



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

Mishna

If an animal was seized with blood (*an increase in blood that resulted in the animal becoming sick*), or was overcome by smoke or by the cold, or if it ate *hardufni* (*possibly oleander, which is poisonous for animals*) or chickens' dung, or if it drank bad water (*that had been left uncovered*), it is permitted (*for although it will very likely die, it is not regarded as tereifah*). If it ate poison (*for humans*), or was bitten by a snake, it is not forbidden as *tereifah*, but it is forbidden as a danger to human life. (58b)

Chiltis and Poisons

Shmuel said: If it was given *chiltis* (*asafoetida*) to eat, it is *tereifah*. Why? Because it will puncture the internal organs.

Rav Shizbi asked from the following *braisa*: If an animal was seized with blood, or was overcome by smoke, or if it ate *hardufni* or chickens' dung, or if it drank bad water, or if someone fed it *tiah* (*a very bitter herb*), *chiltis* or peppers, or if it ate poison, it is permitted. If it was bitten by a snake or by a mad dog, it is not forbidden as *tereifah*, but is forbidden as a danger to human life. Is there not here a contradiction in the matter of *chiltis* (*against Shmuel's ruling that the animal is rendered tereifah*), and also in the matter of poison (*for our Mishna taught that this would endanger the life of a human*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Regarding *chiltis* there is no contradiction, because the *braisa* speaks of the leaves, and Shmuel is speaking about the grains (*which are sharp and will puncture the animal's internal organs*). And regarding poison there is also no contradiction, for the *braisa* speaks of poison for animals (*which does endanger a human's life*), and the *Mishna* refers to something that is poisonous for humans.

The *Gemora* asks: But if it is only a poison for animals, then it is the same as *hardufni* (*which the braisa already stated*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It mentions two kinds of poison.

Rav Yehudah explains that *tiah* mentioned in the *braisa* refers to the root of aconite (*which is poisonous*).

Rav Yehudah said: He who eats three *shekels* of *chiltis* on an empty stomach will shed his skin (*for it will cause a high fever*).

Rabbi Avahu said: It actually happened with me when I ate one *shekel* of *chiltis* and had I not immersed myself in water, I would have lost my skin. I thus applied to myself the verse: *Wisdom preserves the life of its owner*.

Rav Yosef said: He who eats sixteen eggs, forty nuts and seven caperberries, and drinks one quarter of a *log* of honey in the summer months on an empty stomach - his heartstring will snap.

There once came before the Exilarch a young deer whose hind legs were broken. Rav examined it in the region of the juncture of the sinews and declared it to be permitted. He thought to eat a portion of it rare (*heavily salted and grilled a bit*), when Shmuel said to him: Master, have you no concern that it has been bitten by a snake (*in that area, and is thus forbidden on account of the poisonous venom which can endanger the life of a human*)? Rav replied: Then, what is the remedy? Let it be put into an oven and it will check itself. It was immediately put into an oven and it fell to pieces (*due to the venom*). Shmuel applied to Rav the verse: *No harm shall befall the righteous*, and Rav applied to Shmuel the verse: *No secret is hidden from you*. (58b – 59a)

Mishna

The characteristics (*kosher signs*) of *beheimah* (*domesticated animal*) and *chayah* (*wild animals*) are stated in the Torah. [If an animal has split hooves or brings up its cud, it is classified as kosher.]

The characteristics of birds are not stated, but the Sages have said that every bird that claws (*its prey, and raises it to its mouth to eat*) is nonkosher. Every bird that has an extra toe (*above and in back of the others*), a crop, and a gizzard that can be peeled, is kosher. Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Rabbi Tzadok says: Every bird that parts its toes (*whenever it perches on a string, it divides its toes evenly, two toes on each side*) is nonkosher (*for it most definitely claws*).

Regarding grasshoppers: All that have four legs, four wings, (*two*) jumping legs (*long legs, besides the legs it uses for walking, attached to its body close to the neck*), and wings covering the greater part of the body (*are kosher*). Rabbi Yosi says: it must also bear the name *chagav*.

