



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

Chullin Daf Pey Zayin

MISHNA

- If someone shechted a chaya or bird and did not cover its blood, and someone else saw the uncovered blood, he is chayuv to cover it.
- If one covered the blood and it then became uncovered, he is patur from having to cover it again.
- If the wind covered the blood, there is an obligation to cover it.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'shafach...v'chisah", which teaches that the one who shechts is the one who should cover the blood. How do we know that if he didn't cover the blood and someone else sees it, that the other person must cover the blood? The pasuk says "va'omar livnei Yisrael" – this is a warning to all Yidden.
 - Another Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'shafach...v'chisah", which teaches that the shochet should cover the blood with what he used to spill the blood (i.e. his hand). This teaches that he should not use his foot, so as not to treat the mitzvah disgracefully.
 - A Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'shafach...v'chisah", which teaches that the one who shechted should cover the blood. It once happened that before the shochet could cover the blood someone else came and did so, and **R' Gamliel** made this person pay 10 golden dinars to the shochet for having deprived him of the reward.
 - **Q:** Did he have to pay him for depriving him of the reward for doing the mitzvah or for the bracha? The difference would be regarding birchas hamazon (if one had to pay for depriving another of that). If he must pay for the mitzvah, this is only one mitzvah. If he must pay for the bracha, this is 4 brachos and he would have to pay 40 golden dinars. **A:** It once happened that a Tzeduki ate a meal with **Rebbi**, and **Rebbi** asked if he would be staying for birchas hamazon or would rather take 40 golden dinars and leave. The Tzeduki said he wanted to stay. A Bas Kol called out and said "the kos shel bracha (bentching) is worth 40 golden dinars".
 - **R' Yitzchak** said, that family of this Tzeduki is still among the prominent people of Rome and are known as "Bar Luyanus".

KISAHU V'NISGALAH

- **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, why is this different than returning a lost item, where we darshen the pasuk of "hasheiv" to teach that it must be done again and again, even 100 times? **R' Ashi** said, the pasuk here says "v'chisahu", which limits the obligation to one act of covering.

KISAHU HARUACH

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, it only needs to be covered if the blood became uncovered again (after having been covered by the wind). If not, there is no obligation to cover it.
 - **Q:** Even if it becomes uncovered, since it was covered by the wind it has become rejected and should not be obligated again!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, we see from here that there is no concept of rejection regarding mitzvos ("ein dichuy eitzel mitzvos").
 - **Q:** Why is this different than the Braisa which says that if one shechts and the blood becomes absorbed in the ground it must be covered? **A:** The Braisa is talking about a case where the outside of the blood in the ground is still noticeable.

MISHNA

- If blood of a chaya or bird became mixed with water, if the mixture still looks like blood, it is considered to be blood and must be covered. If the blood became mixed with wine, we view the wine as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the wine were water the mixture would look like blood, it must be covered). If the blood became mixed with blood of a beheima or of the wound of a chaya (which need not be covered), we view the other blood as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the other blood was water the mixture would look like blood, it must be covered). **R' Yehuda** says that blood cannot nullify blood (and therefore if even a drop of blood of a chaya or a bird was mixed into a large amount of blood from a beheima, the mixture would have to be covered).
- Blood that splattered or that is on the knife must be covered. **R' Yehuda** said, this is only when that is the only blood that exists to be covered. However, if there is other blood, one is patur from having to cover the splattered blood and the blood that is on the knife.

GEMARA

- A Mishna regarding the blood of a korbon says, if blood of a korbon became mixed with water, then if the mixture still looks like blood, it is considered to be valid blood (and can be used for zrika). If the blood became mixed with wine, we view the wine as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the wine were water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid). If blood of a korbon became mixed with blood of an animal that is not a korbon or with the blood of a chaya, we view the other blood as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the other blood was water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid). **R' Yehuda** says that blood cannot nullify blood (and therefore if even a drop of korbon blood was mixed into a large amount of blood from an animal that is not a korbon, the mixture is valid to be used for zrika).
 - **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the mixture of blood and water is only valid when water fell into blood, but if blood fell into water in small amounts, every drop of blood becomes batul as it falls into the water and the mixture is therefore not valid as blood.
 - **R' Pappa** said, with regard to the mitzvah of kisuy hadam, even if the blood fell into water there would still be a requirement to cover the mixture, because there is no rejection of mitzvos (even if the first drops become batul, when the later drops then join and make the water become the color of blood, it again becomes subject to the mitzvah of kisuy hadam).
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, blood that is any type of red can be used to bring a kapparah with a korbon, can make something muchshar l'kabel tumah, and is subject to kisuy hadam.
 - **Q:** The ruling regarding being used for zrika of a korbon was already taught in a Mishna, the ruling regarding kisuy hadam was already taught in our Mishna, and the ruling regarding muchshar is also obvious, because if it is considered blood it is muchshar, and if it is considered to be water it is muchshar!? **A: R' Yehuda** was teaching regarding a case where blood mixed with rainwater (which is not muchshar), and teaches that once it is any type of red it is muchshar.
 - **Q:** Once he takes the rainwater and mixes it with the blood, his taking shows an intent for use and therefore even the rainwater would be muchshar!? **A: R' Assi of Neharbil** said, he is referring to the clear part of the blood, which, if it is reddish at all, can accomplish these 3 things.
 - **R' Yimiya MiDifti** said, eating this clear blood would make one chayuv in kares. The Gemara says, this is only where there is at least a kezayis of regular blood.
 - A Braisa says that this clear blood even gives off tumas ohel. The Gemara says, this is only where there is a revi'is of regular blood.
 - A Braisa says, all liquids of a meis are tahor except for its blood. Any of its clear blood that has reddish to it, gives off tumas ohel.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the liquids that come from "lenient" sources of tumah and that come from "stringent" sources of tumah become a rishon. Presumably, the lenient source refers to a sheretz or zav and the

stringent source refers to the meis. This contradicts the Braisa!? **A:** The lenient source refers to the sheretz and the stringent source refers to the zav.

- **Q:** Why is it that the **Rabanan** were goizer regarding the liquids of a zav, but not of a meis? **A:** People don't separate themselves from a zav, so the **Rabanan** had to be goizer. People do separate themselves from a meis, and therefore there was no need for them to be goizer.