

תלמוד בבלי • דף יומי

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף נ"ד

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we continue our deep dive into the halachos of tereifos, focusing on the critical differences between the gullet (veshet) and the windpipe (kaneh). The Gemara explores the severe nature of clawing (derisah) by a predator, explaining how the venom burns and widens any wound, which requires a thorough inspection of the animal. We also learn about the immense stature of Rav, as Rabbi Yochanan rebukes Reish Lakish and describes Rav's unmatched greatness in Torah and piety.

Additionally, the sugya addresses whether we can add to the list of tereifos established by Chazal. We encounter hunters who killed animals by striking them in the sciatic nerve or the kidneys, yet the Sages ruled these are not tereifos because the wounds could theoretically heal with medicine. We then begin a new Mishnah listing the cases where an animal remains kosher, such as a split windpipe, a fractured skull where the brain membrane is intact, or removed kidneys.

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

עמוד א' DAF 54A

STATEMENT

וּשְׁט נְקוּבָתוֹ בְּמִשְׁהוֹ, דְּרוּסָתוֹ בְּמִשְׁהוֹ.

Regarding the **gullet, its perforation** renders the animal a tereifa **in any amount**, and likewise **its clawing** renders it a tereifa **in any amount**.

QUESTION

כָּנָה נְקוּבָתוֹ בְּכַאִיסָר, דְּרוּסָתוֹ בְּכַמָּה?

But regarding the **windpipe, its perforation** renders it a tereifa only **as** the size of an **issar**; if so, **its clawing** requires how much reddening to render it a tereifa? **In how much** is it?

RESOLUTION

בְּתַר דְּבִעָא הָדָר פְּשֻׁטָּה: אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה בְּמִשְׁהוֹ.

After he raised the dilemma, he then resolved it: Both this, the gullet, **and that**, the windpipe, render the animal a tereifa if they are clawed and redden **in any amount**.

EXPLANATION

מַאי טַעְמָא? זִיְהִירִיָּה מְקַלָּא קְלִי וְאַזִּיל.

What is the reason? The predator's **ve nom burns continuously** and **goes** on to widen the hole.

STATEMENT

יְתִיב רַב יִצְחָק בַּר שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר מַרְתָּא קָמִיה דְּרַב נַחֲמָן, וְיְתִיב וְקָאָמַר: דְּרוּסָה שְׁאָמְרוּ – צְרִיכָה בְּדִיקָה כְּנֶגֶד בְּנֵי מַעֲיִים.

Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marta sat before Rav Nachman, and he sat and was saying: A clawed animal about which the Sages said one must be concerned, requires inspection only in the area adjacent to the intestines.

OBJECTION

רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר: הֲאֵלֶּהִים! מוֹרִי בַּה רַב מִכָּפָא וְעַד אֶטְמָא.

Rav Nachman said to him: By God! Rav would teach regarding it that it must be inspected from the hollow to the thigh.

EXPLANATION

מַאי כָּפָא? אֵילִימָא כָּפָא דִּידָא – הֵיִינוּ כְּנֶגֶד בְּנֵי מַעֲיִים, אֶלָּא מִכָּפָא דְּמוֹחָא עַד אֶטְמָא.

What is the hollow? If we say it is the hollow of the foreleg, that is the same area as adjacent to the intestines, and Rav Nachman would have said nothing new. Rather, it means from the hollow of the brain, the skull, to the thigh.

STATEMENT

כִּי סָלִיק רַב חִיָּיא בַּר יוֹסֵף, אֲשֶׁכְּחִינְהוּ לְרַבֵּי יוֹחָנָן וְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ דִּיתְבִּי וְקָאָמְרוּ: דְּרוּסָה שְׁאָמְרוּ – צְרִיכָה בְּדִיקָה כְּנֶגֶד בְּנֵי מַעֲיִים.

When Rav Chiyya bar Yosef went up to Eretz Yisrael, he found Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish sitting and saying: A clawed animal about which the Sages said one must be concerned, requires inspection adjacent to the intestines.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לְהוּ: הֲאֵלֶּהִים! מוֹרִי בַּה רַב מִכָּפָא וְעַד אֶטְמָא.

