



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

### Chullin Daf Kuf Yud Ches

- A Mishna says, anything that is attached to food and is a “yad” but is not a “shomer”, makes the food tamei if it becomes tamei, can give off tumah if the food is tamei, but does not combine with the food for the minimum required measurement for food tumah. Anything that is attached to food and is a shomer, even if it is not a yad, it makes the food tamei if it becomes tamei, can give off tumah if the food is tamei, and combines with the food for the minimum required measurement for food tumah. Anything that is attached to food and is not a “yad” or a “shomer”, does not make the food tamei if it becomes tamei, does not give off tumah if the food is tamei, and does not combine with the food for the minimum required measurement for food tumah.
  - **Q:** Where is the halacha of a yad written in the Torah? **A:** The pasuk that talks about food becoming tamei says “lachem”, which teaches that it applies to any part of the food that is necessary for us, and comes to include the ability for a yad to acquire tumah for the food. The pasuk regarding neveila also says the word “lachem”, which teaches that any part of the food that is necessary for us, which includes yados, can also give off tumah.
    - Once we know these halachos for yados we can learn that a shomer acquires tumah and gives off tumah of the food based on a kal v'chomer from yados – if yados, which don't protect the food, acquire and give off tumah of the food, then a shomer, which does protect the food will certainly do so as well. If so, when the pasuk teaches that a shomer is subject to tumah, it must be teaching that the shomer even combines with the food for the minimum required size.
    - **Q:** Maybe we should say that a yad can only acquire tumah, but not give off tumah (the pasuk from which this was learned was a pasuk regarding neveila, which we can say is different), and then say that a shomer can acquire and give off tumah, but does not combine for the minimum required size? **A:** It is a bigger chiddush for a yad to be able to acquire tumah for something that is not tamei, than for it to give off tumah from something that is already tamei. Therefore, if we say that it acquires tumah we will definitely say that it gives off tumah.
    - **Q:** Maybe say that the pasuk of yad teaches that it can give off tumah, but not that it can acquire it!? **A:** The pasuk regarding an oven says “lachem”, which also comes to include yados. Since this is an extra reference to yad (the halachos of tumah regarding an oven could have been learned from the halachos of food tumah), we can say that one teaches that a yad can acquire tumah and the other teaches that it can give off tumah. The pasuk regarding shomer will then teach that a shomer even combines for the minimum required size.
    - **Q:** Which pasuk of yados is extra? If it would only say the yados regarding food tumah, and not regarding ovens and neveila, we would not be able to learn from food for the others, because food tumah has the chumra that it can even become tamei from a rishon! If it would only say the yados regarding ovens, we would not be able to learn from ovens for the others, because ovens have the chumra that they can even become tamei from tumah being in their airspace! If it would only say the yados regarding neveila, we would not be able to learn from neveila for the others, because neveila has the chumra that it can even make a person tamei, gives off tumah by carrying it, and is a tumah that comes from itself! Clearly we can't learn from one of these 3 to the other two!? Maybe we can learn from 2 and learn the third from them? If the pasuk of food tumah was not written we could not learn it from the other two, because food tumah

is different in that it must first become muchshar likabel tumah! [R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua said, this is not a good argument, because food that is not muchshar is like an oven that has not yet been completed, in which case it also cannot become tamei! Rather, the Gemara says, the reason we cannot learn food from the other two is that the other two can acquire tumah without touching something that is tamei, whereas food must touch it to become tamei.] If the pasuk regarding ovens was not written we could not learn it from the other two, because food and neveila are edible items, whereas an oven is not! **A:** Rather, the pasuk regarding neveila is not needed since it could have been learned from the other two. Since it is not needed to teach yados for neveila, we can say that it teaches regarding yados generally. Therefore, we have a pasuk to teach that yados acquire tumah and a pasuk to teach that yados give off tumah. The pasuk of shomer then teaches that a shomer even combines with the food for the minimum required size.

