



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

Severed leg

The *Mishna* says that if an animal’s leg was cut from the *arkuvah* – joint and below, it is permitted, but if it was cut from *arkuvah* and above, it is prohibited as a *tereifah*. If the meeting of tendons was removed, it is also a *tereifah*. If a bone broke, and the animal was slaughtered, if most of the flesh is intact, it is permitted, but otherwise, the limb is prohibited. (76a)

Which joint and where was it severed?

The *Gemora* cites a debate about the exact anatomical meanings of the first section of the *Mishna*. Rav Yehudah quotes Rav in the name of Rabbi Chiya saying that the *arkuvah* refers to the lower joint of the leg, which is sold along with the head, and “below” and “above” mean the location directly above and below it. Ulla quotes Rabbi Oshaya saying that the joint is the upper one, which is the one recognizable on a camel.

Ulla said that according to his reading, we can understand why the meeting of tendons, which is between the upper and lower joints, were mentioned. Since the *Mishna* said that an animal whose leg was cut below the *arkuvah* is permitted, we would not have known that it is prohibited if the meeting was removed. However, according to Rav Yehudah, we would already know that the animal is prohibited when the meeting was removed, since the *Mishna* already taught that it is prohibited when cut above the lower joint.

Rav Yehudah answered that the *Mishna* is teaching about two cases – when the bone was broken, but the tendons are intact, and when the tendons were removed, but the whole bone is intact.

Ulla rejected this answer, as the *Mishna* refers to the leg being *severed* above the *arkuvah*, implying that nothing is left, including the tendons, and Rav Yehudah did not respond.

After Ulla left, Rav Yehudah thought that he should have responded that when the *Mishna* refers to severing above the *arkuvah* it means above the tendons, and not directly above the joint, and therefore the *Mishna* had to continue with the case of the meeting of tendons that were removed.

Rav Yehudah then realized that Ulla would not have accepted this answer. Just as he objected to Rav Yehudah’s answer by noting the exact language of the *Mishna*, so he would have objected to this answer, by noting that the *Mishna* refers to the leg being cut *above*, which implies a cut directly above the joint.

Rav Pappa cites a different version of the discussion, in which Rav Yehudah and Ulla agree that the *arkuvah* refers to the upper joint. Rav Yehudah explains that the cut below the *arkuvah* refers to a cut below the joint and the meeting of tendons, while the cut above refers to a cut above the joint and meeting.

The *Gemora* challenges the position of Ulla (*and Rav Pappa’s version of Rav Yehudah*), as it means that cutting the leg at a

higher position (*below the upper joint, but above the tendons*) is permitted, but cutting it at a lower position (*among the tendons*) is prohibited.

Rav Ashi answers that we cannot make logical arguments in the realm of *tereifah*, as an animal can live when cut in one spot, but not live when cut in another lower spot. (76a)

Meeting of the tendons

The *Gemora* asks where the meeting of tendons is, and offers the following answers:

1. From the point they leave the bone and enter the muscles (Rav Ashi).
2. Along the section where they are on the bone (Rabba bar Rav Huna, quoting Rav Ashi).
3. From above the bones of the lower joint until they enter the muscles (Rava berai deRabba bar Rav Huna, quoting Rav Assi).

A scholar in front of Rabbi Abba said that it starts in the bones of the lower joint, but Rabbi Abba objected, saying that Rav Yehudah said it is the spot where the butchers cut the leg open, which is consistent with this answer.

4. Where they are connected (Rav Yehudah, quoting Shmuel).

The *Gemora* asks how far the cluster extends upwards, and cites Rav Yaakov saying in the name of Shmuel that it starts from the location where they are connected and extends until they split. Abaye says this is a length of four fingers in an ox.

The *Gemora* describes where the meeting of the tendons is in a small animal.

Abaye lists the following signs:

1. Where they protrude from the flesh, but not where they are enclosed in it.
2. Where they are still hard.
3. Where they are white. Mar bar Rav Ashi says that even if they are shiny, even if not truly white.

Ameimar quotes Rav Zevid saying there are three tendons, one of which is thicker than the others. It is prohibited if most of the tendons' thickness was severed (*i.e. the thick one was severed*), or if most of the tendons were severed (*i.e., the two thin ones are severed*).

