



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

Chullin Daf Yud Beis

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rav** said, if someone saw a person shecht, if he saw him from beginning to end of the shechita he may eat from the shechita. If not, it is assur to eat from the shechita.
 - **Q:** What is the case? If the shochet is known to know the halachos, why does someone have to watch him at all? If he is known not to know the halachos, this it is obvious that the shechita must be watched!? If the case is that we don't know whether the shochet knows the halachos, then why don't we rely on the fact that most people who shecht are mumchin!? We see this in a Braisa which says that if a person found a shechted chicken or told a shaliach to shecht a chicken for him and then found the chicken shechted, he may presume that it is properly shechted, because we say that most people who shecht are mumchin. The same should be said here!? **A:** The case is actually that the shochet was known not to know the halachos, and he shechted one of the simanim in front of us and did so properly, and then shechted the other siman. We would think that since he shechted the first properly he must have shechted the second properly as well. **Rav** therefore teaches that it may be that he happened to shecht the first one properly, but during the second one he may have paused or pressed down during the shechita.
- **R' Dimi bar Yosef** asked **R' Nachman**, what is the halacha if someone tells a shaliach to go and shecht an animal for him, and the person then found the animal to have been shechted? **R' Nachman** said, it is presumed to have been properly shechted. **R' Dimi** then asked, what is the halacha if someone tells a shaliach to go and separate terumah for him, and the person then found that terumah was separated? **R' Nachman** said, we cannot presume that the terumah was properly separated. **R' Dimi** asked, if there is a chazaka that a shaliach does what he was told to do, then even the terumah should be presumed to have been properly separated, and if there is no such chazaka, then even the shechita should not be presumed to be a valid shechita!? **R' Nachman** said, there is no such chazaka. However, regarding shechita even if it was someone other than the shaliach who did the shechita, we say that most people who shecht are mumchin and it is therefore valid. Regarding terumah we must be concerned that someone other than the shaliach separated the terumah and the halacha is that if terumah was separated without knowledge of the owner it is not a valid separation of terumah.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that whether we say that most people who shecht are mumchin, is a subject of machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if a person lost goats or chickens and found them shechted, **R' Yehuda** says they are assur and **R' Chanina the son of R' Yose Haglili** says they are mutar. **Rebbi** said, I agree with **R' Yehuda** when they are found in the garbage pile and I agree with **R' Chanina** when they are found in the house. Maybe we can say that **R' Chanina** holds that we say that most people who shecht are mumchin and **R' Yehuda** says that we don't say that? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it may be that all agree that we do say that most who shecht are mumchin. It may be that all would agree that when they are found in the house they are mutar, and all agree that when they are found in the garbage pile in the market they are assur. The machlokes is regarding when they are found in the garbage of the house – **R' Yehuda** holds that people throw their neveilos into the garbage of the house, and **R' Chanina** says that people do not.
 - **Q:** **Rebbi** said that he agrees with the view of **R' Yehuda** when the animals are found in the garbage pile. What type of garbage pile does he mean? If he is referring to the garbage in the market, we have just said that all would agree in that case that the animals are assur!? You must say that he is referring to the

garbage in the house. However, **Rebbi** then says that he agrees with the view of **R' Chanina** when it is found in the house. This can't refer to when it is found in the actual house, because we said that everyone agrees that in that case the animals are mutar. Rather, he must be referring to the garbage in the house. Based on this there is a contradiction between **Rebbi's** first statement and his second statement!? **A: Rebbi** meant to say that **R' Yehuda's** view is agreed to by **R' Chanina** when the animals are found in the garbage of the marketplace, because **R' Chanina** only argues when they are found in the garbage of the house.

CHUTZ MAICHEIREISH SHOTEH V'KATAN SHEMA YEKALKILU ES SHECHITASAN

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna use future tense instead of past tense? **A: Rava** said, this teaches that we don't give even chullin to them to shecht l'chatchila, even when someone will be watching the shechita.

V'KULAN SHESHACTU VA'ACHEIRIM RO'IM OSAM SHECHITASAN KISHEIRA

- **Q:** These people don't have the capacity to have intent, which means the Mishna holds that there is no intent that is needed for shechita. Who is the Tanna who holds this way? **A: Rava** said it is **R' Nosson**, as we find that **Oshaya** taught that if one threw a knife to stick it in the wall and on its way it properly shechted an animal, **R' Nosson** says it would be valid and the **Chachomim** say it is passul. **Oshaya** then paskened like **R' Nosson**.
 - **Q:** One must move the knife back and forth for a shechita to be valid!? **A:** The case is, that after cutting the simanim it bounced off the wall and cut the simanim again in the reverse direction. Therefore, there was a back and forth.