

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ס"ט

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by continuing our deep dive into the halachos of a fetus in its mother's womb at the time of shechitah. The Gemara explores the boundaries of what is permitted by the mother's slaughter, specifically analyzing the status of an uncloven-hoofed fetus (a 'shasua') according to Rabbi Shimon, and whether its presence in the womb protects it from being forbidden. We then move into a fascinating series of yeshivish dilemmas raised by the Amoraim regarding limbs that extend outside their proper boundaries before shechitah.

Our Rabbeim guide us through intricate questions of kedushah and tumah. We look at a fetus of a Korban that extends a limb outside the womb while in the Beis HaMikdash, and whether the courtyard walls or the mother herself define its boundary. We also learn about the mechanics of shechitah, analyzing whether the cutting of the first and second simanim can combine to purify an extended limb from the tumah of a carcass, and we delve into the halachic status of the offspring and milk of an animal that had an extended, forbidden limb.

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

עמוד א' DAF 69A

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

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

The Mishnah stated: **This is the general rule: Any part that is** considered part of **its body** which was severed before slaughter **is forbidden** to be eaten, **and** any part **that is not** considered part of **its body** but is a separate entity, i.e., the fetus, **is permitted** by the slaughter of the mother.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

שאיין גופה לאתויי מאי? לאו לאתויי כהאי גוונא?

The Gemara asks: The phrase "**that is not** part of **its body**" comes to include what case? Is it not to include a case like this, where the majority of the fetus has already emerged, and yet the remainder inside is permitted?

ANSWER

לא, לאתויי קלוט במעי פרה, ואליבא דרבנן שמעון,

The Gemara answers: **No**, it comes **to include** a fetus with **uncloven hooves** found **in the womb of a cow**, and this is **in accordance with** the view of **Rabbi Shimon**,

EXPLANATION

דאף על גב דאמר רבי שמעון: קלוט בן פרה אסור – הני מילי היכא דיצא לאויר העולם, אבל במעי אמו – שרי.

for even though Rabbi Shimon says that an uncloven-hoofed offspring of a cow is forbidden because it lacks kosher signs, these words apply only where it emerged into the airspace of the world as a live birth, but if it is still in its mother's womb when she is slaughtered, it is permitted by her slaughter.

QUESTION

בעי רב חנניא: הוציא עובר את ידו בפעורה, מהו?

Rav Chananya raised a dilemma: If a fetus of a Kodshei Kodashim offering extended its foreleg out of the womb while in the Temple courtyard, and then brought it back, what is the law?

EXPLANATION

מגו דהוי מחיצה לגבי קדשים – הוי נמי לגבי דהאי, או דלמא לגבי דהאי לאו מחיצה היא, דמחיצת עובר – אמו היא?

Do we say that since the courtyard wall is a boundary regarding holy offerings, keeping them within their permitted area, it is also considered a boundary regarding this fetus, so that the limb did not leave its boundary? Or perhaps regarding this fetus, the courtyard wall is not considered its boundary, because the boundary of a fetus is its mother alone, and thus the limb did leave its boundary?

OBJECTION

אמר ליה אביי: ותבעי לה קדשים קלים בירושלם?

Abaye said to him: But let you raise the same dilemma regarding offerings of lesser sanctity whose limbs are extended in Yerushalayim, which is their boundary!

REFUTATION

קדשים קלים בירושלם מאי טעמא לא קא מיבעיא לה? דמחיצת עובר אמו הוא, הכא נמי מחיצת עובר אמו הוא.

What is the reason that you did not raise the dilemma regarding offerings of lesser sanctity in Yerushalayim? It must be because it is obvious to you that the boundary of a fetus is its mother and not the city walls. If so, here too, regarding Kodshei Kodashim, the boundary of a fetus is its mother and not the courtyard walls.

QUESTION

בעי אילפא: הוציא עובר את ידו בין סימן לסימן, מהו?

Ilfa raised a dilemma: If a fetus extended its foreleg outside the womb between the cutting of the first siman and the second siman, what is the law?

