

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ע'

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we are zocheh to delve deeper into the sugya of bechor (firstborn) animals and the exact moment of birth that determines their kedushah. The Gemara continues analyzing the machlokes between Rabba and Rav Huna regarding whether the birth of a firstborn consecrates the limbs retroactively or only from that point forward. We look closely at a Mishnah discussing a mother animal having difficulty giving birth, where one cuts the fetus limb by limb, and we try to resolve our questions based on whether the limbs must be buried or can be thrown to the dogs.

We then move into a beautiful series of deep halachic she'eilos raised by Rava and other Amoraim regarding the physical mechanics of birth. The Gemara explores various scenarios of interposition (chatzitzah) in the womb, such as wrapping the fetus in palm bast, a cloak, or the afterbirth of another animal. We also learn about unusual cases, like a fetus swallowed by a weasel and brought out, or a fetus passing from one womb directly into another attached womb, analyzing what truly constitutes a halachic birth.

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

עמוד א' DAF 70A

EXPLANATION

ואי אתמר בהא: בהא קאמר רבה, אבל בהא – אימא מודי ליה לרב הונא, צריכא.

And if the dispute **was stated** only **with regard to that** case of the firstborn, one might have thought: **It is only in that case that Rabba says** the animal is consecrated from that point forward, as it results in a stringency, **but in this** case of selling to a gentile, **I might say he concedes to Rav Huna**. Therefore, both statements are **necessary**.

QUESTION

תנו: המכפרת המקשה לילד – מחתה אבר ואבר ומשליה לבלבדים.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **We learned** in a Mishnah: If **an animal giving birth to a firstborn is having difficulty giving birth, one may cut** the fetus limb by limb and **cast** the limbs to the dogs.

QUESTION

מאי לאו, מחתה ומניח?

What, is it not referring to a case where **one cuts and leaves** the limbs aside, casting them to the dogs only after most of the fetus has emerged?

QUESTION

ואי אמרת למפרע הוא קדוש – יקבר מיבעי ליה!

And if you say that once the majority emerges, the fetus is consecrated retroactively, then it should have said that the limbs must be buried, since they are retroactively consecrated!

ANSWER

לא, הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינוּ? בְּמַחְתָּהּ וּמִשְׁלִיהָ.

The Gemara answers: No, here we are dealing with a case where one cuts and immediately casts each limb to the dogs before the majority of the fetus has emerged.

QUESTION

אֲבָל מְחַתָּהּ וּמְנִיחָהּ, מַאי יִקְבֵּר?

The Gemara asks: But if one cuts and leaves them, what is the halacha? Must they indeed be buried?

QUESTION

אֲדֹתָנָא סִיפָא: "יֵצֵא רוּבוֹ יִקְבֵּר וְנִפְטָרָה מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה",

If so, rather than teaching in the latter clause: If its majority emerged, it must be buried, and the mother is exempted from future firstborn status,

QUESTION

לִיפְלוֹג וְלִיתְנֵי בְּדִידֶיהָ: בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אֲמֹרִים – בְּמַחְתָּהּ וּמִשְׁלִיהָ אֲבָר אֲבָר, אֲבָל מְחַתָּהּ וּמְנִיחָהּ – יִקְבֵּר.

let the Tanna distinguish and teach within the first case itself: In what case are these words said? With regard to one who cuts and casts limb by limb. But if one cuts and leaves them, they must be buried!

ANSWER

הֲכִי נִמְי קֶאָמַר: בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אֲמֹרִים? בְּמַחְתָּהּ וּמִשְׁלִיהָ, אֲבָל מְחַתָּהּ וּמְנִיחָהּ – נַעֲשֶׂה כְּמִי שִׁיֵּצֵא רוּבוֹ, וְיִקְבֵּר.

The Gemara answers: Indeed, this is what the latter clause of the Mishnah is saying: In what case are these words said? With regard to one who cuts and casts them. But if one cuts and leaves them, it is considered as though its majority emerged at once, and it must be buried.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רָבָא: הֲלָכוּ בְּאִיבְרִין אַחֵר הָרֹב, אוֹ לֹא הֲלָכוּ בְּאִיבְרִין אַחֵר הָרֹב?