He said to them: By God! Rav would teach regarding it that it must be inspected from the hollow to the thigh.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיהִי רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: מִנּוּ רַב וּמִנּוּ רַב? וְלֹא יָדַעְנָא לִיהִי!

Reish Lakish said to him: Who is Rav, and who is Rav? I do not know him!

EXPLANATION

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: וְלֹא נִהֲרָא לִיהִי לְאוֹתוֹ תְּלָמִיד שְׁשִׁימָשׁ אֶת רַבִּי רֵבָה, וְרַבִּי חִיָּיא? וְהֲאֵלֶּהִים! כָּל אוֹתָן שְׁנַיִם שְׁשִׁימָשׁ אוֹתוֹ תְּלָמִיד בִּישִׁיכָה, אֲנִי שְׁמַשְׁתִּי בְּעַמֻּדָה, וּמֵאן גָּבַר? הוּא גָּבַר בְּכוּלָּא.

Rabbi Yochanan said to Reish Lakish: And do you not remember that student who served Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi the Great, and Rabbi Chiyya? By God! All those years that that student served in the yeshiva, I served standing, and who was the greater man? He was the greater man in everything, in Torah and piety.

STATEMENT

מִיד פִּתַּח רִישׁ לָקִישׁ וְאָמַר: בְּרַם זְכוּר אוֹתוֹ הָאִישׁ לְטוֹב, שְׁאָמְרוּ שְׁמוּעָה מִפִּיו: שְׁמוּטָה וּשְׁחוּטָה – כְּשֶׁרָה, שְׂאִי אֶפְשָׁר לְשְׁמוּטָה שְׁתִּיעֶשֶׂה שְׁחוּטָה.

Immediately Reish Lakish began to speak and said: Indeed, remembered is that man for good, as they said a halachic ruling from his mouth: If the windpipe was dislocated and then the animal was slaughtered, it is kosher, because it is

impossible for a dislocated windpipe to be slaughtered, as it would slip away from the knife.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אומר: יביא ויִקְרֶה.

And Rabbi Yochanan says: This is not certain; rather, he should bring the windpipe, make a new cut, and compare the two cuts to see if they are similar.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב נחמן: לא שנו אלא שלא תפס בסימנים, אבל תפס בסימנים ושחט – אפשר לשמוטה שתיעשה שחוטתה.

Rav Nachman said: They only taught that it is impossible to slaughter a dislocated windpipe where he did not hold the simanim, but if he held the simanim and slaughtered, it is possible for a dislocated windpipe to be slaughtered.

QUESTION

זה הכלל, לאתויי מאי? לאתויי שב שמעתתא.

The Mishnah stated: This is the general rule. To include what? To include seven halachic rulings of tereifot taught by the Amora'im.

STATEMENT

דבי יוסף רישבא מחו בגידא נשיא וקטלי, אתו לקמיה דרבי יהודה בן בתירא, אמר להו: וכי להוסיף על הטרפות יש? אין לה אלא מה שִּמְנו חכמים!

The men of the house of Yosef the hunter would strike animals in the sciatic nerve and kill them. They came before Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira to ask if it is a tereifa. He said to them: Is there any authority to add to the tereifot? You have only what the Sages enumerated!

STATEMENT

רב פפא בר אבא רישבא, מחו בכוֹלִיא וקטלי. אתו לקמיה דרבי אבא, אמר להו: וכי להוסיף על הטרפות יש? אין לה אלא מה שִּמְנו חכמים!

The men of Rav Pappa bar Abba the hunter would strike animals in the kidney and kill them. They came before Rabbi Abba. He said to them: Is there any authority to add to the tereifot? You have only what the Sages enumerated!

QUESTION

והא קא חזינן דקא מתה!

The Gemara asks: But we see that they die from these wounds! Why are they not tereifot?

ANSWER

גמירי דאי בדרי לה סמא, חזיא.

