



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

Chullin Daf Ayin Beis

- **Q:** The Gemara quoted the ruling of **Rabbah** that just as a tamei thing that is swallowed up (is completely enveloped in something) does not give off tumah, so too a tahor item that is swallowed up also does not become tamei from other things. **Rava** asked, both of these rulings are already taught in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if a Kohen swallowed a tamei ring he may go to the mikvah and eat terumah even though the tamei ring is still inside him. If he later expelled it, the ring is still tamei and makes the Kohen tamei. From here we see that a tamei thing that is swallowed up does not give off tumah. The Mishna also says, if someone swallowed a tahor ring and went into a room in which there was a meis, and he then went through the tahara process for becoming tamei meis and then expelled the ring, the ring remains tahor as it was all along. From here we see that a tahor item that is swallowed up also does not become tamei from other things. Since these concepts are taught in the Mishna, why did **Rabbah** have to teach them to us? **A: Rabbah** was teaching regarding a case where a person swallowed two rings – one that was tamei and one that was tahor. **Rabbah** teaches, that since they are both enveloped within the person, the tamei ring does not make the tahor ring to become tamei.
 - **Q:** The case in our Mishna of the fetus and the midwife is like a case of two rings being enveloped in the same person, and yet the Mishna says that the fetus makes the midwife tamei!? **A: Rabbah** said, the case of the Mishna is different, because the fetus is destined to come out and is therefore not considered to be totally enveloped in the person.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, the rings are also destined to come out of the person and yet they are considered to be fully enveloped!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said that **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the midwife becomes tamei not D'Oraisa, only D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** Why didn't he simply say that she is only tamei D'Rabanan? **A: R' Yosef** meant to teach, that you should not say that she is only tamei according to **R' Akiva**, who holds that the fetus in the womb gives off tumah even D'Oraisa. Rather, it even follows **R' Yishmael** who says the fetus is tahor, because the midwife becomes tamei only D'Rabanan.
 - **R' Hoshaya** explained, the reason for the gezeira is that we are concerned that the baby will have stuck out its head from the birth canal, in which case it is legally born and therefore gives off tumah D'Oraisa, and the midwife will not realize this and will think that she is not tamei for having touched the baby. Therefore, the **Rabanan** were goizer that it always gives off tumah.
 - **Q:** If so, we should say that the woman giving birth should become tamei meis as soon as the fetus dies (even while still in the womb) for the same gezeira!? **A:** A woman knows when the baby has emerged.
 - **Q:** Why can't she tell the midwife and obviate the need for the gezeira? **A:** She is preoccupied with her labor pains and won't tell her.
- **Q:** What is the machokes between **R' Akiva** and **R' Yishmael** referred to above? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'chol asher yigah ahl pnei hasadeh". **R' Yishmael** says that this comes to exclude a dead fetus in the womb from giving off tumas meis. **R' Akiva** says that this comes to include the cover and wall of a coffin as giving off tumah.

- **R' Yishmael** says that this halacha of **R' Akiva** is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, so the pasuk is not needed for that. **R' Akiva** says a dead fetus in a womb does give off tumah.
 - **R' Oshaya** said, **R' Akiva** learns this from the pasuk of "hanogeya b'meis b'nefesh" – this refers to the fetus in the woman, and teaches that it gives off tumah. **R' Yishmael** uses this pasuk to teach that a revi'is of blood of a single meis gives off tumah as well. **R' Akiva** doesn't agree with this, because he darshens another pasuk to teach that even a revi'is of blood that came from two different meisim gives off tumah.

MISHNA

- If an animal is having a difficult labor, and the fetus sticks a leg out of the womb and a person cut it off, and the mother is then shechted, the rest of the flesh of the fetus remains tahor. If the mother was first shechted and the leg was then cut off, **R' Meir** says the flesh of the fetus that was attached to this leg becomes tamei for having touched a neveila. The **Chachomim** say the flesh is only tamei for having touched a treifa that was shechted – just as when a treifa is shechted the shechita makes it tahor from becoming a neveila, so too the shechita of the mother makes the leg tahor from becoming a neveila. **R' Meir** said to them, the shechita of a treifa is different in that it is making *itself* tahor, whereas this is different in that it is the shechita of the mother and the leg of the fetus!
- How do we know that the shechita of a treifa prevents it from becoming tamei as a neveila? In fact, we should say that a non-kosher animal is assur to be eaten and a treifa is assur to be eaten – just as the shechita of a non-kosher animal doesn't prevent it from becoming tamei as a neveila, the shechita of a treifa should also not prevent it from becoming tamei as a neveila!? The cases are very different, because a non-kosher animal never had a time when it was fit for shechita, whereas a treifa did. The Mishna asks, what will you say regarding an animal that was born as a treifa (why does the shechita help in that case)? Rather, the reason a non-kosher animal is different than a treifa is that a non-kosher animal has no animal of its kind that is fit for shechita, whereas a treifa does (and that is why shechita can prevent a treifa from becoming tamei as a neveila). The one exception will be a kosher animal's fetus born in its 8th month (less than full term). Shechita of this fetus will not prevent it from becoming tamei as a neveila, because there is no animal of its kind that is fit for shechita.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does the flesh become tamei from having touched the severed leg? They only touch under the skin, which is a concealed place, and the halacha is that tumah does not make other things tamei when it is in a concealed place!? Must we say that **R' Meir and the Rabanan** of our Mishna follow the view of **R' Meir** (who argues with **R' Yose**) elsewhere, where he says that things can become tamei even when in a concealed place? **A:** **Ulla** explained there that **R' Yose** would agree that as things are being separated from each they would be able to become tamei from each other, because at the moment of separation they are no longer concealed, but they are still touching. The same can be said regarding the leg and the flesh of the animal in our Mishna. Therefore, all would agree that it can become tamei through contact with the leg.
 - **Ravina** said, the machlokes between **R' Meir and R' Yose** was regarding a garment that was ripped into two. In that case, since a garment does not stand to be cut it is considered to be concealed until after it is cut. In our case, the leg stands to be severed. Therefore, even before it is cut it is already considered to be cut and is therefore not considered to be concealed.
 - **Q:** This seems to only follow **R' Meir**, who says that the extra long handle of a keili that will be cut off is already considered to be cut off and need not be toiveled in a mikvah if the keili becomes tamei. **R' Yehuda** argues and says that it is not considered to be cut off even though it stands to be cut off. **Ravina's** answer seems to only follow **R' Meir**!? **A:** With regard to food even **R' Yehuda** would agree, that if it stands to be cut it is already considered to be cut.
 - **Q:** According to **Ulla** it makes sense why the Mishna says that after the shechita the leg was cut off (it is only then that it makes the animal's flesh tamei).

However, according to **Ravina** even if it was not actually cut off it makes it tamei, so why does the Mishna have to say that it was actually cut off? **A:** Since the Mishna's first case discusses a case where the leg was actually cut off, this case of the Mishna does that as well.