



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf Daled

- The Gemara had quoted a Mishna that said that to remove the tumah from a tamei oven, one must break the oven into 3 pieces (so that there is no one piece that is a majority).
 - **Q:** Another Mishna says that it loses its tumah as long as none of the broken pieces are 4 tefachim high. This suggests that even if one of them make up the majority of the oven it will not make it remain tamei!? **A:** That Mishna refers to where the oven was split horizontally, whereas the first Mishna refers to where it was split vertically.
 - **Q:** The second Mishna said, with regard to a small oven it may be of any height (which **R' Yannai** explained to mean at least a tefach) and still become tamei, and if a broken piece retains most of the height of the oven, it remains tamei. Now, what is an oven that is only a majority of a tefach fit for? **A: Abaye** said, that part of the Mishna is referring to a large oven (which is spoken about earlier in the Mishna).
 - **Q:** The **Rabanan** said that the piece must be 4 tefachim in order to remain tamei!? **A:** The Mishna that refers to the majority of the height refers to an oven that was 9 tefachim tall, whereas the reference to the piece being 4 tefachim is where the oven was 7 tefachim tall.
- There is another version of the machlokes between **Reish Lakish** and **R' Yochanan** (brought down earlier), which says that **Reish Lakish** says that if a leather garment is ripped but is still attached to the size of a kerchief it is still tamei, because such an amount is considered significant for a leather garment. **R' Yochanan** says that even for a leather garment that would not be significant and the garment would become tahor. **R' Yochanan** then asks from the Mishna that says that a leather garment that is cut down to less than 5 tefachim becomes tahor!? The Gemara answers that the case is that this piece of leather is needed for a seat for a zav, and since it is too small and no longer fit for this use, it is tahor.

MISHNA

- If there is a piece of skin with a kezayis of neveila meat attached to it, if one touches a sliver of meat that comes out of it or a hair that is opposite the meat, he is tamei.
- If there are 2 half kezaysim of meat attached to a skin, **R' Yishmael** says the meat gives off tumah to one who carries it, but not to one who touches it. **R' Akiva** says it doesn't give off tumah at all. However, **R' Akiva** agrees that if someone put two half kezaysim of the meat onto a stick and moves them, he is tamei. If so, why does he say the person is tahor when the two pieces of meat are attached to the skin? It is because he says that the skin is mevatel the pieces of meat.

GEMARA

- **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, this (the first case of the Mishna) is only where this meat was ripped out by another animal (in that case it retains significance as a piece of meat). However, if it was cut out by a person it becomes batel to the skin and would not give off tumas neveila.
 - **R' Nachman** asked **Ulla**, did **R' Yochanan** even say this regarding a piece of meat that is as large as a "tarta"? **Ulla** said, yes. **R' Nachman** asked, what if it was the size of a sifter? **Ulla** said, yes. **R' Nachman** said, even if I would have heard this from **R' Yochanan** himself I would not listen to it, because it can't be that a skin is mevatel such a large piece of meat. When **R' Oshaya** went to EY he met **R' Ami** and repeated this discussion. **R' Ami** said, just because **R' Nachman** is the son in law to the Nasi, does that give him the right to belittle the teaching of **R' Yochanan**!? At another time **R' Oshaya** found **R'**

Ami repeating the ruling of **R' Yochanan**, but on the end of the Mishna – where **R' Yishmael** said that the two half kezaysim give off tumah through carrying. On that he said that **R' Yochanan** said that is only where this meat was ripped out by another animal, but if it was cut out by a person it becomes batel to the skin and would not give off tumah. **R' Oshaya** said, you learned that on the end of the Mishna? **R' Ami** said, did **R' Huna** say it regarding the beginning of the Mishna? If so, even if I had heard that from Yehoshua ben Nun I would not have listened to it!

- **Ravin** and all those who came down to Bavel taught **R' Yochanan's** ruling in regard to the first part of the Mishna.
 - **Q:** If so, the skin should even be mevatal much larger pieces of meat, and that seems unreasonable!? **A:** It is like **R' Pappa** said, that there are two pieces of meat that make up a kezayis and are connected by a thin piece of meat. Since that connection is insignificant, that is why the skin is able to be mevatal it.

