



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***Limb of the Fetus and a Dangling Limb***

The Sages had stated in the *Mishna* that if an animal was in difficult labor and the fetus extended its foreleg (*out of the womb*) and a person slaughtered the mother first and then cut it off, the flesh (*of the fetus*) is *tamei*, like that which had touched a slaughtered *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* explains: They maintain that the limb does not have the *tumah* of *neveilah*, for the *shechitah* of the mother accomplishes that much – although it does not render it permitted for consumption. It does, however, acquire the *tumah* of a slaughtered *tereifah*. This is a Rabbinical *tumah* in the case of *kodashim*; accordingly, if the mother was a *korban*, the meat will acquire *tumah* due to the fact that it touched the *tamei* limb. If, however, the mother was *chullin*, the meat is completely *tahor*.

The *Mishna* had stated the logic of the Sages: For just as we find that the slaughtering of a *tereifah* animal renders it *tahor* (*and it does not acquire the tumah of neveilah*), so too, the slaughtering of the animal (*the mother*) should render the (*protruding*) limb *tahor*. [*Rabbi Meir said to them: No! For when you say that the slaughtering of a tereifah renders it tahor, you are dealing with the animal’s own body, but can you say that it will render tahor the limb which is not part of the animal itself?*]

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which contains a different version of their discussion: Rabbi Meir said to them: But what was it that rendered this limb *tahor* from the *tumah* of *neveilah*? Was it not the slaughtering of its mother? Then it should also

render it permitted to be eaten! They replied: It is often the case that an act has a greater effect upon that which is not part of her own body than upon that which is part of her own body; for we have learned in a *Mishna*: Whatever is cut off from the fetus within the womb (*and left inside*) may be eaten, but whatever is cut off from the spleen or kidneys (*of the animal and left inside*) may not be eaten (*for the shechitah does not render them permitted*).

Rava explains that it is as if there are missing some words here, and this is what it meant to say: Rabbi Meir said to them: But what was it that rendered this limb *tahor* from the *tumah* of *neveilah*? Was it not the slaughtering of its mother? Then it should also render it permitted to be eaten! They replied: The case of a *tereifah* proves otherwise, for the slaughtering renders it *tahor* from the *tumah* of *neveilah*, and yet, it does not render it permitted to be eaten. Rabbi Meir retorted: It is not so. For when you say that the slaughtering of a *tereifah* renders it *tahor*, you are dealing with the animal’s own body, but can you say that it will render *tahor* the limb which is not part of the animal itself? They replied: It is often the case that an act has a greater effect upon that which is not part of her own body than upon that which is part of her own body; for we have learned in a *Mishna*: Whatever is cut off from the fetus within the womb (*and left inside*) may be eaten, but whatever is cut off from the spleen or kidneys (*of the animal and left inside*) may not be eaten (*for the shechitah does not render them permitted*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which supports this explanation: Rabbi Meir said to them: But what was it that rendered this limb *tahor* from the *tumah* of *neveilah*? Was it not the

slaughtering of its mother? Then it should also render it permitted to be eaten! They replied: The case of a *tereifah* proves otherwise, for the slaughtering renders it *tahor* from the *tumah* of *neveilah*, and yet, it does not render it permitted to be eaten. Rabbi Meir retorted: It is not so. For when you say that the slaughtering of a *tereifah* renders it *tahor*, and the slaughtering of an animal renders *tahor* a limb that was mostly detached and dangling from it, you are dealing with the animal's own body, but can you say that it will render *tahor* the limb which is not part of the animal itself? They replied: It is often the case that an act has a greater effect upon that which is not part of her own body than upon that which is part of her own body; for we have learned in a *Mishna*: Whatever is cut off from the fetus within the womb (*and left inside*) may be eaten, but whatever is cut off from the spleen or kidneys (*of the animal and left inside*) may not be eaten (*for the shechitah does not render them permitted*).

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Just as they argue with regard to the limb of the fetus, so too they differ with regard to dangling limbs. Rabbi Yochanan said: They argue only with regard to the limb of the fetus, but with regard to a dangling limb of the animal, all agree that at the slaughtering it is regarded as detached (*and it is not tahor from the tumah of neveilah*).

Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina said: What is Rabbi Yochanan's reason according to the view of the Sages? It is that in this case (*of the fetus*) it can be rectified by withdrawal (*into the womb*), but in that case (*of the dangling limb*) it cannot be rectified by withdrawal.

The *Gemora* asks on Rabbi Yochanan from a *braisa*: Rabbi Meir retorted: It is not so. For when you say that the slaughtering of a *tereifah* renders it *tahor*, and the slaughtering of an animal renders *tahor* a limb that was mostly detached and dangling from it, you are dealing with the animal's own body, but can you say that it will render *tahor* the limb which is not part of the animal itself? Now,

this is all well according to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, for then Rabbi Meir would be arguing from the point of view of the Sages, and he was stating as follows: According to my view, there is no difference between the limb of the fetus and the dangling limb of an animal; they are both alike (*and the shechitah does not render them tahor from neveilah; but according to you, there can be a distinction between the two*). But according to Rabbi Yochanan, this is a difficulty (*for he said that everyone agrees that the dangling limb is tamei, and here Rabbi Meir says that it is not*)!

The *Gemora* revises their dispute as follows: Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Just as they argue with regard to the limb of the fetus, so too they differ with regard to dangling limbs. Rabbi Yochanan said: They argue only with regard to the limb of the fetus, but with regard to a dangling limb of the animal, all agree that at the slaughtering it is not regarded as detached (*and it is tahor from the tumah of neveilah*).

Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina said: What is Rabbi Yochanan's reason according to the view of Rabbi Meir? It is that in this case (*of the dangling limb*) it is part of the body, but in that case (*of the limb of the fetus*) it is not part of the body. (73a – 73b)

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### *The Soldier's Body Remained Intact*

"And meat **in the field**, *tereifah*, you shall not eat" (Shemos 22:30). *Kol Yehudah* states that one must avoid forbidden food not only at home but also "in the field", on a journey and in extraordinary conditions. He mentions the well-known story about the town that moved its cemetery because of the authorities' demands. To everyone's surprise, two of the deceased were found intact: a holy *tzadik* and a Russian soldier. Who was the soldier? It turned out that he was a Jew conscripted into the Russian army who perished because he refused to eat forbidden food. When his commander found out about his refusal, he ordered that he be fed pork. When the Jew refused, two soldiers grabbed him and tried to feed him by force but he choked and died on the spot (*Yalkut Chamishii*, Shemos).