The Gemara answers: It is learned as a tradition that if they apply medicine to it, it would live, and a wound that can heal does not make a tereifa.

MISHNAH

מתני' ואלו כשרות בבמה, ניקבה הגרגרת או שנסדקה.

MISHNAH: And these are kosher in an animal: If the windpipe was perforated, or if it was split lengthwise.

MISHNAH

עד כמה תחסר? רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: עד פאיסר האיטלקי.

How much can be missing from the windpipe and still be kosher? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Up to the size of an Italian issar.

MISHNAH

נפחתה הגולגולת ולא ניקב קרום של מוח, ניקב הלב ולא לבית חללו, נשברה השדרה ולא נפסק החוט שלה, ניטלה הכבד ונשתיר הימנה פזית.

If the skull was fractured but the membrane of the brain was not perforated; if the heart was perforated but not to its chamber; if the spine was broken but its cord was not severed; if the liver was removed but an olive-bulk of it remained, it is kosher.

MISHNAH

המסס ובית הפוסות, שניקבו זה לתוך זה.

If the omasum and the reticulum were perforated one into the other, it is kosher.

MISHNAH

ניטל הטחול, ניטלו הכליות, ניטל לחי התחתון, ניטלה האם שלה, וחרוטה בידי שמים.

If the spleen was removed, or the kidneys were removed, or the lower jaw was removed, or its womb was removed, or if the lung shriveled by the hand of Heaven, it is kosher.

MISHNAH

הגלודה – רבי מאיר מכשיר, וחכמים פוסלין.

An animal whose hide was removed — Rabbi Meir deems it kosher, and the Sages deem it unfit as a tereifa.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' אתמר: רבי יוחנן אומר: "אלו טרפות" דוקא, ורבי שמעון בן לקיש אומר: "אלו כשרות" דוקא.

GEMARA: It was stated: Rabbi Yochanan said: The phrase "These are tereifot" in the first Mishnah is **exclusive**, meaning only these are tereifot but other cases are kosher. And Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: The phrase "These are kosher" in our Mishnah is **exclusive**, meaning only these are kosher but other cases are tereifot.

EXPLANATION

במאי קא מיפלג? בדרב מתנא, דאמר רב מתנא: האי בוקא דאטמא דשף מדוכתיה – טרפה.

In what do they differ? They differ regarding the ruling of Rav Mattana, as Rav Mattana said: This head of the femur that slipped from its place is a tereifa.

EXPLANATION

רבי יוחנן אמר: "אלו טרפות" דוקא, תנא טרפות, ותנא "זה הכלל",

Rabbi Yochanan said: "These are tereifot" is exclusive. The Mishnah taught tereifot, and taught "This is the general rule" to include other cases.

צמוד ב' DAF 54B

EXPLANATION

וחזייה לדרב מתנא דאתיא בזה הכלל,

And the Tanna saw that the case of Rav Mattana, where the thigh bone is dislocated, comes under the category of "This is the general rule", which includes cases of missing limbs, and one might think it is a tereifa.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? דדמא לנטולי.

What is the reason for this? Because it is similar to cases of removed organs, which render the animal a tereifa.

EXPLANATION

תנא "אלו טרפות" – הני הוא דטרפה, הא דרב מתנא כשרה.

Therefore, the Tanna taught "These are the tereifos" at the beginning of the Mishnah to emphasize: These listed cases alone are tereifos, but this case of Rav Mattana is kosher.

STATEMENT

ורבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר: אלו פשרות דוקא,

And Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: "These are kosher" at the end of the Mishnah is meant specifically to exclude other cases.

EXPLANATION

תנא טרפות, ותנא "זה הכלל",

The Tanna taught the list of tereifos, and then taught "This is the general rule" to include other cases of tereifos.

EXPLANATION

וחזייה לדרב מתנא דלא אתיא ב"זה הכלל",

And the Tanna saw that the case of Rav Mattana does not come under "This is the general rule", and one might think it is kosher.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? לאו לנקובי דמזא, ולא לפסוקי דמזא, ולנטולי נמי לא דמזא,

What is the reason for this? It is not similar to perforated organs, and not similar to severed organs, and also not similar to removed organs.