EXPLANATION

מי מצטרף סימן ראשון לסימן שני לטהוריה מידי נבלה, או לא?

Does the first siman combine with the second siman to purify it from the impurity of a carcass, or not? Since the first cut was made while the limb was inside, and the second while it was outside, do they combine?

RESOLUTION

אמר רבא: קל וחומר, אם הועיל לו סימן ראשון לסימן שני להתירו באכילה, לא יועיל לו לטהוריה מידי נבלה?

Rava said: It is a kal vachomer: If the first siman was effective in combining with the second siman to permit the rest of the fetus for eating, will it not be effective for it to purify the extended limb from the impurity of a carcass?

QUESTION

בעי רבי ירמיה: מהו לחוש לזרעו?

Rabbi Yirmeya raised a dilemma: What is the law regarding whether to be concerned for its offspring? If a fetus extended a limb, making that limb forbidden, and then emerged alive after the mother's slaughter, does the prohibition of the limb affect its offspring?

QUESTION

היכי דמי? אילימא דאזל אבהמה מעלייתא, מאי איריא האי דאית פיה איסור יוצא?

The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances? If we say that it went and mated with a normal, standard animal, why discuss specifically this animal which has the prohibition of leaving its boundary?

EXPLANATION

אפילו בן פקועה דעלמא נמי, דאמר רב משרשיא: לדברי האומר חוששין לזרע האב, בן פקועה הבא על בהמה מעלייתא – הולד אין לו תקנה.

Even a regular ben pekua that mated with a normal animal as well would have a problem, as Rav Mesharshiyya said: According to the one who says we are concerned for the seed of the father, a ben pekua that mates with a normal animal—the offspring has no rectification through slaughter, because of its mixed status.

ANSWER

לא צריכא, דאזל אפן פקועה דכוותיה. מאי?

The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary in a case where it went and mated with a ben pekua like itself. What is the law?

EXPLANATION

אמר מיליד אבר, וחתיה ליה ושרי, או דלמא מבבל זרעיה?

Do we say that each limb of the father generates the corresponding limb in the offspring, and so one can cut off that specific limb in the offspring and the rest is permitted? Or perhaps its seed is intermingled throughout the entire body of the offspring?

STATEMENT

הדר אמר: פשיטא דמבבל זרעיה, דאם בן, סומא יולד סומא, וקיטע יולד קיטע!

Rabbi Yirmeya then said: It is obvious that its seed is intermingled, for if so, a blind animal would always give birth to a blind offspring, and a maimed animal would give birth to a maimed offspring, which is not the case.

QUESTION

אָלאַ פֿשיטא דמבֿלבל זרעיה, וְהִכִּי קְמִיפֵעִיא לִן: בְּהֶמָּה בְּעֵלְמָא, לֹא מִכַּח חֵלֶב וְדָם קִאֲתִיא, וְשָׂרִיא?

Rather, it is obvious that its seed is intermingled, and this is what we are asking: A regular animal, does it not come from the strength of forbidden chelev and blood of its parents, and yet it is permitted?

EXPLANATION

הָכָא נָמִי לֹא שָׂנֵא. אוּ דְלָמָּא: תְּרֵי אִיסוּרֵי אֲמַרִינֵן, תִּלְתָּא לֹא אֲמַרִינֵן?

Here too, it is no different, and the offspring should be permitted. Or perhaps: We say that the offspring is permitted despite two prohibitions of the parents (chelev and blood), but we do not say so when there are three prohibitions, including the forbidden extended limb?

QUESTION

וְלָמָּאן? אִי לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר – אִיסוּר חֵלֶב וְדָם אִיכָא, אִיסוּר יוֹצֵא יֵיכָא.

The Gemara asks: And according to whom would there be three prohibitions? If according to Rabbi Meir, there is the prohibition of chelev and blood, but there is no prohibition of the extended limb because he holds a fetus does not have a limb prohibition;

EXPLANATION

אִי לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה – אִיסוּר יוֹצֵא אִיכָא, אִיסוּר חֵלֶב וְדָם לֵיכָא!

if according to Rabbi Judah, there is the prohibition of the extended limb, but there is no prohibition of chelev and blood for a fetus!

