



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

Chullin Daf Samach Ches

PEREK BEHEIMA HAMEKASHEH -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- If an animal was having a difficult labor and the fetus stuck a leg out of the mother and then brought it back in, and the mother was then shechted (with the fetus still inside), it may be eaten. If it had stuck out its head, even if it brought it back in before the shechita, it is considered to have been born and it does not become mutar through the shechita of the mother.
- If one sticks his hand inside the mother, cuts off a piece of the fetus and leaves it inside the mother and then shechts the mother, the piece that was cut off becomes mutar to eat. However, if one cuts off a piece from the mother's spleen or kidney and leaves it inside the mother and then shechts her, the cut off pieces are assur to eat.
- The general rule is, something that is part of the animal's body that is cut off and found inside is assur, but something that is not from its body (i.e. a fetus) that is found inside is mutar.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, in a case like that in the beginning of the Mishna, where the fetus draws the leg back inside, the rest of the fetus is mutar, but that leg that was stuck out is assur (even though it was back inside for the shechita). This is based on the pasuk of "ubasar basadeh treifa lo socheilu", which teaches that once meat goes beyond its boundaries, it becomes assur.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna in the first case said "it is mutar", which seems to be referring to the leg that was stuck out!? **A:** "It" is referring to the fetus.
 - **Q:** If it refers only to the fetus, why does the Mishna mention that the leg was drawn back inside the mother? Even if it wasn't drawn back in, the rest of the fetus would be mutar!? **A:** There is no reason to mention that it drew it back inside. The Mishna only mentions that, because it wants to mention that in the second case, where it stuck out its head, it is assur *even if* it drew it back in before the shechita.
 - **Q:** Is the second part of the Mishna really the main part that the rest is based on? It seems to be teaching that a fetus is considered to be born when it sticks its head out. That is something that is already taught regarding a human fetus for purposes of bechor!? You can't say that it needed to teach this again regarding an animal, because we would have thought that an animal and a human are treated differently for this purpose (if we would only teach this regarding an animal we would say that for an animal emergence of the head is considered birth, because emergence puts it in plain view, whereas by a human emergence is still not in view, because of the mother's legs, and if we would only teach this regarding a human we would say that this is so because the face of a human is its most defining feature, but this may not be true regarding an animal), because another Mishna teaches that a human and an animal are treated the same regarding this!? Now, if we say that in the first case the Mishna gives the case that it drew its leg back in because when it does so even the leg becomes mutar, we can say that the second case of the Mishna is given just to contrast the first case (the Mishna wanted to give a case where even when the thing that was stuck out is drawn back in the fetus is still assur). However, if the mention of drawing the leg back in teaches nothing in the first

case, and the second case is something that we could have learned from other Mishnayos, then why was the drawing back in of the leg even mentioned!? **A:** In truth, the leg does not become mutar when it is drawn back in, and it is only the rest of the fetus that is mutar. The reason the Mishna gives the case that the leg is drawn back in, is as **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, that if the leg is drawn back in, the place of the leg that is at the opening of the womb becomes mutar with the mother's shechita (if it is not drawn back in that place is assur).

