

דף יומי • חקליון • דף נ"ח

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 a tereifa, focusing on the status of its offspring and eggs. The Gemara explores whether an egg laid by a tereifa bird is mutar, distinguishing between the first clutch of eggs that grew while the mother was already a tereifa and subsequent eggs fertilized by a kosher male. We also look into a major machlokes between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua regarding whether the offspring of a tereifa animal may be brought as a korban on the Mizbe'ach, which hinges on the fundamental question of whether a fetus is considered a part of its mother's body (ubar yerech imo).

Additionally, the Gemara transitions into the physical signs and lifespans of various creatures to determine their halachic status. We learn about the twelve-month rule for determining if a doubtful animal is a tereifa, and Rav Huna's famous principle regarding boneless creatures. This leads to practical halachic applications regarding the prohibition of eating worms found in fruits and vegetables, such as cucumbers and stored dates.

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

עמוד א' DAF 58A

STATEMENT

שיח לא קמא אסירא, מפאן ואילך – הוה ליה זה וזה גורם, ומותר.

The **first clutch** of eggs that were in its body when it became a tereifa **is prohibited**, but **from here and onward**, any egg fertilized **is** a case of **this and that causing** it, i.e., a tereifa mother and a kosher father, **and** the rule is that it is **permitted**.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רב אשי לאמימר: ושיון בביצת טריפה שאסורה, מפני שגדלה באיסור!

Rav Ashi raised an objection to Ameimar from a Mishnah: **And they agree with regard to the egg of a tereifa bird that it is prohibited**, because **it grew in a state of prohibition!** This implies that even eggs that grew after it became a tereifa are prohibited.

ANSWER

התם בדספנא מארעא.

Ameimar answered: **There**, the Mishnah is dealing **with** a bird **that is warmed by the ground**, meaning it was not fertilized by a male, so the tereifa mother is the sole cause.

QUESTION

ולישני ליה בשיח לא קמא?

The Gemara asks: **And let him answer him** that the Mishnah is dealing **with the first clutch** of eggs, which were already in its body when it became a tereifa?

ANSWER

אם כן, "גדלה"? "גמרה" מיבעי ליה.

The Gemara answers: **If so**, why does the Mishnah say **"it grew"**? **"It was finished"** in a state of prohibition **it should have** said.

QUESTION

אָלָא, הָא דְתַנּוּ: וְלִד טְרֵפָה, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אָמַר: לֹא יִקְרַב לְגַבִּי מִזֶּבֶחַ, וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אָמַר: יִקְרַב.
בְּמַאי קָא מִיפְלָגִי?

Rather, that which we learned in a Mishnah: The offspring of a tereifa animal, Rabbi Eliezer says: It shall not be sacrificed upon the Altar, and Rabbi Yehoshua says: It may be sacrificed. In what case do they disagree?

EXPLANATION

בְּשֵׁנִיטְרָפָה וּלְבִסּוּף עִיבָרָה, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר סָבַר: זֶה וְזֶה גֹרֵם אָסוּר, וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ סָבַר: זֶה וְזֶה גֹרֵם מוּתָר.

They must disagree in a case where it became a tereifa and afterwards became pregnant from a kosher male, where Rabbi Eliezer holds: An offspring brought about by this and that causing it is prohibited, and Rabbi Yehoshua holds: An offspring brought about by this and that causing it is permitted.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, אֲדַמִּיפְלָגִי לְגִבּוֹתָ, לִיפְלָגוּ לְהִדְיוּט?

The Gemara asks: **If so**, rather than disagreeing regarding whether it may be offered to the Most High on the Altar, let them disagree regarding whether it is permitted for an ordinary person to eat!

ANSWER

לְהוֹדִיעָה כַּחו דְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, דְּאִפִּילוּ לְגִבּוֹתָ נָמִי שְׂרִי.

The Gemara answers: The Tanna chose this case to let you know the power of Rabbi Yehoshua, that even for the Most High it is also permitted.

QUESTION

וְלִיפְלָגוּ לְהִדְיוּט, לְהוֹדִיעָה כַּחו דְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, דְּאִפִּילוּ לְהִדְיוּט נָמִי אָסוּר!

The Gemara objects: But let them disagree regarding an ordinary person, to let you know the power of Rabbi Eliezer, that even for an ordinary person it is also prohibited!

