



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

Chullin Daf Ayin Daled

- **R' Yosef** was sitting by **R' Huna** and said that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that if someone ate a dangling limb he gets malkus (it is assur D'Oraisa). One of the **Rabanan** said, do not listen to him, because **R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa in the name of Rav** said that one who eats it does not get malkus (it is only assur D'Rabanan). **R' Huna** asked, who should we follow? **R' Yosef** turned away (to show his dissatisfaction) and said, I was talking about a case where the animal dies other than through shechita and such a death makes the limb to be considered as if it fell off, and the other statement was where the animal was shechted and shechita does not make it considered as if it fell off.
 - **Rava** asked, what is the source for the ruling that death of the animal makes the dangling limb to be considered as if it fell off, whereas shechita does not? He said, the pasuk says "v'chol asher yipol alav mayhem b'mosam yitmah", which we darshen to mean that something that falls from them through their death is considered to have fallen off, but not when the death is through shechita.
 - **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked **Rava**, that pasuk is written regarding sheratzim!? **A:** **Rava** answered, the pasuk is not needed to teach regarding sheratzim, because they are not subject to shechita, so we instead say that it comes to teach regarding animals.
 - **Q:** The word "b'mosam" is used to darshen that sheratzim only give off tumah when they are still moist, but not when they are totally dried out!? **A:** The word "b'mosam" is written twice.
- **R' Chisda** said, the machlokes between **R' Meir and the Rabanan** (as to whether the fetus's leg that was stuck out of its mother before the mother's shechita is prevented from becoming tamei as a neveila) is only when the fetus was alive. However, if the fetus was dead all would agree that the shechita makes the limb to be considered as if it was detached. **Rabbah** said, the machlokes is whether the fetus was alive or dead.

BEN SHMONAH CHAI...

- **Q:** The Mishna said that a fetus born alive in the 8th month is considered to be of a kind that *is not* fit for shechita, but a Braisa says that a fetus born alive in the 8th month is considered to be of a kind that *is* fit for shechita!? **A: R' Kahana** said, the Braisa calls it of a kind that is fit for shechita because it becomes mutar with the mother's shechita, whereas our Mishna holds that since it is never itself subject to its own shechita, it is not called of a kind that is subject to shechita.
 - **Q:** According to the Braisa, how do we know that a treifa is prevented from becoming a source of tumah if it is shechted? **A:** It is learned from the drasha of **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav**, who said that the pasuk of "v'chi yamus *min* habeheima" teaches that only some animals ("*min* habeheima") become tamei when they die, but others do not. The ones that do not are the animals that were shechted when they were a treifa.
- **Q: R' Hoshaya** asked, if someone stuck his hand into the mother and shechted the full-term fetus that was alive inside the mother, does the fetus become mutar based on that shechita? This question can be asked according to **R' Meir** (who says that a fetus that emerges alive after the shechita of the mother would require its own shechita), because it may be that he only requires a shechita once it has emerged, but not when it is still inside the mother (and a shechita would therefore not be effective for it). The question can also be asked according to the **Rabanan** (who say that a fetus that emerges alive after the shechita of the mother would not require its own shechita), because it may be that they hold this fetus has "4 simanim" (it can become mutar either with the shechita of the 2 simanim of the mother or with the shechita of its own 2 simanim). What is the halacha? **A: R' Chananya** said, our Mishna said that an animal

that is born as a treifa is never considered to have been fit for shechita. Now, if shechita is effective in the womb, we can have a fetus that is fit for shechita even though it was born as a treifa (it was fit before it became a treifa)! Rather, it must be that shechita before it is born is not a shechita at all.

- **Rava** said this is not a proof. It may be that the Mishna means an animal that was created as a treifa is the type that is never fit for shechita, but if it became a treifa during its development it may be that it was fit for shechita at one point in time.

MISHNA

- If one shechts an animal and found a fetus in its 8th month inside – whether it is alive or dead – or if he found a 9 month fetus (fully developed fetus) that was dead, he may tear the fetus and eat the meat (without having to shecht it), as long as he removes its blood. If he found a 9 month fetus that was still alive, **R' Meir** says it would require shechita, and would be chayuv in the halacha of “oso v'es bno”. The **Chachomim** say that the mother's shechita makes the fetus mutar. **R' Shimon Shezuri** says, even if this fetus grew to be 5 years old and was plowing a field, the shechita of the mother makes it mutar to be eaten.
- If one ripped open an animal (not with shechita) and found a 9 month fetus inside that is alive, it would require its own shechita, because its mother was not shechted.

