



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

Chullin Daf Ayin Hey

- The Gemara quoted the Braisa that 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).
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna of this Braisa? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said it is **R' Yose Haglili** of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar in the name of R' Yose Haglili** says that a ben pakuah can become tamei as food as long as it becomes muchshar. The **Chachomim** say it cannot become tamei as food, because it is alive and live things can't become tamei as food.
 - **R' Yochanan** follows his view of elsewhere where he says that **R' Yose Haglili and B"R** say the same thing. **R' Yose Haglili** is the ruling we just said. **B"R** is in a Mishna where they say that fish can become tamei as food as soon as they are caught. **B"H** say, only once they die. **R' Akiva** said, once they are unable to live, which **R' Yochanan** explains to mean that once they are jumping at the end of life and will surely die, even though they are not yet dead.
 - **Q:** **R' Chisda** asked, according to **R' Akiva**, if a fish becomes a treifa, could it become tamei as food at that point? Even according to the view that says that an animal that is a treifa can live, that may be true for an animal, which is stronger, but a fish is not as strong and therefore may be considered unable to live when it becomes a treifa? Even according to the view that an animal that is a treifa is considered to be dead, maybe that is only for an animal which is subject to shechita, but fish are not subject to shechita and therefore maybe we say that the laws of treifa don't affect them at all? What is the halacha? **TEIKU**.
- If a beheima miscarried, **R' Yochanan** said its cheilev has the status of cheilev of a beheima and is therefore assur with kares. **Reish Lakish** said its cheilev has the status of cheilev of a chaya (which would be assur as neveila, but not as cheilev with kares).
 - **R' Yochanan** said, it is like cheilev of a beheima, because its coming out into the world makes this fetus have the status of the beheima. **Reish Lakish** said, only a full-term beheima fetus gets the status of a beheima, and therefore this miscarried fetus gets the status of a chaya.
 - **Others** say, if it is not a full-term fetus all agree that it does not get the status of a beheima. The machlokes is where one stuck his hand into the womb and took a piece of the cheilev of a full-term, live fetus and ate it. In that case **R' Yochanan** says it is like cheilev of a beheima, because it is a full-term fetus, and **Reish Lakish** says it is like the cheilev of a chaya, because it needs full-term and to be born in order to get the status of a beheima.
 - **Q:** **R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that if a pregnant korbon is offered, the fats and kidneys of the fetus do not need to be offered on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** asked, according to me it makes sense that a pasuk is needed to exclude this, because once it is full-term it has the status of a beheima. However, according to you, why do I need a pasuk to teach that we don't offer these fats!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, that pasuk is the basis for my view that the fats of a fetus are not considered to be cheilev of a beheima.
 - **Others** say that **Reish Lakish** asked from this Braisa on **R' Yochanan** and said, according to me it makes sense why these fats are not offered, but according to you why does the pasuk say that they should not be offered!? **R' Yochanan**

answered, because the cheilev of a fetus is similar in concept to an animal which can't be offered until it is 8 days old. Although it is a beheima, it is not yet ready to be offered as a korbon.

