



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Chuf Tes

- A Braisa says, if a kezayis of meat is cut off of an eiver min hachai, if he first cut it off and only then intended to use it as food it is tahor, but if he intended to use it as food and then cut it off it is tamei.
 - **R' Assi** once did not go to the Beis Medrash and when he met **R' Zeira** he asked him what was said in Beis Medrash that day. He explained, that the reason he was asking was that he had difficulty understanding the Braisa quoted above that says that if he intended to use it as food and then cut it off it is tamei – the meat only touched the limb in a concealed area and therefore should not pass along tumah!? **R' Zeira** said, I had the same question and asked this to **R' Abba bar Mamal**, who told me that the Braisa follows **R' Meir** who says that tumah does pass even when it is touched in a concealed area. **R' Assi** said, I have heard this from him as well, but I asked him that **R' Meir** only holds that way regarding something that does not require hechsher!?
 - **Rava** said, maybe we can simply say that the Braisa is discussing where the meat was already muchshar!? **Rabba bar R' Chanan** said to **Rava**, even if the meat was not muchshar it can become tamei as food tumah, because it was once capable of giving off stringent tumah (tumah of eiver min hachai) when attached to the limb, and something like that can become tamei with food tumah even without hechsher! **Rava** said, when it was part of the limb it acted like a “piece of wood” (it was not yet intended for food) and therefore it would still require hechsher to become tamei with food tumah.
 - **Abaye** said, a Braisa says, if a block of chametz was designated to be used to sit on, it becomes batul as chametz and it may be kept on Pesach. That means that it can now become tamei with tumas “moshav” (if it is sat on by a zav, zava, etc.). It must be that such tumah is only D'Rabanan, because if it would be D'Oraisa we would have a case of food that gives off stringent tumah (which we have learned previously cannot be). The Gemara says, based on **Rava's** statement we can say that the food used as a chair acted like a piece of wood, and therefore would not be a case of “food” giving off stringent tumah.
 - **Abaye** said, a Braisa says that an offering of food for avoda zara gives off tumas ohel. However, it must be that such tumah is only D'Rabanan, because if it would be D'Oraisa we would have a case of food that gives off stringent tumah (which we have learned previously cannot be). The Gemara says, based on **Rava's** statement we can say that the food acted like a piece of wood (because it became assur b'hana'ah and is no longer food), and therefore would not be a case of “food” giving off stringent tumah.
 - **Abaye** said, a Mishna says, food connected to a keili becomes like the keili itself (and can become tamei with stringent tumah like the keili). However, it must be that such tumah is only D'Rabanan, because if it would be D'Oraisa we would have a case of food that gives off stringent tumah (which we have learned previously cannot be). The Gemara says, based on **Rava's** statement we can say that the food acted like a piece of wood, and therefore would not be a case of “food” giving off stringent tumah.
 - **R' Pappa** said to **Rava**, a Mishna says that the cheilev of a neveila in the villages can become subject to food tumah if there is intent to be used

as a food and it becomes muchshar. However, the tumas neveila it gets from the kidney (that it protects) must be only D'Rabanan, because if it would be D'Oraisa we would have a case of food that gives off stringent tumah (which we have learned previously cannot be). The Gemara says, based on **Rava's** statement we can say that the cheilev acted like a piece of wood (as a protection for the kidney), and therefore would not be a case of "food" giving off stringent tumah.

- **R' Masna** said, they have said that a house that used edible seeds for its roof, even if the seeds were tamei, they now become tahor (because they are considered part of the house, and would even be subject to tumas tzaraas). However, it must be that the tumas tzaraas is only D'Rabanan, because if it would be D'Oraisa we would have a case of food that gives off stringent tumah (which we have learned previously cannot be). The Gemara says, based on **Rava's** statement we can say that the seeds acted like a piece of wood, and therefore would not be a case of "food" giving off stringent tumah.