Mar bar Rav Ashi disagrees, saying that as long as most of the tendons or most of their thickness is intact, it is permitted. Therefore, it is only prohibited if the thick one and one of the others were severed.

The *Gemora* describes where the meeting of the tendons is in birds. There are sixteen sinews, and it is prohibited if even one is severed. Mar bar Rav Ashi says that he observed his father, Rav Ashi, rule on a bird which only had fifteen sinews. Rav Ashi noticed that one of them was different, and when he struck it, it split into two, revealing all sixteen present.

Rav Yehudah quotes Rav saying that the meeting of the tendons applies to a majority of it.

The *Gemora* explains that this means that if most of any one tendon was severed, it is prohibited.

Rav Yehudah says that when he told this to Shmuel, he disputed, saying that even if one is totally removed, there are two still remaining.

The *Gemora* says that this implies that Shmuel would rule that it is prohibited if two were removed, which differs from Ravnai, who quotes Shmuel saying that as long as even part of one tendon remains, the length of a string to close a shirt neck, it is permitted.

Some say that Rav meant that it is prohibited only if most of all three tendons were removed, and Shmuel challenged this, saying that if a third of each one remains, it is permitted. This supports Ravnai, who says that even part of one tendon is sufficient. (76a – 76b)

Broken bone

The *Mishna* said that if the bone broke, and the animal was slaughtered, the attached limb is permitted only if most of the flesh is intact.

Rav says that if the break is above the joint, if most of the flesh is intact, the animal and the limb are permitted, but otherwise, the animal is *tereifah*, and both are prohibited. If the break is below the joint, if most of the flesh is intact, the limb and the animal are permitted, but otherwise, the animal is permitted, but the limb is not. Shmuel says that whether the break is above or below the joint, if most of the flesh is intact, both are permitted, but otherwise, the animal is permitted, but the limb is not.

Rav Nachman challenged Shmuel, since it is illogical for part of the animal to be considered a carcass, while the rest is permitted.

Rav Nachman explains that his question is only according to Shmuel, since only he says that even in a case where the limb is one that enables the animal's life (*i.e., cut above the joint*) the limb is prohibited (*implying it is considered disconnected*), but the animal is permitted (*implying it's considered connected*).

They sent a message from *Eretz Yisroel* ruling like Rav, then one ruling like Shmuel, and finally one ruling like Rav, and adding that the limb has the full impurity of a carcass, as the slaughtering was totally ineffective for it.

Rav Chisda challenged this from the *braisa*, which discusses the slaughtering of a *tereifah* or an animal with a dangling limb. Rabbi Meir says that these make the animal (*or limb*) pure, even though they are prohibited, since they are part of the animal itself, as opposed to the limb of a fetus which exited the womb prematurely. This proves that a dangling limb is pure when the animal is slaughtered.

Rabbah asked why Rav Chisda asked from this *braisa*, as opposed to the *Mishna*, which cites the dispute about an animal with dangling limbs which was slaughtered. Rabbi Meir says that the slaughtering enables the animal and the limbs to become impure, while Rabbi Shimon says that the limbs are not enabled. This implies that they all agree that the limb is not impure as a carcass.

Rav Chisda answered that a proof from this *Mishna* can be deflected, as it may only be referring to dangling flesh, and not a dangling limb.

When Rabbi Zeira went to *Eretz Yisroel*, he found Rabbi Yirmiyah explaining the *Mishna* like Rav, and he complimented him on this explanation. He added that Shmuel in Bavel also explained it this way.

The *Gemora* explains that although Shmuel had a different explanation, as cited above, he later retracted, and agreed to Rav's explanation. (76b)

Exposed bone

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that if an animal's bone broke and was exposed, it is permitted only if skin and flesh cover most of it.

The *Gemora* asks what "most" means, and cites Rav Dimi quoting Rabbi Yochanan explaining it as either most of its thickness, or most of its surface.

Rav Pappa says that we must therefore be strict, and only permit it if most of its thickness and most of its surface are covered. (76b)

Skin covering

Ulla quotes Rabbi Yochanan saying that skin is equivalent to flesh for this purpose.

Rav Nachman asked Ulla why he did not say that skin can *combine* with flesh to cover most of the bone, implying that there must be some flesh, as the *braisa* refers to skin *and* flesh which cover most of it.

Ulla answered that his version of the *braisa* says skin *or* flesh, and therefore, he considers skin itself to be equivalent to flesh, even without any flesh.

