



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

Chullin Daf Samach Vuv

- The earlier Gemara quoted two Braisos – one from Toras Kohanim and one from the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** – that darshened the pasuk regarding grasshoppers, each darshening in a different way.
 - **Q:** What is the machlokes between the Braisos based on? **A:** They argue regarding a grasshopper with a long head. The first Braisa holds that “asher lo kera'ayim” is a klal, “arbeh...sal'am...chargol...chagav” and the “limineihu” regarding each one, is a prat. This means we only include in the klal what is in the prat. The result is that the only things included in the “limineihu” are grasshoppers that share all 4 characteristics *and* that don't have long heads, like the four species that are listed. The Braisa of **R' Yishmael** holds that “asher lo kera'ayim” is a klal, “arbeh...sal'am...chargol...chagav” is a prat, and the “limineihu” regarding each one is another klal. The result is a klal, uprat, uklal, which teaches to include things that are similar to the prat. This includes grasshoppers that share the 4 characteristics even if they have a long head.
 - **Q:** How can **R' Yishmael** darshen a klal uprat uklal with this pasuk? The first klal and the second klal are very different!? The first klal would say that anything that has jumping legs can be eaten, whereas the second klal says that it must have all 4 characteristics to be eaten. We don't darshen a klal uprat uklal in this way!? **A:** The **Tanna Divei R' Yishmael** does darshen a klal uprat uklal even in circumstances like this.
 - **Q:** The Braisa of **R' Yishmael** said, based on the word “chagav” we would think that if a grasshopper is called chagav it is kosher even if it doesn't have the 4 characteristics. The pasuk therefore says “limineihu”, to teach that it must have all 4 characteristics. Now, the pasuk already says “arbeh” and “chargol”, which do have the 4 characteristics, so how could we have a thought to say that the 4 characteristics are not needed? **A:** Once the pasuk says “sal'am”, which teaches that a grasshopper with a long head is kosher even though those listed in the pasuk do not have a long head, this shows that a grasshopper does not need to be exactly like those listed in order to be kosher. Therefore, we would think that simply being called chagav may on its own be enough to make it kosher.
 - **Q:** The first Braisa says that “sal'am” is the “rashon” and that the “chargol” is the “nipul”. The second Braisa reverses these!? **A:** They each gave the names that were used for these grasshoppers in the place where they lived.

UVIDAGIM KOL SHEYEISH LO SNAPIR V'KASKESES

- A Braisa says, fish that don't yet have fins and scales, but which would grow them as they mature, like the “sultanis” and the “afyan”, are mutar. Fish that have fins and scales now, but which lose them when they are pulled from the water, like the “akunas”, “afunas”, “kisifti'us”, “achsifti'us”, and the “atunas” are also mutar.
- A Mishna says, any fish that has scales definitely has fins, but there are fish that have fins that don't have scales.
 - **Q:** Based on this, the Torah should only say that a fish needs scales to be kosher, because we know that if it has scales it also has fins!? **A:** If the Torah would have only written “kaskeses” we would say that kaskeses is fins. The Torah therefore also wrote “snapir”, which thereby teaches that one is fins and one is scales.
 - **Q:** We know that kaskeses, as opposed to the snapir, refers to the scales based on the pasuk that says that Galyas wore a coat of “kaskasim”. Based on this, even if only kaskeses was written alone it should have been known that it refers

to the scales!? **A: R' Avahu** and the **Tana Divei R' Yishmael** said, this was done "yagdil Torah v'yadir".

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that we may eat fish that have fins and scales. This would teach us that we may not eat fish that don't have fins and scales. The pasuk then says that we may not eat fish that don't have fins and scales. This would teach us that we may eat fish that do have fins and scales. Why are both pesukim needed? They are needed so that one who does eat a fish without fins and scales would be oiver for an assei and a lo saasei. What does the pasuk of "tochlu mikol asher bamayim" teach? We would think that since the pasuk allows the eating of water sheratzim specifically and generally, we should say that just as the allowance in specific cases is only in cases of sheratzim that grow in water that is in a keili, the same should be true for the general allowance. How do we know that there is even an allowance for sheratzim that grow in water of boros, sichin, and me'aros (as opposed to water in the sea and rivers), which would mean that a person may bend down and drink from these waters without having to worry whether there are sheratzim in the water? The pasuk therefore says "tochlu mikol asher bamayim", which teaches to allow the eating of water sheratzim, even those that grew in boros, sichin, and me'aros.
 - **Q:** Where do we find that the Torah allows the sheratzim that grew in the water in a keili? **A:** The pasuk says, "es zeh tochlu mikol asher bamayim..." (and goes on to say that creatures that have fins and scales in the water in the seas and streams, those you may eat). This teaches that it is only in regard to the creatures of the seas and the streams that one may not eat them if they don't have fins and scales. But, with regard to those that grow in the water of keilim, they may be eaten even if they don't have fins and scales.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should instead understand the pasuk as saying that creatures that grow in the water in keilim may not be eaten *even if* they have fins and scales!? **A:** That can't be, because the pasuk says "v'chol asher ein lo snapir v'kaskeses bayamim uvanichalim mikol sheretz hamayim" – which teaches that in the seas and streams a creature without fins and scales may not be eaten. This means that in water of keilim, even creatures that don't have fins and scales may be eaten.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that "bamayim" is a klal and "bayamim uvanichalim" is a prat, which should teach that the only things included in the klal are the things mentioned in the prat, which would mean that the fins and scales requirement only applies to seas and streams, but would not apply to ponds and canals, and certainly not to water in keilim!? **A:** When the pasuk again says "bamayim" it is a second klal, which makes it into a klal uprat uklal.
 - **Q:** The two klals are not separated by the prat, so how can it be darshened as a klal uprat uklal!? **A: Ravina** said, it is like they say in EY, when two klals are written together, we view them as if the prat is written in between them. Therefore, we darshen "bamayim" as a klal, "bayamim" as a prat, and "bamayim" as another klal, and we darshen it as a klal uprat uklal, where we include things that are similar to the prat – just as the prat (the sea) is water that comes from a wellspring, we include all waters that come from a wellspring. Therefore, we include the ponds and canals but exclude boros, sichin, and me'aros.
 - **Q:** Maybe instead darshen that the prat is water that has accumulated on the ground, in which case we should even include boros, sichin, and me'aros as being like the seas and the canals!? **A:** The word "tochlu" is not needed to permit the creatures with no fins and scales that grow in keilim, so it must be coming to permit these creatures that grow in boros, sichin, and me'aros.