ANSWER

כַּח דְּהִיתָרָא עֲדִיף לִיה.

The Gemara answers: The power of leniency is preferable to the Tanna to emphasize.

STATEMENT

וּמוֹדִים בְּבִיצַת טְרֵפָה שְׂאִסוּרָהּ, בְּדִסְפָּנָא מֵאַרְעָא, דְּחֵד גֹּרֵם הוּא.

And they agree with regard to the egg of a tereifa that it is prohibited, in a case where it is warmed by the ground, because it is a case of only one cause.

STATEMENT

רב אחא סבר לה כרב אחא בר יעקב, ומתני לה לדאמימר כדאמרן.

Rav Acha holds in accordance with Rav Acha bar Yaakov that a tereifa can give birth, and he teaches this statement of Ameimar as we have said.

STATEMENT

רבנא לא סבר לה כדרב אחא בר יעקב, ומתני לה לדאמימר בהאי לישנא:

Ravina does not hold in accordance with Rav Acha bar Yaakov, and he teaches this statement of Ameimar in this version:

STATEMENT

אמר אמרימר: הני ביצי דספק טרפה, דשיח לא קמא משהינן להו, אי הדרה וטענה – שריין, ואי לא – אסירן.

Ameimar said: These eggs of a doubtful tereifa bird, of the first clutch, we set them aside; if it goes back and conceives again, they are permitted because she is clearly not a tereifa, and if not, they are prohibited.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רב אשי לאמימר: ומודים בכיצת טרפה שאסורה, מפני שגדלה באיסור.

Rav Ashi raised an objection to Ameimar: And they agree with regard to the egg of a tereifa that it is prohibited, because it grew in a state of prohibition. This implies a tereifa can lay eggs!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: התם בדשיח לא קמא.

Ameimar said to him: There, the Mishnah is dealing with the first clutch of eggs that were in its body before it became a tereifa.

QUESTION

אם כן, "גדלה"? "גמרה" מבעי ליה!

Rav Ashi asked: If so, why does it say "it grew"? "It was finished" in a state of prohibition it should have said!

ANSWER

תני: גמרה.

Ameimar replied: Teach the emended version: "It was finished."

QUESTION

אלא, הא דתנן: ולד טרפה, ר' אליעזר אומר: לא יקרב לגבי מזבח, ר' יהושע אומר: יקרב, במאי קא מיפלגי?

Rather, that which we learned in a Mishnah: The offspring of a tereifa animal, Rabbi Eliezer says: It shall not be sacrificed upon the Altar, Rabbi Yehoshua says: It may be sacrificed. In what case do they disagree?

EXPLANATION

כְּשֶׁעִיבְרָה וּלְבֶסוּף נִטְרָפָה, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר סָבַר: עוֹבֵר יָרֵךְ אִמּוֹ הוּא, וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ סָבַר: עוֹבֵר לֹא יָרֵךְ אִמּוֹ הוּא.

They must disagree in a case where it became pregnant and afterwards became a tereifa, where Rabbi Eliezer holds: A fetus is considered the thigh of its mother and becomes a tereifa with it, and Rabbi Yehoshua holds: A fetus is not considered the thigh of its mother.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, אֲדַמִּיפִּלְגִי לְגִבּוֹתָּ, לִיפִלְגוּ לְהַדְיוּט!

The Gemara asks: If so, rather than disagreeing regarding whether it may be offered to the Most High, let them disagree regarding whether it is permitted for an ordinary person!

ANSWER

לְהוֹדִיעָךְ כַּחוֹ דְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ.

The Gemara answers: It is to let you know the power of Rabbi Yehoshua, that it is permitted even for the Altar.

QUESTION

וְלִיפִלְגוּ בְּהַדְיוּט לְהוֹדִיעָךְ כַּחוֹ דְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר?

The Gemara asks: And let them disagree regarding an ordinary person, to let you know the power of Rabbi Eliezer that it is forbidden even to eat?

ANSWER

כַּח דְּהִיתִירָא עָדִיף לִיה.

The Gemara answers: The power of leniency is preferable to the Tanna.

STATEMENT

וּמוֹדִים וְדַאי בְּכִיצַת טְרִיפָה שְׁאִסוּרָה, בְּדִשְׁיחָלָא קָמָא, מַאי טַעְמָא? גּוֹפֵה הִיא.

