

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ע"ג

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we continue our deep dive into the sugya of a fetus's limb that protruded from the womb before shechitah. We explore the machlokes between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis regarding whether a limb destined to be cut off is already considered severed, and how this affects the tumah of the limb. The Gemara brings a beautiful clarification from Ravina, explaining that even the Rabbis, who normally argue on Rabbi Meir regarding vessels, would agree that food connections are considered separated and merely touching, which directly impacts our understanding of the fetus and its limb.

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

עמוד א' DAF 73A

STATEMENT

כחתוך דמי.

it is **regarded as though** it were already **cut** and separated.

QUESTION

כמאן?

The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose** opinion is this principle? Is it

INFERENCE

כרבי מאיר, דתנן: כל ידות הפלים שהן ארוכות ועתיד לקצצן – מטביל עד מקום מדה, דברי רבי מאיר.

in accordance with Rabbi Meir? As we learned in a Mishnah: Regarding **all handles of vessels that are too long** and **one is destined to cut them down**, **one** only needs to **immerse** the handle **until the point of** its eventual **measure**, and the vessel is purified even though the rest of the handle was not submerged; these are **the words of Rabbi Meir**.

INFERENCE

וחכמים אומרים: עד שיטביל את כולו.

And the Sages say: The vessel is not purified **until he immerses all of it**, including the entire handle. Evidently, only Rabbi Meir holds that what is destined to be cut is considered already cut.

ANSWER

אפילו תימא רבנן, חבורי אכלין כמאן דמפרתי דמי, ונגיעי בהדידי.

The Gemara answers: **You may even say** that Ravina's explanation is in accordance with **the Rabbis**, for the Rabbis only argue regarding vessels, but **the connections of foods are regarded as though they are separated**, and they are merely **touching one another**. Since the fetus and its limb are treated as food, they are considered separated and touching.

QUESTION

בְּשֵׁלְמָא לְעוּלָא, הֵיִינוּ דְקִתְנִי "חֲתֻכָּה",

The Gemara asks: **Granted according to Ulla**, who says the limb became tamei at the moment of its separation, **this is the reason that the Mishnah teaches** the case where "**he cut it**",

QUESTION

אֵלָא לְרַבִּינָא, מַאי "חֲתֻכָּה"?

but according to Ravina, who says the connection is like food and it is considered separated even while attached, **what** is the need for the Mishnah to say "**he cut it**"?

ANSWER

אֵיִדִּי דְתַנָּא רִישָׁא "חֲתֻכָּה", תַּנָּא נָמִי סִיפָא "חֲתֻכָּה".

The Gemara answers: **Since the Tanna taught in the first clause "he cut it"**, where it was necessary, **he also taught in the latter clause "he cut it"** for stylistic consistency.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: מִנְעַ טְרֵפָה שְׁחוּטָה.

The Mishnah stated: **And the Sages say** that the fetus has the status of **contact with a slaughtered tereifah**.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

טְרֵפָה שְׁחוּטָה מִי מְטַמְּא?

The Gemara asks: **Does a slaughtered tereifah impart tumah?**

ANSWER

אֵין, כְּדֹאבוּה דְשְׁמוּאֵל, דְּאָמַר אָבוּה דְשְׁמוּאֵל: טְרֵפָה שְׁשֻׁחְטָה מְטַמְּא בְּמוֹקֵדְשִׁין.

The Gemara answers: **Yes, in accordance with the statement of Shmuel's father**, as Shmuel's father said: **A tereifah that one slaughtered imparts tumah to sacrificial foods by Rabbinic decree.**

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מה מצינו בטריפה ששחיטתה מטהרתה, אף שחיטת בהמה תטהר את העופר.

The Mishnah cited the Rabbis' reasoning: Just as we find regarding a tereifah that its shechitah purifies it from the tumah of a carcass, so too, the shechitah of the animal should purify the limb of the fetus.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

תנאי, אמר להן רבי מאיר: וכי מי טיהרו לאבר זה מידי נבלה? שחיטת אמו! אם כן, תתירנו באכילה!

It was taught in a Braisa: Rabbi Meir said to them: And indeed, what purified this limb from the status of a carcass? The shechitah of its mother! If so, let it also permit it for eating!

BRAISA

אמרו לו: הרבה מצלת על שאינו גופה יותר מגופה, שהרי שנינו: חותך מן העופר שבמעיה – מותר באכילה, מן הטחול ומן הכליות – אסור באכילה.