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya** said, the **Rabanan** are only lenient with regard to a 9 month fetus's shechita, but not with regard to its cheilev or its gid hanasheh.
 - **Q:** This can't be referring to the cheilev of the fetus itself, because we clearly find that **R' Yehuda** argues with **R' Meir** regarding the fats and the gid hanasheh of a fetus, and **R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya** explained that they argue in the case of a 9 month fetus that was found alive!? This also can't be referring to the cheilev of the gid hanasheh (and that he means that all agree that it is mutar), because we clearly see that **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** argue with regard to how much of the fats of the gid hanasheh are assur, but all agree that at least some of it is assur!? **A:** Rather, he meant that the **Rabanan** are only lenient in matters of eating the fetus, but not in other matters, such as zenus with it and pairing it with an animal of another species for plowing.
 - **Reish Lakish** said, the view that permits the cheilev of the ben pakuah also permits its blood. The view that says its cheilev is assur will also say that its blood is assur. **R' Yochanan** said, that even according to the view that says that the cheilev is mutar, the blood will be assur.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, our Mishna clearly says that the blood must be removed even from a ben pakuah in its 8th month, where all would agree that the cheilev is mutar!? **A: R' Zeira** said, **Reish Lakish** meant that according to the view that permits the cheilev, there would be no kares for one who ate the blood, but he agrees that it would be assur.
 - **Q:** This means they are saying that according to **R' Yehuda**, who says that the cheilev is mutar, there would be no kares for someone who ate its blood. However, this blood is no less blood than the blood of an animal that is not its “life blood” (“dam hatamtzis”) and **R' Yehuda** holds that one gets malkus for eating tam hatamtzis!? **A: R' Yosef the son of R' Sala Chasida** explained to **R' Pappa** that **R' Yehuda** includes dam hatamtzis in kares based on the extra word of “kol dam”. This teaches to compare dam hatamtzis to lifeblood and teaches that in a case where one would be chayuv kares for eating life blood he would also be chayuv kares for eating dam hatamtzis. Since one is not chayuv kares for eating the life blood of a fetus (it doesn't have life blood) he would also not be chayuv kares for eating its dam hatamtzis.
- **Q:** May one redeem a “peter chamor” (a firstborn male donkey) with a ben pakuah? According to **R' Meir** who requires shechita for the ben pakuah it is certainly considered a regular animal and therefore can be used for the redemption. According to the **Rabanan** who say that no shechita is needed, do we say that the ben pakuah is like meat in a pot, and therefore can't be used for redemption, or do we say that since it is alive and walks around it is a full-fledged

animal for purposes of redemption? **A: Mar Zutra** said it may not be used for redemption and **R' Ashi** said it may be used.

- **R' Ashi** said to **Mar Zutra**, the basis of your view is that you make a gezeira shava between redemption of a peter chamor to a Korbos Pesach, on the word "seh", which teaches that just as a ben pakuah may not be used for a Korbos Pesach, it may also not be used for redemption. If so, we should also learn from the gezeira shava that the redemption animal must also be like the Korbos Pesach in that it must be a male, may not have a mum, and must be within its first year!? **Mar Zutra** said, the pasuk twice says the word "tifdeh", which comes to include an animal for redemption even if it doesn't have these characteristics. **R' Ashi** asked, if so, we should even include a ben pakuah? **Mar Zutra** said, the gezeira shava of "seh" must teach that something is excluded, so it must exclude the case of ben pakuah.
- **Q:** If after the shechita of the mother the mother's meat becomes tamei (e.g. as a rishon), will the fetus inside her get that same level of tumah or will it be a grade lower (e.g. a sheini)? **A: R' Yochanan** said it gets a level lower than the mother, and **Reish Lakish** said it gets the same level of tumah as the mother, because it is like a nut inside its shell.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, the earlier Mishna said that after the shechita the mother's flesh and the fetus's flesh become tamei from having touched the leg that is sticking out of the mother. Now, according to me (**Reish Lakish**) it makes sense to say that the fetus's flesh becomes tamei, because the mother's flesh became muchshar with its blood and the fetus's flesh is considered to be part of the body of the mother. However, according to you, how did the flesh of the fetus ever become muchshar? **A: R' Yochanan** said, it became muchshar through the act of the shechita itself, because the Mishna follows the view of **R' Shimon** who says that.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Braisa says, if a ben pakuah grew up and walked through a stream of water it becomes muchshar for tumah, and if it then went into a cemetery it becomes tamei (although live animals can't become tamei, since a ben pakuah doesn't need shechita it is considered to be food). Now, according to me (**R' Yochanan**) it makes sense that it has to become muchshar, because it is considered to be a separate entity than its mother. However, according to you, since the mother was muchshar with the blood of the shechita, the ben pakuah should not need to become muchshar again!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the case is where the shechita did not cause any blood to come out, and the Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**.