

דף יומי • חלין • דף ע"ב

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we dive deeper into the sugya of swallowed impurity (tumah beluah), specifically focusing on the status of a dead fetus inside its mother's womb. The Gemara discusses whether a midwife who touches the fetus during childbirth becomes tamei, analyzing the machlokes between Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva regarding whether a fetus in the womb is tamei by Torah law or only mid'Rabbanan. We learn how the Chachamim made a special decree to prevent a situation where the fetus's head might emerge without the midwife realizing, which would make it a full-fledged corpse under the open sky.

We then move into a new Mishnah that deals with a highly practical and intricate area of hilchos shechitah: an animal having difficulty giving birth where the fetus extends a foreleg outside the womb. The Mishnah explores the status of this protruding limb if it was severed before or after the mother's shechitah, bringing us into a beautiful debate between Rabbi Meir and the Sages about whether the shechitah of the mother can purify the limb from the severe impurity of a carcass (neveilah), drawing comparisons to the halachos of a tereifah.

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

דף 72א • עמוד א'

OBJECTION

וְהָא עוֹבֵר וְחֵיָה, דְּכִשְׁתִּי טַפְעוֹת דָּמוֹ, וְקָא מְטִימָא לָהּ עוֹבֵר לְחֵיָה?

The Gemara objects: **But** what about the case of a dead **fetus** and the **midwife** who touches it inside the womb, **which are comparable to** the case of **two** swallowed **rings**, as the fetus is swallowed inside the mother's body, **and yet** the **fetus** renders the **midwife** impure?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבָּה: שְׂאֵנִי עוֹבֵר, הוֹאִיל וְסוּפוֹ לְצֵאתָ.

Rabba said: A fetus is different, since it is ultimately destined to emerge from the womb, and therefore it is not considered truly swallowed.

OBJECTION

אָמַר רַבָּא: עוֹבֵר סוּפוֹ לְצֵאתָ, טַפְעַת אֵין סוּפָהּ לְצֵאתָ?

Rava said in wonderment: Is a fetus ultimately destined to emerge, but a swallowed ring is not ultimately destined to emerge? It will surely pass through the body and emerge as well!

STATEMENT

אָלָא אָמַר רַבָּא: פּוּמְבִּדִּיתָאֵי יִדְעֵי טַעְמָא דְּהָא מִלְּתָא, וּמַנּוּ? רַב יוֹסֵף.

Rather, Rava said: The Pumbeditans know the true reason for this matter, and who is this Sage referred to as the Pumbeditans? It is Rav Yosef.

EXPLANATION

דָּאָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: טוּמְאָה זוֹ אֵינָהּ מִדְּבַרֵי תוֹרָה, אֶלָּא מִדְּבַרֵי סוּפְרִים.

As Rav Yosef says that Rav Yehuda says that Shmuel says: This impurity of the midwife is not by Torah law; rather, it is only by Rabbinic law.

QUESTION

מַאי אֵינָהּ מִדְּבַרֵי תוֹרָה אֶלָּא מִדְּבַרֵי סוּפְרִים?

The Gemara asks: **What** is Shmuel's intention in emphasizing: "It is not by Torah law, rather, by Rabbinic law"?

ANSWER

דָּלָא תִּימָא אֵלֵיבָא דְרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא דָּאָמַר: "עוֹפֵר בְּמַעֲי אִשָּׁה טְמֵא", אֶלָּא אֶפִּילוּ לְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל דָּאָמַר: "עוֹפֵר בְּמַעֲי אִשָּׁה טָהוֹר", גְּזֵרוּ בֵּה טוּמְאָה מִדְּרַבְּנָן.

He said this so that you should not say that the Mishnah's ruling is only according to Rabbi Akiva, who says: "A fetus in a woman's womb is impure" by Torah law; rather, he teaches that even according to Rabbi Yishmael, who says: "A fetus in a woman's womb is pure" by Torah law, the Sages nevertheless decreed impurity upon her, the midwife, by Rabbinic law.

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא?

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** for this Rabbinic decree?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב הוֹשַׁעְיָא: גְּזִירָה שְׁמָא יוֹצִיא וְלֹד רֹאשׁוֹ חוּץ לְפֶרוֹזְדוֹר.

