

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ע"ז

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by continuing our deep dive into the halachos of a broken bone in an animal's leg, specifically when the bone has protruded outward. The Gemara discusses the status of the flesh and skin covering the bone, exploring various cases where the flesh might be torn, decomposed, or peeled off, and how this affects the animal's kashrus. We learn about the practical advice given by the Sages and doctors regarding how to heal such wounds, emphasizing the difference between using a bone or an iron instrument.

We then move into a new Mishnah that teaches us the halachos of a placenta (shilyah) found inside a slaughtered animal. The Mishnah outlines whether a placenta is considered edible, how it contracts tumah (impurity), and the status of a placenta that partially emerged before shechitah. We also learn the halachos of a placenta from a firstborn animal and the prohibition against following the superstitious practices of the Amorites.

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

דף 77א DAF 77A

PROOF

נִמְנָן עֲלֵיהֶן בַּפֶּסַח,

We see that **one may be registered for them**, i.e., for these sinews, **for the Pesach offering**, which proves they are considered edible flesh.

STATEMENT

וְעוֹד, הַתּוֹרָה חָסָה עַל מָמוֹן שֶׁל יִשְׂרָאֵל.

And furthermore, the Torah spared the money of Israel, so we should seek a lenient ruling to save the owner from loss.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַב פָּפָא לְרַבָּה: רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ,

Rav Pappa said to Rabba: But **Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish** disagrees with Rabbi Yochanan,

OBJECTION

וְאִי־סוּרָא דְאִדְרֵייתָא, וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ: מַאי לִיחּוּשׁ לְהוּ?!

and this is a matter of a Torah prohibition of tereifah, **and yet you say: What concern is there for them**, i.e., for these sinews, as if they are valid flesh?!

STATEMENT

אִישְׁתִּיק.

Rabba **was silent**, having no immediate answer.

QUESTION

ואמאי אישתיק? והאמר רבא: הלכתא כוותיה דרבי שמעון בן לקיש בהני תלת!

The Gemara asks: **And why was he silent? But doesn't Rava say: The halacha is like Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish** in his disputes with Rabbi Yochanan **only in these three** specific cases, and not here?

ANSWER

שאני הקא, דהדר ביה רבי יוחנן לגביה דרבי שמעון בן לקיש,

The Gemara answers: **It is different here**, for Rabbi Yochanan retracted his opinion in favor of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish on this matter,

EXPLANATION

דאמר ליה: אל תקניטני, בלשון יחיד אני שונה אותה.

as he said to him: **Do not provoke me**, for I teach it only as the opinion of a **single Sage**, but not as the accepted halacha.

STATEMENT

ההוא נשבר העצם ויצא לחוץ, דאישתקיל קורטיתא מיניה,

There was a **certain** animal whose **bone broke and protruded outward**, from which a small piece was removed,

STATEMENT

אתא לקמיה דאבאי, שהיה תלתא ריגלי.

and the case **came before Abaye**, who **delayed it** for **three Festivals** to consult with the Sages.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה רב אדא בר מתנא: זיל קמיה דרבא בריה דרב יוסף בר חמא, דחריפא ספיניה.

Rav Adda bar Mattana said to the owner: **Go before Rava** the son of Rav Yosef bar Chama, whose knife is sharp, meaning he is sharp-witted and can resolve this quickly.

RULING

אתא לקמיה, אמר: מכדי "נשבר העצם ויצא לחוץ" תנו,

The owner **came before him**. Rava said: **Now, we learned** in the baraita: "If the bone broke and protruded outward" and is covered by a majority of skin and flesh, it is kosher;

RULING

מה לי נפל, מה לי איתיה?

what difference is it to me if a piece of the bone fell out, and **what difference is it to me** if it is still there? In either case, if it is covered, it is kosher.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רבינא לרבא: מתלקט מהו?

Ravina said to Rava: If the flesh covering the bone was torn but **could be gathered** together to cover the majority, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

מתרוסס מהו?

If the flesh was **pulverized**, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

מתמסמס מהו?

If the flesh was **decomposed**, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

היכי דמי מתמסמס?

