



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Examination for Clawing

Rav Nachman said: In the case of a thorn, the animal is not rendered *tereifah* unless it penetrated into the body cavity; in the case of clawing, the animal is rendered *tereifah* when the flesh in the region of the viscera becomes reddened.

Rav Zevid taught Rav Nachman’s law as follows: In the case of clawing, the animal is rendered *tereifah* when the flesh in the region of the viscera becomes reddened; if the pipes were clawed, the animal is rendered *tereifah* when the pipes themselves become red.

Rav Pappi said that Rav Bibi bar Abaye inquired: With regard to the esophagus, as the slightest puncture is sufficient to render the animal *tereifah*, so too is the slightest indication of clawing (*a very small red spot*); but with regard to the trachea, since it is established that there must be a puncture the size of an *issar*, what is the law with regard to the clawing of it?

The *Gemora* relates that after raising this inquiry, he himself resolved it as follows: In either pipe, the slightest indication of clawing (*a very small red spot*) will render the animal *tereifah*. Why? It is because the poison gradually spreads and burns away more (until it will eventually be the size of an *issar*).

Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marta was sitting before Rav Nachman and he said the following: The examination of which the Rabbis have spoken in the case of clawing, must be carried out in the region of the viscera. Rav Nachman exclaimed: By God! Rav used to rule that an examination must be made from the spoon to the thigh (*which is an area larger than the viscera*).

The *Gemora* seeks to determine the definition of ‘the spoon.’ It cannot be referring to the spoon of the foreleg (*the shoulder blade*), for then, this view would be identical with the opinion that says ‘in the region of the viscera’ (*for the shoulder blade is directly above the beginning of the viscera*). It must therefore mean: from the spoon of the brain (*the skull*) to the thigh.

When Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef went up to *Eretz Yisroel*, he found Rabbi Yochanan and Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish stating the following: The examination of which the Rabbis have spoken in the case of clawing, must be carried out in the region of the viscera. Rabbi Chiya exclaimed: By God! Rav used to rule that an examination must be made from the spoon to the thigh (*which is an area larger than the viscera*). Rish Lakish retorted: Who is this Rav? Who is this Rav? I do not know who he is. Rabbi Yochanan said to him: Do you not remember that disciple who attended the lectures of Rebbe, the Great and of Rabbi Chiya, and, by God! All the years during which that disciple sat before his

teachers, I remained standing! [*Those who sat were considered more advanced.*] And in what did he excel? He excelled in everything (*including Torah and piety*). Immediately Rish Lakish exclaimed: Yes! I remember him, and that man is to be remembered for good! For the following dictum has been reported in his name: If, after slaughtering, the trachea was found to be torn loose (*from its moorings in the jaw*), the animal is permitted, for it is impossible to slaughter a pipe that had been torn loose (*for it would slip away*). Rabbi Yochanan, however, said: He should bring a knife and compare it. [*He should cut the trachea again and compare the two cuts; if they are dissimilar, it is an indicator that the initial cut was made when the animal's pipe was still connected to the jaw, and the shechitah would be ruled to be valid.*]

Rav Nachman said: The *shechitah* is ruled to be valid only if the slaughterer did not grasp the pipes when slaughtering, but if he did grasp them, the *shechitah* is invalid, for then it is possible to cut through a pipe that had been torn loose. (53b – 54a)

Other Injuries

The *Mishna* concluded with the following: This is the general rule (*if an animal with a similar defect could not continue to live, it is a tereifah*).

The *Gemora* asks: What cases does it include?

The *Gemora* answers: It includes the seven teachings (*mentioned by the Amoraim on 42b*).

The members of the house of Yosef the hunter used to kill animals by striking them on the sciatic nerve (*either with an arrow or stick*). When they came to enquire of

Rabbi Yehudah ben Beseirah (*to find out if an animal hit in such a manner would be deemed a tereifah*), he said to them: May we then add to the list of *tereifos*? We accept only those mentioned by the Sages.

The members of the house of Rav Pappa ben Abba the hunter used to kill animals by striking them in the kidney. When they came to enquire of Rabbi Abba (*to find out if an animal hit in such a manner would be deemed a tereifah*), he said to them, May we then add to the list of *tereifos*? We accept only those mentioned by the Sages.

The *Gemora* asks: But do we not see that the animal dies from such a blow?

The *Gemora* answers: We have a tradition that if medicines were applied, it would live. (54a)

Mishna

And these are kosher (*and not deemed to be tereifah*): If the trachea was punctured, or slit lengthwise. To what extent may it be deficient? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Up to an Italian *issar*. If the skull was diminished but the membrane of the brain was not punctured; if the heart was punctured but not as far as its cavity; if the spinal column was broken but the cord was not severed; if the liver was removed but an olive's volume of it remained; if the omasum and reticulum were punctured one into the other; if the spleen was removed; if the kidneys were removed; if the lower jaw was removed; if its uterus was removed; if the lung was shriveled up by an act of Heaven. If an animal was stripped of its hide, Rabbi Meir declares it kosher, but the Sages declare it invalid. (54a)

Emphasis on which Expression?