Rav Hoshaya said: It is a decree lest the offspring extend its head outside the birth canal, which constitutes birth and renders it a corpse that imparts impurity by Torah law, and the midwife might touch it without realizing it had emerged.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, אִשָּׁה נִמִּי?

The Gemara asks: **If so**, should the **woman** herself **also** be decreed impure, lest she touch it?

ANSWER

אִשָּׁה מֵרֶגֶשֶׁת בְּעַצְמָהּ.

The Gemara answers: A woman feels what happens within herself, and would know if the head emerged.

QUESTION

וְתִימָא לָהּ לְחִתָּיה!

The Gemara asks: **But** then **let her tell the midwife** that the head emerged, and if she did not say so, why should the midwife be impure?

ANSWER

טרידא.

The Gemara answers: The mother is **distracted** by the pain of childbirth and does not think to tell her.

QUESTION

מאי רבי ישמעאל, ומאי רבי עקיבא?

The Gemara asks: **What is** the source for the dispute of **Rabbi Yishmael** and **what is** the source for **Rabbi Akiva**?

PROOF

דתנא: "וכל אשר יגע על פני השדה" – להוציא עובר במעי אשה, דברי רבי ישמעאל.

As it is taught in a Braisa: The verse states, "And whoever touches in the open field"—this comes to exclude a fetus in a woman's womb from imparting impurity; these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael.

STATEMENT

רבי עקיבא אומר: לרבות גולל ודופק.

Rabbi Akiva says: The phrase "in the open field" comes to include the grave-cover and the grave-walls as sources of impurity.

QUESTION

ורבי ישמעאל, גולל ודופק – הלכתא גמירי לה.

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Yishmael**, from where does he derive the impurity of a grave-cover and grave-walls? He learned it as a **Halacha** transmitted to Moshe from Sinai.

QUESTION

ורבי עקיבא, עובר במעי אשה טמא מדאורייתא – מנא ליה?

And Rabbi Akiva, that a fetus in a woman's womb is impure by Torah law—from where does he derive it?

ANSWER

אמר רבי אושעיא, אמר קרא: "הנוגע במת בנפש", איזהו מת שבנפש של אדם? הוי אומר זה עובר שבמעי אשה.

Rabbi Oshaya said: The verse states, "Whoever touches a corpse, in the life of a person." What is a corpse that is inside the life of a person? You must say this is a fetus in a woman's womb.

EXPLANATION

ורבי ישמעאל, האי מיבעי ליה לרביעית דם הפאה מן המת, שמיטמאה, שנאמר: "הנוגע במת בנפש האדם", איזהו נפש של אדם שמיטמא? הוי אומר זו רביעית דם.

And Rabbi Yishmael requires this verse for a quarter-log of blood that comes from a corpse, that it imparts impurity, as it is stated: "Whoever touches a corpse, in the life of a person." What is the life of a person that when dead imparts impurity? You must say this is a quarter-log of blood, which is the minimum amount of blood upon which life depends.

EXPLANATION

ורבי עקיבא לטעמיה, דאמר: אף רביעית דם הבא מִשְׁנֵי מֵתִים מְטַמֵּא בִּאֵהָל, דְּתַנָּא: רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא
אומר: מִנֵּין לְרַבִּיעִית דָּם הַבָּא מִשְׁנֵי מֵתִים שְׁמִטְמָאָה בִּאֵהָל?

And Rabbi Akiva is consistent with his reasoning, as he says: Even a quarter-log of blood that comes from two corpses imparts impurity in a tent, as it is taught in a Braisa: Rabbi Akiva says: From where is it derived that a quarter-log of blood that comes from two corpses imparts impurity in a tent?

PROOF

שנאמר: "וְעַל כָּל נַפְשֹׁת מֵת לֹא יָבֹא", שְׁתֵּי נַפְשֹׁת וְשִׁיעוּר אֶחָד.

As it is stated: "And he shall not come upon any dead souls [nafshot met]." The plural "souls" and singular "dead" implies: two souls, and yet one measure of a quarter-log of blood combined.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי בְּהֶמָּה הַמְקֻשָּׁה לִילָד, וְהוֹצִיא עוֹבֵר אֶת יָדוֹ, וְחִתְּקָהּ, וְאַחֲרַיָּךְ שָׁחַט אֶת אִמּוֹ – הַבֶּשָׂר טָהוֹר.

