



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

Chullin Daf Ayin

- **Q: Rava** asked, do we follow the concept of majority with regard to limbs or not?
 - **Q:** What is the case of the question? It can't be where a majority of an animal emerged from the womb but it is only a majority when it includes a limb which less than majority had emerged, and **Rava's** question is whether we consider that limb to follow its majority and is therefore not considered to have emerged, with the result that the entire animal is not considered to be born (because less than a majority has emerged), because it is certain that we would not ignore the majority of the animal and instead only take into account the majority of the limb!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** is asking about a case where exactly half of the animal has emerged, but that half consists of a majority of a limb of which a minority has still not yet emerged. The question is, do we say that since the majority of that limb has emerged it is considered as if the entire limb has emerged and therefore we now have a majority of the animal that has emerged and the animal is therefore considered to be born, or not.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer **Rava's** question from our Mishna, which said that if the majority of the bechor has emerged, it must be buried. "Majority" can't refer to a simple majority, in which case the Mishna would be teaching that the emergence of a majority is when an animal is considered to be born, because we already know the concept of "rubo kikulo", so there would be no reason to teach that here! Rather, it must be that the case is where exactly half of the animal emerged and that half includes the majority of a particular limb, and we see that the Mishna says the animal is considered to be born!? **A:** The Mishna's case may be where a majority of the animal had emerged, and that majority includes a minority of a particular limb, and the Mishna is teaching that we still look at the entirety of the animal and not of a particular limb (and therefore a majority of the animal has emerged and the animal is considered to be born).
- **Q: Rava** asked, what is the halacha if a person wrapped the bechor fetus in fibers before it left the womb (so that it never touched the walls of the womb when it was born) – would it still have kedushas bechor or not? What if he wrapped it in a garment? What if he wrapped it in its amniotic sac? [The Gemara asks, it is normal for it to be in its amniotic sac, so that certainly would not be a chatzitza!? The Gemara says, the question was where he wrapped it in the amniotic sac of another fetus.] What if the person assisting the birth wrapped the fetus in her hands and in that way pulled it out of the womb? [The Gemara says, the case can't be where the head emerged and the rest of the body was then wrapped in one of these ways, because the emergence of the head alone would give this fetus the kedusha of a bechor. Rather, the case is where the fetus was breached and emerged with its feet first, and the rest of the body was then wrapped in one of these ways before it emerged.] What if a weasel put its mouth into the womb, swallowed the fetus, pulled out of the womb, and then spit it out outside the womb? [The Gemara asks, how is this different than any of the other questions posed so far? Rather, the case is, that after pulling it out of the womb the weasel stuck its mouth back into the womb and spit the fetus back into the womb, and the fetus was then born naturally.] What if a person put the openings of two wombs against each other and the fetus exited its womb and entered the other womb – do we say that if its mother has another offspring it will not be a bechor but if the second animal (which had never had offspring) has offspring it will become a bechor (because this fetus that came from another animal cannot make it patur from bechor even though it has already technically been the first animal to exit its womb) or do we say that it even makes this second animal patur from having a bechor in the future? On all these questions the Gemara says **TEIKU**.

- **Q: R' Acha** asked, what if the walls of the womb opened wide to the point that the fetus did not even touch them as it exited? Do we say that the airspace of the womb makes it a bechor or is it only the actual touching of the walls of the womb that make it a bechor?
 - **Q: Mar bar R' Ashi** asked, what if the walls of the womb were totally removed before the birth?
 - **Q:** If they were totally removed there is certainly no way for the fetus to have become kadosh as a bechor!? **A:** Rather, the case is where the walls of the womb were removed and the fetus emerged with the walls of the womb around its neck – do we say that the womb walls only give kedushas bechor when they are in their proper place, but not when they are somewhere else, or not?
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, what if the inner layer of the walls of the womb were peeled off? **A: R' Zeira** said, you have touched upon a question that we have asked as well. We find that **R' Zeira** asked (to **R' Assi**), what if a majority of the womb walls are present, but some is missing and the fetus emerged via the missing part, or if the majority is missing and the fetus emerged via the part that is not missing? We see that the question is only in a case where at least part of the wall continues to be intact. This suggests that if the entire inside was peeled away it would not even be a question and the fetus would not get kedushas bechor. From this we can answer **R' Yirmiya's** question.

MISHNA

- If a fetus died inside the womb, and the shepherd stuck his hand into the womb and touched the dead fetus, whether it is a kosher or a non-kosher animal, the shepherd remains tahor (the fetus in the womb does not give off tumah of a neveila). **R' Yose Haglili** said, if the animal is a non-kosher animal the shepherd is tamei, if it is a kosher animal he is not tamei.

GEMARA

- **R' Chisda** explains the logic of the **T"K** as being based on a kal v'chomer – if the mother can make this fetus mutar to be eaten (with her shechita), she should surely prevent the fetus from becoming tamei as a neveila (with her being alive)!
 - **Q:** This kal v'chomer is appropriate for a kosher animal (only in that case does the mother's shechita make the fetus mutar). Why does the **T"K** say that even a non-kosher animal's fetus is not tamei? **A:** The pasuk says "v'chi yamus min habeheima" – which refers to a non-kosher animal, "asher hee lachem l'achla" – which refers to a kosher animal. This creates a hekesh from a non-kosher animal to a kosher animal regarding the halachos of neveila. This hekesh teaches, that just as the fetus of a kosher animal does not become tamei if it is dead in the womb, the same is true for the fetus of a non-kosher animal.
- **R' Yitzchak** explains the logic of **R' Yose Haglili** as being based on a drasha of the pasuk. The pasuk regarding the tumas neveila of a non-kosher animal says "v'chol holeich ahl kapav b'chol hachaya haholeches...". This teaches that even the "animal within the animal" (i.e. a dead fetus of a non-kosher animal) is tamei as neveila.
 - **Q:** Based on this we should say that a fetus that does not have split hooves that is in a cow, and the fetus dies in the womb, it should give off tumas neveila (it is "holeich ahl kapav" – which means it does not have split hooves)!? **A:** The pasuk continues and says it refers to an animal that "walks on 4 hooves" (i.e. it does not have split hooves). This teaches that it refers to a fetus in an animal where the mother also doesn't have split hooves. That is the only time that the fetus gives off tumas neveila.
 - **Q:** Based on this, if a fetus inside a camel has split hooves it should not give off tumas neveila (since the fetus has split hooves)!? **A:** The extra word of "v'chol holeich" teaches to include such a fetus as giving off tumas neveila.
 - **Q:** Based on this, if a kosher animal happens not to have split hooves (it is a cow with this physical defect) and its fetus is like it in this way, if the fetus dies in the womb it should become tamei with tumas neveila!? **A: R' Chisda's** kal v'chomer is effective in teaching that it would not become tamei.
 - **Q: R' Achdevoy bar Ami** asked, the fetus of a pig that died in its mother should not give off tumas neveila, because it is a fetus with split hooves in a mother with split hooves!?

A: Rather, **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the pasuk regarding tumas neveila says that a person who touches the neveila of "beheima tamei'ah" becomes tamei. Now, this is not accurate, because even touching the neveila of a kosher animal makes a person tamei!? Rather, this pasuk is referring to a dead fetus, and teaches that only the dead fetus of a non-kosher animal gives off tumas neveila, not the fetus of a kosher animal.

- **Q:** Once we have this drasha, what is the drasha of **R' Yitzchak** used for? **A:** If not for **R' Yitzchak's** drasha we would have darshened this pasuk in a different way, as **Rebbi** does (later in the Gemara).