



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf Zayin

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "hatzav limineihu" comes to include the "arvad" (offspring of a frog and a snake), the "ben hanefilim", and the salamander in the category of "tzav". When **R' Akiva** would reach this pasuk he would say "mah rabu maasecha Hashem". He said there are creatures that grow in the sea and others that grow on land, and each would die in the environment of the other. There are creatures that grow in fire and others that grow in air, and each would die in the environment of the other.
- A Braisa says, every creature that exists on dry land has a counterpart in the sea, except for the weasel.
 - **R' Zeira** said, this is alluded to in the pasuk of "haazinu kol yoshvei chaled".
 - **R' Huna in the name of R' Yehoshua** said, the beavers of Narash only live in the water.
 - The Gemara brings a number of Amoraic statements regarding the wickedness of the people of Narash, and then states that the people of Narash, Nehar Pekod, and of Pumbedisa are all thieves.
- **R' Huna bar Torasa** said, I once went to the city of Vaad and saw a snake hanging around a frog, and a short time later an arvad was produced from them. When I then went to **R' Shimon Hachasid** he told me that the people of Vaad produced many kinds of klayim against Hashem's Will, so Hashem therefore created the klayim of the arvad to punish them.
 - **Q: Rav** has said that only creatures that have similar ways of mating and pregnancy periods can produce offspring, so how can a snake and frog produce offspring? **A:** Hashem made this happen as a double miracle, just to punish these people for the klayim that they produced.

MISHNA

- The limb and the flesh that are dangling from an animal are subject to food tumah even while still attached to the animal, but must become muchshar in order to become tamei. If the animal is shechted **R' Meir** says these dangling limbs or flesh become muchshar from the blood of the animal, but **R' Shimon** says they do not. If the animal died without shechita, the dangling flesh requires hechsher to become tamei, but the limb gives off tumah as eiver min hachai, but not as an eiver of neveila. This is the view of **R' Meir**. However, **R' Shimon** says it is tahor.

GEMARA

- The Mishna means that the dangling limb and flesh are subject to food tumah, but not to tumas neveila.
 - **Q:** What is the case? If they can regenerate and become healthy again, they should not even be subject to food tumah, and if they can't regenerate they should even be subject to tumas neveila!? **A:** The case is that they can't regenerate, and the reason they are not subject to tumas neveila is because the pasuk regarding neveila says "ki yipol", which teaches that it is not neveila until it falls off completely. A Braisa says this as well.
 - Even though these dangling limbs and flesh are considered attached for purposes of neveila, they are considered detached and therefore subject to food tumah. This supports the ruling of **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Shmuel**, who says that figs that are dried on their branches are subject to food tumah even though they are still attached to the tree, and one who picks them off the tree on Shabbos is chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring another Braisa that supports this ruling. The Braisa says, if vegetables dried on their stems, such as cabbage and gourds, they do not become subject to food tumah. However, if they were cut off and dried, they

are subject to food tumah. Now, this can't be understood literally, because when these are dried they are like pieces of wood!? **R' Yitzchak** said, this means that they were cut off with the intent to dry them (although they are still moist now) they become subject to food tumah for as long as they remain moist. This suggests that it is things like cabbage and gourds that when dried don't have food tumah, because they are like pieces of wood, but other produce would be subject to food tumah even when they are dried. Now, the case can't be where the fruit and the stems were dried up, because that would certainly be considered to be detached from the ground. Rather, the case must be where the produce dried but the stems did not. This supports **Shmuel's** ruling! **A:** It may be that the case was where the stems also dried up, and the reason the Braisa needed to give that case was to teach that even when he cut them with the intent to dry them (at which point they would be like pieces of wood) they are subject to food tumah for as long as they are moist.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a branch of fruit broke off from its tree, they are considered to be detached even if they are still moist. However, if the fruits dried up while still attached to the tree they would be considered as attached to the ground. Presumably, just as the Braisa means it is detached in all respects, when the Braisa says they are attached it means in all respects. This refutes **Shmuel**!? **A:** It may be that detached means in all respects (e.g. with regard to Shabbos and tumah) but attached is only regard to some respects (e.g. Shabbos but not tumah).