



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

Chullin Daf Ayin Vuv

MISHNA

- If an animal's back leg was severed below the joint it remains kosher. If it is severed above the joint it becomes a treifa. Similarly, if the tzumas hagidin were removed the animal becomes a treifa. If the bone is broken (and the bone pierces the skin), if most of the flesh remains, the shechita of the animal would make the leg mutar to be eaten as well. If not, the shechita does not permit the leg.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav in the name of R' Chiya** said, when the Mishna says "below the joint" it means immediately below the joint, and when it says "above the joint" it means immediately above the joint. To which joint does the Mishna refer? To the joint that is sold with the head (this is the lower joint of the animal's leg – the animal's leg has 3 bones and two joints). **Ulla in the name of R' Hoshaya** said, the Mishna refers to the joint that is noticeable in a camel (this is the upper joint).
 - **Ulla** said to **R' Yehuda**, according to me, that I say the Mishna refers to the upper joint, that is why the Mishna has to then say that removal of the tzumas hagidin also make it into a treifa, even though the tzumas hagidin are located in between the lower and upper joints (so if the bone was cut there it would not make it a treifa unless the tzumas hagidin were affected). However, according to you, the Mishna already says that if the leg is severed immediately above the lower joint, which is where the tzumas hagidin are, it is a treifa, so why does it then separately mention the tzumas hagidin!? **R' Yehuda** said, the Mishna first teaches that the animal is a treifa if the bone is cut even though the tzumas hagidin were not, and then teaches that it is a treifa if the tzumas hagidin were removed even though nothing happened to the bone. **Ulla** asked, the Mishna says that when the leg is *severed* it is a treifa – *severed* can't be understood as referring to where the bone is cut without the tzumas hagidin!? **R' Yehuda** remained silent. After he left, he said to himself that he should have answered that when the Mishna says "below" it means that when the leg is severed below the lower joint and the tzumas hagidin the animal remains kosher, and when it says "above" it means that when it is severed above the lower joint and the tzumas hagidin it is a treifa. The Mishna then discusses where the leg is cut immediately above the lower joint, at the place of the tzumas hagidin! He then said, it is good that I did not answer that to him, because just as he said the word "severed" in the Mishna must be understood in its plain meaning, he would also have said that "above" must be understood in its plain meaning, which would suggest "immediately above the joint".
 - **R' Pappa** had a different version of **R' Yehuda**. He said that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav in the name of R' Chiya** said, when the Mishna says "below the joint" it means below the upper joint and the tzumas hagidin (referring to the lower bone), and when it says "above the joint" it means when it is severed above the upper joint and the tzumas hagidin (referring to the upper bone). The Mishna then discusses, if the tzumas hagidin were removed the animal becomes a treifa, which refers to where the middle bone is severed, and teaches that if the tzumas hagidin are severed it is a treifa, otherwise it is not. The "joint" being referred to is the upper joint, as stated by **Ulla in the name of R' Hoshaya**.
 - **Q:** How can it be that if the leg is severed higher up on the middle bone it is not a treifa, but if it is severed lower down on it, it is? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, we don't ask

such questions regarding treifos, because we see that there are times when cutting an animal in one place makes it a treifa and cutting in another does not.

- **Q:** Where exactly are the tzumas hagidin? **A:** **Rabbah in the name of R' Ashi** said, it is where this bundle of sinews move off the bone and into the flesh. **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of R' Ashi** said, it is where the sinews are attached to the bone. **Rava the son of Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of R' Assi** said, it is from the "arkum" bone (located in the lower joint) and up until where the sinews separate from each other (this is the most expansive view).
 - One of the Rabanan said in front of **R' Abba**, even the area opposite the arkum bone is included in the tzumas hagidin (this is even more expansive than the last view). **R' Abba** said, do not listen to him, because **R' Yehuda** said it is from the place that the butchers skin the animal, which is the same as the view of **Rava the son of Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of R' Assi**.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the tzumas hagidin referred to is the place where the sinews are all connected.
 - **Q:** How high up does that go? **A:** **R' Yaakov** said, **R' Yehuda** said in the name of **Shmuel** that it goes up to the place that the sinews separate.
 - **Q:** How big of an area is this? **A:** **Abaye** said, in an ox it is 4 etzba'os. In a small animal, where the sinews stick out it is the tzumas hagidin, but when they are absorbed in the flesh it is not. When they are hard it is, and when they are soft it is not. When they are thick it is, and when they are thin it is not. When they are white it is, and when they are not white it is not. **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, even if they are somewhat clear and not white, it is the tzumas hagidin.
- **Ameimar in the name of R' Zvid** said, there are 3 strands of sinews that make up the tzumas hagidin – one is thick and two are thin. If the thick one is severed, the tzumas hagidin have lost the majority of their structure. If the two thin ones are severed, the tzumas hagidin have lost their majority in number (and therefore in both cases the animal would become a treifa).
 - **Mar bar R' Ashi** said that **R' Zvid** stated his ruling l'kula – if the thick one is severed it still has the majority in number, and if the 2 thin ones are severed it still has the majority in structure (and in both cases it would not be a treifa).
- With regard to birds, there are 16 strands in the tzumas hagidin. If any of them are severed the bird becomes a treifa.
 - **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, that his father once checked a bird and only found 15 strands. He saw one that looked thicker than the others and realized that it was actually two.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, an animal becomes a treifa if the majority of the tzumas hagidin are severed. "Majority" refers to the majority of even one of the sinews. When I repeated this to **Shmuel** he said that that would not make it a treifa, because there would still be 2 that would be intact. This suggests that if there were not two left intact it would be a treifa. This argues on **Rabinai**, who said in the name of **Shmuel**, that if even only a small string remains of each sinew, it would not be a treifa.
 - **Another** version says that **R' Yehuda** said, to be a treifa the majority of each sinew must be cut. **Shmuel** disagreed and said that as long as there is something remaining of each it would remain kosher. This supports **Rabinai**.