PROOF

דְּתַנּוּ: גִּיד הַנֶּשֶׁה נוֹהֵג בְּשָׁלִיל, וְחֵלְבוֹ אָסוּר, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: אֵין נוֹהֵג בְּשָׁלִיל, וְחֵלְבוֹ מוּתָר.

As we learned in a Mishnah: The sciatic nerve applies to a fetus, and its chelev is forbidden; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Judah says: It does not apply to a fetus, and its chelev is permitted. Thus, neither Tanna holds there are three prohibitions.

STATEMENT

אָלא, כֹּל מִכַּח לֹא אֲמַרִינֵן דְּשָׂרִי.

Rather, we must say that any argument based on "coming from the strength of" forbidden parents we do not say is permitted, as the offspring of a forbidden limb is indeed forbidden.

QUESTION

וְהִכִּי קְמִיפֵעִיא לִן: מָהוּ לְגִמּוּעַ אֶת חֵלְבוֹ?

And this is what we are asking: What is the law regarding drinking its milk? If this animal grew up and produced milk, is the milk forbidden because of the limb?

EXPLANATION

חלב דעלמא לא פאבר מן החי דמי, ושרי, האי נמי לא שנא.

Do we say that **regular milk is not considered like a limb from a living animal, and is permitted**, and this milk is also no different?

EXPLANATION

או דלמא התם, אית ליה תקנתא לאיסוריה בשחיטה, הכא לית ליה תקנתא לאיסוריה בשחיטה?

Or perhaps there, the animal's meat has a remedy for its forbidden state through slaughter, so its milk is permitted, whereas here, the forbidden limb has no remedy for its forbidden state through slaughter, so its milk is forbidden?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara concludes: The question **stands unresolved**.

QUESTION

חותה מעובר וכו'. מנל?

The Mishnah stated: If one **cuts from a fetus** in its mother's womb, it is permitted. The Gemara asks: **From where do we** derive this?

PROOF

דכתיב: "וְכָל בְּהֵמָה מִפְּרֶסֶת פֶּרֶסָה וְגו'...", "בְּהֵמָה ... בְּבֵהֶמָה" – לרבות את הולד.

As it is written: "And every animal that has a split hoof..." and the verse continues, "an animal... within the animal"—this comes to include the offspring as permitted by the mother's slaughter.

OBJECTION

אָלָא מַעֲתָה, זְמִירוּ בּוֹ! אֵלֶּמָּה תִּנּוּ: אֵין מְמִירִין לֹא אֲבָרִין בְּעוּבָרִין, וְלֹא עוּבָרִין בְּאֲבָרִין, וְלֹא אֲבָרִין עוּבָרִין בְּשִׁלְמִין, וְלֹא שְׁלִמִין בָּהֶן!

The Gemara asks: If that is so, let them effect Temurah (substitution) with it! Why then did we learn in a Mishnah: One cannot substitute limbs for fetuses, nor fetuses for limbs, nor limbs and fetuses for whole animals, nor whole animals for them! If a fetus is considered a separate animal, Temurah should apply.

ANSWER

אָלָא, אָמַר קְרָא: "וְכָל בְּהֵמָה", לרבות את הולד.

Rather, the Gemara says, **the verse states: "And every animal,"** with the extra word "and" coming to include the offspring for slaughter, but not for Temurah.

QUESTION

אי הכי, אפילו חותה מן הטחול ומן הכליות נמי, אלמא תנן: חותה מן העובר שבמעיָה – מותר באכילה, מן הטחול ומן הכליות – אסור באכילה?

The Gemara asks: If so, that the mother's slaughter permits everything inside her, even if one cuts from the spleen or from the kidneys before slaughter, they should also be permitted! Why then did we learn in the Mishnah: One who cuts from the

fetus in its womb—it is permitted for eating, but if he cuts from the spleen or from the kidneys—it is forbidden for eating?

ANSWER

אמר קרא: "אותה" – שלמה ולא חסרה.

