



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The severed limb (cont.)

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges Ravina's explanation of the Mishnah.

Another unsuccessful challenge to Ravina's position is presented.

2) Slaughtered tereifah

The Gemara explains that in the case of an animal slaughtered as a korban and then discovered to be a tereifah it transmits tum'ah.

3) The dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim

A Baraisa presents a continuation of the debate between R' Meir and Chachamim.

Rava further explains Chachamim's response to R' Meir.

A Baraisa is cited that confirms this explanation.

4) Dangling limbs

Reish Lakish teaches that the same dispute that applies to the protruding limb of a fetus applies to a dangling limb of the animal itself.

R' Yochanan disagrees and asserts that all opinions agree that a dangling limb is tamei.

R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina elaborates on R' Yochanan's position.

R' Yochanan's position is successfully challenged forcing the Gemara to revise its understanding of the dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish.

R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina elaborates on R'

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim?
.....
2. What is the point of dispute between Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan?
.....
3. What is נִיפּוּל?
4. What is the significance that the Mishnah used the term הוֹכְשָׁרוֹ in the plural?
.....

Distinctive INSIGHT

The spot where the fetus and its arm are connected
מטביל עד מקום מדה

The Mishnah (72b) taught that when a fetus reaches outside the womb with its forelimb, both R' Meir and Chachamim agree that the flesh of the fetus inside contracts tum'ah from its contact with the limb which exited the womb. The Gemara notes that the spot where the fetus and the limb connect is within the mother, which is a case of "swallowed up" tum'ah. Tum'ah of the limb should not be able to impart tum'ah to the fetus.

Ravina answers that when a limb of the fetus reaches out of the womb, that limb will be prohibited to be eaten, while the portion of the fetus which remains inside its mother will be permitted to be eaten, once the mother is shechted. Because of this distinction, we view the limb as being separate from the rest of the fetus, and as if it was cut off from it. Therefore, the spot where they are connected is no longer considered inside and swallowed up, but rather outside and exposed. Therefore, tum'ah of the fetus can affect the limb.

The Gemara notes that the answer of Ravina is based upon the opinion of R' Meir in a Mishnah (Mikva'os 10:5). A utensil which has a very long handle becomes tamei. The owner of the vessel plans to cut off half the length of the handle. R' Meir holds that the utensil may be immersed in a mikveh up until the point which has been measured for the eventual resultant handle. The extra length of the handle is ignored, as it is seen as already being cut off and not part of the utensil. Chachamim, however, hold that the handle is still connected, and until it is actually removed it must also be immersed. According to this, Ravina's comment regarding the arm of the fetus was said only according to R' Meir and not according to Chachamim.

The Gemara responds that Ravina may be understood even according to Chachamim. It is possible that Chachamim only say that the handle of the utensil continues to be seen as attached because the handle is a solid piece of material. The connection between the body of the fetus and its forelimb is flimsy, because they are food items and, as Rashi explains, they are both "soft." Here, even Chachamim agree that they are seen as already severed, and merely in contact with each other in the meantime, and the spot of connection is not "swallowed up."

Tosafos notes that in the case of the long-handled uten-

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Immersing a utensil with a handle one intends to shorten

כל ידות הכלים שהן ארוכות וכו'

The handles of utensils that are too long etc.

Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that when immersing a utensil one is required to immerse the handle as well. If, however, the handle is very long and one intends on shortening it one is not required to immerse any more than the part of the handle that will remain. This is based on our Gemara that teaches that something that stands to be cut is considered as though it is already cut. Tosafos² finds this ruling of the Gemara difficult. If we assume that part of the handle is considered as though it is cut off that means that the place where the handle will be cut will not be immersed. Although it is only a minority of the utensil, nevertheless, the entire utensil must come in contact with the mikvah water. They answer that the handle is made of links and as such the water is able to come in contact with the entire exposed surface even though the extra length of the chain has not yet been removed.

Rash and Rosh³ answer that the part that will become exposed after the additional length of handle is removed is considered a concealed place and it is unnecessary for the mikvah water to reach such an area. Even though regarding people it is necessary for the potential to exist that the mikvah water could reach the concealed place, nevertheless, re-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

garding utensils there is no such requirement. Chazon Ish⁴ questions this answer. Although it is not necessary for the mikvah water to touch a concealed area, it is still necessary that the concealed area should be surrounded by the mikvah water. Thus, even though one does not open one's mouth in the mikvah to allow water into one's mouth, one's mouth must be in the water and if one immersed with his mouth outside of the water the immersion would not be valid. Accordingly, how could the Gemara rule that the part of the handle that one intends to remove need not be in the water? Teshuvav Avnei Nezer⁵ explains that the part of the handle that will be cut must be in the water and it is only the part of the handle that is further up than that cut that may be out of the water. ■

garding utensils there is no such requirement. Chazon Ish⁴ questions this answer. Although it is not necessary for the mikvah water to touch a concealed area, it is still necessary that the concealed area should be surrounded by the mikvah water. Thus, even though one does not open one's mouth in the mikvah to allow water into one's mouth, one's mouth must be in the water and if one immersed with his mouth outside of the water the immersion would not be valid. Accordingly, how could the Gemara rule that the part of the handle that one intends to remove need not be in the water? Teshuvav Avnei Nezer⁵ explains that the part of the handle that will be cut must be in the water and it is only the part of the handle that is further up than that cut that may be out of the water. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' ק"כ סעי' י"ב.

2. ד"ה מטביל.

3. מקוואות פ"י מ"ה.

4. חזו"א מקוואות סי' י' אות א'.

5. שו"ת אבני נזר יו"ד סי' רס"ז אות ה'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Burnt Challos

"כחתוך דמי..."

The halachah is that it is preferable for women to bake challah for Shabbos.

One time, in a certain family, the challos got overdone—in some parts even burnt. The family wondered if they could use one of the burnt challos for lechem mishneh. Perhaps a burnt challah is not considered like a whole bread since the burnt parts will eventually be cut away. If this was the case the challah could hardly be called complete.

When this question reached the author of the Sha'ar Efraim, ז"ל, he permitted it. "In Chullin 73 we find that

Ravina rules that what is going to be cut off is considered cut off even while attached. According to this, a burnt challah may not be used if too much is burnt. We learn from the Mishnah in Tevul Yom that there is a difference between up to a finger-width of burnt matter and more than this regarding ritual impurity—the paradigm for learning various halachos of breaking bread. It follows that according to Ravina if more than a finger's width is burnt, the challah may not be used for lechem mishneh,

"But the halachah does not follow the opinion of Ravina. It follows that even a challah burnt more than that is considered whole and can be used for lechem mishneh."¹ ■

1. שו"ת שער אפרים, סי' א ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Yochanan's position.

R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan asserts that all opinions agree that death effects detachment but slaughtering does not effect detachment.

The intent of this teaching is clarified.

It is noted that these principles have been taught elsewhere

The novelty of R' Yochanan's teaching is explained.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yosef states that one should follow the teaching of R' Yitzchok bar Yosef since Rabbah bar Channa follows his opinion as well. ■