Rava raised a dilemma: Do we follow the majority with regard to limbs, or do we not follow the majority with regard to limbs?

EXPLANATION

הֲכִי דְּמִי: אִילִימָא, כְּגוֹן שִׁיֵּצֵא רוּב בְּמִיעוּט אֲבָר, וְקָא מִיפְעִיָא לִיה: הָאִי מִיעוּט דְּבִרְאִי, בְּתֵר רוּב דְּאֲבָר שְׁדִינָן לִיה, אוֹ בְּתֵר רוּבָא דְּעוֹפֵר שְׁדִינָן לִיה?

What are the circumstances? If we say, for example, that the majority of the fetus emerged, but that majority includes the minority of a limb whose majority is still inside, and his dilemma is: This minority of the limb which is outside, do we cast it

after the majority of the limb and consider it as if it is inside, or do we cast it after the majority of the fetus and consider it emerged?

EXPLANATION

פְּשִׁיטָא דְּלֹא שְׁבָקִינָן רוּבָא דְּעוּבָר, וְאִזְלִינָן בְּתֵר רוּב אֲבָר!

It is obvious that we do not abandon the majority of the fetus and follow the majority of a limb!

EXPLANATION

אֵלָּא, כְּגוֹן שֶׁיֵּצֵא חֲצִי בְּרוּב אֲבָר, וְקָא מִיבְעָא לֵיה: הֲהוּא מִיעוּט דְּבִגְנָא, מִהוּ לְמִישְׁדֵּייה בְּתֵר רוּב אֲבָר?

Rather, the dilemma is in a case where exactly half of it emerged, but that half includes the majority of a limb whose minority is still inside, and his dilemma is: That minority of the limb which is inside, what is the law as to casting it after the majority of the limb and considering it as if it has emerged, thereby completing the majority of the fetus?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: יֵצֵא רוּב – הֲרִי זֶה יִקָּבֵר.

Come and hear a resolution from our Mishnah: If its majority emerged, it must be buried.

PROOF

מֵאִי רוּבוֹ? אֵילִימָא רוּבוֹ מִמָּשׁ, עַד הַשְׁתָּא לֹא אֲשַׁמְעִינָן דְּרוּבוֹ כְּכוּלוֹ?

What is meant by 'its majority'? If we say its actual majority, until now have we not been taught that the majority of something is like all of it?

PROOF

אֵלָּא לָאוּ, כְּגוֹן שֶׁיֵּצֵא חֲצִי בְּרוּב אֲבָר!

Rather, is it not referring to a case where half of it emerged, but that half includes the majority of a limb, proving that we do follow the majority of a limb?

ANSWER

לֹא, כְּגוֹן שֶׁיֵּצֵא רוּבוֹ בְּמִיעוּט אֲבָר, וְקָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן דְּלֹא שְׁבָקִינָן רוּבוֹ דְּעוּבָר דְּבִהֶמָּה וְאִזְלִינָן בְּתֵר אֲבָר.

The Gemara rejects this: No, it is referring to a case where its majority emerged, but that majority includes the minority of a limb, and it teaches us that we do not abandon the majority of the animal's fetus and follow the limb.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַבָּא: כְּרָכוּ בְּסִיב, מִהוּ? בְּטָלִיתוּ, מִהוּ? בְּשָׁלִיתוּ, מִהוּ?

Rava raised a dilemma: If one wrapped the fetus in palm bast inside the womb and it emerged, what is the law? If one wrapped it in his cloak, what is the law? If it emerged wrapped in its afterbirth, what is the law?

OBJECTION

בְּשָׁלִיתוּ? אֹרְחִיהָ הוּא!

The Gemara asks: Why raise a dilemma about **its afterbirth**? That is its **natural manner** of birth, and it is not an interposition!

QUESTION

אֵלָא בְּשִׁלְיָא אַחֶרֶת, מָהוּ?

Rather, the dilemma is: If it was wrapped **in the afterbirth of another** animal, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

כְּרַכְתּוֹ וְאַחֲזָתוֹ וְהוֹצִיאָתוֹ, מָהוּ?

If **she wrapped it** with her hands, **held it, and brought it out**, **what is** the law?

