



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

Chullin Daf Daled

- A Braisa says, the shechita of a Kuti is mutar. However, that is where a Yid is there watching the shechita. If a Yid came and found that an animal was already shechted by a Kuti, we cut off a kezayis and give it to the Kuti to eat – if he eats it we may eat from it as well, but if he does not, we may not eat from it. Similarly, if a Yid found a Kuti holding a string of shechted birds in his hand, he should cut off the head of one of the birds and give it to the Kuti to eat – if he eats it, all the birds are mutar, but if he does not, they are assur.
 - **Abaye** makes an inference from the beginning of the Braisa and says, the reason it is mutar is because there is a Yid there watching the shechita, but if the Yid was only walking in and out it would not be a valid shechita l'chatchila. **Rava** makes an inference from the end of the Braisa and says, the reason we have to give the Kuti a piece to eat is because the Kuti shechted without any Yid there at all, but if there would have been a Yid walking in and out, it would have been valid even l'chatchila.
 - **Abaye** would say that “walking in and out” is considered to be the same thing as when a Yid “came and found the animal shechted”. **Rava** would say that “walking in and out” is the same thing as having a Yid standing there and watching the shechita.
 - **Q:** Why is it that if he eats one of the bird heads all the birds become mutar? Maybe it was only that bird that was shechted properly!? **A: R' Menashe** said, the case is that the Yid hides all the birds under his clothing and pulls out one head (so the Kuti doesn't know which bird it is from).
 - **Q:** Maybe there was a mark on the head that allowed the Kuti to recognize it as being the one with the proper shechita? **A: R' Mesharshiya** said, the case is that the Yid crushes the head before giving it to him (eliminating any possible mark).
 - **Q:** Maybe the Kutim hold that D'Oraisa birds don't need shechita, and that is why he eats it!? **A:** Based on this, the oral laws of shechita (shehiya, drasa, chalada, hagrama, and ikur) are not written in the Torah, so how do we trust a Kuti to abide by them? Rather, it must be that we say that since we see that the Kutim follow these laws we can even rely on them to do so. The same can be said with regard to the requirement that a bird needs shechita.
 - It is actually a machlokes whether we can rely on a Kuti regarding a halacha that is not written in the Torah, even when we see that they follow the halacha. A Braisa says, the matzah of a Kuti may be eaten on Pesach and one can be yotzeh on Pesach by eating the matzah made by a Kuti. **R' Eliezer** says one cannot be yotzeh with that, because the Kutim are not careful with the finer points of the mitzvos. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, with regard to any mitzvah which the Kutim believe in, they are actually more careful with it than a Yid would be.
 - **Q:** If the matzah is mutar it is obvious that one can be yotzeh with it on Pesach!? **A:** We would think that they are not familiar with the halacha that the matzah must be guarded for the sake of the mitzvah, which is what matzah needs to be in order to be yotzeh with it on Pesach. The Braisa teaches that the Kuti may be relied upon for that. **R' Eliezer** says one is not yotzeh with their matzah, because he holds that they are not familiar with this halacha.
 - **Q:** It seems that the **T"K** and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** are saying the same thing!? **A:** The machlokes would be regarding a halacha that is written in the Torah, but that we don't see that they believe in. According to the **T"K**, since it is written we can trust them. According to **R' Shimon**, since we don't see that they believe in it we would not trust them.

- **Q:** The pasuk says that Hashem said that He was “enticed” to destroy Iyov, and that clearly does not refer to eating and drinking!? **A:** Enticing said in reference to Hashem is obviously different.
 - **Q:** Maybe Yehoshafat only drank but did not eat? **A:** If he was able to drink Achav’s wine it would have to be based on the fact that a mumar for avoda zara is not considered to be a mumar for all of the Torah. Once we say that concept, he would be allowed to eat from his shechita as well.
 - **Q:** There was no gezeira on ordinary wine of goyim at that time (only wine actually poured for avoda zara was assur then). That may be why he was allowed to drink, but maybe he was not allowed to eat!? **A1:** It is not fitting for a king to drink without eating, so he must have eaten as well. **A2:** The pasuk places the word of enticement and the word of shechita together, which teaches that he enticed him with what was shechted.
- **Q:** Maybe it was Ovadya who shechted the animals (and he was not a mumar)!? **A:** The pasuk says that an abundant number of animals were shechted, so it must be that other people of Achav shechted as well.
- **Q:** Maybe it was the 7,000 Yidden who had not gone in the way of avoda zara who shechted the animals? **A:** Those people were hiding from Izevel, so they could not have been there.
- **Q:** Maybe Achav had people who were righteous and it was they who did the shechitos? **A:** A pasuk teaches that a leader who is a rasha has servants who are resha’im.
- **Q:** Maybe it was only the unrighteous people of Yehoshafat who ate from the shechitos of Achav’s people, but Yehoshafat himself only ate from the shechita of Ovadya? **A:** We can infer from the above pasuk that a righteous leader has righteous servants, so Yehoshafat’s servants must have been righteous people.
- **Q:** Maybe Achav’s people shechted only for Achav’s people and Yehoshafat’s people shechted for Yehoshafat’s people? **A:** We find that Yehoshafat fully trusted Achav, as the Gemara shows from a drasha of pesukim, and he therefore would not have shechted for himself.