The Gemara asks: **What is the case of** flesh that is **decomposed**?

ANSWER

אמר רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: כל שחרופא קודרו.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said: Any flesh that the doctor would scrape away and remove because it cannot heal.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: ניקב מהו?

A dilemma was raised by them: If the flesh covering the bone was **perforated**, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

נקלף מהו?

If the flesh was **peeled** off the bone, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

נסדק מהו?

If the flesh was **cracked**, **what is** the law?

QUESTION

ניטל שליש התחתון מהו?

If **the bottom third** of the thickness of the flesh, closest to the bone, was **removed**, **what is** the law?

PROOF

תא שמע, דאמר עולא אמר רבי יוחנן: עור הרי הוא כבשר,

Come and hear, for Ulla said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Skin is like flesh to cover the bone,

REFUTATION

דלמא דקנה משכא דידיה.

but **perhaps** that is only where **the skin holds its own place** naturally, such as near the knee, but not where there was once flesh.

QUESTION

אמר רב אשי: כי הוינו בי רב פפי, איבעיא לן: נקדר כמין טבעת, מהו?

Rav Ashi said: When we were in the study hall of Rav Pappi, we raised a dilemma: If the flesh was cut in the shape of a **ring** around the bone, **what is** the law?

RESOLUTION

ופשטנא מהא דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב: דבר זה שאילתי לחכמים ולרופאים,

And we resolved it from that which Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: I asked about this matter to the Sages and to the doctors,

RESOLUTION

ואמרו: מסרטו בעצם ומעלה ארוכה, אבל פרזלא מזרף זרית.

and they said: One scratches it with a bone and it will heal, but an iron instrument causes inflammation and prevents healing.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב פפא: והוא דקנה גרמא דידיה.

Rav Pappa said: And this healing is only where the bone holds its own place and is not loose.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' השוחט את הבهמה ומצא בה שליא – נפש היפה תאכלנה,

MISHNAH: One who slaughters an animal and finds a placenta in it, a hearty soul may eat it,

MISHNAH

ואינה מטמאה לא טומאת אכלין ולא טומאת נבלות.

and it does not contract the impurity of foods, nor the impurity of carcasses.

MISHNAH

חישב עליה – מטמאה טומאת אכלין, אבל לא טומאת נבלות.

If he intended to eat it, it contracts the impurity of foods, but not the impurity of carcasses.

MISHNAH

שליא שיצתה מקצתה – אסורה באכילה,

A placenta, part of which emerged before slaughter, is forbidden to be eaten,

MISHNAH

סימן וְלֹד בְּאִשָּׁה וְסִימָן וְלֹד בַּבְּהֵמָה.

for a placenta is the sign of a child in a woman, and the sign of an offspring in an animal, and we fear the head of the offspring emerged.

MISHNAH

הַמְכַבֶּרֶת שֶׁהִפִּילָה שְׁלִיָּא – יִשְׁלִיכֶנָּה לְכֻלָּבִים,

An animal giving birth for the first time that discharged a placenta, one may cast it to the dogs, and we do not worry that it was a male firstborn,

MISHNAH

וּבְמוֹקֵדֶשִׁין תִּקְבֵּר,

but in the case of consecrated animals, the placenta must be buried,

MISHNAH

וְאִין קוֹבְרִין אוֹתָהּ בְּפֶרֶשֶׁת דְּרָכִים, וְאִין תּוֹלִין אוֹתָהּ בְּאֵילָן, מִפְּנֵי דְרָכֵי הָאֻמּוֹרִי.

and we do not bury it at a crossroads, nor do we hang it on a tree, because of the ways of the Amorites.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

GEMARA

גְּמ' מִנָּא הֵנִי מִלִּי?

GEMARA: From where are these words derived that a placenta is permitted by the slaughter of the mother?

BRAISA

דְּתַנּוּ רַבָּנָן: "כָּל (בַּהֲמָה) [בְּבֵהֶמָה] תֹּאכִלוּ" – לְרִבּוּת אֶת הַשְּׁלִיָּא.

For the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says, "Any animal in the beast you may eat" to include the placenta.

