



- c. *Challenge*: he invoked v. 3 (פרסה/פרסות) – isn't one for limb, other for מקום חתך?
- d. *Correction*: one is for חתך, מקום חתך, other for fused hoof in womb
- i. *Per*: ר"ש – who prohibits an (otherwise טהור) animal with "solid" hoof –
- ii. *But*: only applies if it is inside womb, not if it came "out"
- b. *per* ר' יוחנן: even the limb is permitted:
- i. *Argument*: all "exits" were included in v. 1 – when תורה explicated חוץ למחיצה שיצא חוץ למחיצה → all others are not אסור
1. *Refutation*: ברייתא – טריפה – ברייתא includes anything that is irrevocably fouled by leaving מחיצה, unlike מכורים
2. *Source*: מע"ש ובכורים – v. 2; only בשערך is there a prohibition, but leaving and returning to ירושלים is valid
- c. *Note*: this was the version of the dispute as recorded in בבב; in א"י they had a different version:
- i. רב/ר' יוחנן: א"י disagreed if there was לידה לאברים (רב – there is)
1. *Point of disagreement* (this follows ר"א's understanding of the question מאי בנייהו): whether a minority of the limb prohibits while inside if the majority is outside
2. *Question*: according to ר"י (who holds לאברים, אין לידה לאברים), if the animal put out one leg and retracted it, then another leg and so on, such that a majority of the foetus had come out (in temporal segments) – is that considered רוב, or since each אבר was retracted we don't reckon it that way?
- (a) *If*: we follow the line that retraction negates the "exit", what if he cut off each limb as it was retracted?
- (i) *Lemma1*: a majority has come out (and not retracted)
- (ii) *Lemma2*: we require a majority at one time
1. *Proposed answer*: from rule at end of משנה אסור – דבר שבגופה אסור – isn't that intended to include our case?
2. *Rejection*: that is intended to account for "solidified hoof" per ר"ש, who prohibits such an animal –
- a. *But only*: if it has come out – not if it is inside