They said to him: The shechitah saves that which is not its body much more than it saves its own body, as we learned: One who cuts from a fetus that is in its womb and leaves the pieces inside, they are permitted for eating through the mother's shechitah; but if he cuts from the spleen or from the kidneys of the mother, they are forbidden for eating.

QUESTION

מאי קאמר?

The Gemara asks: What is this dialogue saying? The flow of the argument is unclear.

ANSWER

אמר רבא, ואמרי לה כדי: חסורי מחסרא והכי קתני,

Rava said, and some say it unattributed [kedi]: The Braisa is missing words, and this is what it is teaching:

BRAISA

אמר להן רבי מאיר: וכי מי טהרו לאבר זה מידי נבלה? שחיטת אמו, אם כן תתירנו באכילה!

Rabbi Meir said to them: And indeed, what purified this limb from the status of a carcass? The shechitah of its mother, if so, let it permit it for eating!

BRAISA

אמרו לו: טריפה תוכית, ששחיטתה מטהרתה מידי נבלה ואינה מתירתה באכילה.

They said to him: Let the case of a tereifah prove the point, as its shechitah purifies it from the status of a carcass, yet does not permit it for eating.

BRAISA

אמר להן: לא, אם טיהרה שחיטת טרפה אותה, דבר שהיא גופה, תטהר את האבר דבר שאינו גופה?

He said to them: No, if the shechitah of a tereifah purified it itself, which is something that is its own body, should it also purify the limb of the fetus, which is something that is not its own body?

BRAISA

אמרו לו: הרבה מצלות על שאינו גופה יותר מגופה, שהרי שנינו: חותה מן העובר שבמעיה – מותר באכילה, מן הטחול ומן הכליות – אסור באכילה.

They said to him: The shechitah saves that which is not its body much more than it saves its own body, as we learned: One who cuts from a fetus that is in its womb and leaves the pieces inside, they are permitted for eating; but if he cuts from the spleen or from the kidneys of the mother, they are forbidden for eating.

PROOF

תנא נמי הכי: אמר להן רבי מאיר: וכי מי טיהרו לאבר זה מידי נבלה? אמרו לו: שחיטת אמו. אם כן, תתירנו באכילה!

It was also taught likewise in another Braisa: Rabbi Meir said to them: And indeed, what purified this limb from the status of a carcass? They said to him: The shechitah of its mother. He replied: If so, let it permit it for eating!

PROOF

אמרו לו: טרפה תוכיח, ששחיטתה מטהרתה מידי נבלה ואינה מתירתה באכילה.

They said to him: Let the case of a tereifah prove the point, as its shechitah purifies it from the status of a carcass, yet does not permit it for eating.

PROOF

אמר להן: אם טיהרה שחיטת טרפה אותה ואת האבר המדולדל בה, דבר שגופה, תטהר את העובר שאינו גופה?

He said to them: If the shechitah of a tereifah purified it and the limb dangling from it, which is something that is its own body, should it purify the fetus, which is not its own body?

PROOF

אמרו לו: הרבה מצלות על שאינו גופה יותר מגופה, שהרי שנינו: חותה מן העובר שבמעיה – מותר באכילה, מן הטחול ומן הכליות – אסור באכילה.

They said to him: The shechitah saves that which is not its body much more than it saves its own body, as we learned: One who cuts from a fetus that is in its womb and leaves the pieces inside, they are permitted for eating; but if he cuts from the spleen or from the kidneys of the mother, they are forbidden for eating.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: כמחלוקת בעופרין, כך מחלוקת באיברין.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Just as there is a dispute between Rabbi Meir and the Sages regarding the limbs of fetuses, so too there is a dispute regarding the dangling limbs of the mother animal itself.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: מחלוקת באבר דעופר, אבל באבר דבהמה – דברי הפל שחיטה עושה ניפול.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: The dispute is only regarding a limb of a fetus, but regarding a limb of the animal itself, all agree that shechitah makes it fall away, meaning it is considered completely severed and is not purified from carcass-tumah.

EXPLANATION

אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: מאי טעמא דרבי יוחנן אליבא דרבנן?

Rabbi Yose b'Rabbi Chanina said: What is the reason of Rabbi Yochanan according to the Rabbis, who distinguish between the limb of a fetus and the limb of the mother?

EXPLANATION

האי אית ליה תקנתא בחייה, והא לית ליה תקנתא בחייה.

This limb of a fetus has a remedy by returning to the womb, for if it is retracted, the shechitah permits it; but this limb of the mother has no remedy by returning, for even if it is reattached, it remains forbidden.