OBJECTION

הִיכִי דְּמִי? אִי דְּנִפְק דְּרָךְ רִישִׁיָּה – פְּטָרְתִּיהּ!

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances?** If it **emerged headfirst**, the head **exempted it** from firstborn status before the hands could interpose!

EXPLANATION

אֵלָא דְּנִפְק דְּרָךְ מַרְגְּלוֹתָיו.

Rather, it is a case **where it emerged feetfirst**.

QUESTION

בְּלַעַתְהוּ חוּלְדָּה וְהוֹצִיאָתוֹ, מָהוּ?

Rava raised another dilemma: If **a weasel swallowed it and brought it out**, **what is** the law?

OBJECTION

הוֹצִיאָתוֹ? הָא אִפִּיקְתִּיהּ!

The Gemara asks: If the weasel **brought it out**, then the weasel **has brought it out** and it did not open the womb directly!

QUESTION

אֵלָא, בְּלַעַתּוֹ וְהוֹצִיאָתוֹ, וְהִכְנִיסְתּוֹ וְהִקְיָאָתוֹ, וְיִצֵּא מֵאֱלִיו, מָהוּ?

Rather, the dilemma is: If the weasel **swallowed it and brought it out**, and then **brought it back in and vomited it up**, and it then **emerged on its own**, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

הַדְּבִיק שְׁנֵי רַחֲמִים, וְיִצֵּא מִזֶּה וְנִכְנַס לָזֶה, מָהוּ?

If **one attached two wombs** of two animals together, and it **emerged from this womb and entered into that womb**, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

דִּידִּיהּ פֶּטֶר, דְּלֹא דִּידִּיהּ לָא פֶּטֶר, אוּ דְלִמָּא דְּלֹא דִּידִּיהּ נָמִי פֶּטֶר?

Does only **its own** womb **exempt** it, but **one that is not its own** does **not exempt** it, or perhaps **one that is not its own** also **exempts** it?

RESOLUTION

תיקון.

The Gemara concludes: The dilemma **shall stand** unresolved.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַב אַחָא: נִפְתְּחוּ כּוֹתְלֵי בֵּית הָרֶחֶם, מָהוּ?

Rav Acha raised a dilemma: If the walls of the womb were opened and the fetus emerged without touching them, what is the law?

QUESTION

אוֹיֵר רֶחֶם מְקַדֵּשׁ, וְהָאֵיפָא, אוּ דְלָמָּא נִגְיַעַת רֶחֶם מְקַדֵּשָׁה, וְהָא לִיפָא?

Does the airspace of the womb consecrate, and here it is present, or perhaps touching the womb consecrates, and here it is not present?

QUESTION

בְּעֵי מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי: נִעְקְרוּ כּוֹתְלֵי בֵּית הָרֶחֶם, מָהוּ?

Mar bar Rav Ashi raised a dilemma: If the walls of the womb were uprooted, what is the law?

OBJECTION

נִעְקְרוּ – לִיתְנָהוּ!

The Gemara asks: If they were uprooted, they are not there at all, so how could they consecrate?

QUESTION

אֵלָּא נִעְקְרוּ וְתָלוּ לִיהָ בְּצוּאָרֶיהָ, מָאִי?

Rather, the dilemma is: If they were uprooted and hung on its neck as it emerged, what is the law?

QUESTION

בְּמִקְוֵי מְקַדְּשֵׁי, שֶׁלֹּא בְּמִקְוֵי מִן לֹא מְקַדְּשֵׁי, אוּ דְלָמָּא שֶׁלֹּא בְּמִקְוֵי מִן נִמְי מְקַדְּשֵׁי?

Do they consecrate only in their place, but not in their place they do not consecrate, or perhaps not in their place they also consecrate?

QUESTION

בְּעֵי מִינְיָה רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה מְרַבִּי זִירָא: נִגְמְמוּ כּוֹתְלֵי בֵּית הָרֶחֶם, מָהוּ?