Regarding fish: All that have *kaskasin* - fins and *senapirin* - scales are kosher. Rabbi Yehudah says: There must be (*at least*) two Scales and one fin. The *kaskasin* are those which are attached to the fish (*its scales*), and *senapirin* are those by which it swims (*its fins*). (59a)

Signs of a Kosher Animal

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The following are the characteristics of a kosher animal: *Every animal that has a split hoof* etc. If an animal brings up its cud, one may be certain that it has no upper front teeth and it is kosher.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this a general rule (*that any animal that has no upper front teeth is kosher*)? Behold the camel that brings up its cud and has no upper front teeth and yet, it is nonkosher!?

The *Gemora* answers: The camel has canines (*so it is regarded as having upper front teeth*).

The *Gemora* asks: But the young camel doesn't even have canines (*and yet, it is nonkosher*)!? Furthermore, the *shafen* (*hyrax*) and the *arneves* (*hare*) bring up their cud, and nevertheless, they have upper front teeth, and are nonkosher! And even furthermore, are teeth (*or the lack thereof*) mentioned at all in the Torah (*as being a characteristic of being kosher or not*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, this is the meaning of the *braisa*: If an animal has no upper front teeth, one may be certain that it brings up its cud and has split hooves, and it is therefore kosher. [One who sees that it has no upper front teeth does not need to wait to see if it brings up its cud, for it certainly does; he also knows that it has split hooves – except for the young camel.]

The *Gemora* asks: But one can simply examine its hooves (*so what is the necessity of this rule*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is necessary for a case where its hooves were cut off. And this is in accordance with Rav Chisda's teaching, for Rav Chisda said: If one was walking in the desert and found an animal with its hooves cut off, he should examine its mouth: if it has no upper front teeth, he may be certain that it is kosher, otherwise, he may be certain that it is nonkosher; provided, however, that he recognizes the camel.

The *Gemora* asks: But the camel has canines!?

The *Gemora* answers: He meant: provided that he recognizes the young camel.

The *Gemora* asks: Just as you admit then that there is the young camel (*which is an exception to the rule*); perhaps there might well be another species similar to the young camel (*and therefore, you should not be allowed to rely on the lack of upper front teeth*)?

The *Gemora* answers: That should not enter your mind, for a *braisa* was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written: *The camel, because it brings up its cud (but does not have a split hoof)*. The Ruler of His Universe knows that there is no other

creature that brings up its cud and is nonkosher except the camel (*and shefen and arneves*); therefore, the verse particularly stated 'it.'

And Rav Chisda said: If one was walking on the road and found an animal with its mouth mutilated, he should examine its hooves: if they are split, he may be certain that it is kosher, otherwise, he may be certain that it is nonkosher; provided, however, that he recognizes the pig (*for it has split hooves, but does not bring up its cud*).

The *Gemora* asks: Just as you admit then that there is the pig (*which is an exception to the rule*); perhaps there might well be another species similar to the pig (*and therefore, you should not be allowed to rely on the split hooves*)?

The *Gemora* answers: That should not enter your mind, for a *braisa* was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written: *And the pig, because it has a split hoof (but does not bring up its cud)*. The Ruler of His Universe knows that there is no other creature that has a split hoof and is nonkosher except the pig; therefore, the verse particularly stated 'it.'

And Rav Chisda said: If one was walking on the road and found an animal with its mouth mutilated and its hooves cut off, he should examine its muscle; if it runs lengthwise and crosswise, he may be certain that it is kosher, otherwise, he may be certain that it is nonkosher; provided however, that he recognizes the wild donkey.

The *Gemora* asks: Just as you admit then that there is the wild donkey (*which is an exception to the rule*); perhaps there might well be another species similar to the wild donkey (*and therefore, you should not be allowed to rely on the direction of the muscles*)?

The *Gemora* answers: There is a tradition that there are not.

The *Gemora* asks: Where precisely should he examine the muscle?

Abaye, and others say Rav Chisda, answers: By the flanks of the tail.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The following are the characteristics of a *chayah*:

The *Gemora* interrupts: But surely the *chayah* is included under *beheimah* with regard to the signs of being kosher?

