



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

Chullin Daf Hey

- **Q:** Maybe we can bring proof for **R' Anan** that the shechita of a mumar with regard to avoda zara is a valid shechita. The pasuk says that when Eliyahu went into hiding the ravens ("orvim") would bring bread and meat in the morning and in the evening. **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the meat was taken from Achav's butchers. We see that Eliyahu ate from the shechita of Achav's people! **A:** This is not a valid proof. It may be that since this was done by the word of Hashem it is different.
 - **Ravina** said that the "orvim" referred to in the pasuk are actual raven birds. **R' Ada bar Minyumei** asked him, maybe it refers to two people whose names were "orvim"? **Ravina** said, it is highly unlikely to say that there were two people who each had this unusual name. **R' Ada** asked, maybe "orvim" was the name of the place that these two people came from? **Ravina** said, if that was the case the pasuk would have said "orviyim", not "orvim".
- **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says, all may shecht: even a Kutzi, even an arel (one who is uncircumcised), and even a Yid who is a mumar. Now, what is the case of the arel? It can't mean that someone who didn't get a bris because his brothers all died from getting a bris, because such a person is a full-fledged Yid, and can obviously shecht! Rather, it must refer to a Yid who is a mumar with regard to circumcision. Based on this, it must be that the Tanna holds that just because a person is a mumar for one area doesn't mean he is a mumar for other areas of the Torah, which is why he may shecht. When the Braisa then mentions a mumar, what type of mumar is it referring to? It can't be referring to a mumar for a particular aveira, because that was already covered for in the case of the mumar for circumcision. Rather, it must be referring to one who is a mumar regarding avoda zara, and we therefore see that the Braisa supports **R' Ana!** **A:** This is not a valid proof. It may be that a mumar regarding avoda zara may not shecht since we have learned that the aveira of avoda zara is so stringent that accepting an avoda zara is like rejecting the entire Torah. The Braisa is instead referring to a mumar for eating neveila for pleasure, and the Braisa that allows him to shecht is following the view of **Rava**.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of "mikem" teaches to exclude a mumar from being allowed to bring a korban. The Braisa then says that we see from here the **Rabanan** said that we accept korbanos from the sinners of Klal Yisrael to try to get them to repent and do teshuva, except for a mumar, one who pours wine to avoda zara, and one who is machalel Shabbos publicly. Now, the Braisa first excludes a mumar from being allowed to bring a korban and then says that we do accept korbanos from sinners? We must say that the beginning is talking about a mumar for all of the Torah and the middle part is talking about where he was a mumar for one particular matter. However, the Braisa then ends off and excludes a mumar again. This can't be referring to a mumar to all of the Torah, because that is dealt with in the beginning of the Braisa! It can't be dealing with a mumar for one matter, because that is dealt with in the middle of the Braisa! Rather, it must be that the Braisa is saying that we accept korbanos from a mumar to one matter, except if he is a mumar for pouring wine to avoda zara or to be mechalel Shabbos publicly. We see from here that a mumar for avoda zara is considered to be a mumar for all of the Torah. This is a **TEYUFTA of R' Anan!**
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that the source for not accepting korbanos from a mumar is the pasuk of "mei'ahm haaretz ba'asosah", which teaches that one who is a mumar would not bring a chatas if he does an aveira b'shogeg. **R' Shimon bar Yose in the name of R' Shimon** said, we don't need that pasuk for that, because we darshen another pasuk to teach that only someone who would stop from doing the aveira if he knew he was doing an aveira brings a chatas for doing that aveira. A person who would not stop does not bring a korban. **R' Hamnuna** said, the difference between these shitos would be one

who was a mumar to eat cheilev, but who mistakenly ate blood. The T"K would hold that he is considered to be a mumar regarding blood as well and therefore could not bring a korbon. **R' Shimon bar Yose in the name of R' Shimon** would hold that since he would stop eating blood if he knew what he was doing, he would bring a korbon for having eaten blood. In any case, we see that the Braisa uses a different source for this exclusion!?

A: One pasuk teaches to exclude the mumar from bringing a chatas and the other teaches regarding an olah. Both are needed. If we would only be taught that he is excluded from a chatas we would say that this is so only because it brings a kapparah (and it makes no sense for him to get a kapparah when he will knowingly be doing the aveira again), but to bring an olah, which is a gift to Hashem, maybe we would accept it from him. If we were only taught regarding an olah, we would say we don't accept that from him, because he is under no obligation to bring the korbon. However, the chatas is obligatory for him to bring and therefore maybe he does bring the chatas. Therefore, we need both pesukim.

- **Q:** The Braisa mentioned above said that the words "min habeheima" teach to exclude a "person who is like an animal" in that he does not keep the mitzvos. The Gemara now asks, we find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** darshens the word "beheima" elsewhere to refer to a person with superior qualities!?
- A:** The pasuk darshened by **Rav** says "adam ubeheima", whereas the pasuk darshened in the Braisa says only "beheima".
 - **Q:** A pasuk says "zerah adam v'zerah beheima" and yet darshens this in an inferior way to refer to ahm haraatzim!?
 - A:** The words "adam" and "beheima" are separated there.
- **R' Chanan in the name of R' Yaakov bar Idi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, **R' Gamliel** and his Beis Din voted and paskened that the shechita of a Kuti is assur. **R' Zeira** asked **R' Yaakov bar Idi**, maybe you heard that they paskened this way only when there was no Yid who was there during the shechita? **R' Yaakov bar Idi** said, if there was no Yid standing there, there would be no need to pasken that the shechita is assur (rather, it must be that they paskened this way even when there was a Yid who was there).
 - **Q:** Did **R' Zeira** accept this or not? **A:** We find that **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak in the name of R' Assi** said, that he saw **R' Yochanan and R' Assi** each eat from the shechita of a Kuti. **R' Zeira** wondered whether they knew of the decision of **R' Gamliel's** Beis Din and disagreed with it or just never knew of it. **R' Zeira** then said, it must be that they knew of it and disagreed, because if we say that they didn't know, but would have agreed had they known, that would mean that they inadvertently ate assur meat. We find that Hashem protects even the animals of tzaddikim so that they don't eat assur things, so surely Hashem would have not allowed these great tzaddikim to eat assur meat. Therefore, it must be that they knew about it and disagreed, which is why they held that it was not assur meat. Now, if **R' Zeira** did not accept what **R' Yaakov bar Idi** said, he could have answered that **R' Yochanan and R' Assi** ate from a shechita that was watched by a Yid, whereas the psak of the Beis Din was for a shechita that was not watched by a Yid. From the fact that he didn't answer this, it must be that he did accept what **R' Yaakov bar Idi** said.