



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf Vuv

- The Gemara said 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. However, this contradicts another ruling of **R' Yose** from another Mishna. The other Mishna says, if a dog ate flesh of a meis and the dog then died and lies across the threshold of a house (with its neck and head within the threshold area), **R' Meir** says if its neck has the space of a tefach it brings tumah into the house, but if not it does not. **R' Yose** says we look at the tumah (the location of the flesh of the meis inside the dog) – if it is within the door jam, the house is tamei, if not, it is tahor. **R' Elazar** says, if the mouth is inside the house the house is tahor, and if the mouth is outside the house is tamei, because the tumah exits through the back of the animal. **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** says that in all these cases the house is tamei. Now, presumably **R' Yose** stated his ruling on the case of where the neck is not the size of a tefach, and this shows that he holds that tumah in a space smaller than a tefach does break through to the sky!? **A: Rava** said, **R' Yose** means to say we look at the empty space in the neck of the dog – if there is a tefach of space it makes the house tamei (no matter where the tumah is) and if it is not that size the house is not tamei. He is thereby arguing with **R' Meir** on two points: one, **R' Meir** says we look at whether the size of the neck is a tefach and **R' Yose** says we look at the size of the *empty space* within the neck; and two, **R' Meir** said that if the dog's mouth lies anywhere on the threshold the house is tamei, and **R' Yose** says that it is only when it is within the door jam. We find that **R' Acha the son of Rava** taught explicitly that this is the understanding of the Mishna.
- **Q:** Who is the Tanna that argues with **R' Yose** and holds that becoming an ohel over tumah and touching tumah are *not* considered to be the same category of tumah? **A:** It is **R' Shimon**, who says in a Braisa that a spoonful of decomposed meis dust gives off tumah through ohel, but not through touching. We see that he holds they are different categories.

KULIS NEVEILA V'KULIS HASHERETZ...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "b'nivlasa" written regarding neveila comes to exclude one from becoming tamei from touching a closed marrow bone. We would think that even if the bone is pierced it does not give off tumah. The pasuk therefore says "hanogeya...yitmah", which teaches that if something can be touched it is tamei even by touching the bone, whereas something that cannot be touched (the marrow inside a closed bone) does not give off tumah when touching the bone.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** said to **Abaye**, based on this, an animal that has not yet been skinned should not give off tumah, because its flesh is completely enclosed and cannot be touched!? **A: Abaye** said, there are many holes in an animal and therefore the flesh can be touched through them.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Rava**, the kidney of a neveila enveloped in its fat should not give off tumah since the kidney cannot be touched!? **A: Rava** said, there are many strands of flesh that run through the fat, and that is why it is considered as able to be touched.
 - **Q: R' Oshaya** asked, if one intended to pierce the marrow bone but did not, do we consider the lack of piercing like the lack of an action and therefore it does not give off tumah, or not? **A: R' Oshaya** then answered that it is not considered to be like the lack of an action, and the intent alone would make the bone have the ability to give off tumah.

MISHNA

- The egg of a sheretz in which an embryo has formed, is tahor (the embryo is totally enclosed and cannot be touched). If there is even the slightest hole in the egg it does give off tumah.

- With regard to a mouse that is half flesh and half earth, if one touched the flesh he is tamei, but if he touched the earth part he is tahor. **R' Yehuda** says, if one touched the earth opposite the flesh he is also tamei.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the word “ha'temei'im” comes to include the egg of a sheretz and the marrow bone of a sheretz as being tamei. We would think that this is so even if the egg has no embryo. The pasuk therefore says “hasheretz” to teach that it is only if there is an embryo in the egg. We would think that this is so even if the egg is not pierced at all. The pasuk therefore says “hanogeya...yitmah”, which teaches that only something that can be touched can give off tumah. How large must the hole be? It must be the size of a strand of hair, because that is the size that makes it possible to be touched.

ACHBAR SHECHETZYO...

- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, this is only so if an entire side of the sheretz is made of flesh. If not, it is not tamei.
 - **Others** say that this was said in regard to the ruling of **R' Yehuda** in the Mishna.
 - The version that says the ruling was said on the first part of the Mishna certainly holds it was said on the later part, but according to the **Others**, it will not hold true for the first part of the Mishna.
- A Braisa says, the word “achbar” would be thought to include even a mouse of the sea since it is also called a mouse. However, the Torah said that a weasel is tamei and that a mouse is tamei. We can compare them and learn that just as the weasel is a land creature, the mouse referred to is also a land creature. Or, maybe we should make the comparison to teach that just as a weasel includes anything that is referred to as a weasel, the same should be true for a mouse and should therefore also include the mouse of the sea? The pasuk therefore says “ahl haaretz” to teach that only the land creature is tamei. If the pasuk only said “ahl haaretz” we would think that it is only tamei when on dry land, but if it goes into the sea it would not give off tumah. The pasuk therefore says “hashoretz”, which teaches that wherever it crawls it is tamei. Maybe we should instead say that “hashoretz” teaches that only creatures that produce offspring are tamei, which would exclude the mouse that is half flesh and half earth, since it does not produce offspring? The comparison to the weasel teaches that anything referred to as a mouse is included, and therefore this mouse of half flesh and half earth is included as well. Or, maybe we should make the comparison to teach that just as a weasel produces offspring, so too any mouse that produces offspring is included? The pasuk says “basheretz”, which teaches that even a sheretz that cannot produce offspring is included (which means that “hashoretz” teaches that a sheretz gives off tumah on land and in the sea, and “ahl haaretz” therefore excludes the mouse of the sea).
 - One of the **Rabanan** asked **Rava**, maybe say that “basheretz” comes to include the mouse that is half flesh and half earth, “hashoretz” comes to include any sheretz that produces offspring – which would include the mouse of the sea, and “ahl haaretz” teaches that it only gives off tumah on dry land and not when it is in the sea? **Rava** said, if you establish that the mouse of the sea is tamei, that means that the sea is a place that can produce tumah. If so, there should be no difference whether the sheretz is on dry land or in the sea.
 - **Q: R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** said that “ahl haaretz” is used for another drasha!? **A:** There are two places where the pasuk says “ahl haaretz”.