MISHNAH: If an animal was having difficulty giving birth, and the fetus extended its foreleg outside the womb, and a person severed it, and afterward slaughtered its mother—the flesh of the fetus is pure from the impurity of a carcass.

MISHNAH

שָׁחַט אֶת אִמּוֹ וְאַחֲרַיָּךְ חִתְּקָהּ – הַבֶּשָׂר מִנְּעָה נִבְלָה, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי מַעֲיָר.

If he slaughtered its mother and afterward severed the limb, the flesh of the fetus is forbidden and has the status of contact with a carcass; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

MISHNAH

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: מִנְּעָה טְרֵפָה שְׁחוּטָה,

And the Sages say: The flesh has the status of contact with a slaughtered tereifah, which is Rabbinically impure but does not carry the severe impurity of a carcass.

עמוד ב' DAF 72B

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

EXPLANATION

מָה מְצִינוּ בְּטְרֵפָה שְׁשֻׁחִיטָתָהּ מְטַהֲרָתָהּ,

Just as we have found regarding a tereifah that its slaughter purifies it from the impurity of a carcass,

EXPLANATION

אף שְׁחִיטַת בְּהֶמָּה תְּטַהֵר אֶת הָאֵבֶר.

so too, the slaughter of the mother animal should purify the protruding limb from the impurity of a carcass.

OBJECTION

אמר להם רבי מאיר: לא,

Rabbi Meir said to them: No,

OBJECTION

אם טיהרה שחיטת טרפה אותה, דבר שגופה,

if the slaughter of a tereifah purified it, which is something that is part of its own body (the throat),

OBJECTION

תטהר את האבר דבר שאינו גופה?

should it purify the limb, which is something that is not part of the mother's body?

QUESTION

מנין לטרפה ששחיטתה מטהרתה?

The Mishnah asks: **From where** is it derived regarding a tereifah that its slaughter purifies it?

STATEMENT

בהמה טמאה אסורה באכילה, אף טרפה אסורה באכילה,

One might argue: A non-kosher animal is forbidden for consumption, and a tereifah is also forbidden for consumption;

STATEMENT

מה בהמה טמאה – אין שחיטתה מטהרתה, אף טרפה – לא תטהרנה שחיטה!

just as with a non-kosher animal, its slaughter does not purify it, so too with a tereifah, slaughter should not purify it!

REFUTATION

לא, אם אמרת בבהמה טמאה שלא היתה לה שעת הכושר,

The Mishnah refutes this: **No**, if you say so regarding a non-kosher animal, which never had a period of fitness to be permitted through slaughter,

REFUTATION

תאמר בטרפה שהיתה לה שעת הכושר?

would you say the same regarding a tereifah, which had a period of fitness before it became a tereifah?

OBJECTION

טול לה מה שהבאת, הרי שנו לדה טרפה מן הכסון, מנין?

The Mishnah objects: **Take back what you brought** as a distinction, for **behold**, what of an animal that was born a tereifah **from the womb**, which never had a period of fitness? **From where** do we know that its slaughter purifies it?

REFUTATION

לא, אם אמרת בבמה טמאה שכן אין במינה שחיטה,

Rather, the distinction is: No, if you say so regarding a non-kosher animal, because there is no concept of slaughter in its species,

REFUTATION

תאמר בטריפה שיש במינה שחיטה?

would you say the same regarding a tereifah, where there is a concept of slaughter in its species?

RULING

כן שמנה חי, אין שחיטתו מטהרתו, לפי שאין במינו שחיטה.

Therefore, an eight-month fetus born alive, its slaughter does not purify it, because there is no concept of slaughter in its species (as slaughter only applies to viable, full-term births).

QUESTION

גמ' אמאי? טומאת בית הסתרים היא, וטומאת בית הסתרים לא מטמא!

GEMARA: Why should the rest of the fetus become impure from the severed limb? It is impurity in a concealed place, and impurity in a concealed place does not transmit impurity!

QUESTION

לימא רבי מאיר לטעמיה?

Shall we say that Rabbi Meir is consistent with his standard line of reasoning?

PROOF

דתנן: שלשה על שלשה שנחלק – טהור מן המדרס, אבל טמא מגע מדרס, דברי רבי מאיר.

As we learned in a Mishnah: A garment of three by three handbreadths that was impure with midras-impurity which was divided is pure from midras-impurity, but each piece remains impure with the touch of midras-impurity; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

PROOF

ותניא, אמר רבי יוסי: וכי באיזה מדרס נגע זה?