Rabbi Yirmeyah asked Rabbi Zeira: If the walls of the womb were cut down, what is the law?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיהָ: קָא נִגְעַת בְּבַעֲיָא דְּאִיבַעֲיָא לֹו, דְּבַעֲיָא רַבִּי זִירָא, וְאָמְרִי לָהּ בְּעָא מִינְיָה רַבִּי זִירָא מְרַבִּי אָסִי:

He said to him: You have touched upon a dilemma that was asked of us, which Rabbi Zeira raised, and some say Rabbi Zeira asked Rabbi Assi:

QUESTION

עומד מרובה על הפרוץ ויצא דרך פרוץ, פרוץ מרובה על העומד ויצא דרך עומד, מאי?

If the **standing** part of the womb is **greater** than the **breached** part, and it emerged through the **breached** part, or if the **breached** part is **greater** than the **standing** part, and it emerged through the **standing** part, what is the law?

EXPLANATION

עד כּאן לֹא איבּעֵינָא לִיה אֶלָּא פְּרוּץ מְרובהּ עַל הָעוֹמֵד, דְּאיכָא עוֹמֵד בְּעוֹלָם, אֲבָל נִגְמָמוּ – לֹא קָא מיבּעֵינָא לִיה.

Only in those cases did he raise a dilemma, where the breached is greater than the standing, because there is some standing part in existence, but where the walls were cut down entirely, he did not raise a dilemma, as it is obvious that it is not consecrated.

עמוד ב' DAF 70B

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' בהמה שמת עוברת בתוך מעיה והושיט הרועה את ידו ונגע בו, בין בבמה טמאה בין בבמה טהורה – טהורה.

MISHNAH: In the case of an animal whose fetus died inside its womb, and the shepherd reached his hand inside and touched it, whether in a non-kosher animal or in a kosher animal, the shepherd remains pure from the impurity of a carcass.

MISHNAH

רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: בטמאה – טמא, ובטהורה – טהור.

Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: In a non-kosher animal, the fetus is impure, and in a kosher animal, it is pure.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' מאי טעמא דתנא קמא?

GEMARA: What is the reason of the First Tanna who rules that the fetus is pure in both cases?

ANSWER

אמר רב חסדא: קל וחומר, אם הועילה אמו להתירו באכילה, לא תועיל לו לטהוריה מידי נבלה?

Rav Chisda said: It is derived from an **a fortiori** argument: If the slaughter of its mother is effective to permit it for eating as a kosher fetus, **will it not be effective for it to purify it from the impurity of a carcass** while still inside?

QUESTION

אֲשֶׁכַּחַן בְּהֶמָּה טְהוֹרָה, בְּהֶמָּה טְמֵאָה מִנָּלָן?

The Gemara asks: **We have found** a source for a **kosher animal**; but for a **non-kosher animal**, from where do we derive that its dead fetus is pure?

ANSWER

אָמַר קְרָא: "וְכִי יָמוּת מִן הַבְּהֵמָה" – זוֹ בְּהֶמָּה טְמֵאָה, "אֲשֶׁר הִיא לָכֶם לֶאֱכֹלָה" – זוֹ בְּהֶמָּה טְהוֹרָה,

The Gemara answers: **The verse states:** "And when there dies of the animals" — this refers to a **non-kosher animal**; "which is yours to eat" — this refers to a **kosher animal**.

ANSWER

אֵיתָקַשׁ בְּהֶמָּה טְמֵאָה לְבְּהֶמָּה טְהוֹרָה: מָה בְּהֶמָּה טְהוֹרָה – עוֹבְרָה טְהוֹרָה, אֲףִי בְּהֶמָּה טְמֵאָה – עוֹבְרָה טְהוֹרָה.

Thus, a **non-kosher animal** is juxtaposed to a **kosher animal**: Just as with a **kosher animal**, its fetus is pure, so too with a **non-kosher animal**, its fetus is pure.

QUESTION

וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי, מַאי טַעְמָא?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Yosei HaGelili**, what is his **reason** for ruling that the fetus of a non-kosher animal is impure?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק: דָּאָמַר קְרָא "וְכָל הוֹלֵךְ עַל כַּפָּיו בְּכָל הַחַיָּה הַחֹלֶכֶת וְגו' – מִהֶלְכִּי כַּפַּיִם בְּחַיָּה טְמֵאָתִי לָהּ.

Rabbi Yitzchak said: As the verse states: "And whatever walks on its paws among all the living things that walk..." which is expounded to mean: **Those that walk on paws inside a living thing**, I have declared impure for you.

