

דף יומי • חלין • דף ס"ח

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we begin a new and fascinating perek of Maseches Chullin, focusing on the halachos of a fetus found inside an animal after she is slaughtered. The Mishnah introduces a classic case of an animal having difficulty giving birth, where the fetus extends a foreleg outside the womb and then pulls it back in before the mother is slaughtered. We learn the crucial distinction between a limb that emerges, which does not constitute birth, and the head emerging, which the Torah considers a full birth, requiring the newborn animal to have its own shechitah.

The Mishnah also contrasts the status of the fetus with the mother's own organs. If one cuts off pieces of a fetus while it is still in the womb and then slaughters the mother, those severed pieces are permitted. However, if one cuts pieces from the mother's own spleen or kidneys and leaves them inside, they are strictly forbidden as limbs from a living animal (eiver min hachai). This leads into a deep Gemara discussion on the status of an emerged limb, exploring the opinion of Rav that once a limb goes outside its boundary, it becomes permanently forbidden like a tereifah.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 68A

MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי בְּהֶמָה הַמִּקְשָׁה לֵילֵד, וְהוֹצִיא הָעוֹבֵר אֶת יָדוֹ וְהִחְזִירוֹ – מוֹתֵר בְּאֲכִילָהּ.

MISHNAH: If there is **an animal that is having difficulty giving birth**, and the fetus **extended its foreleg** outside the womb **and then brought it back** inside, and then the mother was slaughtered, the fetus is **permitted for eating** through the slaughter of its mother.

MISHNAH

וְהוֹצִיא אֶת רִאשׁוֹ, אֲפֹל עַל פִּי שֶׁחֲזָרוּ – הֲרִי זֶה כְּלִיד.

But if it **extended its head** outside, **even though it brought it back** inside, **behold this is like a newborn** animal, and the slaughter of the mother does not permit it; rather, it requires its own slaughter.

MISHNAH

חֹתֶת מֵעוֹבֵר שֶׁבִּמְעֵיהָ – מוֹתֵר בְּאֲכִילָהּ,

If one **cuts off pieces from a fetus that is in its womb** and leaves them inside, and then slaughters the mother, the severed flesh is **permitted for eating**.

MISHNAH

מן הטחול ומן הכליות – אסור באכילה.

But if one cuts pieces **from the spleen or from the kidneys** of the mother animal and leaves them inside, and then slaughters her, they are **forbidden for eating** as limbs from a living animal.

MISHNAH

זה הכלל: דבר שגופה – אסור, ושאינה גופה – מותר.

This is the general rule: Any thing that is part of its body which was severed before slaughter is **forbidden**, and any thing that is **not** part of its body, namely its fetus, is **permitted**.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גמ' אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: ואבר עצמו אסור.

GEMARA: Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: **And** as for the extended limb itself, even though it was brought back inside, it is **forbidden** to be eaten.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? דאמר קרא: "ובשר בשדה טרפה לא תאכלו", כיון שיצא בשר חוץ למחיצתו – נאסר.

What is the reason? Because the verse says: "And flesh in the field, a tereifah, you shall not eat." This teaches that once flesh has gone outside of its boundary, which the Torah calls "the field," it becomes **forbidden** like a tereifah.

OBJECTION

תנו: בהמה המקשה לילד, והוציא העובר את ידו והחזירו – מותר באכילה. מאי לאו אאבר?

The Gemara objects: **We learned** in our Mishnah: If there is an animal that is having difficulty giving birth, and the fetus extended its foreleg and brought it back, it is **permitted for eating**. What, is it not referring to the limb itself, which would contradict Rav?

ANSWER

לא, אעובר.

The Gemara answers: **No**, the Mishnah's ruling of permitted refers only **to the** rest of the fetus.

QUESTION

אי אעובר, מאי איריא החזירו? אפילו לא החזירו נמי!

The Gemara asks: If it refers only **to the** rest of the fetus, why specifically mention that it brought it back? Even if it did not bring it back, the rest of the fetus is **also** permitted!

ANSWER

הוא הדין אף על גב דלא החזירו.

The Gemara answers: Indeed, **the same law applies** even though it did not bring it back.

EXPLANATION

וְאִיִּדִּי דְקָא בְּעֵי מִיתְנָא סִיפָא: הוֹצִיא אֶת רֹאשׁוֹ אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁהִחְזִירוּ – הָרִי זֶה כְּלֹד, תִּנָּא נָמִי רִישָׁא הִחְזִירוּ.

And since the Tanna wanted to teach in the latter clause: If it extended its head, even though it brought it back, behold this is like a newborn, he also taught in the first clause the case where it brought it back, for stylistic symmetry.