BRAISA

יָכוֹל אֶפִּילוּ יֵצֵתָה מִקְצֵתָהּ?

I might have thought even if part of it emerged it is permitted?

BRAISA

תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר: "אוֹתָהּ" – אוֹתָהּ וְלֹא שְׁלִיָּתָהּ.

Therefore the verse says: "it", meaning it inside the womb is permitted, but not its placenta if it has partially emerged.

QUESTION

מַכְדִּי אֵין שְׁלִיָּא בְּלֵא וְלֵד, לָמָּה לִּי קָרָא?

The Gemara asks: **Now, there is no placenta without an offspring**, so the placenta is just part of the offspring; **why do I need a verse** to permit it?

ANSWER

קָרָא אֶסְמַכְתָּא בְּעָלְמָא.

The Gemara answers: **The verse is a mere support**, as logically it is permitted.

STATEMENT

וְאֵינָהּ מְטַמְּאָה.

We learned in the Mishnah: **And it does not contract impurity**.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַבִּי יִצְחָק בַּר נַפְחָא: עוֹר חֲמוֹר שֶׁשָּׂלְקוּ מֵהוּ?

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Nappacha asked: **If one boiled the skin of a donkey**, what is the law?

QUESTION

לָמָּא? אִי לְטוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין – תִּנִּינָא,

The Gemara asks: **For what** law is this asked? **If for the impurity of foods**, we already learned it in our Mishnah regarding the placenta!

צמוד ב' DAF 77B

OBJECTION

אִי לְטוּמְאַת נְבִילוֹת – תִּנִּינָא.

If you say Rabbi Yitzchak's inquiry was **with regard to the ritual impurity of animal carcasses**, we already learned this halakha in another baraita.

EXPLANATION

טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין, דִּתְנִינָא: הָעוֹר וְהַשְּׂלֵיָּא – אֵין מְטַמְּאִין טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין, עוֹר שֶׁשָּׂלְקוּ, וְהַשְּׂלֵיָּא שֶׁחִישַׁב עָלֶיהָ – מְטַמְּאִין טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין.

With regard to **the ritual impurity of foods**, as it is taught in a baraita: **The hide and the placenta of an animal do not become impure with the ritual impurity of foods**; but a hide that one cooked until it became soft, and a placenta that one intended to eat, do become impure with the ritual impurity of foods.

EXPLANATION

טוּמְאַת נְבִילוֹת נִמֵּי תִנִּינָא: "בְּנִבְלָתָהּ" – וְלֹא בָּעוֹר, וְלֹא בְּעֲצָמוֹתָיו, וְלֹא בְּגִידָיו, וְלֹא בְּקַרְנָיו, וְלֹא בְּטַלְפָּיו.

With regard to **the ritual impurity of animal carcasses also**, we already learned in a baraita: The verse states, 'And when a domesticated animal dies... one who touches **its carcass** shall be impure'—implying that one is rendered impure by touching the

carcass, **but not by touching the hide, and not by its bones, and not by the sinews, and not by the horns, and not by the hooves.**

EXPLANATION

וַאֲמַר רַבָּה בַּר רַב חַנָּא: לֹא נִצְרְכָה אֶלָּא שְׁעֲשֹׂאן צִיָּקֵי קִדְרָה.

And Rabba bar Rav Chana said in explanation of this baraita: This exclusion was **necessary only** for a case **where one prepared them as a meat pudding** by cooking them with spices, which might have made them considered edible flesh. Thus, even when cooked, they do not convey carcass impurity.

RESOLUTION

לְעוֹלָם טוּמְאַת אֶכְלִין, וְשֶׁאֵין עוֹר חֲמוֹר דְּמֵאִיס.

The Gemara answers: **Actually**, Rabbi Yitzchak's inquiry was with regard to **the ritual impurity of foods**, and yet his question was necessary because **the hide of a donkey is different, as it is repulsive**, and one might think that even when cooked it does not become food.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

שֶׁלִּיא שִׁיצְתָּהּ.