OBJECTION

מיתיבי: אמר להם רבי מאיר: לא, אם טיהרה שחיטת טרפה אותה ואת האבר המדולדל בה – דבר שגופה, תטהר את העופר – דבר שאינו גופה?

The Gemara raises an objection from the Braisa: Rabbi Meir said to them: No, if the shechitah of a tereifah purified it and the limb dangling from it, which is something that is its own body, should it purify the fetus, which is something that is not its own body? This implies that the Rabbis hold that shechitah does purify a dangling limb of the mother!

עמוד ב' DAF 73B

EXPLANATION

בשלמא לרבי שמעון בן לקיש, לדבריהם קאמר להו:

Granted, according to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, we can explain that Rabbi Meir was speaking to them, the Rabbis, according to their own words, as follows:

EXPLANATION

לדידי לא שניא אבר דעופר ולא שניא אבר דבהמה, כי הדידי ניהו.

According to my own opinion, there is no difference with regard to the limb of a fetus, and there is no difference with regard to the limb of an animal; they are like each other in that the slaughter of the animal does not render either of them pure.

OBJECTION

אלא לרבי יוחנן, קשיא.

But according to Rabbi Yochanan, who holds that both agree that a hanging limb is not rendered pure by slaughter, Rabbi Meir's statement is difficult, as it is inconsistent with both his opinion and the Rabbis' opinion.

RESOLUTION

אָלֵא, אִי אֶתְמַר הָכִי אֶתְמַר:

Rather, if such a dispute was stated, it was stated like this:

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ: כְּמַחְלוקת בְּעוֹפְרִים, כֵּן מַחְלוקת בְּאֵיכָרִין.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Just as there is a dispute with regard to the limbs of fetuses that emerged, so too there is a dispute with regard to hanging limbs of an animal.

STATEMENT

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: מַחְלוקת בְּאֵכָר דְּעוֹפֵר, אֲבָל בְּאֵכָר דְּבִהְמָה – דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל אֵין שְׁחִיטָה עוֹשֶׂה נִפְּוֹל.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: The dispute is only with regard to the limb of a fetus, but with regard to the limb of an animal, everyone agrees that slaughter does not make it as though it has fallen off prior to the slaughter, and therefore it does not contract the impurity of a carcass.

QUESTION

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: מַאי טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אֲלִיכָא דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר?

Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Chanina said: What is the reason of Rabbi Yochanan according to Rabbi Meir for distinguishing between a hanging limb and a fetus's limb?

ANSWER

הָאִי גּוֹפָה, וְהָאִי לֹא גּוֹפָה.

This hanging limb is part of its own body, but that fetus's limb is not part of its body.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב יִצְחָק בַּר יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הַכֹּל מוֹדִים שְׁמִיתָה עוֹשֶׂה נִפְּוֹל, וְאֵין שְׁחִיטָה עוֹשֶׂה נִפְּוֹל.

Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Everyone agrees that death makes a hanging limb as though it has fallen off beforehand, and everyone agrees that slaughter does not make it as though it has fallen off.

QUESTION

בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינוּ?

With what are we dealing here?

OBJECTION

אִילִימָא בְּאֵכָר דְּעוֹפֵר – מִיפְּלַג פְּלִיגִי!

If we say we are dealing with the limb of a fetus, they explicitly disagree about this!

OBJECTION

אָלֵא בְּאֵכָר דְּבִהְמָה – מִיתָה תְּנִינָא, שְׁחִיטָה תְּנִינָא.

Rather, we must be dealing with the limb of an animal. But if so, the halacha regarding death we have already learned in a Mishnah, and the halacha regarding slaughter we have already learned in a Mishnah!

PROOF

מִיתָה תִּנִּינָא: מִתָּה הִבְהֵמָה – הַבֶּשֶׂר צָרִיךְ הַכָּשֶׁר, וְהָאֶבֶר מְטַמָּא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַחַי, וְאִינוּ מְטַמָּא מְשׁוּם אֶבֶר מִן הַנֶּבֶלָה; דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

The halacha regarding death we have learned in the Mishnah: If the animal died, the hanging flesh needs susceptibility to impurity, and the limb imparts impurity because of a limb from a living animal, and it does not impart impurity because of a limb from a carcass; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

PROOF

שְׁחִיטָה נִמְי תִּנִּינָא: נִשְׁחָטָה בְּהֵמָה – הוֹכְשָׁרוּ בְּדָמֶיהָ, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמֵר: לֹא הוֹכְשָׁרוּ.

