



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf Hey

MISHNA

- With regard to the marrow bone of a human meis and the marrow bone of kodashim that became nossar, if someone touches these bones, whether they are entirely closed (so that the marrow can't be touched) or whether they are pierced, the person becomes tamei.
- With regard to the marrow bone of a neveila or of a sheretz, if one touches them while they are entirely closed he remains tahor. If he touches them when they are even minimally pierced the touching makes him tamei. How do we know that the sealed bone will also not give off tumah by carrying? The pasuk says "hanogeya...v'hanosei". This teaches that only something that can give off tumah through touching it can give off tumah through carrying it.

GEMARA

- The Mishna says that one who touches the human marrow bone would become tamei, which implies that it would not give off tumas ohel. What is the case of this bone? If there is a kezayis of meat on it, it should give off tumas ohel because of the meat!? Rather, it must be that there is not a kezayis of meat on the bone. If there is a kezayis of marrow inside the bone, it should give off tumas ohel because of the marrow!? Rather, it must be that there is not a kezayis of marrow in the bone. If the Mishna holds that marrow from inside the bone can regenerate flesh outside the bone, it should have the status of a limb and give off tumas ohel because of that!? **R' Yehuda the son of R' Chiya** said, we see from here that marrow from inside the bone cannot regenerate flesh outside the bone.
 - **Q:** If the Mishna is discussing where there is less than a kezayis of meat or marrow, why in the case of nossar does it give off tumah? Also, in the Mishna's case of the bone of the neveila and of the sheretz, why do they give off tumah if they are pierced!? **A:** We can say that the Mishna's first case is where there was not a kezayis and the later cases are where there was a kezayis.
 - **Q:** If the case is that there was not a kezayis of meat on the human bone, what is the Mishna coming to teach? **A:** The Mishna is teaching a number of things. The case of the human bone is teaching that marrow from inside the bone cannot regenerate flesh outside the bone. The case of kodashim teaches that just as nossar makes things tamei, the bone that "served" the nossar also makes things tamei. The case of the neveila is teaching that it only gives off tumah when the bone is pierced.
 - **Abaye** said, we can say that marrow from inside the bone can regenerate flesh outside the bone. The case of the Mishna is where the bone was scraped away to the point that it could not regenerate the flesh. We find that **R' Elazar** said this as well, that if the bone is scraped (in the width) it is prevented from being able to regenerate the flesh.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna is talking about where the human bone *does* have a kezayis of marrow, and we say that marrow from inside the bone can regenerate flesh outside the bone. When the Mishna says that "touching" it brings on tumah, it actually means tumas ohel, for touching and ohel are considered to be of the same category.
 - **Q:** If we say that marrow from inside the bone can regenerate flesh outside the bone, why is it that in the case of neveila there is only tumah if the bone is pierced? It should be viewed as a limb and should give off tumah!? **A:** **R' Binyamin bar Gidal in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the case is where the marrow is rattling around in the bone (the marrow is dried out). Regarding a meis it still gives off tumah. However, regarding a neveila, since it is dried out it is not viewed as a limb.

- **R' Avin** (or **R' Yose bar Avin**) said, we see from a Mishna that touching and ohel are in the same category. The Mishna says that if one touches a half kezayis of a meis and at the same time there is an ohel over another half kezayis of a meis or another half kezayis is an ohel over him, they combine and he becomes tamei. Now, the Mishna also says that only things in the same category can combine for tumah. Therefore, it *must* be that touching and ohel are in the same category.
 - **Q:** The end of the Mishna says, if he touches a half kezayis and is at the same time under a common ohel with another half kezayis he would remain tahor. Now, if they are truly of the same category, why does he remain tahor!?
 - **Q:** Based on this, the beginning of the Mishna is difficult to understand – why do they combine!? **A:** The case of the beginning of the Mishna is where the tumah is squished into a place of less than a tefach. When one is an ohel over that it has the status of him touching that tumah. That is why they combine.
 - Based on this, when **R' Yochanan** said that touching and ohel are of the same category he was following the view of **R' Yose**, who says in a Braisa regarding a spoonful of meis dust, that it makes one tamei through touching, through carrying, and through ohel. Now, when one touches the dust he is not touching *all* of it, so why does he become tamei? It must be that “touching” refers to tumas ohel.
 - **Q:** The Braisa separately lists touching and ohel!? **A:** **Abaye** said, when a roof is less than a tefach from the tumah it is called “a roof of touching” and when it is more than a tefach away it is simply called a roof (ohel). **Rava** said, even when it is more than a tefach it is called a “roof of touching”. A regular ohel is when two things share the same roof without being one on top of the other.
 - **Rava** said, he can prove his view in **R' Yose** from a Braisa, where **R' Yose** says, the latticework of a bed or a window can interpose to prevent the spread of tumah between a lower and upper floor. If it was put in the airspace of a meis, if one “touches” opposite an opening in the latticework he becomes tamei, but if he touches opposite the latticework itself he remains tahor. Now, what is the case? If it is within a tefach to the meis, even when he puts his hand opposite the latticework itself he should become tamei, just as he would be if he put his hand over the clothing of a meis!? Rather, it must be that it was more than a tefach away, and yet **R' Yose** refers to it as “touching”! **Abaye** said this is not a proof, because it is different than the clothing (tachrichin) of a meis, which become batul to, and part of the meis. Therefore, the Braisa may be referring to a case where the latticework was within a tefach to the meis.
 - **Q:** If it is within a tefach to the meis we should say that the “tumah breaks through to the sky” and the latticework should not stop the tumah from spreading upwards!? **A:** **R' Yose** holds that

even when a covering is within a tefach of the meis, it still does not break through to the sky.

- The Gemara proves from a Mishna that **R' Yose** holds that even when a covering is within a tefach of the meis, it still does not break through to the sky. A Mishna says, if there is tumah in a box and there is a tefach of space in the box, but less than a tefach of space at the opening, the house that it is in becomes tamei, but if there is tumah in the house the items in the box would not become tamei – this is because it is easier for tumah to leave the box into the house than for it to enter the box. **R' Yose** says it is tahor, because the tumah in the box can be broken down to smaller pieces before being taken out. Now, in a Braisa **R' Yose** says it is tahor. What is he referring to in the Braisa? It must be that the **T"K** gave two reasons that the house becomes tamei – one, because it is normal for tumah to leave the box and go into the house, and two, because the tumah that is covered less than a tefach to the tumah breaks through and goes up to the sky. In the Mishna **R' Yose** addressed the first reason and in the Braisa he is addressing the second reason and saying it is tahor because tumah does not break through and go up to the sky!