QUESTION

וְסִיפָא, מָאִי קָמְשַׁמַּע לִי? דְּכִיּוֹן דִּינָצָא רֹאשׁוֹ הָוִיא לָהּ לִידָה? תִּנָּינָא:

The Gemara asks: And as for the latter clause, what does it come to teach us? That once its head emerged, it is considered a birth? But we have already learned this in a Mishnah in Bekhoros:

PROOF

אִיזְהוּ בְּכוֹר לְנִחְלָה וְאִינוּ בְּכוֹר לְכֹהֲנִים – הֵבֵא אַחֵר נִפְלִים, אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁיִּצָּא רֹאשׁוֹ חַי, אוּ בֶן תִּשְׁעָה שָׁנִים יִצָּא רֹאשׁוֹ מֵת.

Who is a firstborn for inheritance but not a firstborn for the Kohanim? One who comes after miscarriages, even though the miscarriage's head emerged alive, or a nine-month-old fetus whose head emerged dead.

INFERENCE

טַעְמָא דְּרֹאשׁוֹ מֵת, הָא רֹאשׁוֹ חַי – הֵבֵא אַחֲרָיו בְּכוֹר לְנִחְלָה נָמִי לָא הָוִי.

We infer: The reason the next child is a firstborn for inheritance is because the miscarriage's head emerged dead, but if its head emerged alive, the one who comes after it is also not a firstborn for inheritance, because the emergence of the head is considered a birth. Why repeat this rule in our Mishnah?

STATEMENT

וְכִי תֵימָא, אֲשַׁמְעִינוּ בְּאָדָם, וְקָא מְשַׁמַּע לִי בְּבִהְמָה.

And if you say: The Mishnah there teaches us this rule regarding a human, and our Mishnah teaches us this rule regarding an animal, and both are necessary:

EXPLANATION

דְּאָדָם מִבְּהֵמָה לָא יָלִיף, דְּאִין פְּרוּזְדוֹר לְבִהְמָה,

For a human cannot be derived from an animal, because there is no birth canal that is concealed for an animal, whereas a woman's thighs conceal her womb, so we might think her birth is not defined by the head's emergence alone;

EXPLANATION

וּבְהֵמָה מֵאָדָם לָא יָלִיף, דִּחְשִׁיב פְּרָצוּף פָּנִים דִּידָהּ.

and an animal cannot be derived from a human, because a human's facial features are significant, so perhaps only for a human is the head's emergence considered a birth.

OBJECTION

הָא נָמִי תִנָּינָא: שְׁלֵיָא שְׁיִצְתָּהּ מְקַצָּתָהּ – אֲסוּרָה בְּאֶכִילָהּ, כִּסְיָמָן וְלֹד בְּאִשָּׁה כִּי סִימָן וְלֹד בְּבִהְמָה!

But **this too** we have already learned in a Mishnah: **A placenta of which a part emerged is forbidden for eating**, and the Sages said: **Just as the sign of a child in a woman, so is the sign of a child in an animal!** Thus we already know that the rules of birth are equated.

STATEMENT

אי אמרת בשלמא הוזירו דרישא דוקא, תנא סיפא אטו רישא.

Granted, if you say that "brought it back" in the first clause is precise and teaches that the limb itself is permitted, then the Tanna taught the latter clause for the sake of symmetry with the first clause.

QUESTION

אָלאַ אי אמרת: לא דרישא דוקא, וְלֹא דסיפא דוקא, לָמָּה לִּיה לַמִּתְנִייה כָּלֵל?

But if you say that neither the first clause is precise, nor the latter clause is precise, why did he have to teach it at all?

ANSWER

לא, לעולם אעופר, וכדאמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: לא נצרכה אלא למקום חתך.

The Gemara answers: **No**, actually the first clause refers to the fetus, and it is as Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said in another context: **It is only necessary for the place of the cut.**

EXPLANATION

הָכָא נָמִי, לֹא נִצְרְכָה אֶלָּא לְמָקוֹם חֲתָךְ.

Here too, it is only necessary for the place of the cut, to teach that the point where the limb is severed is permitted.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: בְּהֵמָה הַמִּקְשָׁה לִילָד, הוֹצִיא עוֹפֵר אֶת יָדוֹ וְהִזְיָרָהּ, וְאַחֲרַיָּהּ כָּף שָׁחַט אֶת אִמּוֹ – מוֹתֵר בְּאַכִּילָהּ.

Come and hear a proof from a Baraisa: If there is an animal that is having difficulty giving birth, and the fetus extended its foreleg and brought it back, and afterward he slaughtered its mother, it is permitted for eating.