NISHBAR HA'ETZEM...

- **Rav** said, if the middle bone breaks, then if most of the exposed bone is covered with skin and flesh, the animal and the leg are both mutar. If not, the animal and the leg are assur. If the lower bone is broken, then if most of the exposed bone is covered with skin and flesh, the animal and the leg are both mutar. If not, the animal is mutar and the leg is assur. **Shmuel** said, whether it was the lower or the middle bone that broke, if most of the exposed bone is covered with skin and flesh the animal and the leg are both mutar. If not, the animal is mutar and the leg is assur.
 - **R' Nachman** asked, according to **Shmuel's** view, people will say – one of the limbs must be thrown away and yet the animal is mutar!? **R' Acha bar R' Huna** said to **R' Nachman**, the same is true according to **Rav's** view! **R' Nachman** said, the difference is, that according to **Shmuel** this is even true about a limb that if cut off would make the animal a treifa!
 - They sent from EY that the halacha follows **Rav**. They later sent that the halacha follows **Shmuel**. They then again sent that the halacha follows **Rav** and said that the leg itself is also eiver min hachai, which is tamei as a neveila.

- **R' Chisda** asked, an earlier Gemara quoted the Braisa that said that **R' Meir** says that the shechita of an animal prevents a limb that is dangling from it from becoming tamei like a neveila!? **Rabbah** said to him, you didn't have to ask this from a Braisa, you could have asked the same question from a Mishna as well. **R' Chisda** said, the Mishna is not as explicit and can be understood differently. The Braisa is indisputably a refutation.
 - When **R' Zeira** went to EY he found **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** teaching the ruling of **Rav**. He told him, you are saying well, and in fact **Shmuel** said this way in Bavel too.
 - **Q: Shmuel** argues on **Rav**, so how could he have said like him!? **A: Shmuel** ended up retracting his view for that of **Rav**.
- A Braisa says, if the bone broke and pierced through the skin, if skin and flesh covers most of it, it is mutar. If not, it is assur.
 - **Q:** What is meant by "majority"? **A: R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, it is the majority of the bone's thickness. **Some** say it is the majority of the bone's circumference.
 - **R' Pappa** said, based on this we require that the majority of the thickness and of the circumference be covered.
 - **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, skin is treated like flesh (if skin covers the bone that saves it as well). **R' Nachman** asked him, you should instead say that skin can combine with flesh, since the Braisa says "skin and flesh", which suggests that skin alone would not suffice! **Ulla** said, our version of the Braisa says "skin or flesh".
 - **Others** said that **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, skin can be combined with the flesh. **R' Nachman** asked him, you should instead say that skin can complete a covering that is mostly flesh, which would be a more stringent ruling! **Ulla** said, I know of an actual case where a young bird with a broken leg had the bone covered with skin and flesh and **R' Yochanan** said it was mutar. **R' Nachman** said, the skin of a young bird is different, because it is soft and therefore treated as flesh.
 - There was a case of a young animal with very soft sinews with a broken leg which was covered by flesh and these soft sinews. **Rava** said we do not have to be concerned that the sinews are not treated like flesh, for two reasons: first, **R' Yochanan** said that soft sinews which will eventually harden are considered to be portions of the Korbbon Pesach (so we see they are flesh), and second, the Torah is concerned for the money of the Yidden. **R' Pappa** said to **Rava**, we have **Reish Lakish** who argues on **R' Yochanan** and the fact that we are dealing with an issur D'Oraisa, so how can you be so sure that we need not be concerned!? **Rava** remained quiet.
 - **Q:** Why did he remain quiet? We find that **Rava** says we only pasken like **Reish Lakish** in 3 cases (none of which are the case at hand)!? **A:** We find that **R' Yochanan** ultimately retracted his view for that of **Reish Lakish** regarding this case.