



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

Chullin Daf Ayin Gimmel

VACHACHOMIM OMRIM MAGAH TREIFA SHECHUTA

- **Q:** A treifa that was shechted does not give off tumah at all!? **A:** It does, as taught by **Shmuel's** father, that a treifa of kodashim does give off tumah.

MAH MATZINU B'TREIFA SHESHICHITASA...

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** said to the **Rabanan**, what prevents this leg from becoming tamei as a neveila – it is the shechita of the mother. If so, the shechita should even be effective to make it mutar to be eaten!? The **Rabanan** replied, the mother's shechita is even more effective for something that is not part of its body (i.e. a fetus) than it is for its own body. As we find in the earlier Mishna, that if one cuts off a piece from the fetus and leaves it inside the mother, the detached piece becomes mutar to eat with the mother's shechita. However, if one cuts off a piece of the mother's spleen or kidney and leaves it inside, the mother's shechita does not make it mutar to be eaten.
 - **Q:** How does the response of the **Rabanan** respond to **R' Meir's** question? **A:** **Rava** said, the Braisa is missing words and should be read as follows. **R' Meir** said to the **Rabanan**, what prevents this leg from becoming tamei as a neveila – it is the shechita of the mother. If so, the shechita should even be effective to make it mutar to be eaten!? The **Rabanan** replied, the case of a treifa disproves this theory, for a shechita prevents a treifa from becoming tamei as a neveila but does not make it mutar to be eaten. **R' Meir** said to them, this is not a valid proof, because the shechita of a treifa prevents *itself* from becoming a neveila, but why should we say that it even helps to prevent its fetus from becoming a neveila? The **Rabanan** said, the mother's shechita is even more effective for something that is not part of its body (i.e. a fetus) than it is for its own body. As we find in the earlier Mishna, that if one cuts off a piece from the fetus and leaves it inside the mother, the detached piece becomes mutar to eat with the mother's shechita. However, if one cuts off a piece of the mother's spleen or kidney and leaves it inside, the mother's shechita does not make it mutar to be eaten.
 - Another Braisa brings this conversation as well, with the only difference being in **R' Meir's** response of "This is not a valid proof, because the shechita of a treifa prevents *itself* from becoming a neveila, but why should we say that it even helps to prevent its fetus from becoming a neveila", where he adds the words "because the shechita of a treifa prevents *itself and a limb that is mostly detached and is dangling from it*, from becoming a neveila..."
 - **Reish Lakish** said, just as the **Rabanan** and **R' Meir** argue regarding the mother's shechita preventing the fetus's leg that was stuck out from becoming a neveila, they also argue regarding a limb that dangles from an animal itself (it is mostly detached and now dangles), whether the animal's shechita prevents that limb from becoming tamei as a neveila. **R' Yochanan** said the machlokes is only regarding a fetus, but in the case of the dangling limb all would agree that it is considered to be detached at the time of shechita and therefore the shechita does *not* prevent it from becoming tamei as a neveila.
 - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** explained, that according to **R' Yochanan** the reason that the **Rabanan** agree regarding a dangling limb is that nothing can be done to fix it, whereas the leg of the fetus that was stuck out can be brought back inside the mother before the shechita (in which case **R' Yochanan** said it becomes mutar to be eaten).
 - **Q:** The Braisa (quoted above) said that **R' Meir** said that the shechita of a treifa prevents itself and a dangling limb from becoming tamei as a

neveila. Now, according to **Reish Lakish** this can be understood as **R' Meir** saying to the **Rabanan** – according to me the dangling limb will become tamei as a neveila, but according to you it doesn't. However, according to **R' Yochanan** all agree that the dangling limb becomes tamei as neveila, so what is **R' Meir** saying? **A:** Rather, we must say that the machlokes is as follows: **Reish Lakish** says, in the same way that **R' Meir and the Rabanan** argue regarding the ability of the shechita to prevent the leg of the fetus from becoming tamei as neveila, they also argue regarding a dangling leg of the animal itself. **R' Yochanan** says they only argue regarding the leg of the fetus, but regarding the dangling leg *all agree* that the shechita does not make it to be considered detached and the leg does not become tamei as neveila.

- According to this version of the machlokes, **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, according to **R' Yochanan** the reason **R' Meir** makes a differentiation between the leg of the fetus and the dangling leg of the animal is that the dangling leg is part of the animal itself, whereas the fetus is not.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, all agree that when an animal dies by ways other than shechita, if it had a dangling leg the leg is considered to become detached at the time of death, but if it dies through shechita, the leg is not considered to become detached at the time of the shechita.
 - **Q:** What case is he referring to? He can't be referring to the leg of a fetus that was stuck out of its mother, because we have said that **R' Meir and the Rabanan** argue regarding the halacha in that case!? **A:** Rather, the case is where there is a leg of the animal itself that was dangling prior to its death.
 - **Q:** Why did **R' Yochanan** need to teach these rulings? They have both been taught in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if an animal dies (not through shechita), if there was flesh dangling before the death, the flesh needs to be muchshar in order to become tamei, and if there was a dangling limb it gives off tumah as eiver min hachai, but not a limb of a neveila. This is the view of **R' Meir**. We see that the Mishna says that death by means other than shechita makes the dangling parts to be considered as detached. The Mishna also says, if the animal was shechted, **R' Meir** says they become muchshar for tumah from its own blood, whereas **R' Shimon** says that it does not become muchshar. We see that if the animal is shechted, the dangling limb is not considered to be detached. Since both rulings of **R' Yochanan** are stated in the Mishna, why does he have to teach them!? **A:** The second case of the Mishna doesn't specifically mention what it is referring to, and we would therefore say that when **R' Meir** says "they become muchshar" he is referring only to dangling flesh, but a dangling limb would be tamei as eiver min hachai, because the shechita makes the limb to be considered as detached.
 - **Q:** **R' Meir** says "they become muchshar", which clearly refers to the dangling flesh and limb (since "they" is plural), which means that he holds that the limb is not tamei as eiver min hachai, which means he holds that it is not considered to become detached with shechita!? **A:** We would have said that "they" refers to flesh that is separated from the animal itself, and flesh that is separated from the limb that itself is dangling.
 - **Q:** Why would there be a need for **R' Meir** to mention each example of separated flesh separately? Why

would we think that they are treated differently? **A:** We would have thought that the flesh that comes from the dangling limb does not even need to become muchshar, because it was attached to a strong form of tumah (eiver min hachai). Therefore, **R' Meir** would be teaching that it does need to become muchshar in order to become tamei.

- **R' Yosef** said, hold onto the teaching of **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef**, because we find that **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said like him, where he explained a Braisa in the name of **R' Yochanan** to say that when the Braisa says that flesh or a limb that are dangling from an animal or bird that are shechted are assur, the Braisa means it is only assur D'Rabanan, but D'Oraisa they are still considered to be attached and would therefore not be assur.