Another version cites Ulla quoting Rabbi Yochanan saying that skin combines with flesh to cover most of the bone. Rav Nachman asked Ulla why he did not say that skin can fill in gaps of flesh, implying that most of the covering must be flesh, and Ulla answered that he witnessed a ruling which taught him that the covering need not be mostly flesh.

A pigeon was brought to Rabbi Yitzchak, with a bone which was covered by skin and flesh, but without most of the covering being flesh, and Rabbi Yochanan ruled that it was permitted.

Rav Nachman rejected this proof, since this may only be the case with a pigeon's skin, which is soft, making it fully equivalent to flesh, but not with other animals or birds. (76b)

Soft sinews covering

An animal's bone was broken, but was mostly covered by flesh and soft sinews, and it was brought to Rabbah. Rabbah said that it is permitted, as Rabbi Yochanan says that sinews that are now soft, even if they will harden later, are considered meat, and one may join a Pesach sacrifice planning to eat them. In addition, the Torah is concerned that a Jew not lose money, and we can therefore be lenient with this animal.

Rav Pappa challenged Rabbah, since Rish Lakish disagrees with Rabbi Yochanan, and does not consider these sinews meat, and this is potentially a Torah prohibition. We

therefore cannot just be lenient to avoid a monetary loss. Rabbah did not respond.

The *Gemora* asks why he did not respond that we rule like Rabbi Yochanan in all but three cases, so we need not be concerned about Rish Lakish's position, and the *Gemora* answers that in the case of the soft sinews, Rabbi Yochanan retracted his position, and agreed to Rish Lakish. (76b – 77a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Severed below the joint

The *Gemora* cites various explanations for the *Mishna's* statements about an animal whose leg was cut.

Rashi explains that the "leg" refers to the hind legs only, as the fore legs are referred to as "hands" in the *Mishna*.

The Rishonim differ in their ruling about a severed leg.

The *Gemora* cites a position that the joint the *Mishna* refers to is the lower joint, and one that it is the upper joint.

The Rambam and Rif rule that the *Mishna* is referring to the upper joint, while the Rosh rules that it is referring to the lower joint.

The Shulchan Aruch (YD 55:1) cites both opinions, with the Rambam's and Rif's position first, and the Rosh's as a differing opinion. This formulation indicates that the Shulchan Aruch is ruling like the Rambam and Rif, in accordance with the ruling recorded in the Bais Yosef, following the majority of the three decisors (Rambam, Rif, and Rosh).

The Rama says that the custom among the Jews of Germany and France is to rule strictly like the Rosh.



DAILY MASHAL

Exposed Bone

The *braisa* states that if an animal's bone was broken and protruded, it is prohibited unless most of it is covered by flesh and skin. The *Gemora* rules that most of the surface and thickness must be covered, and debates what must cover it. The *Gemora* discusses whether the covering must be mostly flesh, and whether soft sinews are considered a covering.

The Rambam rules that a covering that is half flesh and half skin is sufficient, but the Rosh rules that the covering must be mostly flesh. The Shulchan Aruch (55:7) rules like the Rosh.

The *Gemora* says that on a bird, whose flesh is soft, skin and flesh are equivalent.

The Rashba explains that we can therefore permit it if the covering is half flesh and half skin, but not if it is totally skin. However, the Rashba says that in a section of the body where there is no flesh, but only skin (e.g., the lower joint), flesh is a sufficient cover, even for animals.

The Rambam rules that sinews that will harden are not valid covers, and the Shulchan Aruch (55:9) follow this ruling.

The Rama (55:5) cites a position that if the bone was exposed, even temporarily, the animal is prohibited, even if it was covered before slaughtering. He explains that therefore the custom arose to consider any animal whose leg had a break in a place that would make it *tereifah* (had it been severed).

The Shach (14) notes that this is an extreme stringency, and should not be considered a standard halachic requirement.

Prayer for the Ill

In his old age, when he was almost constantly bedridden, HaGaon Rabbi Chayim Shmuelevitz zt"l asked his family to take him to the Western Wall. They understood that his condition was so grave that he wanted to pray to arouse mercy on himself, and they willingly fulfilled his wish despite the great difficulty. How surprised they were to see him, as he reached the Wall, take out a paper given to him with the name of an ill person and pray fervently for him.