We learned in the Mishnah: With regard to **a placenta, part of which emerged** from the womb before the mother was slaughtered, its consumption is prohibited.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שֶׁאֵין עֶמְה וְלֹד, אֲבָל יֵשׁ עֶמְה וְלֹד – אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְוֹלֵד אַחֵר.

Rabbi Elazar said: They taught this prohibition **only where there is no fetus with it** in the womb; **but if there is a fetus with it**, we do not fear for another fetus that might have been inside the placenta.

STATEMENT

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: בֵּין אֵין עֶמְה וְלֹד בֵּין יֵשׁ עֶמְה וְלֹד – חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְוֹלֵד אַחֵר.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Whether there is no fetus with it or whether there is a fetus with it, we must fear for **another fetus** that might have been inside the placenta, and it is prohibited.

QUESTION

אֵינִי? וְהָא אָמַר רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה: לְחוּמָרָא אָמַרָה רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר!

The Gemara asks: **Is that so? But didn't Rabbi Yirmeya say: Rabbi Elazar said it as a stringency?** According to this version, Rabbi Elazar is the lenient one!

STATEMENT

אָלָא, אִי אַתְמַר חָכִי אַתְמַר, אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: לֹא שָׂנוּ אֶלָּא שְׂאִינָהּ קְשׁוּרָה בְּוֶלֶד, אֲבָל קְשׁוּרָה בְּוֶלֶד – אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְוֶלֶד אַחֵר.

Rather, if it was stated, it was stated like this: Rabbi Elazar said: They taught that the placenta is prohibited **only** when it is **not attached to the fetus** found inside; **but** if it is **attached to the fetus**, we **do not** fear for another fetus. Thus, Rabbi Elazar prohibits even when a fetus is present, unless it is attached.

STATEMENT

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אָנוּ אֵין לָנוּ אֶלָּא שְׂלֵיָא בְּלֹא וֶלֶד, אֲבָל יֵשׁ עִמָּהּ וֶלֶד, בֵּין קְשׁוּרָה בְּוֶלֶד בֵּין אֵין קְשׁוּרָה בְּוֶלֶד – אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְוֶלֶד אַחֵר,

And Rabbi Yochanan said: We have **only** the ruling of the Mishnah prohibiting a placenta without a fetus; but if there is a fetus with it, whether the placenta is attached to the fetus or whether it is not attached to the fetus, we do not fear for another fetus.

INFERENCE

וְחֵינּוּ דְאָמַר רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה: לְחומְרָא אַמְרָה ר' אֶלְעָזָר.

And this is in line with that which Rabbi Yirmeya said: Rabbi Elazar said it as a stringency, since he prohibits an unattached placenta even when a fetus is present.

PROOF

תִּנְיָא בְּוֵיתִיהּ דְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: הַמִּפְלֵת מִין בְּהֵמָה חַיָּה וְעוֹר, וְשְׂלֵיָא עִמָּהּ, בְּזִמְנָא שְׂקֻשׁוּרָה בָּהּ – אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְוֶלֶד אַחֵר, אֵינָהּ קְשׁוּרָה בָּהּ – הֲרִינִי מְטִיל עָלֶיהָ חוֹמֶר שְׁנֵי וִלְדוֹת.

It is taught in a baraita in accordance with Rabbi Elazar: A woman who expels a fetus that has the form of a species of domesticated animal, wild animal, or bird, and there is a placenta with them; when the placenta is attached to them, we do not fear for another fetus of human form; but if it is not attached to them, behold I impose upon her the stringency of two births, i.e., both a male and a female birth.

EXPLANATION

שְׂאִינִי אוֹמַר: שְׂמָא נִימּוּחַ שְׂפִיר שְׂלֵיָא, שְׂמָא נִימּוּחָהּ שְׂלִיתוּ שְׂלֵי שְׂפִיר.

For I say: Perhaps the fetus of the placenta dissolved, and that fetus was of human form, and perhaps the placenta of the animal-shaped fetus dissolved.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הַמְבַכֶּרֶת שֶׁהִפִּילָהּ.

We learned in the Mishnah: An animal giving birth for the first time that expelled a placenta, one may cast it to the dogs.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא?