PROOF

שָׁחַט אֶת אִמּוֹ וְאַחֲרַיָּהּ כָּף הִזְיָרָהּ – אָסוּר בְּאַכִּילָהּ.

But if he slaughtered its mother and afterward it brought it back, it is forbidden for eating.

PROOF

הוֹצִיא אֶת יָדוֹ וְחִתְכוּ, וְאַחֲרַיָּהּ כָּף שָׁחַט אֶת אִמּוֹ – שְׂפִחוּץ טָמֵא וְאָסוּר, וְשִׁפְפָנִים טָהוֹר וּמוֹתֵר.

If it extended its foreleg and he cut it off, and afterward he slaughtered its mother, that which is outside is tamei and forbidden, and that which is inside is tahor and permitted.

PROOF

שָׁחַט אֶת אִמּוֹ וְאַחֲרַיָּהּ כָּף חֲתָכוּ –

If he slaughtered its mother and afterward he cut it off, the Baraisa continues...

STATEMENT

הבשר מגע נבלה, דברי רבי מאיר.

the rest of **the flesh** of the fetus is rendered impure through **contact with a carcass**, i.e., the forbidden limb, which is treated as a carcass; these are **the words of Rabbi Meir**.

STATEMENT

וחכמים אומרים: מגע טרפה שחוטה.

And the Sages say: The rest of the flesh has only the status of **contact with a slaughtered tereifa**, which is rabbinically impure but does not carry the severe impurity of a carcass.

OBJECTION

קתני מיהא רישא: הוציא עובר את ידו והחזירה, ואחר כך שחט את אמו – מותר באכילה;

In any event, **the first clause teaches:** If a fetus extended its foreleg outside the womb and returned it inside, and afterward one slaughtered its mother, it is permitted for eating.

QUESTION

מאי לאו אאכר?

What, is it not referring to the limb itself, meaning that even the extended limb is permitted if returned, which contradicts Rav's ruling?

ANSWER

לא, אעובר.

The Gemara answers: **No**, it refers to the rest of the fetus, but the limb itself remains forbidden.

OBJECTION

אי אעובר, אימא סיפא: שחט את אמו ואחר כך החזירו – אסור באכילה;

The Gemara objects: If it refers to the fetus, then say the latter clause: If one slaughtered its mother and afterward it returned the limb, it is forbidden for eating.

QUESTION

ואי עובר, אמאי אסור?

And if this refers to the rest of the fetus, **why is it forbidden?** The slaughter of the mother should permit the entire fetus except for the extended limb!

ANSWER

כדאמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: לא נצרכה אלא למקום חתה, הקא נמי לא נצרכה אלא למקום חתה.

The Gemara answers: It is as Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said in another context, that **it is not necessary** to state this **except with regard to the place of the cut** on the fetus's body where the limb is severed. **Here too, it is not necessary except with regard to the place of the cut**, which becomes forbidden if the limb was not returned before slaughter.

QUESTION

איני? והא כי אתא אבימי מבי חוזאי, אתא ואיתי מתניתא בידיה:

The Gemara asks: Is that so? But when Avimi came from Bei Chozai, he came and brought a baraisa in his hand which states:

PROOF

פרסה החזיר – אכול, פרסות החזיר – אכול.

If it extended a hoof and returned it, eat; if it extended hooves and returned them, eat.

QUESTION

מאי לאו החזיר פרסה – אכול פרסה?

What, is it not that if it returned a hoof, you may eat the hoof itself?

ANSWER

לא, החזיר פרסה – אכול עובר.

The Gemara answers: No, it means if it returned the hoof, you may eat the fetus.

OBJECTION

אי עובר, מאי איריא החזיר? אפילו לא החזיר נמי!

The Gemara objects: If it refers to the fetus, why specifically mention that it returned it? Even if it did not return it, the fetus should also be permitted!

ANSWER

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: לא נצרכה אלא למקום חתה.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: It is not necessary except with regard to the place of the cut, which is permitted only if the limb was returned.

QUESTION

והא תרי קראי קא נסיב לה!

The Gemara asks: But the baraisa adduces two verses, "hoof" and "hooves," for this ruling!

QUESTION

מאי לאו חד לאבר, וחד למקום חתה?

What, is it not that one is for the limb itself to be permitted, and one is for the place of the cut?

ANSWER

לא, חד למקום חתה, וחד לקלוט במעי פרה.

The Gemara answers: No, one is for the place of the cut, and one is for a fetus with uncloven hooves inside the womb of a cow.

EXPLANATION

וְאֵלֵיבָא דְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן, דְּאָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן: קָלוּט בֶּן פָּרָה אָסוּר.