HAYU ALAV

- **R' Pada** said, according to **R' Yishmael** the two pieces combine to create tumah only when someone touched the skin from the other side of the meat. However, if he touched the two pieces of meat directly he would be tamei, because two acts of touching combine for purposes of tumah. **R' Yochanan** said, two acts of touching do not combine for purposes of tumah. Therefore, even if he touched the two pieces of meat directly he would not be tamei.
 - **R' Yochanan's** view of **R' Yishmael** here is consistent with his view elsewhere, where he says that **R' Yishmael** (of here) and **R' Dosa ben Hurkinas** say the same thing. The view of **R' Dosa ben Hurkinas** is in a Mishna where he says that two pieces of a meis (where each piece is smaller than the size necessary to create tumas ohel) that were under the same roof do not give off tumas ohel, but the **Rabanan** say that they do. Now, we see that **R' Dosa ben Hurkinas** holds they don't combine, which is a similar idea to what **R' Yishmael** is saying in our Mishna according to **R' Yochanan**.
 - **Q:** If **R' Dosa ben Hurkinas** holds like **R' Yishmael**, that would mean that the **Rabanan** (who argue on **R' Dosa ben Hurkinas**) hold like **R' Akiva**. However, **R' Akiva** held that the two pieces attached to the skin are tahor, whereas the **Rabanan** say that the two pieces in the ohel do create tumah!? **A:** **R' Akiva** only says they are tahor when they are attached to the skin, but in other cases he would agree that they combine. We see this from the end of the Mishna that says, **R' Akiva** agrees that if someone put two half kezaysim of the meat onto a stick and moves them, he is tamei. If so, why does he say the person is tahor when the two pieces of meat are attached to the skin? It is because he says that the skin is mevatal the pieces of meat.
 - **Q:** **R' Ukva bar Chama** asked, a Braisa says, the pasuk of "binivlasam" teaches that if someone touches a skin with two half kezaysim of neveila meat on it, he will not become tamei. We would think that he would also not become tamei for carrying this skin. **R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk says "v'hanosei yitmah" which teaches that he would become tamei for carrying it. **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk says "hanogeya...v'hanosei", which teaches that something that gives off tumah when touched can give off tumah when carried, but something that cannot give off tumah when touched cannot give off tumah when carried. Now, according to **Bar Pada's** view of **R' Yishmael** these pieces are subject to giving off tumah when touched directly, so why does **R' Akiva** say they are not subject to tumah by touching!? **A:** **Rava** said, **R' Akiva** means that it has to be subject to giving off tumah when touched from any side in order to make it subject to giving off tumah by carrying.
 - **R' Avya Saba** asked **Rabbah bar R' Huna**, what would **R' Yishmael** hold regarding a closed marrow bone? Does he agree that if something is not subject to tumah through touching it is not subject to tumah through carrying and this marrow can't be touched and therefore doesn't give off tumah through carrying, and the reason when he holds there is tumah from carrying in our Mishna is because it can be touched from at least one side, or does he not hold of this concept at all and therefore this bone would give off tumah by carrying even though the marrow can't be touched? **Rabbah bar R' Huna** changed the

topic instead of answering. He explained to his son **Rava** that he did so, because he was weak from giving the drasha and did not have the presence of mind to answer such a deep question.

- **Ulla** said, if someone sticks two half kezeysim on a stick, even if he carried it all day long he remains tahor. The reason is that the word in the pasuk is written as “neesa” and read as “nosei” which teaches us that it only gives off tumah when it is carried in a way that it can be carried as one (not in two pieces).
 - **Q:** In our Mishna **R’ Yishmael** says that there is tumah from carrying the skin with the two half kezeysim even though they can’t be carried as one!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, the case in the Mishna is where the two pieces are connected with a thin strip of meat. Therefore, they can be carried as one and can give off tumah by carrying.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that **R’ Akiva** agrees that if someone put two half kezeysim of the meat onto a stick and moves them, he is tamei. Why is he tamei!? The two pieces can’t be carried as one!? **A:** Here too, the case in the Mishna is where the two pieces are connected with a thin strip of meat. Therefore, they can be carried as one and can give off tumah by carrying.
 - **Ulla’s** ruling is actually a matter of machlokes among Tanna’im. A Braisa says, both, one who touches and one who moves neveila meat is tamei. **R’ Eliezer** says, also one who carries it is tamei. Now, isn’t one who carries it also “one who moves it”? What is **R’ Eliezer** saying different than the **T”K**? Rather, the Braisa is saying, both, one who touches and one who moves neveila meat that cannot be moved as one, is tamei. **R’ Eliezer** argues and says that he is only tamei if the full required amount can be moved as one.