



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

Chullin Daf Nun Ches

- **Ameimar** said, with regard to eggs of a treifa bird, the first bunch of eggs (that were in the bird at the time that it became a treifa) are assur. The eggs that the bird lays after that are mutar, because something that is caused by two things – one of which is assur and one of which is mutar (the female treifa and the male that is not a treifa) – is mutar (“zeh v'zeh gorem mutar”).
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked **Ameimar**, a Braisa says that all agree that the egg from a bird that is a treifa is assur, because it developed in something that is assur!? **A:** This Braisa is discussing an egg that was not fertilized by a male (so it is only the treifa female that causes this egg to come into being).
 - **Q:** Why didn't **Ameimar** just answer that the Braisa is talking about the first bunch of eggs of the treifa bird? **A:** If that was what the Braisa was referring to it would have said that the eggs “became completed” in the treifa, not that they “were developed” in the treifa.
 - **Q:** Based on this, when a Braisa says that with regard to the offspring of a treifa animal **R' Eliezer** says it may not be brought as a korbon and **R' Yehoshua** says that it may be brought as a korbon, the machlokes must be where the mother first became a treifa and then conceived, and the machlokes is that **R' Eliezer** says “zeh v'zeh gorem” is assur and **R' Yehoshua** says that it is mutar. If so, why do they state their machlokes in terms of a korbon? Why not state it in terms of regular people and whether the offspring may be eaten? **A:** They spoke in terms of a korbon to teach the extent of **R' Yehoshua's** view, that he even allows the offspring for purposes of a korbon.
 - **Q:** Why didn't they instead argue with regard to eating the animal, which would be better, because it would show the extent of the view of **R' Eliezer** that he says it is assur even for mundane eating? **A:** We prefer to teach the extent of a heter than the extent of an issur.
 - They agree that the egg of a treifa bird that was produced without a male is assur, because in that case there is only one thing that causes it to be formed, and that thing is a treifa.
 - **R' Acha** held like **R' Acha bar Yaakov** (who said that a treifa can have offspring) and therefore had the version of **Ameimar** as we have it, above. **Ravina** does not hold like **R' Acha bar Yaakov** and therefore says that **Ameimar's** ruling was regarding a safek treifa, and said that the first bunch of eggs must be held until we see if the bird produces more eggs. If it does, it means it is not a treifa and therefore even the first bunch are mutar. If it does not, the first bunch are assur.
 - **Q:** Based on this version, **R' Ashi** asked **Ameimar**, a Braisa says that all agree that the egg from a bird that is a treifa is assur, because it developed in something that is assur. We see that a treifa can produce eggs!? **A:** **Ameimar** answered, this refers to the first bunch, which was produced before the bird became a treifa.
 - **Q:** If so, the Braisa should have said that the eggs “became completed” in the treifa, not that they “were developed” in the treifa!? **A:** Read the Braisa as if it says that the eggs “became completed” in the treifa.
 - **Q:** According to this understanding, when a Braisa says that with regard to the offspring of a treifa animal **R' Eliezer** says it may not be brought as a korbon and **R' Yehoshua** says that it may be brought as a korbon, the machlokes must be where the mother first conceived and then became a treifa, and the machlokes is that **R' Eliezer** says the fetus is

considered to be a part of the mother (and so it too becomes a treifa) and **R' Yehoshua** says that a fetus is not considered to be a part of the mother.