The Gemara answers: **The verse states: "You shall slaughter... it,"** implying she must be slaughtered whole and not lacking her own limbs, which excludes her own spleen or kidneys.

QUESTION

אלא מעתה, השוחט את הבהמה ומצא בה דמות יונה תשתרי? אלא אמר רבי יוחנן: השוחט את הבהמה ומצא בה דמות יונה (אסור) [אסורה] באכילה?

The Gemara asks: **If that is so, one who slaughters an animal and finds in it the shape of a dove, let it be permitted by the slaughter!** Why then did Rabbi Yochanan say: **One who slaughters an animal and finds in it the shape of a dove—it is forbidden for eating?**

עמוד ב' DAF 69B

EXPLANATION

בעינא פרסות, וליכא.

The Gemara explains: **I require** that the fetus have **hooves** to be permitted, **and** in a dove-shaped fetus **there are none**.

OBJECTION

אלא מעתה, קלוט במעי פרה ליתסר?

The Gemara objects: **But if so**, that the fetus is permitted only if it fulfills the conditions mentioned in that verse, then a fetus with **non-cloven hooves** found **inside a cow's womb** should be **forbidden**, whereas the baraita states that it is permitted!

ANSWER

הא תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל כרבי שמעון בן יוחי: "פרסה בבהמה תאכל".

The Gemara answers: **This** is as the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught in accordance with Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai, who expounds the verse: **"An animal that has a hoof, in the animal, you may eat"**, teaching that even a fetus with a non-cloven hoof is permitted.

STATEMENT

רב שימי בר אשי אמר: לעולם פדקאמרת מעיקרא,

Rav Shimi bar Ashi said: Actually, the halacha that the fetus is permitted should be derived **as you said at first**, from the phrase "an animal in the animal."

EXPLANATION

ודקא קשיא לה "אין ממירין", הא מני? רבי שמעון היא, דמקיש תמורה למעשר:

And as for that which was difficult to you from the mishna in Temura which states "one cannot substitute" for a fetus, whose opinion is this? It is Rabbi Shimon, who compares substitution to the animal tithe:

EXPLANATION

מה מעשר אינו נוהג באברים ועופרים, אף תמורה אינה נוהגת באברים ועופרים.

Just as the animal tithe does not apply to limbs and fetuses, so too, substitution does not apply to limbs and fetuses.

PROOF

ומנא תימרא, דתנן: אמר רבי יוסי: והלא במוקדשים, האומר: "רגלה של זו עולה" – כולה עולה,

And from where do you say that this mishna in Temura is Rabbi Shimon's opinion? As we learned in a mishna there: Rabbi Yosei says: But with regard to consecrated offerings, one who says: "The leg of this animal is a burnt offering" – all of it is a burnt offering,

PROOF

אף כשיאמר: "רגל של זו תחת זו" – תהא כולה תמורה תחתיה.

so too, when one says: "The leg of this non-sacred animal should be substituted instead of that offering" – the entire animal should be a substitute in its stead.

QUESTION

למאן קא מהדר ליה? אילימא לרבי מאיר ורבי יהודה, מי אית להו האי סברא?

The Gemara asks: To whom is Rabbi Yosei responding? If we say he is responding to Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda, do they accept this reasoning that substituting a limb is not possible?

OBJECTION

והתנא: יכול האומר "רגלה של זו עולה" תהא כולה עולה? תלמוד לומר: "כל אשר יתן ממנו לה' יהיה קדש" – ממנו קדש, ולא כולו קדש.

But isn't it taught in a baraita: One might have thought that one who says: "The leg of this animal is a burnt offering," all of it will be a burnt offering? Therefore, the verse states: "Anything of it that one gives to Hashem, it shall be sacred" – "of it" shall be sacred, but all of it will not be sacred.

EXPLANATION

יכול תצא לחולין? תלמוד לומר: "יהיה" – ביהוייתה תהא.

One might have thought it may go out to non-sacred status by being redeemed? Therefore, the verse states: "It shall be" – it shall remain in its status.

EXPLANATION

הא כיצד? תמכר לצרכי עולות, ודמיה חולין, חוץ מדמי אבר שבה – דברי רבי מאיר ורבי יהודה.

