



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

Chullin Daf Pey Vuv

MISHNA

- If a chaya or bird was shechted by a cheireish, shoteh, or katan while other people watched the shechita, there is an obligation of kisuy hadam. If they shechted without others watching, there is no obligation of kisuy hadam. The same would be in regard to oso v'es beno. If they shechted while other people watched the shechita it would be assur to shecht the mother or the offspring after them. If they shechted without others watching, **R' Meir** says it would be mutar to shecht the mother or the offspring on that same day, and the **Chachomim** say it would be assur. The **Chachomim** agree that if one did shecht the mother or the offspring that same day, the shochet would not be chayuv malkus.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that regarding kisuy hadam the **Rabanan** agree with **R' Meir** and say their shechita is not a shechita at all, but with regard to oso v'es beno they argue with him and say that it is possibly a valid shechita? **A:** With regard to kisuy hadam, if we say the blood must be covered, people will think that the shechita is a valid shechita and may come to eat from the meat.
 - **Q:** We should have that same concern regarding saying that oso v'es beno applies to their shechita!? **A:** If a person is prevented from shechting the other animal that day people will say it is only because they did not need the meat, they will not say it is because the first shechita was a valid shechita.
 - **Q:** With regard to kisuy hadam as well, people will say that he is covering the blood to clean his field, not for the mitzvah of kisuy hadam!? **A:** In a case where he shechted it over the garbage that excuse will not apply. Also, if one asks Beis Din whether he must cover the blood and they tell him yes, people will say it is because the shechita was valid.
 - **Q:** With regard to oso v'es beno, if one asks Beis Din if he must wait to shecht the second animal and they tell him yes, people will say it is because the first shechita was valid!? **A:** Rather, the **Rabanan** argue in both cases. However, they waited until **R' Meir** fully concluded his view before stating their view.
 - **Q:** The view of the **Rabanan** is understandable, because they go l'chumra. However, what is the reasoning of the view of **R' Meir**? **A:** **R' Yaakov in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Meir** would give one who ate from their shechita malkus for eating neveila. On that premise he also says that it is not a valid shechita for these other purposes as well. **R' Ami** explains, he holds this way because most actions of these people are ruined.
 - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua**, why is it necessary to say that "most" actions of theirs are ruined? Even if it is only a minority of their actions that are ruined, since we find that **R' Meir** is concerned for the minority, when the minority is added to the chazakah that the meat is assur, the majority is weakened and not authoritative!? We find that he uses this reasoning to declare something tahor that would be tamei if based on strict majority! **A:** **R' Meir** says that regarding making something that would be tamei into tahor, because the minority with the chazaka makes it viewed as 50/50 tamei or tahor. In that case, since there is no intelligent person to ask

what happened (the case involves a child) we pasken that it is tahor. However, in our case, where we are dealing with a case of issur and heter, even if we say it is 50/50, the halacha will be that we must go l'chumra and say that it is assur.

- **Rebbi** paskened like **R' Meir** in our Mishna. Another time he paskened like the **Chachomim**.
 - **Q:** Which of these rulings was later, and is therefore authoritative? **A:** The Gemara brings a conversation which resulted in the repetition of the fact that **R' Elazar** sent to the Galus that **Rebbi** paskened like **R' Meir**. From the fact that he did not also say that **Rebbi** also paskened like the **Rabanan**, it must be that his ruling like the view of **R' Meir** was the later ruling.

MISHNA

- If one shechted 100 chayos in one spot, he can do one act of covering for all the blood. If he shechted 100 birds in one spot, he can do one act of covering for all the blood. If he shechted a chaya and a bird in one spot, he can do one act of covering for all the blood. **R' Yehuda** says, in the last case he should first cover the blood of the chaya before shechting the bird in that spot.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding kisuy hadam says "chaya", which suggests any number of chayos. "Chaya" can also mean many or few. "Oif" suggests any number of birds. "Oif" can also mean many or few. From here they said, if one shechted 100 chayos in one spot, he can do one act of covering for all the blood. If he shechted 100 birds in one spot, he can do one act of covering for all the blood. If he shechted a chaya and a bird in one spot, he can do one act of covering for all the blood. **R' Yehuda** says, in the last case he should first cover the blood of the chaya before shechting the bird in that spot, since the pasuk says "chaya oy oif" (which separates the two and suggests that each needs its own covering). They said to **R' Yehuda**, the pasuk says "ki nefesh kol basar damo b'nafsho hu".
 - **Q:** What is the response of the **Rabanan**? **A:** They meant to say, the word "oy" is needed to separate and teach that there is an obligation to cover the blood of either a chaya or a bird alone, even if it wasn't shechted along with the other species. **R' Yehuda** said, we can learn that from the word "damo", written in the singular. The **Rabanan** said, "damo" can refer to the blood of many species, as we can see from the pasuk of "ki nefesh kol basar damo b'nafsho hu".
 - **R' Chanina** said, **R' Yehuda** agrees regarding the bracha made for the shechita, that if one shechts a chaya and then a bird he makes only one bracha, even if he covers the blood of the chaya before the shechita of the bird.
 - **Q:** **Ravina** asked **R' Acha the son of Rava**, why is this different than the view of the talmidim of **Rav**, who said that **Rav** held, once you have decided to say birchas hamazon, any further drinking will require a new bracha? Similarly in our case, once he busied himself with covering the blood of the chaya he should need to make a new bracha for the shechita of the bird!? **A:** It is impossible to drink and say birchas hamazon at the same time, and therefore the decision to say birchas hamazon is a decision not to drink anymore. However, one can shecht with one hand and cover blood with the other. Therefore, covering the blood is not an indication of a decision not to shecht anymore.