EXPLANATION

תנא "אלו כשרות" – הני הוא דכשרות, הא דרב מתנא טרפה.

Therefore, the Tanna taught "These are kosher" to emphasize: These listed cases alone are kosher, but this case of Rav Mattana is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

גופא, אמר רב מתנא: האי בוקא דאטמא דשף מדוכתיה – טרפה,

Returning to the text itself: Rav Mattana said: This head of the femur that slipped from its place, meaning it was dislocated, renders the animal a tereifa.

STATEMENT

ורבא אמר: כשרה, ואי איפסיק ניביה – טרפה.

And Rava said: It is kosher, but if its sinew that binds the bone in place is severed, it is a tereifa.

RULING

והלכתא: איפסיק נמי כשרה, עד דמתעכלא אתעכולי.

And the halacha is: Even if the sinew is severed, it is also kosher, until it is completely decayed.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

עד כמה תחסר?

The Mishnah states: How much can the windpipe be missing and still be kosher? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Until the size of an Italian issar.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר זעירי: אתון דלא מיתחמי לכוון שיעורא, שיעוריה בדינרא קורדינאה,

Ze'eiri said: You in Babylonia, who do not see and are not familiar with this measure of an Italian issar, its measure is like a Kurdish dinar,

STATEMENT

וְהוּי כְּפִשְׁיטָא זוטרתִי, וּמִשְׁתַּכְחָא בֵּינִי פְּשִׁיטִי דְּפּוּמְבִּדִּיתָא.

and it is like a small peruta coin, and it is found among the perutah coins of Pumbedita.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי חָנָא פְּתוּרָאָה: עֵילָא מִינָאי הָוָה קָאִי בַר נַפְחָא,

Rabbi Chana the moneychanger said: Bar Nappacha, meaning Rabbi Yochanan, was standing over me,

STATEMENT

וּבִעָא מִינִי דִּינָרָא קוּרְדִּינָאָה לְשַׁעוּרֵי בֵּיהּ טְרִיפְתָּא, וּבָעִי לְמִיקָם מְקָמֶיהּ וְלֹא שְׂבָקְנִי.

and he requested of me a Kurdish dinar to measure a tereifa with it, and I wanted to stand up before him out of respect, but he did not let me.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִי: שֵׁב בְּנִי שֵׁב, אֵין בָּעֲלִי אוּמָנִיּוֹת רִשָּׁאִין לְעָמוּד מִפְּנֵי תַלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים בְּשַׁעֲה שְׁעִסוּקִין בְּמַלְאכְתָּם.

He said to me: Sit, my son, sit; craftsmen are not permitted to stand before Torah scholars at the time when they are occupied with their work.

QUESTION

וְלֹא? וְהִתְנֹן: כָּל בָּעֲלִי אוּמָנִיּוֹת עוֹמְדִים מִפְּנֵיהֶם, וְשׂוֹאֲלִין בְּשָׁלוֹמָן,

And are they **not** permitted to stand? But didn't we learn in a Mishnah regarding those bringing Bikkurim: All the craftsmen stand before them and greet them,

QUESTION

וְאוֹמְרִין לָהֶם: אַחֲינוּ אַנְשֵׁי מְקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי בּוֹאֲכֶם בְּשָׁלוֹם!

and say to them: "Our brothers, people of such-and-such place, may your coming be in peace!"

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מִפְּנֵיהֶם עוֹמְדִין, מִפְּנֵי תַלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים אֵין עוֹמְדִין.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Before them, the bringers of Bikkurim, they stand, but before Torah scholars they do not stand while working.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בַר אֲבִין: בָּא וּרְאֵה כַּמָּה חֲבִיבָה מְצוּהָ בְּשַׁעֲתָהּ, שֶׁהָרִי מִפְּנֵיהֶם עוֹמְדִין, מִפְּנֵי תַלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים אֵין עוֹמְדִין.