And it was taught in a beraisa, Rabbi Yosei said: But with what midras did this piece touch? Since they were connected, it is a concealed contact.

PROOF

אלא שאם נגע בו זב, שיהא טמא מגע זב.

Rather, they are pure, unless a zav touched it directly, so that it would be impure with the touch of a zav. Thus, Rabbi Meir holds that concealed contact transmits impurity.

OBJECTION

לאו איתמר עליה, אמר עולא: לא שנו אלא שלשה על שלשה שנחלק.

The Gemara objects: **Was it not stated concerning this explanation, Ulla said: They only taught this regarding a three-by-three garment that was divided,**

EXPLANATION

אַבָּל שְׁלֹשׁ עַל שְׁלֹשׁ הַפָּאוֹת מִפְּגַד גָּדוֹל – בְּשַׁעַת פְּרִישְׁתָּן מֵאֲבִיהֶן, מְקַבְּלוֹת טוּמְאָה מֵאֲבִיהֶן.

but pieces of **three by three** fingerbreadths that come from a large garment, at the moment of their separation from their father source, they receive impurity from their father source. This is because they are fit to be separate vessels.

RESOLUTION

הָא נָמִי בְּשַׁעַת פְּרִישְׁתָּן מֵאֲבָר, מְקַבֵּל טוּמְאָה מֵאֲבָר.

Here too, at the moment of their separation from the limb, the fetus receives impurity from the limb, and it is not a case of concealed contact.

RESOLUTION

רַבִּינָא אָמַר: בָּגַד – לֹא לְחִתִּיכָה קָאִי, עוֹבֵר – לְחִתִּיכָה קָאִי, וְכָל הָעוֹמֵד לְחִתוּךְ.

Ravina said: A garment is not standing to be cut, whereas a fetus is standing to be cut, and anything that is standing to be cut is considered as if it is already cut, so the contact is not considered concealed.

SUMMARY

The daf begins by resolving the difficulty of the midwife touching a dead fetus, explaining that according to Shmuel, her tumah is only a Rabbinic decree to prevent a mishap where the head might have emerged. The Gemara brings the source for Rabbi Yishmael, who learns from the pasuk "in the open field" that a fetus in the womb is tahor from the Torah, while Rabbi Akiva uses the pasuk to include the grave-cover and grave-walls. We then learn the Mishnah regarding a fetus that extended its leg during a difficult birth; Rabbi Meir rules that if the mother was slaughtered before the limb was severed, the limb is forbidden and carries the tumah of touching a neveilah, whereas the Sages argue that the mother's shechitah purifies the limb from neveilah tumah, just as shechitah purifies a tereifah. The Gemara concludes by analyzing the source for why shechitah purifies a tereifah, distinguishing it from a non-kosher species because a tereifah belongs to a species where shechitah is fundamentally effective.

In our sugya, the Gemara discusses the midwife who touches a dead fetus inside the womb. By Torah law, she is pure because the fetus is hidden away, but the Sages decreed her impure. Why? Because they worried that the fetus might have briefly extended its head outside the birth canal, rendering it a full corpse, and the midwife wouldn't realize. The Gemara asks: why doesn't the mother simply tell her? The answer is so deep: "Trida", she is distracted. She is in too much pain and distress to think clearly or communicate what is happening.

This is a profound lesson in how we look at other Yidden. Sometimes we see a friend, a spouse, or a child who is acting distant, unresponsive, or fails to communicate something important to us. Our natural reaction might be to feel hurt or to judge them. But the Torah teaches us to remember the concept of "trida." You do not know what hidden pain, anxiety, or overwhelming pressure another person is carrying in their heart. They aren't ignoring you; they are simply distracted by the heavy burden they are bearing.

True ahavas Yisrael and middos mean giving others the space to be overwhelmed without holding it against them. When someone close to you fails to communicate, instead of reacting with frustration, remind yourself that they may be going through a quiet struggle. Be the one who steps in with patience, understanding, and a soft heart.

Today, if someone in your life is unresponsive, irritable, or forgets to tell you something important, do not judge them or react with anger. Take a deep breath, judge them favorably, and assume they are simply "trida", carrying a hidden burden that needs your gentleness, not your criticism.