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if an animal was having a difficult labor and the fetus stuck a leg out of the mother and then brought it back in, and the mother was then shechted (with the fetus still inside), it may be eaten. If the mother was first shechted and then the fetus drew its leg back inside, it is assur. If it stuck out its leg and the person cut it off and then shechted the mother, that which is outside (the severed leg) is tamei (as eiver min hachai) and assur and that which is inside (the fetus) is tahor and mutar. If he first shechted the mother and then cut off the leg that is stuck outside, **R' Meir** says the flesh of the fetus and the mother is tamei for having touched neveila (eiver min hachai has tumah like a neveila), but the **Chachomim** say the flesh is tamei only for having touched a treifa that was shechted. Now, presumably when the Braisa's first case says that "it is mutar" it is referring to the leg that was stuck out and drawn back in!? **A:** It is referring to the fetus.
 - **Q:** If it refers to the fetus, how do we explain the next case of the Braisa which says that if the mother was first shechted and then the fetus drew its leg back inside, it is assur. If "it" refers to the fetus, why would the fetus be assur in this case? **A:** It is as **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, that this is needed to teach regarding the place of the cut itself (the place at the opening of the womb) – if the leg is drawn back in, the place of the leg that is at the opening of the womb becomes mutar with the mother's shechita (if it is not drawn back in, that place is assur).
- **Q:** When **Avimi** came from Bei Chuzai he taught a Braisa that said, a hoof that was drawn back in may be eaten, and hooves that were drawn back in may be eaten. This seems to mean that if the hoof was drawn back in, the hoof itself may be eaten!? **A:** It means that if the hoof is drawn back in the fetus may be eaten.
 - **Q:** If it refers to the fetus, why is it only mutar when the hoof is drawn back in? Even if it was not drawn back in it should be mutar!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, that this is needed to teach regarding the place of the cut itself (the place at the opening of the womb) – if the leg is drawn back in, the place of the leg that is at the opening of the womb becomes mutar with the mother's shechita (if it is not drawn back in that place is assur).
 - **Q:** The Braisa makes two drashos – one on "hoof" and one on "hooves" – and they can't both be teaching the same thing!? Presumably, we must say that one teaches regarding the place of the cut and the other teaches regarding the leg itself, to teach that it is mutar!? **A:** One teaches regarding the place of the cut and the other teaches regarding a fetus that does not have split hooves where the mother does have split hooves, and follows the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that such an animal is assur if it is born, but is mutar if it was in the mother when the mother was shechted.
- **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** (argues on **Rav** and) says, if the leg is drawn back in before the shechita, the leg is mutar as well.
 - **R' Yehuda** asked **Ulla**, we find that **Rav** and **Shmuel** both say that the leg would be assur!? **Ulla** said, we find that **R' Yochanan** said, all things are included in the pasuk of "ubasar basadeh treifa lo socheilu". The pasuk then goes on and says that a chatas that left its boundary and then went back in remains assur. This teaches that only a chatas that left its boundaries and went back in is assur, but other cases that left and went back in would be mutar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, what does the pasuk of "ubasar basadeh treifa lo socheilu" teach? We would think that since we find regarding maaser sheini and bikkurim that left their boundary and then came back in, that they are mutar, we would think that the same

should be for meat as well (e.g. the same should be for the leg of a fetus that was stuck out of the womb and was then returned before the mother's shechita). The pasuk therefore says "treifa" – which **Rabbah** explains that it teaches that it is like a treifa – just as a treifa can never become mutar again, the same is true regarding meat that left its boundary. This refutes **Ulla**! The Gemara says **TEYUFTA**.

- **Q:** Where do we find regarding maaser sheini and bikkurim that left their boundary and then came back in, that they are mutar? **A:** The pasuk says, "lo suchal lechol bisharecha maasar digancha...", which teaches that they may not be eaten "in your cities", but if they left and came back to Yerushalayim, they may still be eaten.
- In EY they taught the machlokes as follows: **Rav** says there is birth for individual limbs (and therefore the leg is considered to be born and can't be included in the mother's shechita) and **R' Yochanan** says there is no birth for individual limbs (and therefore, as long as it is in the mother during the shechita it becomes mutar with that shechita).
 - **Q:** What is the difference between this version of the machlokes and the previous version? **A:** The difference would be regarding the minority of the leg that did not leave the mother, according to **Rav**. According to the first version it remains mutar. According to this second version, it is considered to be born along with the majority of the leg and is therefore assur.
 - **Q:** According to the view that there is no birth for individual limbs, what is the halacha if the fetus sticks out one leg and draws it back in, and then continues to do so for other limbs, to the point that it adds up to most of the fetus having been stuck out at one point (although not at the same time)? Do we say that the majority of the animal has left the womb and it is therefore considered to have been born, or do we say that since each time it drew it back in, it is not considered to be born? **Q2:** If you say that it is not considered to be born in this case, what if as each limb was stuck out the person cut it off (so it was never drawn back in) until the majority of the animal was cut off? Do we say that a majority has definitely been born and therefore even the minority inside is considered to be born, or do we say that the majority must come out of the womb at one time in order for it to be considered as born? **A:** Our Mishna said, the general rule is, something that is part of the animal's body that is cut off and found inside is assur, but something that is not from its body (i.e. a fetus) that is found inside is mutar. Presumably it means to include the case that is the subject of this question, and we see that what remains inside is mutar.
 - The Gemara says, this is not what the "general rule" means to include. Rather, it means to include the case of a fetus that does not have split hooves but the mother does have split hooves, according to the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that such an animal is assur only if it is born, but is mutar if was in the mother when the mother was shechted.