

Chullin – Simanim

פרק ב – השוחט

דף לט – Daf 39

1. *Machlokes* if מעבודה לעבודה

Amoraim discuss: if one *shechts* an animal with intent לעבודת כוכבים – *to throw its blood for idolatry*, or *to burn its fats for idolatry*, Rebbe Yochanan says the animal is forbidden in benefit as an idolatrous sacrifice, because מעבודה לעבודה – *one is able to have intent from one avodah to another avodah* for idolatry, by deriving חוץ מבפנים – “outside” sacrifices (i.e., idolatry) from “inside” sacrifices (i.e., *korbanos* inside the Mikdash), where a *korban shechted* with the intent to perform זריקה the next day immediately becomes חוץ מבפנים. Reish Lakish said the animal is permitted, because he holds מעבודה לעבודה, and does not derive חוץ מבפנים. They argue similarly where one *shechted* a *korban [chatas]* לשמה – *for its own sake* with intent to perform *zerikah* לשמה – *not for its own sake*. Rebbe Yochanan says the *korban* is פסול, because מעבודה לעבודה – *one is able to have intent from one avodah to another avodah*, which we derive from חוץ מבפנים. Reish Lakish says the *korban* remains valid, because his intent during one *avodah* about another does not impact the *korban*, and we do not derive otherwise from חוץ מבפנים.

2. *Machlokes* if הוכיח סופו על תחילתו where one declared idolatrous intent after *shechting*

A Baraisa teaches regarding one who *shechted* an animal, ואח"כ חיישב עליה – *and afterwards* declared he *intended* to perform זריקה of its blood or burn its fats *for idolatry*, such an incident occurred in קיסרי ולא אמרו בה לא איסור ולא קיסרי – *and they did not rule on [the animal], neither a permit nor a prohibition*. The question is whether his later idolatrous intent indicates that the original *shechitah* was also for idolatry. Rav Chisda suggests that they did not expressly prohibit it משום כבוד דרבנן – *out of respect for the Rabbonon* of our Mishnah, who hold we do not assume an idolator's intent is always for idolatry, and they did not expressly permit it out of respect for Rebbe Eliezer, who holds we do assume an idolator's intent is for idolatry. However, the Gemara rejects the comparison: the Rabbonon only permitted a case where we never heard idolatrous intent from the idolator, but here, where the Yisroel declared idolatrous intent, הוכיח סופו על תחילתו – *his ultimate [intent] indicates his original [intent]*. On the other hand, Rebbe Eliezer only prohibited the case of a gentile idolator, but regarding a Yisroel, perhaps we do not say his later intent proves his original intent was for idolatry.

3. *Machlokes* about one who later protests against receiving a gift

Ravina ultimately explains that they did not expressly permit the above case out of respect for Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who holds הוכיח סופו על תחילתו: if one writes all his assets (including slaves) to someone, and the recipient said: אי אפשי בהן – *“I do not want them,”* the Tanna Kamma says that if the recipient is a Kohen, the slaves may eat *terumah* (because the gift took effect). Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says his protest voids the gift, and the first owner's heirs inherit the slaves. The Gemara clarifies: בצווח מעיקרא – *if he protested from the beginning*, all agree the gift is void. בשותק ולבסוף צווח – *Where he was initially silent, and later protested*, all agree the gift is valid (and he merely changed his mind). They argue שדיכה לו על ידי אחר – *where he transferred it to him through another person* (who acquired it on his behalf), and the recipient was initially silent and later protested. The Tanna Kamma holds his initial silence proves he wanted it. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel holds: הוכיח סופו על תחילתו – *his eventual [protest] proves the intent of his initial [silence]*. He never wanted it, and was initially silent because he reasoned: כי לא אתי – *as long as they did not come into my hands, why should I protest?*

Siman - Letter (Mailman)

The **mailman**, who used his **letter opener** to *shecht* an animal while thinking that he would do *zerikah* in front of עבודה זרה on his mail route, and the **mailman** who used his **letter opener** to *shecht* an animal and afterwards declared his intent to do *zerikah* in front of עבודה זרה, watched as their colleague delivered a letter gifting all of his friend's possessions through a third party to someone who waited a bit then yelled that he does not accept it.



The **mailman**, who used his **letter opener** to **shecht** an animal while thinking that he would do **zerikah** in front of **עבודה זרה** on his mail route, and the **mailman** who used his **letter opener** to **shecht** an animal and afterwards declared his intent to do **zerikah** in front of **עבודה זרה**, watched as their colleague delivered a letter gifting all of his friend's possessions through a third party to someone who waited a bit then yelled that he does not accept it.

3 things to remember

1. **Machlokes** if **מחשבין מעבודה לעבודה**
2. **Machlokes** if **הוכיח סופו על תחילתו** where one declared idolatrous intent after **shechting**
3. **Machlokes** about one who later protests against receiving a gift