- **R' Ami** said, if one shechts a treifa and finds a live, full-term fetus inside it, according to **R' Meir** who holds that when one finds a live, full-term fetus inside a healthy animal that was shechted the fetus requires its own shechita, in this case the fetus of the treifa can have its own shechita and become mutar. According to **R' Yehuda** who holds that when one finds a live, full-term fetus inside a healthy animal that was shechted the fetus does not require its own shechita, in this case the fetus of the treifa will be assur even if it gets its own shechita. **Rava** said, even according to **R' Yehuda** the fetus of the treifa would become mutar with its own shechita, because a full-term fetus is considered to have 4 simanim (the 2 of its mother and the 2 of its own) and can become mutar with the shechita of either set of simanim.
 - **R' Chisda** said, if one shechts a treifa and finds a live, full-term fetus inside it, the fetus would require its own shechita and would be chayuv in "zro'ah, lichayayim, and keiva" (the parts that must be given to a Kohen from any animal that is shechted), and if it dies without shechita it does not become tamei as a neveila.
 - **Rabbah** asked **R' Chisda**, by saying it needs its own shechita and would become mutar you are following the view of **R' Meir**. However, by saying that if it dies without shechita it would not become tamei as a neveila you are following the view of the **Rabanan**!? **R' Chisda** said, you can ask the same question on a Braisa taught by **R' Chiya** which says, if one shechts a treifa and finds a live, full-term fetus inside it, the fetus would require its own shechita and would be chayuv in "zro'ah, lichayayim, and keiva" (the parts that must be given to a Kohen from any animal that is shechted), and if it dies without shechita it does not become tamei as a neveila!? **Rabbah** said, the Braisa's last part is talking about where one found the fetus dead, in which case even **R' Meir** would agree that the mother's shechita prevents it from becoming tamei as neveila. However, your statement was where it was found alive and *later* died!? **R' Chisda** said, my ruling is not difficult, because the entire ruling follows the view of the **Rabanan**, who hold that a full-term fetus is considered to have 4 simanim (the 2 of its mother and the 2 of its own) and can become mutar with the shechita of either set of simanim.
 - **R' Assi** heard **R' Zeira** repeat this ruling of **R' Chisda** and told him, you are correct in the ruling (it is not contradictory, as explained above), and **R' Yochanan** said this as well. **R' Zeira** asked, do you mean to say that **Reish Lakish** did not agree with him? He said, **Reish Lakish** would remain quiet for some time after hearing something from **R' Yochanan** before stating his disagreement, and I left the Beis Medrash during this quiet period (so I don't know if he ultimately disagreed or not).

R' SHIMON SHEZURI OMER AFILU...

- **Q: R' Shimon** seems to be saying the same thing as the **T"K**!? **A: R' Kahana** said, the difference between them would be where the ben pakuah put its hooves on the ground (the **T"K** holds that once it walks on the ground it would need shechita as a gezeira, whereas **R' Shimon** holds it would not).
 - **R' Mesharshiya** said, according to the view that we are concerned for the father's contribution to the offspring, if a father who is a ben pakuah produced offspring with a regular female, the offspring has no way to become mutar (it is considered to have "one siman" that is already shechted based on its father being a ben pakuah).
- **Abaye** said, all agree that a ben pakuah which is also mutated in that it was born without split hooves (although it is a kosher animal born to a kosher animal), would be mutar even without shechita. The reason is that this is a unique animal and will not cause people to forget that the reason it doesn't need shechita is because it is a ben pakuah.
 - **Others** say that **Abaye** said, all agree that a ben pakuah which is mutated in that it was born without split hooves and whose mother was also mutated in this way (although it is a kosher animal born to a kosher animal), would be mutar even without shechita. The reason is that this is a doubly unique animal and will not cause people to forget that the reason it doesn't need shechita is because it is a ben pakuah.

- **Ze'iri in the name of R' Chanina** said we pasken like **R' Shimon Shezuri**, and **R' Shimon Shezuri** would permit all future generations of a ben pakuah (that mated with a bas pakuah) to be eaten without shechita. **R' Yochanan** said the ben pakuah is mutar without shechita, but its offspring is assur without shechita.
 - **Adda bar Chavu** had a ben pakuah that was attacked by a wolf and injured to the point that it could not live. **R' Ashi** told him to shecht the ben pakuah and eat it. **R' Adda** asked him, **Ze'iri in the name of R' Chanina** said we pasken like **R' Shimon Shezuri**, and **R' Shimon Shezuri** would permit all future generations of a ben pakuah, and even **R' Yochanan** agreed that **R' Shimon** allowed the ben pakuah itself to be eaten without shechita!? **R' Ashi** said, **R' Yochanan** meant that that is the view of **R' Shimon**, but not that **R' Yochanan** paskened like **R' Shimon**. **R' Adda** asked, **Ravin bar Chanina in the name of Ulla in the name of R' Chanina** said the halacha follows **R' Shimon Shezuri**, and in fact whenever **R' Shimon Shezuri** is quoted in a Mishna the halacha follows him!? **R' Ashi** said, I hold like **R' Yonason** who said that the halacha only follows **R' Shimon Shezuri** in his ruling regarding a very sick person (that if such a person tells people to write a get for his wife, they are to write it and give it to the wife even though he never instructed them to give it) and in his ruling regarding terumas maaser of demai (that if this became mixed up with the produce from which it was separated, even during the week we may ask the seller if he had separated the maaser and if he says that he did we may rely on him so as not to make the entire mixture have the status of terumas maaser), but not in any other of his rulings.