And they certainly agree with regard to the egg of a tereifa that it is prohibited, in a case of the first clutch. What is the reason? It is considered part of its body.

RULING

וְהִלְכְתָּא בְּזָכָר – כָּל שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר חֳדָשׁ, בְּנִקְבָּה – כָּל שְׁאִינָה יוֹלָדָת.

And the halakha is: Regarding a male animal suspected of being a tereifa, if it lives all of twelve months it is kosher; regarding a female, any animal that does not give birth within twelve months is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: כֹּל (בְּרִיָּה) שְׁאִין בּוֹ עֶצֶם אֵינוֹ מִתְקַיֵּים שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר חֳדָשׁ.

Rav Huna said: Any creature that has no bone does not survive twelve months.

INFERENCE

אמר רב פפא: שמע מינה מדרב הונא, הא דאמר שמואל: קישות (שהתליע) [שהתליעה] באיפיה
אסורה.

Rav Papa said: Learn from it, from this statement of Rav Huna, that which Shmuel said: A cucumber that became infested with worms while on its stalk is prohibited, because the worms must have developed while still attached to the ground.

צמוד ב' DAF 58B

STATEMENT

הני תמרי דכדא לבתר תריסר ירחי שתא שריין.

These dates of a jar, which are stored in a jar, after twelve months of the year have passed are permitted to be eaten, even if they are found to contain worms. Since worms have no bones, they cannot survive twelve months, so any worms found must have hatched inside the jar after the dates were picked, and are therefore permitted.

STATEMENT

אמר רב: לית בקא בר יומא, ולית דיכא בת שתא.

Rav said: There is no mosquito that is a day old, because all mosquitoes die before they have lived a full day; and there is no fly that is a year old.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב פפא לאביי, והא אמרי אינשי: שב שני אימראי בקתא מבקא. דאמרה ליה: חזיתיה
לבר מחוזה דסחא במיא, וסליק ואיכרה בסדינין, ואיתיבת עליה ומצת מיניה, ולא הודעת לי.

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: But don't people say in a popular adage: For seven years the female mosquito rebelled against the male mosquito? As she said to him: I saw a resident of Mechoza who swam in the water, and he came up and wrapped himself in sheets, and you sat on him and sucked blood from him, and you did not inform me of this source of food! This indicates that some boneless creatures can live for seven years.

ANSWER

אמר ליה: וליתעמיה, הא דאמרי אינשי "שיתין מגי פרזלא תלו ליה לבקא בקורנסיה", מי איכא?
איהו גופיה כמה הוי?

Abaye said to him: And according to your reasoning, that which people say: "Sixty maneh of iron hang for the mosquito in its mallet (its stinger)," is there really such a thing? The mosquito itself, how much does it weigh altogether?

ANSWER

אלא במני דידהו, הכא נמי בשני דידהו.

Rather, that adage must refer to their own maneh, i.e., the tiny units of weight of the mosquitoes themselves; here too, the adage of seven years refers to their own years, which are much shorter than human years.

MISHNAH

תִּנּוּ הָתֵם: בְּהֶמָּה בַּעֲלַת חֲמִשׁ רַגְלִים, אוֹ שָׁאִין לָהּ אֶלָּא שְׁלֹשׁ – הֲרִי זֶה מוּם.

We learned in a Mishnah there in Maseches Bechoros: An animal that has five legs, or that has only three legs, behold, this is a blemish that disqualifies it from being offered as a korban.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שְׁחָסֵר וְיֵתֵר בִּיד, אֲבָל חָסֵר וְיֵתֵר בְּרֶגֶל – טְרֵפָה נִמִּי הוּא.

Rav Huna said: They only taught this as a mere blemish where it was missing or had an extra foreleg; but if it was missing or had an extra hind leg, it is also a tereifa, which renders the animal forbidden to be eaten.

EXPLANATION

מַאי טַעְמָא? כָּל יֵתֵר כְּנֻטוּל דְּמִי.

What is the reason? Any extra limb is considered as if it were removed. Since an animal missing a hind leg is a tereifa, one with an extra hind leg is likewise a tereifa.

STATEMENT

הָהִיא חֵיוָתָא דִּהְוָה לָהּ תְּרֵי מִסְנָא דִּיבִי, אֵייתוּהָ לְרַבִּינָא, וְטְרֵפָה מִדְּרַב הוּנָא.

