible treifa. I tried to get up for him (since he was a talmid chochom) but he did not allow me to do so and said that it is assur for a tradesman who is working as an employee to get up for a talmid chochom.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the tradesmen would get up for the people who were bringing bikkurim!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, they would get up for these people, but not for talmidei chachomim. **R' Yose bar Avin** said, this shows how beloved a mitzvah is during its time. The Gemara says this is no proof of this concept, because it may be that they got up so as to make the people want to bring bikkurim again the next year.
- **R' Nachman** said, if it is exactly the size of a selah it is treated as being more than the size of a selah (it is a treifa), and if it is exactly the size of an issar it is treated as being more than the size of an issar (it is a treifa). We see that **R' Nachman** holds that when the Mishna says "ahd" it means "up to but not including".
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, a Mishna says that a rope that comes out of a bed "up to" 5 tefachim is tahor. This seems to say that exactly 5 tefachim is treated like less than 5 tefachim!? **A:** It means that it would be treated like more than 5 tefachim.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says, "from 5 until 10 it is tamei". This seems to say that exactly 10 is treated like less than 10!? **A:** It means that it would be treated like more than 10.
 - **Q:** A Mishna that discusses the size of keilim for purposes of tumah and discusses small keilim "up to a lug". This seems to say that the lug would be treated like less than a lug!? **A:** It means it would be treated like more than a lug.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says "from a lug to a se'ah", which seems to say that a se'ah is treated like less than the se'ah!? **A:** It means it is treated like more than the se'ah.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says, "from a se'ah until 2 se'ah", which seems to say that 2 se'ah is treated like less than 2 se'ah!? **A:** It means it is treated like more than 2 se'ah.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that for the purposes of this last Mishna, the lug, se'ah, and two se'ah are treated like less than the lug, se'ah, and 2 se'ah, respectively!? **A:** That is because that is the way that results in a chumra (whereas **R' Nachman** meant his ruling when interpreting it as such, results in a chumra).