- **Q:** If so, why do they state their machlokes in terms of a korbon? Why not state it in terms of regular people and whether the offspring may be eaten? **A:** They spoke in terms of a korbon to teach the extent of **R' Yehoshua's** view, that he even allows the offspring for purposes of a korbon.
- **Q:** Why didn't they instead argue with regard to eating the animal, which would be better, because it would show the extent of the view of **R' Eliezer** that he says it is assur even for mundane eating? **A:** We prefer to teach the extent of a heter than the extent of an issur.
- When the Braisa says they agree, it refers to the first bunch of eggs of a treifa. The reason **R' Yehoshua** agrees they are assur is because these eggs are literally part of the mother.
- The Gemara paskens, that with regard to a male that is possibly a treifa, if it lives 12 months we can know that it is not a treifa. With regard to a female, if it produces offspring it is not a treifa.
- **R' Huna** said, any creature that doesn't have bones cannot live 12 months.
 - **R' Pappa** said, we can learn from this that when **Shmuel** said that a cucumber that became wormy while it was attached to the ground it is assur, with regard to dates in a keili that became wormy (and we don't know if this happened while the dates were still attached to the ground or after they were detached), they would be mutar to eat after 12 months (from when they were picked, because at that point the worms could not have been from when the dates were attached to the ground and would therefore not be assur).
- **Rav** said, a mosquito doesn't live for a full day and a fly doesn't live for a full year.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye** there is a saying that people say that makes reference to a gnat living for at least 7 years!? **A: Abaye** said, there are other sayings that make reference to things that are impossible. The saying was said in "gnat years", not human years.
- A Mishna says, if an animal has 5 legs or only 3 legs, it is considered to be a mum (e.g. for purposes of a bechor). **R' Huna** said about this Mishna, this is only true regarding the front legs. However, regarding an animal's back legs, if there is one extra or one missing it would be a treifa. The reason an extra back leg would be assur is because anything that is extra is like something that is missing.
 - There was an animal that had two "sanya divei" (part near the intestine) that was brought to **Ravina**, and he said it was a treifa based on the ruling of **R' Huna**.
 - If the two sanya divei pour into each other it would not be a treifa.
 - **R' Ashi** was going to rule an animal a treifa for having something that looked like an extra tube of flesh inside in the digestive tract. **R' Huna Mar bar Chiya** told him, all animals that feed in the wild have this and therefore it is not a treifa.
 - **Mar bar R' Ashi** was going to rule as kosher an animal with an extra tube of flesh at a different part of the body. **R' Oshaya** told him, you have no basis for ruling it kosher based on the previous ruling, because they are in different places and can't be compared.
 - A Braisa said, **Nosson bar Shula**, the head shochet of Tzipori testified to **Rebbi** regarding an animal with two intestines that it is a treifa, but that a bird with this condition would be kosher. The animal is only a treifa if the intestines come out of two different places. However, if they come out of the same place and join together after an etzbah, it would be kosher.
 - The Gemara says, there is a machlokes between **R' Ami** and **R' Assi** whether the two intestines must fully combine back into one in order to be kosher.

- **R' Yochanan** said, **R' Yehuda** and **R' Yishmael** share the same view regarding this. **R' Yehuda's** view is in our Mishna. **R' Yishmael's** view is found regarding piggul, where he equates the feathers near the skin as being skin itself.
 - **Rava** said, it may be that they don't agree. It may be that **R' Yehuda** only holds this way regarding a treifa, because without this layer of feathers there is nothing to protect the animal, but it may be that he does not consider it as edible for purposes of piggul. It may be that **R' Yishmael** holds the opposite and therefore would not agree with **R' Yehuda** regarding a treifa (he may hold that this layer does not protect the bird anyway).

MISHNA

- If an animal had too much blood, making it sick, or an animal that had smoke inhalation, or one that became sick from the cold, or one that ate "hardufni" (which is poisonous to animals), or one that ate the wastes of chickens, or one that drank bad water (water that was left uncovered), it is kosher. If it ate something that is poisonous to people, or was bitten by a snake, it is mutar in regard to being a treifa, but is assur because it presents a sakanas nefashos.

GEMARA

- **Shmuel** said, if one fed an animal "chiltis" the animal becomes a treifa, because it punctures the digestive tract.
 - **Q: R' Shizbi** asked, a Braisa says, if an animal had too much blood, making it sick, or an animal that had smoke inhalation, or one that ate "hardufni" (which is poisonous to animals), or one that ate the wastes of chickens, or one that drank bad water (water that was left uncovered), or if it was fed "ti'ah" (a very bitter herb) or chiltis or peppers, or if it ate poison, it is kosher. If it was bitten by a snake or by a crazed dog, it is mutar in regard to being a treifa, but is assur because it presents a sakanas nefashos. This Braisa contradicts **Shmuel** regarding chiltis and contradicts our Mishna with regard to eating poison!? **A:** With regard to chiltis we can say that the Braisa is referring to the leaves of the plant and **Shmuel** is referring to the grain. With regard to poison we can say that the Braisa is referring to something only poisonous to animals and the Mishna is referring to poison that is poisonous to people.
 - **Q:** Poison of animals is the same things as "hardufni"? **A:** There are different kinds of animal poison.
 - **Q:** What is "ti'ah"? **A: R' Yehuda** said, it is the root of a bitter plant.
 - **R' Yehuda** said, one who eats the weight of 3 shekels of chiltis on an empty stomach will burn with a fever that will cause his skin to fall off.
 - **R' Avahu** said, he once ate the weight of one shekel of chiltis, and had he not sat in water to cool himself down his skin would have fallen off.
 - **R' Yosef** said, if one eats 16 eggs, 40 nuts, and 7 tzlaf seeds, and drinks a revi'is of honey in the summer on an empty stomach, this will cause his heart to have big problems.
 - A deer with severed back legs was brought to the home of the Reish Galusa. **Rav** checked the tzumas hagidin and ruled that it was kosher. He was ready to eat from the meat raw and **Shmuel** said, are you not concerned that the deer suffered a snake bite on the bottom of its leg? **Rav** asked, how can we tell if this happened or not? **Shmuel** said, put it in an oven and it will be self-evident. They put it in an oven and it fell apart to pieces (which showed that it had the poison of a snake in it).