



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

Chullin Daf Samach Zayin

- The previous Gemara quoted a Braisa that darshened the pasuk one way. The Gemara now says that a Braisa taught in the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** darshened the pasuk as follows: the pasuk says "bamayim" and then again "bamayim" and then finally specifies "bayamim uvanichalim". This is to be darshened as a "ribuy umi'at" as follows: "bamayim" is a ribuy, "bayamim uvanichalim" is a mi'at, and then "bamayim" is another ribuy. In this method of drasha we include everything, and therefore include creatures without fins and scales that are found in the ponds and canals, and we exclude only one thing, which would be the boros, sichin, and me'aros.
 - **Q:** Why don't we instead include the boros, sichin, and me'aros, and only exclude keilim? **A:** The pasuk of "tochlu" comes to teach that creatures without fins and scales that grow in the water in keilim are not assur, so the ribuy umi'at must be coming to exclude something else.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say the reverse – that we should exclude ponds and canals and we should include boros? **A:** It is like was taught by **Matisya bar Yehuda** in a Braisa, where he says that the reason boros, sichin, and me'aros do not have the fins and scales requirement is because they are like keilim in that the water within them is contained. However, the water in ponds and canals is not, and that is why they are subject to the fins and scales requirement.
- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier in the Gemara said that the Torah teaches generally and specifically (by saying that one may only eat creatures with fins and scales, and then saying that one may not eat creatures that don't have fins and scales – both times making reference to creatures of the seas and the streams) that the requirement for a water creature to have fins and scales does not apply to water in keilim. Which permit is considered to be the general one and which is considered to be the specific one? **A: R' Acha and Ravina** argue – one says the positive commandment (i.e. you may eat creatures that have fins and scales) is the specific one and the negative commandment (i.e. you may not eat creatures that don't have fins and scales) is the general one, and the other says that the negative commandment is the specific and the positive commandment is the general.
 - The view that the positive commandment is more specific is based on the fact that the words "you shall eat" are located close to the words of "in the seas and the streams" and therefore clearly teaches that it is only in the seas and streams that fins and scales are needed, but in keilim they are not needed. The view that the negative commandment is more specific is based on the fact that if we only had the positive commandment we would say that a creature with fins and scales in the seas may be eaten, but a creature that grows in the water in keilim may not be eaten even if it has fins and scales! It is only because of the negative commandment that we are able to understand the positive commandment to mean that the creatures that grow in the water in the keilim may be eaten even if they don't have fins and scales.
- **R' Huna** said, a person should not sift his beer through a wood sifter at night, because a worm may catch onto the wood and then fall back into the beer, and if a person then drinks that worm he will be oiver for "sheretz hashoreitz ahl haaretz".
 - **Q:** If so, one should also not drink even from a keili, because a worm may crawl onto the wall of the keili and then fall back into the beer!? **A:** The inside wall of the keili is considered to be part of the place where the worm grows and it would therefore not be considered to have ever left the beer and "crawled on the ground". We can prove this from the Braisa quoted earlier which allowed drinking water from boros, sichin, and me'aros, without concern that a worm may have crawled up its wall and fell back into

the water. We see that the internal wall is considered to be the place that it grows. The same is true for the internal wall of a keili.

- **R' Chisda** told **R' Huna**, we can support your ruling from a Braisa. The Braisa says that the pasuk “kol hasheret hashoreitz ahl haaretz” teaches to include in this issue the bugs that were filtered out of wine. This suggests that if they were never filtered out and are still in the wine it would be mutar to drink them in the wine. This supports **R' Huna**.
- **Shmuel** said, a cucumber that became wormy while attached to the ground is assur under “hasheret hashoreitz ahl haaretz” (since the cucumber is attached to the ground the worm is considered to be crawling on the ground).
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof to this from Braisos. One Braisa says that “ahl haaretz” comes to exclude the bugs found in lentils, chickpeas, dates, or figs from the issur of sheratzim. Another Braisa says that “kol hasheret hashoreitz ahl haaretz” comes to include worms that are found in the stems of olives or grapes. Presumably, we can answer this contradiction by saying that the first Braisa is referring to fruit that is not attached to the ground and the second Braisa is referring to fruit that is attached to the ground, and this supports **Shmuel's** ruling! **A:** It may be that the first Braisa is referring to fruit even when it is attached to the ground and the second Braisa refers to worms that are found on the tree itself, and only then is it assur.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, what if a worm grew in a fruit that was detached from the ground and died as soon as it made contact with the ground – is it considered to be a sheretz that was “shoreitz ahl haaretz”? What if only part of the worm came out of the fruit and crawled on the ground? What if it left the fruit but never reached the ground? **TEIKU**.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, what if the worm that grew in a detached date climbed onto the outside of the date? What if it grew in the pit and crawled out of the pit (but remained in the fruit)? What if it burrowed from one date directly into another without ever emerging? **TEIKU**.
- **R' Sheishes the son of R' Idi** said, “kukyanei” (worms that grow in the liver and lungs of animals) are assur to be eaten. The reason is that they come from outside the animal (and are therefore true sheratzim of the ground) and get inside.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, if they truly came from outside, they should be found in the animal's digestive tract, and since they are not, it must be that they grow from within the animal and should not be assur!?
 - The Gemara paskens that the kukyanei are assur, because they enter the animal through its nostrils while it sleeps (which is why they are not found in the digestive tract).
- With regard to worms that are found between the skin and flesh of animals, they are assur. Those found in fish are mutar.
 - **Ravina** explained the difference to **R' Mesharshiya the son of R' Acha**. Worms that grow in animals are like the animals and need shechita to become mutar. Therefore they remain assur. Fish become mutar without shechita and therefore these worms are also mutar in the state that they are.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that it is assur to eat a “holeich ahl gachon” – this refers to a snake. The word “kol” (that precedes “holeich ahl gachon”) comes to include the “shilshul” (a long, snake-like worm) and that which looks like the shilshul. The words “ahl arbah” refers to the scorpion. “Kol holeich” comes to include the “chipushis” and that which looks like it. “Marbei raglayim” refers to the centipede. “Ahd kol” comes to include that which looks like the centipede and that which looks like the thing that looks like the centipede.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yose ben Durmaskis** says, the Livyasan is a kosher fish, as the pasuk regarding it says “gaava afikei maginim” – which refers to its scales, and “tachtav chadudei chares” – which refers to its fins.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EILU TREIFOS!!!