



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

Chullin Daf Pey Hey

MISHNA

- If one shechts a chaya or bird and finds it to be a treifa, or if one shechted it to avoda zara, or if one shechted chullin inside the Azarah or kodashim outside the Azarah, or if one shechted a chaya or bird that was sentenced to be stoned (in all these cases the meat may not be eaten), **R' Meir** says there is an obligation of kisuy hadam and the **Chachomim** say there is not.
- If one shechted and the chaya or bird became a neveila (the shechita wasn't proper), or if it was killed by means other than a shechita, all agree that there is no obligation of kisuy hadam.

GEMARA

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, in the previous Mishna similar to this regarding oso v'es beno **Rebbi** agreed with the view of **R' Meir** in our Mishna (that this shechita is considered to be a shechita) and therefore taught his view as the view of the **Chachomim**, and regarding kisuy hadam he agreed with the view of **R' Shimon** and therefore taught his view in our Mishna as the view of the **Chachomim**.
 - **Q:** What is the reasoning of the view of **R' Meir** regarding oso v'es beno? **A:** **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, he learns a gezeira shava on "shechita" from the case of shechting kodashim outside the Azarah and learns that just as in that case a shechita that is not fit to allow the meat to be eaten is still considered to be a shechita, the same is true for oso v'es beno. **R' Mani bar Patish** explains that **R' Shimon** instead learns a gezeira shava from the story of Yosef having the meal prepared for himself and his brothers, where the pasuk says "tevo'ach tevach" (meaning shechita). Just as there it refers to a shechita that was fit to allow the meat to be eaten, the same is true for oso v'es beno.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Meir** learn from the story of Yosef? **A:** He wants to learn a gezeira shava using the same word of shechita, rather than tevicha.
 - **Q:** The **Tana Divei R' Yishmael** taught that the words used for a gezeira shava do not have to be identical!? **A:** That is true only when there are no identical words to be found.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Shimon** learn from the case of kodashim shechted outside the Azarah? **A:** He wants to learn a case of chullin from a case of chullin, rather than from kodashim.
 - **R' Meir** says oso v'es beno applies to kodashim as well, and therefore we can learn from a case of kodashim.
 - This is what was meant that **Rebbi** agreed with the view of **R' Meir** regarding oso v'es beno and therefore taught it as the view of the **Chachomim**.
 - **Q:** What is the reasoning of the view of **R' Meir** regarding kisuy hadam? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said he learns a gezeira shava on "sheficha" from the case of shechting kodashim outside the Azarah and learns that just as in that case a shechita that is not fit to allow the meat to be eaten is still considered to be a shechita, the same is true for kisuy hadam.
 - **R' Shimon** says the pasuk regarding kisuy hadam says "asher yei'acheil", which means it only applies when the meat may be eaten. **R' Meir** says this just comes to exclude a non-kosher chaya or bird from the kisuy hadam requirement. **R' Shimon** says, a non-kosher bird is not included because it may not be eaten. For the same reason a treifa may not be included.
 - This is what was meant that **Rebbi** agreed with the view of **R' Shimon** regarding kisuy hadam and therefore taught it as the view of the **Chachomim**.

- **R' Abba** said, **R' Meir** did not consider such a shechita to be considered as a shechita for all purposes, because **R' Meir** agrees that this shechita would not make the meat mutar to be eaten. Also, **R' Shimon** did not consider such a shechita not to be considered a shechita for all purposes, because **R' Shimon** agrees that this unfit shechita would prevent the treifa from becoming tamei like a neveila.
 - **Q:** The first part of the statement seems obvious – **R' Meir** would not allow a treifa to be eaten!? **A:** The ruling is needed for a case where one shechted the treifa and found a live, full-term fetus inside. We would think that since **R' Meir** considers this shechita to be a shechita it should even obviate the ben pakuah from needing a shechita. **R' Abba** therefore teaches that it is not a shechita for that purpose.
 - **Q:** **R' Meir** holds that a live, full-term ben pakuah always needs its own shechita!? **A:** The ruling is necessary according to **Rebbi**, who holds like **R' Meir** that the shechita of a treifa is still considered to be a shechita, but who also holds like the **Rabanan** who say that a live, full-term ben pakuah does not need its own shechita. According to **Rebbi** we would think to say that this shechita obviates the need for the ben pakuah to have its own shechita. **R' Abba** therefore teaches that it does not.
 - **Q:** The halacha that the shechita of a treifa prevents it from becoming tamei as a neveila is already taught by **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** from the drasha of a pasuk!? **A:** The ruling is necessary for the case of the shechita of a treifa that was chullin shechted in the Azarah, in which case a Braisa says that **R' Shimon** says the animal is mutar b'hana'ah (which means that the shechita is not considered to be a shechita at all). We would think that maybe it is not even a shechita in regard to preventing it from becoming tamei as a neveila. **R' Abba** therefore teaches that with regard to that it is a shechita and the animal will not have tumas neveila.
 - **R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, does **R' Shimon** holds that chullin shechted in the Azarah becomes assur b'hana'ah even D'Oraisa? **Abaye** said, yes he does. A Mishna says that **R' Shimon** says, chullin that was shechted in the Azarah must be burned, and the same applies to a chaya that was shechted in the Azarah. Now, if he holds that chullin shechted in the Azarah becomes assur D'Oraisa, that is why he is goizer a chaya as well. However, if even a beheima is only a gezeira D'Rabanan, he would not be goizer a chaya on top of beheima which itself is only a gezeira.
- **R' Chiya's** flax was attacked by moths. **Rebbi** told him to shecht a bird over the water in which the flax was soaking, because the smell of the blood will cause the moths to go away.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one shechts because he needs the blood, he still must cover the blood, so he should rather kill it by methods other than shechita so that he may use the blood. So, how could **Rebbi** have given this advice!? **A:** **R' Dimi** said, **Rebbi** told him to first make the bird a treifa and then shecht it, and **Ravin** said **Rebbi** told him to kill the bird without shechita.
 - **R' Dimi** gave his answer to teach that of course if he killed it other than by shechita he could use the blood, but **Rebbi** was teaching that even the shechita of a treifa doesn't need kisuy, as **R' Chiya bar Abba** said is **Rebbi's** view. **Ravin** gave his answer to teach that of course if he shechted it as a treifa it would be patur from kisuy hadam in **Rebbi's** opinion, as stated by **R' Chiya bar Abba**. He was teaching further that we should not say that in truth there is no halacha of shechita for a bird D'Oraisa and therefore any form of killing would require that its blood be covered. He therefore taught that if it is killed other than by shechita there is no obligation to cover its blood, because a bird requires shechita D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** How could it be that **R' Chiya's** flax was attacked by moths? We find that **Ravin bar Abba** said that the flax of all the people of EY were protected because of the zechus of **R' Chiya** and his sons!? **A:** His zechus helped to protect others, but not himself. It is like the statement of **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** who said that every day a Bas Kol calls

out and says, “The entire world is sustained in the zechus of My son Chanina, and yet My son Chanina subsists on a kav of carobs for the entire week”.