The halacha regarding slaughter also we have learned in that Mishnah: If the animal was slaughtered, they, the limb and the flesh, were rendered susceptible to impurity by its blood; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Shimon says: They were not rendered susceptible by its blood.

ANSWER

אִי מַהֲהִיא, הִוָּה אָמִינָא: מֵאִי "הוֹכְשָׁרוּ" – אֲבָשָׁר.

The Gemara answers: If we had derived it only from that Mishnah, I would have said: What is the meaning of "they were rendered susceptible"? It refers only to the flesh, but the limb is considered as though it fell off beforehand and is already impure as a limb from a living animal.

OBJECTION

וְהָא "הוֹכְשָׁרוּ" קְתַנִּי,

The Gemara objects: But it teaches "they were rendered susceptible" in the plural, which implies both the flesh and the limb!

ANSWER

מֵהוּ דִּתִּימָא: חַד לְבֶשֶׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הִבְהֵמָה, וְחַד לְבֶשֶׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הָאֶבֶר.

The Gemara explains: Lest you say that the plural refers to two types of flesh: one for flesh that separates from the animal, and one for flesh that separates from the limb.

QUESTION

וּמֵאִי אוּלְמִיָּה דְּהָאִי מַהֲאִי?

The Gemara asks: And what is the strength of this flesh over that flesh that they both need to be mentioned?

ANSWER

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּהּ אָמִינָא, הוּאִיל וּמְטַמָּא טוּמְאָה חֲמוּרָה אֲגַב אֲבִיו, אִימָא לָא לִיבְעֵי הַכָּשֶׁר, קִמְשָׁמַע לָן.

It might enter your mind to say: Since the flesh on the limb imparts a severe impurity along with its father, the limb itself, I might say it does not require susceptibility to impurity; therefore, the Mishnah teaches us that it does.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: נְקוּט דְרַב יִצְחָק בַּר יוֹסֵף בִּידָהּ, דְּרַבָּה בַּר חַנָּה קָאִי כְּוֹתִיהּ.

Rav Yosef said: Hold the ruling of Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef in your hand, for Rabba bar bar Chana stands like him.

PROOF

דְּתַנְיָא: "וּבֶשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה טְרֵפָה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ" – לְהֵבִיא הָאֵכָר וְהַבָּשָׂר הַמְדוּלָּדִין בְּבִהְמָה וּבְחֵיה וּבְעוֹף, וְשֶׁחָטוּן, שֶׁהֵן אֲסוּרִין.

As it is taught in a Braisa: "And flesh in the field that is torn you shall not eat" — this comes to include the limb and the flesh that are hanging from a domesticated animal, a wild animal, or a bird, and he slaughtered them, that they are forbidden to be eaten.

PROOF

וְאָמַר רַבָּה בַּר חַנָּה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן:

And Rabba bar bar Chana said that Rabbi Yochanan said on this:

SUMMARY

The Gemara goes on to analyze the dialogue and the deep halachic back-and-forth between Rabbi Meir and the Sages regarding whether the mother's shechitah can purify the protruding limb from carcass-tumah. We learn that according to the Rabbis, the shechitah of the mother has a unique power to save that which is not its own body (the fetus) even more than its own body, as seen in the case of one who cuts pieces of a fetus and leaves them inside the womb. Finally, we learn of a major machlokes between Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish and Rabbi Yochanan regarding whether this dispute extends to dangling limbs of the mother animal itself, with Rabbi Yochanan explaining that a fetus's limb is unique because it has a remedy of being retracted back into the womb.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, the Chachamim teach a profound principle: "The shechitah saves that which is not its body much more than it saves its own body." Sometimes, an act of purification or elevation has a far greater impact on the things connected to us, the "fetus" within the womb, than on our own immediate selves.

We often measure our spiritual growth by how much we have personally changed, looking only at "our own body." But the Torah is teaching us that the holiness we generate through our avodah, our mitzvos, and our learning ripples outward, protecting and elevating our children, our students, and our surroundings in ways we cannot even see. Your personal shechitah, your self-discipline and devotion to Hashem, has a saving power that extends far beyond your own boundaries.

Today, when you do a mitzvah or sit down to learn, do not think you are only working on yourself. Have in mind that the holiness you are bringing into your life is actively protecting, nourishing, and elevating your family and everyone around you.