There was a certain animal that had two ceca (blind guts). They brought it before Ravina, and he declared it a tereifa based on the principle of Rav Huna that an extra organ is like a missing organ.

RULING

וְאִי שְׁפָכוּן לְהֶדְדֵּי – כְּשֶׁרָה.

But if they empty into each other, so that food can pass freely between them, the animal is kosher, because they are considered a single organ.

STATEMENT

הָהִיא גּוּבְתָא דִּהְוָה נִפְקָא מִבֵּי כְּסִי לְהוֹבֵלִילָא, סָבַר רַב אָשִׁי לְמִטְרֵפָה.

There was a certain tube that exited from the reticulum (the second stomach) to the omasum (the third stomach). Rav Ashi thought to declare it a tereifa as an extra organ.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה רַב הוּנָא מַר בַּר חִיּוּא לְרַב אָשִׁי: כָּל הָנִי חִיּוּי בְּרִייתָא הָכִי אֵית לָהּ.

Rav Huna Mar bar Chiyya said to Rav Ashi: All these animals that graze in the wild have this kind of tube, and it is completely normal, so it does not render the animal a tereifa.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא גּוֹבֵהֶתָּא דִּהּוּה מְעַבְרָא מִבֵּי כֶסִּי לְכִרְסָא, סִבֵּר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי לְאַכְשׁוּרָהּ.

There was a certain tube that passed from the reticulum to the rumen (the first stomach). Mar bar Rav Ashi thought to declare it kosher, comparing it to the previous case.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה רַב אוֹשְׁעִיָּא: אִטּוּ כּוּלְהוּ בְּחֻדָּא מְחִיתָא מַחְתִּינָהּ? הִיכָא דְאִתְמַר – אִתְמַר, הִיכָא דְלָא אִתְמַר – לָא אִתְמַר.

Rav Oshaya said to him: Is that to say that all of them are woven in one weave, that they are all the same? Where it was stated by the Sages that a tube is normal, it was stated; where it was not stated, it was not stated, and this animal is indeed a tereifa.

BRAISA

הָעִיד נָתַן בַּר שֵׁילָא רַב טַבְחִיָּא דְצִיפּוֹרִי לְפָנֵי רַבִּי, עַל שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי מַעֲיִם הַיּוֹצְאִין מִן הַבֶּהֱמָה כְּאֶחָד, שֶׁהֵיא טְרֵפָה, וְכִנְגֻדָּן בְּעוֹף – כְּשֶׁרָהּ.

Natan bar Sheila, the head of the butchers of Tzipori, testified before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi regarding two intestines that exit from the abomasum of the animal as one, that it is a tereifa; but their counterpart in a bird is kosher, because this is common in birds.

BRAISA

בְּמָה דְּכָרִים אָמוּרִים? שְׁיוֹצְאִין בְּשְׁנֵי מְקוֹמוֹת, אֲבָל יוֹצְאִין בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד, וְכָלִין עַד כְּאַצְבָּע – כְּשֶׁרָהּ.

In what case are these words said, that two intestines render an animal a tereifa? When they exit from two different places; but if they exit from one place, and they end within a fingerbreadth, meaning they merge back into one, the animal is kosher.

STATEMENT

פְּלִיגִי בֵּה רַב אָמִי וְרַב אָסִי, חֵד אָמַר: הוּא דִּהְדְּרִי וְעָרְבִי, וְחֵד אָמַר: אִף עַל גַּב דְּלָא הִדְרִי וְעָרְבִי.

Rav Ami and Rav Asi disagree regarding this halacha. One says: It is kosher only where they return and merge into one; and one says: Even though they do not return and merge, it is kosher.

QUESTION

כְּשֶׁלְמָא לְמֵאן דְאָמַר הוּא דִּהְדְּרִי וְעָרְבִי, הִינֵנוּ דְקִתְנִי "עַד כְּאַצְבָּע", אֲלֵא לְמֵאן דְאָמַר אִף עַל גַּב דְּלָא הִדְרִי וְעָרְבִי, מַאי "עַד כְּאַצְבָּע"?

Granted, according to the one who says: It is kosher only where they return and merge, that is consistent with that which the baraita teaches: "Within a fingerbreadth," meaning they must merge within that distance. But according to the one who says: Even though they do not return and merge they are kosher, what is the meaning of "within a fingerbreadth"?