R' SHIMON METAHER

- **Q:** If **R' Shimon** holds that death of an animal other than by shechita makes a dangling limb to be treated as if it fell off before the death, this limb should give off tumah as eiver min hachai, and if he holds that death does not do that, the limb should be tamei as neveila!? Why does he hold it is tahor!? **A:** **R' Shimon** is referring to the earlier part of the Mishna, which said that a dangling limb and meat are subject to food tumah even while dangling and require hechsher. It is regarding this that **R' Shimon** said that it is tahor.
 - **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the view of **R' Shimon** is based on the pasuk that says "mikol ha'ochel asher yei'acheil", which teaches that food that can (at least) be fed to goyim has the status of food, but food that cannot be fed to goyim does not (and, as eiver min hachai, this may not be fed to goyim). **R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, maybe **R' Shimon's** view is simply based on the fact that it is still attached to the animal and considered to be part of the animal, and a live animal is not subject to tumah, as you explained to be the reason why in another Mishna **R' Yehuda** says that the fruit on a broken branch attached by only its bark, is still considered to be part of the tree!? **R' Assi** said, **R' Yochanan** was giving the basis for **R' Shimon's** view in the middle part of the Mishna, where **R' Shimon** said that the dangling limb and meat do not become muchshar from the blood of the shechita. **R' Zeira** asked, it may be that **R' Shimon** agrees in that case that the limb can become tamei and only argues that the blood of the shechita cannot act as a hechsher, and therefore **R' Yochanan's** statement cannot be going on the middle part of the Mishna!? **A:** **R' Assi** said, **R' Yochanan's** explanation was said in reference to the end of the Mishna (where the animal died without shechita), and when **R' Shimon** says it is tahor he is only referring to the dangling meat, not a limb. The reason he holds that the meat does not become subject to food tumah is based on the pasuk that says "mikol ha'ochel asher yei'acheil", which teaches that food that can (at least) be fed to goyim has the status of food, but food that cannot be fed to goyim does not.

MISHNA

- The limb and flesh that dangle from a person are tahor. If the person dies, the dangling flesh is tahor, but the dangling limb is tamei as eiver min hachai of a person, but not as an eiver of a meis. This is the view of **R' Meir**. However, **R' Shimon** says it is tahor.

GEMARA

- **Q:** If **R' Shimon** holds that death makes a dangling limb to be treated as if they fell off before the death, this limb should give off tumah as eiver min hachai, and if he holds that death does not do that, the limb should be tamei as an eiver from a meis!? Why does he hold it is tahor!? **A:** **R' Shimon** is making a general statement – not referring to the Mishna's case of dangling limbs. He means to say that an eiver that is cut off a meis does not give off tumah (unless it has a kezayis of flesh on it). We find this view in a Braisa where **R' Eliezer** says that a limb cut off a living

person gives off tumah, but a limb cut off a meis does not. **R' Yehoshua** argues and says that if a limb cut off a living person gives off tumah, certainly a limb cut off a meis will give off tumah.

- **Q:** According to **R' Meir**, what is the difference between an eiver cut off a living person and an eiver cut off a meis? **A:** The difference would be regarding a kezayis of flesh or a bone the size of a barley that separates from a limb cut off a living person. We see this in a Mishna which says, with regard to a kezayis of flesh that is separated from an eiver that was cut off of a living person, **R' Eliezer** says it is tamei and **R' Nechunya ben Hakana** and **R' Yehoshua** say it is tahor. With regard to a bone the size of a barley that is separated from an eiver that was cut off of a living person, **R' Nechunya** says it is tamei and **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua** say it is tahor. [**R' Meir** would hold that in regard to an eiver cut from a meis, a kezayis of flesh and a bone the size of a barley that separated from it are tamei. If the limb was cut off a living person, they are tahor.]
 - Now that we have made this distinction between the limb cut from a living person and the limb cut from a meis, we can say that this is the difference between the **T"K** and **R' Shimon** in our Mishna (it is regarding a kezayis of flesh or a bone the size of a barley that are separated from a limb that was cut from a living person).

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HA'OR V'HAROTEIV!!!