



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf Ches

NISHCHATA HABEHEIMA...

- What is the point of machlokes?
 - **Rabbah** said they argue on whether the entire animal becomes a yad for the dangling limb – **R' Shimon** says it does not (and therefore the hechsher on the animal does not accomplish anything for the limb) and **R' Meir** says that it does.
 - **Abaye** said they argue regarding a case of attached items that when the smaller piece is lifted the larger piece will not be able to be lifted along with it. **R' Meir** says that the two pieces are still considered to be one as long as the smaller piece can be lifted by lifting the larger piece, and **R' Shimon** says it is not. We find that **R' Yochanan** also says that they argue in this point.
 - **Rava** said they argue in whether a yad can be effective for hechsher as well as for tumah (which would be the view of **R' Meir**) or is it only effective for tumah (which would be the view of **R' Shimon**).
 - **R' Pappa** said they argue in effectiveness of hechsher that takes place before there is an intent to use the item as food. We find a Braisa in which **R' Akiva** initially held that such a hechsher is effective and later held that it is not. **R' Meir** holds like the original view of **R' Akiva**, and **R' Shimon** holds like his view after his retraction.
 - **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, they argue regarding a case where the blood was wiped off the limb in between the shechting of the first and second siman. **R' Meir** holds the entire act is considered shechita and the blood from the cutting of the first siman is therefore considered to be blood of shechita and is muchshar. **R' Shimon** holds that only the end of the act is considered to be a shechita and therefore the blood from the cutting of the first siman is considered to be blood of a wound and is not muchshar.
 - **R' Ashi** said they argue whether the act of shechita itself, without the blood, can make the animal muchshar. **R' Meir** says it does and even does so for the dangling limb. **R' Shimon** says, only a shechita that makes the meat mutar has the capacity to do so, and since the dangling limb does not become mutar through the shechita, it does not become muchshar from it either.
- **Q: Rabbah** asked, can a living animal become a yad for a dangling limb? **TEIKU**.
 - **Q: Abaye** said, a Mishna says, if a cucumber grows in a pot without a hole (so it is legally detached from the ground and can become tamei) and some of its leaves grow to beyond the pot and hang over the ground, the entire cucumber plant becomes tahor. **R' Shimon** said, only the parts that hang over the ground become tahor, the parts in the pot are subject to tumah. **Abaye** asked, according to **R' Shimon**, are the parts that grow outside the pot considered to be a yad for the parts inside the pot (if the leaves touched tumah will the cucumbers in the pot become tamei)? **TEIKU**.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** said, they have said that if one bows down to half a gourd it becomes assur b'hana'ah (and according to **R' Shimon** it would therefore not be subject to food tumah). **R' Yirmiya** asked, according to **R' Shimon**, can that half act as a yad to make the other half tamei? **TEIKU**.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** said, a Mishna says, if a branch of figs broke off and is only attached to the tree by its bark, **R' Yehuda** says it is still deemed attached and therefore could not become tamei, but the **Chachomim** say that if it can heal by being reattached to the tree it cannot become tamei, but if it cannot it can become tamei. **R' Pappa** asked, according to the **Chachomim**, can a branch that cannot become tamei act as a yad for a branch that can become tamei? **TEIKU**.

- **Q: R' Zeira** said, a Mishna says, with regard to a cornerstone on which a wall adjoining two houses is built and which has now gotten tzaraas, when the stone is removed as part of the tahara process, only the part of the stone that belongs to the house with the tzaraas must be removed, but the neighbor's portion stays. **R' Zeira** asked, can the part without the tzaraas act as a yad for the part with the tzaraas to spread the tumah?

TEIKU.

MEISA HABEHEIMA

- **Q:** What is the practical difference between an eiver min hachai and an eiver from a neveila? **A:** The difference would be with the flesh that separates from the limb – the flesh that separates from eiver min hachai does not make something tamei whereas the flesh of an eiver of neveila does.
- **Q:** How do we know that eiver min hachai makes things tamei? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, it is the pasuk of “v'chi yamus **min** habeheima”, which teaches that even part of an animal – the eiver min hachai – makes things tamei.
 - **Q:** This pasuk is used by **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** to teach something else, namely that a treifa that is shechted does not make things tamei!? **A:** The pasuk could have said “**mibeheima**” and instead says “min habeheima”, which allows us to make two drashos.
 - **Q:** We should use this pasuk to teach that even flesh that is separated from a living animal should give off tumah!? **A:** A Braisa teaches that it would not give off tumah. **R' Yose Haglili** in the Braisa says it is taught by the pasuk of “v'chi yamus min habeheima”, which teaches that only something that is irreversibly dead, like an animal, gives off tumah, but flesh regenerates and is therefore not in this category. **R' Akiva** says, the word “beheima” teaches that only something that has bones and sinews from a living animal will give off tumah, which therefore excludes flesh of a living animal. **Rebbi** says, the word “beheima” teaches that only something that has flesh, bones and sinews from a living animal will give off tumah, which therefore excludes flesh of a living animal.
 - The difference between **Rebbi and R' Akiva** would be the lower leg of an animal – which only has bones and sinews and doesn't have flesh.
 - **R' Pappa** explains that the difference between **R' Akiva and R' Yose Haglili** is the kidneys and lips (they do not regenerate themselves, but they don't have bones).
 - There is a Braisa that brings this same 3 way machlokes regarding the flesh separated from a living sheretz and is based on the pasuk regarding sheratzim. The Gemara explains that there needed to be a separate drasha for beheimos and for sheratzim. If we only had a pasuk for beheima we would say the flesh does not give off tumah, because even when the animal is dead it does not give off tumah when it is the size of a lentil, but sheratzim do and therefore we would think even the flesh of the live sheretz should give off tumah. If we only had a pasuk for sheretz we would say the flesh does not give off tumah, because even when the sheretz is dead it does not give off tumah through carrying, but beheimos do and therefore we would think even the flesh of the live beheima should give off tumah.