How is this possible? It should be sold for the needs of burnt offerings, and its payment is non-sacred, except for the payment of that limb that is in it – these are the words of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda.

EXPLANATION

רבי יוסי ורבי שמעון אומרים: מניין לאומר "רגלה של זו עולה" – תהא כולה עולה? תלמוד לומר: "יהיה" – לרבות את כולה.

Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: From where is it derived for one who says: "The leg of this animal is a burnt offering" – that all of it becomes a burnt offering? The verse states: "It shall be" – to include all of it.

QUESTION

לְמֵאן? אִי לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה – מִי אֵת לָהּ הָאֵי סְבָרָא? אֵלָּא לָאוּ לְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן!

The Gemara returns to its question: **To whom** is Rabbi Yosei responding in the mishna in Temura? **If to Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda – do they accept this reasoning** that substituting a limb is not possible? **Rather, is it not to Rabbi Shimon**, which proves that the mishna there is Rabbi Shimon's opinion!

ANSWER

לֹא, רַבִּי יוֹסֵי טַעֲמָא דְנִפְשִׁיהּ קָאָמַר.

The Gemara rejects this: **No, Rabbi Yosei stated his own reasoning**, without reference to another Sage, and thus there is no proof.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי הַמִּבְּרִית, הַמִּקְשָׁה לֵילֵד – מִחֲתָךְ אֶבֶר אֶבֶר, וּמִשְׁלִיף לְכַלְבִּים.

MISHNAH: An animal giving birth to a firstborn for the first time, that is having difficulty giving birth – one may cut up the fetus limb by limb, and cast it to the dogs.

MISHNAH

יֵצֵא רֹבּוֹ – הֲרִי זֶה יִקָּבֵר, וְנִפְטָרֶת מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה.

If the majority of it emerged – behold, this must be buried, and the mother is exempted from the law of the firstborn in the future.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

GEMARA

גָּמַ' אֶתְמַר: יֵצֵא שְׁלִישׁ וּמָכְרוּ לְגוֹי, וְחָזַר וַיֵּצֵא שְׁלִישׁ אַחֵר –

GEMARA: It was stated: If one-third of a firstborn fetus emerged and he sold it to a non-Jew, and then another third emerged, making a majority,

STATEMENT

רַב הוּנָא אָמַר: קָדוֹשׁ, רַבָּה אָמַר: אֵינוֹ קָדוֹשׁ.

Rav Huna says: It is consecrated as a firstborn, and Rabba says: It is not consecrated.

EXPLANATION

רב הונא אָמַר קְדוּשׁ: קִסְבֵּר לְמַפְרַע קְדוּשׁ, וְכֵינֵן דְּנִפְק לִיה רֹבִיּה – אֵינָּלַי מִיִּלְתָּא לְמַפְרַע
דְּמַעֲיָקְרָא הָוָה קְדוּשׁ, וּמֵאִי דְזִבִּין – לֹא כָּלּוּם זִבִּין.

Rav Huna says it is consecrated: He holds that it is consecrated retroactively from the moment the first part emerged. And since the majority of it emerged, the matter is revealed retroactively that from the outset it was consecrated, and that which he sold to the non-Jew, he sold nothing at all.

EXPLANATION

רַבָּה אָמַר אֵינּוּ קְדוּשׁ: קִסְבֵּר מִכָּאן וּלְהֶבֱא קְדוּשׁ, וּמֵאִי דְזִבִּין – שְׁפִיר זִבִּין.

Rabba says it is not consecrated: He holds that it is consecrated from now and on, only when the majority emerges. And that which he sold, he sold well, as it was not yet consecrated at the time of the sale.

STATEMENT

וְאֲזִדּוּ לְטַעְמֵיהוּ, דְּאֵתְמַר: יֵצֵא שְׁלִישׁ דְּרָךְ דּוּפֹן, וּשְׁנֵי שְׁלִישֵׁי דְרָךְ רַחֵם –

And they go according to their reasoning, as it was stated: If one-third emerged by way of a Caesarean section, and two-thirds by way of the womb,

STATEMENT

רב הונא אָמַר: אֵינּוּ קְדוּשׁ, רַבָּה אָמַר: קְדוּשׁ.