Rabbi Zeira said: The *braisa* wishes to determine the *chayah's* characteristics (that it is distinguishable from *beheimah*) in order that its fat be permitted to be eaten. [*The law is that the cheilev – forbidden fat – of a beheimah is forbidden; from a chayah, it is permitted.*] And the *braisa* should be understood as follows: The following are the characteristics of a *chayah*, whose fat is permitted: All that have horns and (*sharp pointed*) split hooves. Rabbi Dosa said: Those that have horns are not required to be examined regarding their hooves, but those that have (*sharp pointed*) split hooves must still be examined as to their horns. And the *keresh*, though it has but one horn, is permitted.

The *Gemora* asks: But is this a general rule? Behold the goat has horns and (*sharp pointed*) split hooves, and nevertheless, its fat is forbidden (*for it is classified as a beheimah*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is specifically referring to horns that are layered (*layers – each one wrapped upon another one*).

The *Gemora* asks: But are not the horns of an ox layered, and yet, its fat is forbidden?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is specifically referring to horns that are grooved (*with notches and indentations*).

The *Gemora* asks (*thinking that there has been a retraction, and the sign is 'grooved horns,' but it does not need to be layered*): But aren't the horns of the goat notched, and nevertheless, its fat is forbidden?



The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is specifically referring to horns that are forked.

The *Gemora* asks: But the horns of the deer (*which Rashi explains to mean a steenbok*) are not forked, and nevertheless, its fat is permitted?

The *Gemora* answers: In order to be classified as a *chayah*, the horns need to be rounded.

The *Gemora* issues the following summary: Therefore, if its horns are branched, there would be no need for judgment or a judge (*for there is no question about it at all that this animal is a chayah, and its cheilev is forbidden*). But if they are not branched, we then require them to be layered and rounded and also grooved (*and then, we know that they are a chayah*). And to be “grooved,” the grooves must (*be so close to each other that they actually*) run one into the other.

And based upon these rulings, we can understand the doubt in connection with the *karkuz* goat. [*The doubt in connection with this goat is that it has all the characteristics that distinguish the horns of a chayah except that its grooves are not layered; they thought that perhaps it should be classified under beheimah, for it bears the name ‘goat.’ The difference would be regarding the permissibility of eating its fat.*]

Once there was a *karkuz* goat belonging to the Exilarch, from which a basketful of *cheilev* was taken out. Rav Achai forbade it, but Rav Shmuel, the son of Rabbi Avahu ate of it, and applied to himself the verse: *A man’s stomach shall be filled with the fruit of his mouth.* [*By virtue of his learning and the traditions he received from his teachers, he was able to enjoy the fat of this animal.*]

They sent word from there saying: The law is in accordance with Rav Shmuel, the son of Rabbi Avahu, but nevertheless, give heed (*honor*) to the opinion of Rav Achai, for he enlightens the eyes of the Diaspora. (59a – 59b)

DAILY MASHAL

The Torah writes (11:2): These are the animals that you may eat from all the animals that are upon the earth. Everything that has split hooves and that chews its cud- that one you may eat. The Torah continues that there are three animals that chew its cud but do not have split hooves, and therefore may not be eaten: The *gamal*, the *shufun*, and the *arneves*. Also, you may not eat the *chazir* because it has split hooves but does not chew its cud. The *Gemara* in Chullin (59A) explains that the Torah means that these are the only four creatures in the world that have one of the *simanim* and not the other. All others have either both (and are therefore kosher) or neither of them (and are therefore obviously not kosher, and the Torah doesn’t need to list those special.) This is used in seminars and outreach programs to prove that the Torah must have been written by Hashem, because how can any human being write that these are the only such creatures. Maybe there is some animal in a jungle somewhere, not yet discovered, that would prove them wrong. Their whole Torah would be discovered as a fake. Evidently it was written by a G-d that can be the only One to claim such a thing.

Rabbi Eliezer Krohn from the Passaic Clifton Kollel adds that although this is most definitely true, there is more to it than just that. It’s not just that that is the fact of life, and only Hashem can know that to be true without a doubt. It’s more than that. The more accurate way to look at it is that SINCE the Torah wrote that those are the only animals like that, that is WHY there are no other such creatures. First the Torah wrote it, then the world was created to fit what the Torah says. There are many such “Bible codes”, as they are called, that are truly fascinating. The statistics are staggering for what the probabilities are of many of them to work out the way they do. They are all more than just a proof that the Torah is *emes*. Rather they are *emes* BECAUSE the Torah wrote them first.