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

ANSWER

אמר רב איקא בריה דרב אמאי: רוב בהמות יולדות דבר הקדוש בבכורה, ומיעוט בהמות דבר שאינו קדוש בבכורה, ומאי ניהו? נדמה.

Rav Ika the son of Rav Ami said: The majority of animals give birth to something that is holy as a firstborn, and a minority of animals give birth to something that is not holy as a firstborn, and what is it? An offspring that resembles another species.

EXPLANATION

וכל היוולדות יולדות מחצה זכרים ומחצה נקבות, סמוך מיעוטא דנדמה למחצה דנקבות, והווי להו זכרים מיעוטא.

And all giving birth, give birth to half males and half females. Combine the minority of those that resemble another species with the half of females, and the males that resemble their own species—which are the only ones holy as firstborns—become the minority. Therefore, we do not assume the placenta came from a holy firstborn.

EXPLANATION

ובמוקדשין תקבר. מאי טעמא? רובא בר מיקדש הוא.

The Mishnah continues: **But in the case of consecrated animals**, the placenta **must be buried**. What is the reason? The **majority** of offspring of consecrated animals **are fit to be consecrated**, since both males and females are holy.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ואין קוברים אותה.

The Mishnah states: **But one may not bury it** at a crossroads, nor hang it on a tree, because of the ways of the Amorites.

STATEMENT

אפני ורבא דאמרי תרנויהו: כל דבר שיש בו רפואה – אין בו משום דרכי האמורי, אין בו רפואה – יש בו משום דרכי האמורי.

Abaye and Rava both say: Any matter that has healing value is not subject to the prohibition of the ways of the Amorite; but if it has no healing value, it is subject to the prohibition of the ways of the Amorite.

QUESTION

וְהִתְנַחֵא: אֵילָן שֶׁמִּשִּׁיר פִּירוֹתָיו, סוֹקְרוֹ בְּסִיקְרָא וְטוֹעֲנוּ בְּאַבְנִים. בְּשִׁלְמָא טוֹעֲנוּ בְּאַבְנִים – כִּי הֵיכִי

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it taught** in a baraita: **A tree that casts off its fruit, one may paint it with red paint and load it with stones? Granted, loading it with stones** is a physical remedy, **so that** its strength is weakened and it retains its fruit.

SUMMARY

The Gemara first resolves the debate regarding a broken bone, clarifying that if the bone is covered by a majority of skin and flesh, it remains kosher, even if a piece of the bone fell out. We analyze various physical states of the covering flesh, such as being pulverized or decomposed, with Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua defining decomposed flesh as that which a doctor would scrape away. The Gemara then transitions to the Mishnah regarding a placenta, establishing that a placenta is permitted through the shechitah of the mother, as derived from the pesukim. Finally, the Gemara discusses the tumah status of the placenta and hide, comparing it to the skin of a donkey, and clarifies that while they can contract the impurity of foods if cooked or intended for eating, they do not contract the impurity of carcasses.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, we see the beautiful and deep principle of "haTorah chasah al mamonom shel Yisrael", the Torah spares the money of Jewish people. When discussing the status of certain parts of an animal, the Gemara emphasizes that we actively seek out permitted avenues because Hashem cares about our hard-earned livelihood. This is not a compromise on halacha; rather, it is a fundamental truth of the Torah itself. Hashem does not want us to suffer unnecessary loss, and the halacha reflects His deep care for our everyday physical and financial well-being.

This teaches us a profound lesson in how we must view our own resources and those of others. If Hashem Himself is concerned with sparing a Yid's money, how much more so must we be careful with it! We must treat our friend's money with the utmost respect, avoiding any waste, damage, or unnecessary expense on their behalf. Similarly, we should recognize that our own livelihood is a gift from Hashem, meant to be managed with responsibility and gratitude, not wasted carelessly.

Today, show extra care for the property and money of others. Whether it is turning off a light in a shul or office to save on their utility bill, returning a borrowed item promptly so it doesn't get damaged, or being mindful not to cause someone an unnecessary expense, act with the conscious awareness that a Yid's money is precious in the eyes of Hashem.