Rabbi Yosei bar Avin said: Come and see how beloved is a mitzvah in its proper time, for before them, the Bikkurim bringers, they stand, but before Torah scholars they do not stand.

REFUTATION

מַמַּאי? דִּילְמָא כְּדִי שְׁלֹא תִּהְיֵה נִמְצָא מְכַשִּׁילָן לְעֵתִיד לְבָא.

The Gemara objects: **From where** do you prove this? **Perhaps** they stand **so that you do not find yourself causing them to stumble in the future**, meaning they might stop bringing Bikkurim if they are not shown respect.

STATEMENT

אמר רב נחמן: כסלע – כיתר מכסלע, כאיסר – כיתר מכאיסר.

Rav Nachman said: A measure of "like a sela" is like more than a sela, and "like an issar" is like more than an issar.

INFERENCE

אלמא קסבר רב נחמן: "עד", ולא עד בכלל.

Consequently, Rav Nachman holds that the word "until" means until but not including the limit itself.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רבא לרב נחמן: חבל היוצא מן המטה עד חמשה טפחים – טהור.

Rava challenged Rav Nachman from a Mishnah: A rope that extends from a bed, until five handbreadths, is pure.

QUESTION

מאי לאו חמשה כלמטה?

What, is it not that exactly five handbreadths is like below five, meaning it is pure, which proves "until" includes the limit?

ANSWER

לא, חמשה כלמעלה.

The Gemara answers: No, exactly five is like above five, meaning it is susceptible to impurity.

PROOF

תא שמע: מחמשה ועד עשרה – טמא.

Come and hear a proof from the next clause: From five and until ten handbreadths, the rope is impure.

QUESTION

מאי לאו עשרה כלמטה?

What, is it not that exactly ten is like below ten, meaning it is impure?

ANSWER

לא, עשרה כלמעלה.

The Gemara answers: No, exactly ten is like above ten, meaning it is pure.

PROOF

תא שמע: הדקין שבבלי חרס. הן וקרורותיהן ודופןותיהם, יושבין שלא מסומכין –

Come and hear another proof: The smallest of earthenware vessels, they and their bases and their walls, that can sit without being supported, are susceptible to impurity.

SUMMARY

The daf establishes that while a puncture in the windpipe must be the size of an issar to render an animal a tereifa, clawing by a predator renders both the gullet and the windpipe a tereifa in any amount due to the burning venom. The Gemara discusses the scope of inspection required for a clawed animal, bringing Rav's view that it must be checked from the head to the thigh. We then transition to the new Mishnah listing kosher cases, which sparks a fundamental dispute between Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish regarding whether the Mishnah's lists of 'these are tereifos' and 'these are kosher' are exclusive, specifically analyzing how this impacts Rav Mattana's ruling that a dislocated femur is a tereifa.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

We see in our Gemara a beautiful and moving moment of kavod HaTorah. When Rav Chiyya bar Yosef mentioned the ruling of Rav, Reish Lakish initially questioned Rav's authority. But Rabbi Yochanan immediately corrected him, describing how he himself stood in awe of Rav's greatness, testifying that Rav was "the greater man in everything, in Torah and piety." Upon hearing this, Reish Lakish did not let pride get in the way; he immediately changed his tone, praised Rav, and quoted a halachah in his name with the utmost respect.

This teaches us a profound lesson in how we must view and speak of our gedolim, our rabbeim, and indeed, any talmid chacham. It is very easy in the course of learning or discussing Torah to treat opinions as mere intellectual arguments, forgetting the holiness of the souls who carried this Torah down to us. When we speak of the sages of the Gemara, the Rishonim, the Acharonim, or the rabbeim of our own generation, we must do so with a sense of awe and deep reverence.

This respect is not just a nice middah; it is the very foundation of our mesorah. When we show genuine kavod to those who teach and embody the Torah, we are showing kavod to the Torah itself and to the Aibershter who gave it.

Today, when you mention a Torah teaching, a vort, or a halachah, make sure to say the name of the rav or sage who said it with visible warmth and respect, consciously elevating their honor in your conversation.