OBJECTION

אֵלָא מַעֲתָה, קָלוּט בְּמַעֲי פְּרָה לִיטְמָא, דְּמִהֶלְכִּי כַּפַּיִם בְּחַיָּה הוּא?

The Gemara objects: **If that is so**, then a fetus with **uncloven hooves inside the womb of a cow** should become impure, as it is a fetus of **those that walk on paws inside a living thing**!

RESOLUTION

מִהֶלְכִּי כַּפַּיִם בְּמִהֶלְכִּי אַרְבַּע, וְהָאִי מִהֶלְכִּי אַרְבַּע בְּמִהֶלְכִּי שְׁמֹנֶה הוּא.

The Gemara answers: The verse only refers to **those that walk on four paws inside those that walk on four paws**; but this fetus is **one that walks on four inside one that walks on eight**, since a cow's split hooves count as eight.

OBJECTION

פְּרָה בְּמַעֲי גַמְלָל לֹא תִטְמָא, דְּמִהֶלְכִּי שְׁמֹנֶה בְּמִהֶלְכִּי אַרְבַּע הוּא,

The Gemara objects: If so, a fetus of a cow inside the womb of a camel should not become impure, as it is a fetus of those that walk on eight inside those that walk on four!

RESOLUTION

”הוֹלֵךְ”, ”וְכָל הוֹלֵךְ” – לְרֵבוֹת פָּרָה בְּמַעֲי גִמְל.

The Gemara answers: The verse could have said "walks", but it says "and whatever walks" — to include a fetus of a cow inside the womb of a camel.

OBJECTION

קְלוּט בְּמַעֲי קְלוּטָה לִיטְמָא, דְּמַה לְכִי אַרְבַּע בְּמַה לְכִי אַרְבַּע הוּא!

The Gemara objects: If so, a fetus with **uncloven hooves inside** a mother with **uncloven hooves** of a kosher species should become impure, as it is a fetus of those that walk on four inside those that walk on four!

RESOLUTION

לְהִכִּי אַחֲנִי קַל וְחוֹמֶר דְּרַב חֲסִידָא.

The Gemara answers: For this reason, the a fortiori argument of Rav Chisda is effective to purify any fetus of a kosher species.

OBJECTION

מִתְקִיר לַה רַב אַחַדְבוֹי בַּר אַמִּי: חֲזִיר בְּמַעֲי חֲזִירָתָא לָא לִיטְמָא, דְּמַה לְכִי שְׂמֹנָה בְּמַה לְכִי שְׂמֹנָה הוּא!

Rav Achadvoi bar Ami challenged this: If so, a dead pig fetus inside the womb of a female pig should not become impure, as it is a fetus of those that walk on eight inside those that walk on eight!

ANSWER

אָלָא אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק, מֵהֶכָּא: ”נִפְשׁ כִּי תִגַּע בְּכָל טָמֵא אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת חַיָּה טָמְאָה אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת בְּהֵמָה טָמְאָה אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת שָׂרִץ טָמֵא.”

Rather, Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: Rabbi Yosei HaGelili's source is from here: "A soul that touches any impure thing, or the carcass of an impure wild animal, or the carcass of an impure domesticated animal, or the carcass of an impure creeping thing..."

QUESTION

וְכִי נִבְלַת בְּהֵמָה טָמְאָה מְטַמְּאָה, וּבִטְהוֹרָה לֹא מְטַמְּאָה?

The Gemara asks: Does only the carcass of an impure animal impart impurity, and that of a pure animal does not impart impurity? Surely both do!

ANSWER

אָלָא אֵיזָה זֶה? זֶה עוֹבֵר, שֶׁבְּטָמְאָה טָמֵא, וּבִטְהוֹרָה טָהוֹר.

Rather, which case is this referring to? This is a fetus, which in an impure mother is impure, and in a pure mother is pure.

QUESTION

ומאחר דנפקא ליה מדרב נחמן בר יצחק, דרבי יצחק למה לי?

