



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

Chullin Daf Pey

- **R' Yehuda** said that a kvi is its own unique species of animal, and the **Chachomim** could not determine whether it is a type of chaya or a type of beheima. **R' Nachman** said that the kvi is the "wild ram".
 - We find this to be a machlokes among Tannai'im in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the kvi is the "wild ram". **Some** say it is an animal produced from the mating of a deer and a goat. **R' Yose** says that a kvi is its own unique species of animal and the **Chachomim** could not determine whether it is a type of chaya or a type of beheima. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says it is a type of beheima, and in Beis Dushai they would raise herds of this.
- **R' Zeira in the name of R' Safra in the name of R' Hamnuna** said, the "forest goats" are valid to be brought as a korbon on the Mizbe'ach. This is because **R' Hamnuna** holds like **R' Yitzchak** who says that the Torah only lists 10 types of kosher animals. Since the forest goat is not listed as a chaya in the pasuk, it must be that it is truly a type of beheima of the goat family.
 - **Q: R' Acha bar Yaakov** asked, why don't we say that the pasuk that lists the kosher animals says "ayal utzvi" which is a prat, and then says "kol beheima" which is a klal, and the rule is that when a prat is followed by a klal, the klal comes to add things to the prat, meaning that there are more than just the 10 animal types that are listed!? **A:** If this was correct, why did the pasuk need to list all these 10 types? Rather, it must be that we don't darshen this as a prat uklal.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of R' Ika** asked, maybe these forest goats are actually one of the chayos that are listed that we are unfamiliar with what they truly are? **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked a similar question to **R' Ashi** as well.
 - **R' Chanan** told **R' Ashi** that **Ameimar** would permit the cheilev of the forest goat, which means that he paskened it was absolutely a type of chaya.
- **Abba the son of R' Minyamin bar Chiya** asked **R' Huna bar Chiya**, may the forest goats be brought as a korbon on the Mizbe'ach? He answered, we only find that **R' Yose and the Rabanan** argue regarding the status of the wild ox. However, regarding the forest goat all would agree that it is a type of goat and therefore is fit to be brought as a korbon.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of R' Ika** asked, maybe these forest goats are actually one of the chayos that are listed that we are unfamiliar with what they truly are? **Ravina** asked a similar question to **R' Ashi** as well.
 - **R' Chanan** told **R' Ashi** that **Ameimar** would permit the cheilev of the forest goat, which means that he paskened it was absolutely a type of chaya.

KEITZAD HASHOCHET...

- **R' Oshaya** said, the entire Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**. How do we know this?
 - **R' Shimon** holds that a shechita that does not make the animal mutar to be eaten does not have the status of a shechita at all. Our Mishna gives the case of where both animals (the parent and the offspring) were kodashim and they were both shechted outside the Azarah, and the Mishna said that the first shochet is chayuv kares, both animals are passul, and both shoachim get malkus. Now, according to **R' Shimon**, the first shechita is not a "shechita", because it does not permit the animal to be eaten. Therefore, the shechita of the second animal as a korbon is not considered to be "mechusar zman", because it may be shechted that same day (since the first shechita is an act of killing without the status of a shechita). If so, when the second animal is shechted outside the Azarah the shochet should be chayuv kares! This shows that the Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**.
 - A second way we can prove this is from another case in the Mishna. The Mishna says, if both animals were chullin animals and they were both shechted inside the Azarah, they

are both passul and the second shochet gets malkus. Now, according to **R' Shimon** the first shechita does not have the status of a "shechita" (because the animal is assur to be eaten). If so, the second shechita should not make the shochet chayuv to get malkus!

- A third way we can prove this is from another case in the Mishna. The Mishna says, if both animals were kodashim and they were both shechted inside the Azarah, the first animal is kosher and the shochet is patur, and the second animal is passul and its shochet gets malkus. Now, according to **R' Shimon**, since the shechita of a korbon does not permit it to be eaten, since it can't be eaten until after the zrika, the second shochet should not get malkus and the animal should not be passul! Clearly, we see that the Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**.
- **Q:** It seems obvious that the Mishna does not follow **R' Shimon**, so why did **R' Oshaya** have to teach this? **A:** He wanted to teach us that according to **R' Shimon** the shechita of a korbon does not have the status of a shechita that permits the animal to be eaten.
- **Q:** The Mishna says that if both animals were kodashim and they were both shechted inside the Azarah, the first animal is kosher and the shochet is patur, and the second animal is passul and its shochet gets malkus for oso v'es beno. Why doesn't the Mishna say that this shochet gets a second set of malkus for the lav of "lo yeiratzeh", which includes offering a korbon that is mechusar zman? **A:** The Mishna is only discussing malkus obligations for the lav of oso v'es beno, not for malkus incurred for other lavim.
 - **Q:** The Mishna gives the case of where both animals (the parent and the offspring) were kodashim and they were both shechted outside the Azarah, and the Mishna said that the first shochet is chayuv kares, both animals are passul, and both shochtim get malkus. Now the first shochet is chayuv malkus for shechting kodashim outside the Azarah, not for oso v'es beno, and yet the Mishna discusses this set of malkus!? **A:** When the person is chayuv malkus for oso v'es beno the Mishna does not discuss any additional malkus that he may be chayuv. When the person is not chayuv malkus for oso v'es beno the Mishna does discuss other malkus that he may be chayuv.
 - **R' Zeira** said, it may be that the Mishna discusses malkus incurred for lavim other than oso v'es beno. The reason it did not say that the shochet is chayuv malkus for the lav of "lo yeiratzeh" when the korbon was mechusar zman is because the lav of mechusar zman is attached to an assei in the pasuk where it says "miyom hashmini vahala yeiratzeh", and a lav that is attached to an assei does not carry a malkus penalty.
 - **Q:** This pasuk of "miyom hashmini vahala yeiratzeh" is needed for a different drasha of **R' Afturiki**!? **A:** His drasha can be learned from the pasuk of "kein taaseh lishorcha litzonecha". This leaves the "miyom hashmini vahala yeiratzeh" available to make the lav of mechusar zman attached to an assei.