And this is according to Rabbi Shimon, as Rabbi Shimon says: An uncloven-hoofed offspring of a cow is forbidden if born alive.

EXPLANATION

הֲנִי מִיֵּלֵי הַיָּכָא דִּינְצָא לְאִוִיר הָעוֹלָם, אֲכָל בְּמַעֲי אִמּוֹ – שְׂרִי.

This applies only where it emerged into the airspace of the world as a birth, but if it is still inside its mother's womb when she is slaughtered, it is permitted.

STATEMENT

עוּלָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: וְאִכְרַ עֲצָמוֹ מוּתָר.

Ulla said that Rabbi Yochanan said: And the limb itself is permitted by the slaughter of the mother if it was returned inside.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיָּהּ רַב יְהוּדָה לְעוּלָא: וְהָאֵ רַב וּשְׁמוּאֵל דְּאָמְרֵי תְרוּיָהּוּ אִכְרַ עֲצָמוֹ אָסוּר!

Rav Yehuda said to Ulla: But Rav and Shmuel both say that the limb itself is forbidden!

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיָּהּ: מָאֵן יִהְיֶה לָן מַעֲפָרָא דְרַב וּשְׁמוּאֵל וּמִלִּינָן עֵינֵינוּ, אֲלָא הִכִּי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן:

Ulla said to him: Who would give us some of the dust of Rav and Shmuel, and we would fill our eyes with it out of respect; but this is what Rabbi Yochanan said to justify his view:

EXPLANATION

הַכֹּל הָיוּ בְּכֻלָּל "בָּשָׂר בַּשָּׂדֶה טְרֵפָה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ",

All consecrated or bounded meats that leave their boundary were included in the general rule of "And flesh in the field, a tereifa, you shall not eat", which teaches that leaving one's boundary forbids the meat.

EXPLANATION

בְּשִׁפְרֵט לָהּ הַפְּתוּב גַּבִּי חֲטָאת שִׁינְצָתָהּ חוּץ לְמַחֲצֶתָהּ וְחֹזְרָה – אָסוּר,

But when the Scripture specified for you regarding a sin-offering that went outside its boundary and returned that it is forbidden,

EXPLANATION

חֲטָאת הוּא דְפֻרְט רַחֲמָנָא בָּהּ, אֲכָל כָּל מִיֵּלֵי – כִּיּוֹן דִּהְדוּר – שְׂרִי.

it implies that it is only a sin-offering that the Merciful One specified is forbidden, but all other things, once they returned, are permitted.

OBJECTION

מִיִּתְיָבִי: "בָּשָׂר בַּשָּׂדֶה טְרֵפָה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ", מָה תִּלְמוּד לּוֹמַר?

The Gemara challenges this: "And flesh in the field, a tereifa, you shall not eat," what does the verse teach us?

EXPLANATION

לְפִי שֶׁמֵצִינוּ בְּמַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנִי וּבְכוּרִים, שֶׁאֵף עַל פִּי שֶׁיֵּצְאוּ חוּץ לְמַחֲצֵתוֹ וְחָזְרוּ – מוֹתְרִין, יָכוֹל אֵף זֶה כֵּן?

Since we find regarding Second Tithe and first-fruits, that even though they went outside their boundary and returned, they are permitted, I might have thought that this meat of a fetus or offering is also so?

EXPLANATION

תְּלָמוּד לומר "טרפה".

Therefore, the verse teaches "tereifa" to show it is forbidden.

QUESTION

מֵאֵי תְּלָמוּדָא?

The Gemara asks: What is the biblical derivation from the word "tereifa"?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבָּה: כְּטֵרְפָה, מָה טֵרְפָה – כִּיּוֹן שֶׁנִּטְרְפָה שׁוֹב אֵין לָהּ הֵיתֵר, אֵף בָּשָׂר – כִּיּוֹן שֶׁיֵּצֵא חוּץ לְמַחֲצֵתוֹ שׁוֹב אֵין לוֹ הֵיתֵר!

Rabbah said: It is like a tereifa; just as a tereifa, once it becomes torn, can never again have a permit, so too flesh, once it went outside its boundary, can never again have a permit even if it returns!

REFUTATION

תְּיֻבָּתָא דְּעוּלָא, תְּיֻבָּתָא.

This is a conclusive refutation of Ulla, a conclusive refutation.

QUESTION

אָמַר מָר: לְפִי שֶׁמֵצִינוּ בְּמַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנִי וּבְכוּרִים. הֵיכָן מֵצִינוּ?