ANSWER

עַד כְּאַצְבָּע מִלְמַטָּה.

It means that they remain separate until within a fingerbreadth from below, near the anus, where they finally join.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רבי יהודה אומר: אם ניטלה הנוצה – פסולה.

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Yehuda says: If the down (the feathers) was removed from the bird's body, it is unfit** as a tereifa, just like an animal whose hide was removed.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רבי יוחנן: רבי יהודה ורבי ישמעאל אמרו דבר אחד.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yishmael said the same thing, as both hold that the down of a bird is treated like the hide of an animal.

EXPLANATION

רבי יהודה – הא דאמרן, רבי ישמעאל – דתנן: רבי ישמעאל אומר: הנוצה מצטרפת.

Rabbi Yehuda said so in that which we just said in our Mishnah. Rabbi Yishmael said so, as we learned in a Mishnah elsewhere: Rabbi Yishmael says: The down joins with the meat of a bird offering to constitute an olive-bulk for the purpose of rendering the offering piggul if the Kohen had improper intent.

OBJECTION

אמר רבא: דילמא לא היא, עד פאן לא קאמר רבי יהודה הכא אלא לענין טרפה, דליכא מידי דמגין עליה, אכל לענין איפגול לי – כרבנן סבירא ליה, ועד פאן לא קאמר רבי ישמעאל התם אלא לענין איפגול לי, אכל לענין טרפה – אגוני לא מגין.

Rava said: Perhaps it is not so, and they do not agree. Perhaps **Rabbi Yehuda only says so here with regard to a tereifa**, because **there is nothing to protect** the bird once the down is gone, so its life is in danger; **but with regard to piggul**, he holds in accordance with the Rabbis that down is not considered food. **And perhaps Rabbi Yishmael only says so there with regard to piggul** because he holds down is fit for consumption; **but with regard to a tereifa**, he holds that the down **does not protect** the bird, and its removal does not make it a tereifa.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' אחוזה הדם, והמעושנת, והמצוננת, ושאכלה הרדופני, ושאכלה צואת תרנגולים, או ששתת מים הרעים – פשרה.

MISHNAH: An animal that is congested with blood, or that was smoked (suffered smoke inhalation), or that was chilled, or that ate oleander (which is poisonous), or that ate chicken excrement, or that drank foul water—it is kosher, even though it is in danger of dying.

MISHNAH

אֲכָלָהּ סֵם הַמָּוֶת, אוֹ שֶׁהִפִּישָׁה נָחָשׁ – מוּתַרְתָּ מִשּׁוּם טְרֵפָה, וְאַסוּרָה מִשּׁוּם סַכְנַת נַפְשׁוֹת.

If it ate deadly poison, or if a snake bit it, it is permitted from the standpoint of the laws of tereifa, but it is forbidden because of danger to human life if one eats its meat.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גְּמִי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: הֲלַעֲיטָה חֲלִיתִית – טְרֵפָה, מֵאִי טַעְמָא? דְּמִינְקָבָה לָהּ לְמַעְיָנָה.

GEMARA: Shmuel said: If one fed it asafoetida, it is a tereifa. What is the reason? Because it perforates its intestines due to its extreme sharpness.

QUESTION

מֵתִיב רַב שִׁיזְבִּי: אַחוּזַת הַדָּם, וְהַמְעוּשָׁנָה, וְשָׂאֲכָלָה הֶרְדוּפָנִי, וְשָׂאֲכָלָה צִוְּאת תְּרִנְגוּלִים, וְשָׂתָה מִיֵּם הָרָעִים, הֲלַעֲיטָה תִיעָה, חֲלִיתִית וּפְלִפְלִין, אֲכָלָה סֵם הַמָּוֶת – כְּשֶׁרָה.

Rav Sheizvi raised an objection from a baraita: An animal that is congested with blood, or that was smoked, or that ate oleander, or that ate chicken excrement, or that drank foul water, or if one fed it ti'ah, asafoetida, or peppers, or if it ate deadly poison—it is kosher! This contradicts Shmuel's ruling regarding asafoetida.

BRAISA

הַפִּישָׁה נָחָשׁ, אוֹ שֶׁנִּשְׁכָּה כָּלָב שׁוֹטָה – מוּתַרְתָּ מִשּׁוּם טְרֵפָה, וְאַסוּרָה מִשּׁוּם סַכְנַת נַפְשׁוֹת.