The Gemara asks: **And since he derives it from the verse cited by Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak, why do I need the verse of Rabbi Yitzchak?**

ANSWER

אי לא דרבי יצחק, הוה אמינא: כולייה לדרבי הוא דאיתא, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: **Were it not for the teaching of Rabbi Yitzchak, I would have said that the entire verse comes only for that which Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi expounded; therefore, Rabbi Yitzchak teaches us** that it is also expounded this way.

BRAISA

תניא, אמר רבי יונתן: נמתי לו לכן עזאי, למדנו נבלת בהמה טהורה שטמאה, ונבלת בהמה טמאה שטמאה, נבלת חיה טמאה שטמאה.

It was taught in a braisa: Rabbi Yonatan said: I said to Ben Azzai: We have learned that the carcass of a pure domesticated animal imparts impurity, and the carcass of an impure domesticated animal imparts impurity, and the carcass of an impure wild animal imparts impurity.

BRAISA

נבלת חיה טהורה לא למדנו מניין?

But the carcass of a pure wild animal we have not learned; from where do we derive it?

BRAISA

נב לי: "כל הולך על כפיו בכל החיה ההלכת".

He said to me: It is derived from: "Whatever walks on its paws among all the living things that walk."

BRAISA

נמתי לו: וכי נאמר "וכל חיה"? והלא לא נאמר אלא "בכל החיה", למה לבי פנים בחיה הוא דאיתא.

I said to him: Is it written "and all wild animals"? Surely it is only written "among all the living things", which comes only for those that walk on paws inside a living thing!

BRAISA

נב לי: ומה ישמעאל אומר בדבר הזה?

He said to me: And what does your master, Rabbi Yishmael, say on this matter?

BRAISA

נמתי לו: "וכי ימות מן הבהמה" – זו בהמה טמאה, "אשר היא לכם לאכלה" – זו בהמה טהורה, למדנו חיה בכלל בהמה, ובהמה בכלל חיה. חיה טהורה בכלל בהמה טהורה, חיה טמאה בכלל בהמה טמאה.

I said to him: He expounds: "And when there dies of the animals" — this is an impure animal; "which is yours to eat" — this is a pure animal; we have learned that a wild animal is included in "domesticated animal", and a domesticated

animal is included in "wild animal". A pure wild animal is included in a pure domesticated animal, and an impure wild animal is included in an impure domesticated animal.

SUMMARY

The daf begins by clarifying the necessity of both statements of Rabba and Rav Huna, testing Rabba's view of retroactive consecration against a Mishnah about cutting a fetus during a difficult labor. Rava then introduces a series of fascinating dilemmas: whether we follow the majority of a limb to complete the majority of a fetus, and whether various coverings (like palm bast, a cloak, or another animal's afterbirth) act as a chatzitzah during birth. The Gemara also analyzes extraordinary cases, such as a fetus swallowed and regurgitated by a weasel, two wombs joined together, a birth where the fetus does not touch the opened walls of the womb, and a case where the womb's walls are uprooted or partially breached. These deep inquiries into the physical boundaries of birth and kedushah are left unresolved by the Gemara with a status of teiku.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In today's daf, Rava and the other Amoraim take us through a series of extraordinary, highly unusual scenarios regarding how a newborn animal might emerge into the world. They ask about a fetus wrapped in palm bast, wrapped in a cloak, swallowed and vomited out by a weasel, or passing through two attached wombs. On the surface, these cases seem almost impossible, yet our Sages spend precious time analyzing the halachic status of each one.

This teaches us a profound lesson about how Hashem views reality. In the eyes of the Torah, there is no such thing as a situation so bizarre, messy, or convoluted that it is left outside the realm of holiness. We often look at our own lives, our complicated family dynamics, our chaotic schedules, or the sudden, strange challenges that catch us completely off guard, and we think, "This is too messy. Hashem cannot possibly be found in this confusion."

But the sugya shows us otherwise. Just as the halacha reaches into the mouth of a weasel or between two attached wombs to find the line of law and sanctity, so too does Hashem's providence reach into the most tangled corners of your life. No situation you find yourself in is too strange or too broken to be elevated through the Torah.

Today, when you encounter an unexpected, chaotic, or highly unusual disruption in your day, do not throw your hands up in frustration. Take a deep breath, realize that Hashem is present even in this bizarre scenario, and ask yourself: "What is the Ratzon Hashem for me in this exact, messy moment?"