Rav Huna says: It is not consecrated, and Rabba says: It is consecrated.

EXPLANATION

רב הונא אָמַר: אֵינּוּ קְדוּשׁ. רַב הונא לְטַעְמִיהּ, דְּאֵתְמַר: לְמַפְרַע קְדוּשׁ, וְרֹבָא קָמָא לִיתִּיהּ בְּרַחֵם.

Rav Huna says: It is not consecrated. Rav Huna is consistent with his reasoning, as he says: It is consecrated retroactively, and the first majority, which includes the first third, is not entirely born through the womb.

EXPLANATION

רַבָּה אָמַר: קְדוּשׁ. רַבָּה לְטַעְמִיהּ, דְּאֵתְמַר: מִכָּאן וּלְהֶבֱא קְדוּשׁ, וְרֹבָא דְרָךְ רַחֵם נָפִיק.

Rabba says: It is consecrated. Rabba is consistent with his reasoning, as he says: It is consecrated from now and on, and the majority that triggers the consecration emerged by way of the womb.

EXPLANATION

וְצָרִיכָא, דְּאִי אֲשַׁמְעִינּוּ בְּהָא: בְּהָא קָאמַר רַב הונא מְשׁוּם דְּלְקוּלָּא, אֲבָל בְּהָא דְלְחומְרָא – אֵימָא
מוּדִי לִיה לְרַבָּה.

And both cases are necessary, for if we were taught only this first case, we might say in this case Rav Huna says so because it is a leniency, but in that second case which is a stringency, say he agrees with Rabba.

SUMMARY

The daf flows from the general rule of the Mishnah regarding severed limbs to specific, complex scenarios of boundary-crossing. We analyze Rabbi Shimon's view on an uncloven-hoofed fetus, establishing that it is permitted if found inside a slaughtered cow. Rav Chananya's inquiry regarding a Kodshei Kodashim fetus in the Azarah is resolved by Abaye, who proves that the mother, not the Temple walls, is the fetus's primary boundary. Ilfa's dilemma regarding a limb extended

between the cutting of the two simanim is resolved by Rava using a kal vachomer, proving that the shechitah process successfully purifies the limb from tumas neveilah. Finally, Rabbi Yirmeya raises questions about the offspring and the milk of an animal that grew from a fetus with a forbidden, extended limb, leaving the question of the milk's permissibility unresolved as a 'teiku'.

למנשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In the depths of today's sugya, the Gemara discusses a fascinating question raised by Rav Chananya: If a fetus of a holy offering extends its limb outside the womb while inside the Temple courtyard, does the courtyard wall act as a boundary for it, or do we say that "the boundary of a fetus is its mother alone"? Abaye clarifies that indeed, the mother is the fetus's entire world and its only true boundary. Even when standing inside the holy Beis HaMikdash, the fetus is completely defined and protected by its mother.

This teaches us a profound lesson about our own spiritual boundaries and the environments we create. A child, or anyone we are trying to nurture and influence, is like that fetus. We might think that the external walls, the school, the community, the shul, or the general environment, are enough to protect them and keep them holy. But Chazal are teaching us that the ultimate boundary, the one that truly defines and guards a soul, is the home. The mother and father, the warmth of the parents' personal emunah and yiras Shamayim, are the primary "mechitzah" (boundary) that shields a child from the outside world.

You cannot rely solely on the "courtyard walls" of external institutions to do the work of spiritual preservation. The atmosphere inside your own home, the way you speak, the joy you show in doing a mitzvah, and the love you pour into your family are what create the ultimate protective sanctuary. When the home is a place of genuine kedushah, those inside it are protected no matter what winds are blowing outside.

Today, make your home a stronger sanctuary. Speak words of emunah and gratitude to Hashem out loud at the table, ensuring that the atmosphere inside your walls is one of warmth, safety, and unmistakable kedushah.