- **Q:** The pasuk of yados of neveila is not extra! If we learn it from the other two we would say that just as those yados cannot make a person tamei, so too the yad of neveila cannot make a person tamei!? **A:** Rather, it is the pasuk of shomer of neveila that is extra. It is not needed to teach that it combines with the meat for the minimum required size, because we have in fact learned that it does *not* combine! It is not needed to teach that it can give off tumah, because that can be learned through a kal v'chomer with yados. Rather, it is extra. Since it is not needed to teach regarding anything of shomer of neveila we will say that it teaches regarding yados of neveila. Since we don't need it to teach anything regarding yados of neveila we will say that it teaches regarding yados generally. Therefore, we have a pasuk to teach that yados acquire tumah and a pasuk to teach that yados give off tumah. The pasuk of shomer then teaches that a shomer even combines with the food for the minimum required size.
  - **Q:** Maybe instead say that if the pasuk is not needed for shomer of neveila it instead teaches regarding shomer generally, and we therefore are taught that a shomer can acquire tumah and that a shomer can combine for the required size, but a yad can only give off tumah and cannot even acquire tumah!? **A:** The pasuk of yad talks about the *acquiring* of tumah, so that is a given.
  - **Q:** Why do we need the pasuk that discusses the shomer of a neveila? **A:** It must be to teach regarding itself. It is not needed to teach that it combines for the required size, because it in fact does not combine! It is also not needed to teach that it acquires and gives off tumah, because that is learned from a kal v'chomer from yados!? Therefore, we must say that although it can be learned from a kal v'chomer, the pasuk writes it anyway.
    - **Q:** If so, we should also say that the pasuk's mention of shomer teaches that it can acquire tumah, for although that could be learned from a kal v'chomer, maybe the pasuk writes it anyway!? **A:** If we have a drasha to darshen the pasuk we do so, rather than to say that it is written even though it is somewhat unnecessary.
    - **R' Chaviva** said that shomer of neveila must be teaching regarding yados, because it is different than a regular shomer in that it does not combine to make the minimum required size.
- The Gemara earlier said that the halacha of a shomer is learned from a pasuk that discusses tumah of seeds in their shells, since that is how they are planted.
  - **Q: R' Yehuda bar Shmuel** asked, a Mishna says that the "pitam" of a pomegranate combines with the pomegranate to create the minimum required size. Now, a pomegranate is not planted with its pitam, so why does it combine!? Also, our Mishna

says that the skin combines with the meat for food tumah. How is that learned from a pasuk that only discusses edible seeds!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the pasuk uses three similar words – “zera zeiru’ah asher yizareya”. One teaches that a shomer of seeds combines for tumah, one teaches that a shomer of fruits combines for tumah, and one teaches that a shomer of meat, eggs, and fish combines for tumah.

- **R’ Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, there is the halacha of yad for tumah, but there is no halacha of yad for hechsher. **R’ Yochanan** said there is a concept of yad for tumah and for hechsher.
  - **Q:** What is the basis of the machlokes? **A:** We can say that they argue in whether a pasuk is darshened only for the pasuk preceding it or even for the one that is two pesukim before it (the pasuk before talks about tumah and the pasuk two pesukim before talks about hechsher). We can also say that they argue in logic – **R’ Yochanan** holds that hechsher is the beginning of the tumah process (and is therefore part of it) and **Rav** holds that it is not considered the beginning of the tumah process.
  - A Braisa says like **R’ Yochanan**. The Braisa says, just as there is the concept of yad for tumah, there is also the concept of yad for hechsher, and just like something cannot become tamei until after it is removed from the ground, the same is true for hechsher, that it can only take place after it was removed from the ground.
- **Rav** said, there is no concept of yad for food that is less than a kezayis and there is no concept of shomer for less than the size of a bean. **R’ Yochanan** said there is a concept of yad for food that is less than a kezayis and there is a concept of shomer for less than the size of a bean.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there are two human bones and each bone has a half kezayis of flesh on one end, and the empty ends of the bones are stuck into a house, the house becomes tamei with tumas ohel (tumas ohel applies to a kezayis of flesh, not to bare bones). **Yehuda ben Nekusa in the name of R’ Yaakov** said, how can the two bones combine their flesh to a full kezayis? Now, according to **Rav**, if the Braisa is dealing with yad, the **T”K** is problematic, because he says that there is a yad for less than a kezayis, and if the Braisa is dealing with shomer (marrow inside the bone) **Yehuda ben Nekusa** is problematic, because he is saying that there is no shomer for a half of a kezayis, which is larger than a bean!? **A:** **Rav** can say that the Braisa is discussing yad, and he will follow the view of **Yehuda ben Nekusa**, or he can say that it is discussing a shomer and he can hold like the **T”K**. **R’ Yochanan** can say that the entire Braisa is dealing with yad and he holds like the **T”K**.