The baraita continues: If a snake bit it, or if a mad dog bit it, it is permitted from the standpoint of the laws of tereifa, but it is forbidden because of danger to human life.

QUESTION

קָשְׁיָא חֲלִיתִית אַחֲלִיתִית, קָשְׁיָא סֵם הַמָּוֶת אֶסֶם הַמָּוֶת!

The Gemara notes: There is a difficulty between one ruling on asafoetida and the other ruling on asafoetida (Shmuel vs. the baraita), and there is a difficulty between one ruling on deadly poison and the other ruling on deadly poison (our Mishnah, which says it is forbidden only due to danger, vs. the baraita, which says it is kosher)!

ANSWER

חֲלִיתִית אַחֲלִיתִית לֹא קָשְׁיָא: כָּאן בְּעָלִין, כָּאן בְּקֶרְטִין.

The Gemara answers: The contradiction between asafoetida and asafoetida is not a difficulty: Here, where the baraita rules it is kosher, it refers to the leaves of the plant; there, where Shmuel rules it is a tereifa, it refers to the resinous resin-drops, which are extremely sharp and perforate the organs.

ANSWER

סֵם הַמָּוֶת אֶסֶם הַמָּוֶת לֹא קָשְׁיָא: הָא דִּידָהּ, הָא דְאִדָּהּ.

The contradiction between deadly poison and deadly poison is also not a difficulty: This case, where the baraita rules it is kosher, refers to a poison that is deadly to her (the animal); that case, where our Mishnah rules it is forbidden only due to danger,

refers to a poison that is deadly **to man** but not to the animal.

QUESTION

סם המות דבֿהמָה הָיִינוּ הָרְדוּפִינִי?

The Gemara asks: But is **a poison that is deadly to an animal not the same as oleander**, which was already mentioned separately in the baraita?

ANSWER

תְּרֵי גִּוּוֹנֵי סָם הַמָּוֶת.

The Gemara answers: There are **two types of deadly poison** that affect animals, and both had to be mentioned.

QUESTION

מֵאִי תִיעָה? אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה:

The Gemara asks: **What is "ti'ah"** mentioned in the baraita? **Rav Yehuda said:**

SUMMARY

The Gemara begins by analyzing the status of eggs from a tereifa bird, debating whether they are prohibited as having grown in a state of prohibition, or permitted if they were fertilized by a kosher male under the principle of "zeh v'zeh gore" (two factors causing the outcome). This discussion connects to the dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua regarding the offspring of a tereifa animal on the Mizbe'ach, highlighting the rule that the power of leniency (kocha d'heteira) is preferred by the Tanna of the Mishnah. Finally, the Gemara establishes that a boneless creature cannot survive for twelve months, a rule that Shmuel and Rav Papa apply to permit worms found in stored dates after a year has passed, while also discussing the lifespans of mosquitoes and flies.

In today's daf, we encounter a beautiful and famous principle of our Sages: "Koach d'heteira adif" —the power of leniency is preferable. When the Gemara asks why the Mishnah frames a dispute around the high standard of the Altar rather than the everyday standard of common food, it answers that the Tanna preferred to teach us the view of Rabbi Yehoshua, who permits the offering. Our Sages went out of their way to find the path of permission and purity wherever the halakha truthfully allowed it, showing us that Torah is a pathway of life, not of unnecessary restriction.

This is a profound lesson for our own daily avodah, especially in how we view ourselves and other Yidden. The yetzer hara loves to make us adopt a posture of strictness and negativity, constantly looking for the "treif" in our neighbor or the flaws in our own neshama. We can easily become spiritual prosecutors, finding reasons why a situation is hopeless or why a person is beyond repair. But the Torah teaches us that the true strength of a Torah perspective is the "koach d'heteira" —the holy effort to find the merit, the permission, and the spark of goodness.

To live with the "koach d'heteira" means looking at a struggling child, a difficult neighbor, or even your own flawed self, and actively searching for the kosher element. It takes no wisdom to simply declare everything forbidden or ruined. The real greatness, the way of Rabbi Yehoshua, is to find the path of connection and elevation, even when things look compromised.

Today, when you feel tempted to judge someone harshly or write off a situation as hopeless, pause and look for the "koach d'heteira" —find one genuine merit or positive point in them, and focus your mind on that.