

## Chullin 81

R' Mordechai Torczyner – torczyner@torontotorah.com

81a

Gemara: Continuing **שחיטה שאינה ראויה** and **אותו ואת בנו**

- Rav Hemnuna: R' Shimon won't accept **אותו ואת בנו** for kodashim, since it's not shechitah
  - But in a discussion<sup>1</sup> about R' Shimon's position, he maintained that where the first is kodashim inside and the second is kodashim outside, the second does not have **כרת**!

	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Outside, Outside A	Kareit (chutz)	Lo Taaseh (chutz)
Outside, Outside B	Kareit (chutz)	Kareit (chutz)
Outside, Inside	Kareit (chutz)	Kosher
Inside, Outside	Kosher	<u>Lo Taaseh</u>

- Rava: Rav Hemnuna says R' Shimon retains the prohibition, just not the lashes
  - It's a doubtful warning:<sup>2</sup> During the **שחיטה** we don't know that **זריקה** will be done properly
- Similarly, Rava says that where 1<sup>st</sup> is chullin and 2<sup>nd</sup> is shelamim there are no lashes.
- (81b) And where one is an olah he is patur regardless of order – people don't eat it
  - R' Yochanan says it is **אכילה**<sup>3</sup>

Mishnah: **שחיטה שאינה ראויה**

- Shechitah of an animal that isn't edible isn't **שחיטה** per R' Shimon - Tereifah, avodah zarah, parah adumah, shor haniskal, eglah arufah
- All agree that one is exempt from **אותו ואת בנו**<sup>4</sup> if the shechitah is wrecked

Gemara: Kim leih b'd'rabbah mineih - **אותו ואת בנו** with other violations

- Reish Lakish 1 – If second is for avodah zarah then he's exempt for **אותו ואת בנו**<sup>5</sup>
  - R' Yochanan – That's obvious!
- If second is for avodah zarah, and warning was only for **אותו ואת בנו**, then:
  - R' Yochanan – Malkos for **אותו ואת בנו**, since there is no avodah zarah penalty
  - Reish Lakish – No malkos; had they warned for avodah zarah there would have been no malkos
  - They follow their views expressed regarding shogigin for death/lashes who also owe \$

Gemara: Why is parah adumah an inappropriate **שחיטה**?

- R' Shimon believes it may be redeemed and consumed, so that it even has tumat ochlin!<sup>6</sup>
- You're right; remove it from the mishnah

<sup>1</sup> Which we don't have, but don't let that bother you (Ramban)

<sup>2</sup> Rashi: But even if he does zerikah properly, the animal is still unfit!

<sup>3</sup> It is still food as far as tumat ochlin, though (Tosafot)

<sup>4</sup> But liable for other things (R' Akiva Eiger)

<sup>5</sup> Why isn't he a mumar, so that the shechitah is invalid? (Yosef Daas, from Ran 14a)

<sup>6</sup> Doesn't it have its own impurity anyway? (Rashi, Tosafot)