



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

Chullin Daf Tzaddik Hey

- A butcher once told someone, had you been on good terms with me (the butcher and this person did not like each other) I would have given you meat from a fattened ox that I shechted yesterday. The person said, I actually had from the very best parts of that animal! The butcher asked, where did you get it from? The person said, there was a goy who bought from you and sold it to me. The butcher said, I shechted two fattened oxen yesterday, and the one I sold to the goy was a treifa! **Rebbi** said, just because this shoteh did not make an announcement like he should have (when selling a treifa) we don't have to say it is assur to buy meat from a goy (when the majority of butchers are Yidden).
 - **Rebbi** follows his shitah of elsewhere, where he says that if a meat market is supplied by Jewish butchers, the meat that is found in the possession of a goy is mutar.
 - **Others** said that **Rebbi's** reaction to the incident was – we will not make all the meat of a goy assur just because this butcher did something to try and cause aggravation to this other person (we don't believe him that he actually sold a treifa into the market).
 - **Q: Rebbi** has said in a Braisa that if a meat market is supplied by Jewish butchers, the meat that is found in the possession of a goy is mutar!? **A:** This case is different, because there is now a chazaka of assur.
- **Rav** said that meat that was not constantly seen is assur to eat.
 - **Q:** The Braisa quoted above said that **Rebbi** said that if a meat market is supplied by Jewish butchers, the meat that is found in the possession of a goy is mutar. Now, this meat was certainly not under Jewish sight and supervision the entire time and yet it is mutar!? **A:** When a goy was watching over it there is no problem. The problem is when no one was watching it. This leads to the concern that an animal or bird switched it out for not kosher meat.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that when there are a majority of kosher butcher shops and a minority of not kosher butcher shops and one finds a piece of meat in front of them, he can assume that it is from the majority of kosher shops and it is mutar. Now, according to **Rav** it should be assur!? **A:** Here too we are talking about where a goy was holding onto it.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if one found raw meat in a city that is made of Yidden and goyim, we follow the majority of the butcher shops to determine if it is mutar. If one finds cooked meat, we follow the majority of people in the city. Now, according to **Rav** it should be assur!? Now, you can't answer here that someone was holding onto the meat, because if the meat is cooked we should say it follows the person who is holding it (if it is a goy, the cooked meat is assur)!? **A:** The case is that a Yid is standing far away and sees the meat fall from someone, but he can't make out who that person is. Therefore, it was under constant sight.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if meat was found outside Yerushalayim, if it was cut up into limbs it is a neveila and if it was sliced it is mutar. Now, according to **Rav** it should be assur!? Now, you can't answer here that someone was standing far away and sees the meat fall from someone, because then why in the case of limbs is it assur!? **A:** We find that **Rav** actually says that the sliced meat is tahor from being neveila, but is assur to eat. It is **Levi** who says it is mutar.
 - This ruling of **Rav** was not stated explicitly, but was rather gleaned from an incident. A person was once cleaning an animal head in the river and the head slipped out of his hand. He used a basket to fetch it and fetched two animal heads in his basket. **Rav** said, we must be concerned that they are assur (because ravens may have brought this head

from somewhere else and therefore all that we find is assur). We see that **Rav** held that meat that goes out of sight is assur.

- The reason this is not as good as if he said this explicitly is that the incident took place in a port of goyim, and it may be that that was the reason that **Rav** said we must be concerned in that case.
- **Q:** How did **Rav** ever eat meat? **A:** He only ate when he saw the meat from the moment of shechita. **A2:** He ate meat as long as it was tied and sealed. **A3:** He ate it when it had a siman, like **Rabbah bar R' Huna**, who would cut his meat into triangles.
- **Rav** once went to visit his son in law. On his way, the ferry was there right when he needed it. He said this was a sign that there would be a party by his son in law. When he got there he saw through the door that meat was being prepared. When he knocked, all the people inside, including the butchers, came out to greet him. **Rav** did not take his eyes off the meat the entire time and told the butchers, if I would have relied on you, you would have given my grandchildren assur meat to eat! **Rav** himself did not eat the meat.
 - **Q:** Why didn't he eat it? It was never out of sight!? It is also can't be as self-punishment for having taken the ferry's coming as a sign, because doing so is not assur!? **A:** It is because it was not a seudas mitzvah, and **Rav** would not partake of a meal that was not a seudas mitzvah.
 - **Rav** would take signs from the ferry, **Shmuel** would take signs from sefarim, and **R' Yochanan** would take signs from pesukim told to him by children.
 - When **R' Yochanan** would correspond with **Rav** in Bavel he would write "To our rebbi in Bavel". When **Rav** died and **Shmuel** took over, **R' Yochanan** would correspond with him by writing "To our colleague in Bavel". **Shmuel** wanted to prove that he was worthy of being treated as a rebbi as well. He first sent a calendar of 60 years. **R' Yochanan** was unimpressed. He then sent to **R' Yochanan** 13 camel loads of safek treifos. **R' Yochanan** said, he is so great, I must go see him. Before going he asked a child to state a pasuk. The child said "U'Shmuel meis". **R' Yochanan** said, this is a sign that **Shmuel** has died. The Gemara says that **Shmuel** had in fact not died, but Hashem sent that pasuk so that **R' Yochanan** not go through the effort of the travel.
 - A Braisa says, if the building of a house, the birth of a child, or marrying a woman bring one good mazal, it may be taken as a sign that the good mazal will continue. **R' Elazar** said, this is only if a chazaka is established by this good mazal having been shown 3 times.
- **R' Huna** asked **Rav**, what if meat was on a string, is there still a concern if they were out of sight? **Rav** said, that would definitely act as a siman and there would be no need for concern.
 - **Others** say that this ruling was simply made by **R' Huna in the name of Rav**.
- **R' Nachman of Neharda'ah** was visiting **R' Kahana of Pum Nahara** on Erev Yom Kippur. Ravens came and began dropping livers and kidneys. **R' Kahana** said, "You may take these and eat them, because on Erev Yom Kippur, mutar meat is more common than assur meat".
- **R' Chiya bar Avin** lost a piece of meat and found it. **R' Huna** allowed him to eat it based on his recognizing it, even though it did not have a siman. **R' Nachman** allowed the same for **R' Chanina Choza'ah**. **R' Chisda** allowed techeiles based on **R' Nosson bar Abaye's** recognizing the techeiles that he first lost and then found.
 - **Rava** said, initially I would say that a siman is better than just recognition, as we see that a lost item is returned based on a siman, but not based on recognition. However, after hearing these rulings, I now say that recognition is better than a siman. We must say this, because a blind person is only mutar to his wife, and in the dark people are only mutar to their wives, based on recognition of voices. In other cases too, recognition can be relied upon.
 - **R' Yitzchak the son of R' Mesharshiya** said, we can prove this from the fact that if 2 witnesses come and say that someone with certain simanim murdered, we would not put the person to death. However, if

the witnesses say that we recognize a person as having murdered, we would put the person to death.

- **R' Ashi** said, we can prove that recognition is better, because you would rather send a messenger to call someone that he recognizes than a messenger to call someone that he could only find based on simanim on the person.