It was stated: [Our Mishna uses the expression, 'these are kosher,' and the Mishna above uses the expression, 'these are tereifos.'] Rabbi Yochanan says: 'These render an animal *tereifah*' is to be understood in its strict sense. Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish says: 'And these are kosher' is to be understood in its strict sense.

The *Gemora* explains the point of issue between them: It is Rav Masna's case, for Rav Masna ruled: If the ball of the thighbone slipped out of its socket, the animal is *tereifah*. Now, Rabbi Yochanan who said that 'These render an animal *tereifah*' is to be understood in its strict sense argues as follows: The *Tanna* listed various *tereifos* and concluded by saying: This is the general rule (which would include other *tereifos* not mentioned in his list). He saw, however, that Rav Masna's case might be included as a *tereifah* under the clause, 'This is the general rule,' for it is fairly similar to a case where the entire organ was removed. He therefore taught: 'These render an animal *tereifah*,' emphasizing that only these render an animal *tereifah*, but the case stated by Rav Masna does not render the animal *tereifah*.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, who said that 'These are kosher' is to be understood in its strict sense argues as follows: The *Tanna* listed various *tereifos* and concluded by saying: This is the general rule (which would include other *tereifos* not mentioned in his list). He saw, however, that Rav Masna's case might be included as a *tereifah* under the clause, 'This is the general rule,' for it is not quite the same as when an organ is punctured or severed or removed entirely. He therefore taught: 'These are kosher,' emphasizing that only these do not render an animal *tereifah*, but the case stated by Rav Masna does render the animal *tereifah*.

The text stated above: Rav Masna ruled: If the ball of the thighbone slipped out of its socket, the animal is *tereifah*. Rava, however, ruled that it was permitted. However, if its ligaments were severed, it is *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* issues a ruling: Even if its ligaments were severed, it is permitted, unless they had decayed. (54a – 54b)

Measuring Coin

The *Mishna* had stated: To what extent may it be deficient? [Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Up to an Italian *issar*.]

Ze'iri said: You, who have never seen the size of an Italian *issar* (for the deficient trachea), may take instead as a standard the size of a Kurdian *dinar*, which is equal in size to the small *peshita* coin, current among the *peshita* coins of Pumbedisa.

Rabbi Chana, the moneychanger, said: Once, there stood before me Bar Nafcha (the smith's son, i.e., R' Yochanan), who asked me for a Kurdian *dinar* with which to measure a *tereifah*. I wanted to rise before him (as is the *halachah* – before a Torah scholar), but he would not allow me, saying: Sit down, my son, sit down. Tradesmen (paid employees) are not allowed to rise before scholars while they are engaged in their work.

The *Gemora* asks: And they are not obligated to rise? But we learned in a *Mishna*: All the tradesmen would rise before them (those bringing the *bikkurim* to the *Beis HaMikdash*) and they would greet them and say, "Brethren from Such-and-such a place, may your arrival



be peaceful." [We see that they did disrupt their work in order to honor the Torah scholars!]

Rabbi Yochanan answers: They stood before those bringing the *bikkurim*, but not before Torah scholars.

Rabbi Yosi bar Avin explains: Come and see how precious a *mitzvah* is in its proper time, for the tradesmen would rise before those bringing the *bikkurim*, but not before Torah scholars.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps they would only rise before those bringing *bikkurim* (but not for an ordinary *mitzvah*) because if not, they will not bring the *bikkurim* in the future (for they will think that the people living in *Yerushalayim* have no respect for them). (54b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Tradesmen Standing for Torah Scholars

Rabbi Yochanan states: They stood before those bringing the *bikkurim*, but not before Torah scholars.

Rabbi Yosi bar Avin explains: Come and see how precious a *mitzvah* is in its proper time, for the tradesmen would rise before those bringing the *bikkurim*, but not before Torah scholars.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps they would only rise before those bringing *bikkurim* (but not for an ordinary *mitzvah*) because if not, they will not bring the *bikkurim* in the future (for they will think that the people living in *Yerushalayim* have no respect for them).

The *Pnei Yehoshua* writes that although it is obvious that the studying of Torah is greater than the performance of *mitzvos*, and even a *mitzvah* which has a set time, nevertheless, here, those that are performing a *mitzvah* are greater than Torah scholars. This is because it is quite possible that the Torah scholar is not engrossed in learning as he is walking.

The *Chasam Sofer* asks: And is a Torah scholar not occupied in performing *mitzvos* as he is walking? The *Gemora Brochos* states that a Torah scholar does not walk even four *amos* without thinking in Torah!? Why shouldn't they stand before him?

He answers that according to *halachah*, thinking in learning is not equivalent to studying out loud, and therefore it is not in the same category as one who is performing a *mitzvah* while he is walking.

The *Noda BeYehudah* answers that a *mitzvah* which does not apply every day is more significant than the *mitzvah* of studying Torah, which applies every day.