The Master said above: Since we find regarding Second Tithe and first-fruits that they are permitted if they return. Where do we find this?

ANSWER

דְּכַתִּיב: "לֹא תֹכֵל לֶאֱכֹל בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ מַעֲשֵׂר דְּגָנְךָ וְגו'"; בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ הוּא דְּלֹא תִיכּוֹל, אֲכָל יֵצְאוּ חוּץ לְמַחֲצֵתוֹ וְחָזְרוּ – מוֹתְרִין.

As it is written: "You may not eat within your gates the tithe of your grain, etc.", implying that within your gates you may not eat them if they never entered Jerusalem, but if they went outside their boundary and returned, they are permitted.

STATEMENT

בְּמַעֲרָבָא מִתְּנֵי קָבִי, רַב אָמַר: יֵשׁ לִידָה לְאַבְרָהָם, וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אֵין לִידָה לְאַבְרָהָם.

In the West, they taught this dispute as follows: Rav said: There is birth for limbs, meaning a limb extending outside is considered born and permanently forbidden; and Rabbi Yochanan said: There is no birth for limbs.

QUESTION

מאי בינייהו?

What is the difference between them practically?

ANSWER

איכא בינייהו למיסר מיעוט אבר שבפנים.

There is a difference between them regarding forbidding the minority of the limb that remains inside the womb.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: לדברי האומר אין לידה לאברים, הוציא העובר את ידו והחזירה, וחזר והוציא את ידו והחזירה, עד שהשלימו לרובו, מהו?

A dilemma was raised to them: According to the one who says there is no birth for limbs, if the fetus extended its foreleg and returned it, and then again extended its foreleg and returned it, until these parts completed the majority of its body, what is the law?

QUESTION

מי אמרינן הא נפק ליה רובא, או דלמא פיון דהדור הדר?

Do we say, behold, the majority of it has gone out and it is considered born? Or perhaps, since they returned, they returned and are considered inside?

QUESTION

אם תמצי לומר, פיון דהדור הדר, הוציא עובר את ידו וחזרה, וחזר והוציא את ידו וחזרה, עד שהשלימו לרובו, מהו?

If you say, since they returned, they returned; if the fetus extended its foreleg and one cut it off, and then again extended its foreleg and one cut it off, until the cut parts completed the majority of its body, what is the law?

QUESTION

מי אמרינן הא נפיק ליה רובא, או דלמא רובא בבת אחת בעינו?

Do we say, behold, the majority of it has gone out? Or perhaps we require the majority to emerge all at once?

PROOF

תא שמע:

Come and hear a proof:

SUMMARY

The Gemara analyzes the Mishnah's ruling regarding the extended foreleg, bringing the teaching of Rav Yehuda in the name of Rav that the emerged limb itself remains forbidden even if it was brought back inside before shechitah, based on the pasuk of "flesh in the field." The Gemara challenges this from our Mishnah and a Baraisa, questioning whether the term

"permitted" refers to the limb itself or only to the rest of the fetus. To resolve these difficulties, the Gemara suggests that the Mishnah's phrasing was structured for stylistic symmetry with the case of the head emerging, and explores the halachic definitions of birth for both humans and animals, ultimately utilizing the principle of Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak regarding the status of the "place of the cut" where the limb is severed.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In today's sugya, we learn about a fetus that extends its limb outside the womb and then pulls it back. According to Rav, even though the limb returned inside, it remains permanently forbidden. The Torah says, "And flesh in the field, a tereifah, you shall not eat." Once a holy thing or a kosher limb crosses its boundary and goes "outside into the field," it loses its status. Even if it returns to its original place, that brief moment of leaving its proper boundary leaves a permanent mark.

This teaches us a profound lesson about our own spiritual boundaries, our own "mechitza." Hashem places each of us in a specific environment of holiness, our homes, our yeshivos, our communities, and our daily times set aside for Torah and tefillah. The yetzer hara often whispers that we can step "outside" just for a moment, to indulge in something inappropriate or to let our minds wander into forbidden places, thinking, "I will just peek outside and then immediately pull myself back in. No harm done."

But the Torah is teaching us that boundaries matter. When we let ourselves drift outside our spiritual boundaries, even temporarily, it leaves an impression on our neshama. We cannot simply step into the "field" and expect to return completely unaffected. Our avodah is to guard our boundaries with vigilance, recognizing that the safety and purity of our spiritual lives depend on staying firmly within the realm of kedushah.

Today, make a conscious effort to protect your spiritual boundaries. When you feel tempted to look at something you shouldn't, or to engage in speech that is outside the boundary of a Torah Jew, pause and remind yourself: "I am keeping myself inside."