

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ק"ג

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

THE SUGYA

We are starting a fascinating sugya on our daf regarding the concept of *issur chal al issur*, whether one prohibition can take effect on top of another existing prohibition. The Gemara focuses on a case where someone ate a limb from a living animal (*eiver min hachai*) that was also a *tereifa*. Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish argue whether he is *lokeh* once or twice, which leads the Gemara into a deep analysis of how and when these different *issurim* actually take effect on the animal.

Lichoira, we need to understand the mechanics of how these prohibitions collide. The Gemara brings down several ways to explain this *machlokes*, looking at whether an animal during its life is considered already "divided into limbs" (*omed lachasoch*), or whether we say one *issur* can take effect over another because it is a more inclusive prohibition (*issur mosif* or *issur kolel*) that applies to more things or more people.

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

עמוד א' DAF 103A

STATEMENT

אכל אבר מן החי מן הטריפה,

If one **ate a limb from the living** animal which was also **from a tereifa** animal,

STATEMENT

רבי יוחנן אומר: חייב שתים,

Rabbi Yochanan said: He is **liable** to receive **two** sets of lashes, one for eating a limb from a living animal and one for eating from a tereifa.

STATEMENT

ורבי שמעון בן לקיש אומר: אינו חייב אלא אחת.

And Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: He is **not liable except** for **one** set of lashes.

OBJECTION

בשלמא לרבי יוחנן ניהא, אלא לרבי שמעון בן לקיש קשיא.

The Gemara comments: **Granted, according to Rabbi Yochanan** it is **well**, because there are two distinct prohibitions here. **But according to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish**, it is **difficult**; why does he hold that there is only one set of lashes?

ANSWER

אמר רב יוסף: לא קשיא, כאן בבמה אחת, כאן בשתי בהמות.

Rav Yosef said: This is **not difficult**. **Here**, where they argue, it is **with regard to one animal**; but **there**, where everyone agrees he gets two sets of lashes, it is **with regard to two animals**.

EXPLANATION

בְּשֵׁתִי בְּהֵמוֹת מִיִּחְיֵיב שְׁתֵּימָּה, בְּבִהֶמָּה אַחַת פְּלִיגִי.

If he ate **from two animals**, meaning he ate a limb from a living kosher animal and a piece of meat from a dead tereifa animal, everyone agrees **he is liable** to receive **two** sets of lashes. But where he ate **from one animal**, such as a limb from a living tereifa animal, **they disagree**.

QUESTION

בְּבִהֶמָּה אַחַת, בְּמַאי פְּלִיגִי?

The Gemara asks: **With regard to one animal, in what case do they disagree?**

ANSWER

אָמַר אַבְי: כְּגוֹן שֶׁנִּטְרָפָה עִם יְצִיאַת רוּחָהּ,

Abaye said: They disagree, **for example, where** the animal became a tereifa with the emergence of the majority of its body from the womb, so that both the status of tereifa and the status of a living animal began at the exact same moment.

EXPLANATION

מֶר סָבַר: בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיָּיהָ לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, וְאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה וְאִיסוּר אָבֶר בְּהֵדִי הֶדְדִי קָאֲתוּ.

One **Master**, Rabbi Yochanan, **holds:** **An animal during its life stands to be divided into limbs**, meaning we view each limb as a separate entity even while alive. Therefore, **the prohibition of tereifa and the prohibition of a limb from the living come together** at the moment of birth, and both take effect simultaneously.

EXPLANATION

וּמֶר סָבַר, בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיָּיהָ לֹא לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, וְלֹא אֶתִי אִיסוּר אָבֶר חַיִּיל אֲאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה.

And one Master, Reish Lakish, **holds:** **An animal during its life does not stand to be divided into limbs**. Therefore, the prohibition of tereifa takes effect at birth, but the prohibition of a limb from the living only takes effect when the limb is actually severed. Since the tereifa prohibition is already there, **the prohibition of a limb from the living does not come and take effect upon the** already existing **prohibition of tereifa**.

ANSWER

וְאִיפְעִית אִימָא, דְּכוּלִּי עֲלָמָא בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיָּיהָ לֹא לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, וּבְמִיתִי אִיסוּר אָבֶר מִיחַל
אֲאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה קָא מִיפְלִגִּי:

And if you wish, say instead **that everyone agrees** that **an animal during its life does not stand to be divided into limbs**. Rather, **with regard to the coming of the prohibition of a limb from the living to take effect upon the** already existing **prohibition of tereifa, they disagree:**

EXPLANATION

מֶר סָבַר אֶתִי אִיסוּר אָבֶר חַיִּיל אֲאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה, וּמֶר סָבַר לֹא אֶתִי אִיסוּר אָבֶר חַיִּיל אֲאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה.

One **Master**, Rabbi Yochanan, **holds: The prohibition of a limb** from the living, which is a more inclusive prohibition because it applies to Bnei Noach as well, **comes and takes effect upon the prohibition of tereifa**. And one **Master**, Reish Lakish, **holds: The prohibition of a limb** from the living **does not come and take effect upon the prohibition of tereifa**.

ANSWER

איבעית אימא, דכולי עלמא בהמה בחייה לאברים עומדת, וכגון שנטרפה לאחר מכן, ובמית איסור טרפה חייל אאיסור אבר קא מיפלגי.

If you wish, say instead that everyone agrees that an animal during its life stands to be divided into limbs, and this is a case where it became a tereifa after this, meaning after birth. And with regard to the coming of the prohibition of tereifa to take effect upon the already existing prohibition of a limb from the living, they disagree.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר אתי וחייל, ומר סבר לא אתי וחייל.

One **Master**, Rabbi Yochanan, **holds: It comes and takes effect** because it is a more inclusive prohibition, as it forbids the whole animal and not just the limbs. And one **Master**, Reish Lakish, **holds: It does not come and take effect**.

ANSWER

רבא אמר: כגון שת' ממונה אבר וטרפה בו.

Rava said a different explanation: They disagree in a case where he tore a limb from it and thereby rendered it a tereifa by that very act of tearing.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר: בהמה בחייה לאברים אינה עומדת, איסור אבר ואיסור טרפה בחדדי הדי קאתו.

One **Master**, Rabbi Yochanan, **holds: An animal during its life does not stand to be divided into limbs**. Therefore, the limb prohibition only begins at the moment of tearing, which is the exact moment the animal becomes a tereifa. Thus, **the prohibition of a limb** from the living **and the prohibition of tereifa come together**, and both apply.

EXPLANATION

ומר סבר, בהמה בחייה לאברים עומדת, ולא אתי איסור טרפה חייל אאיסור אבר.

And one **Master**, Reish Lakish, **holds: An animal during its life stands to be divided into limbs**. Therefore, the limb prohibition was already in effect from birth, and when the animal becomes a tereifa, **the prohibition of tereifa does not come and take effect upon the** already existing **prohibition of a limb** from the living.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי חייא בר אבא, אמר רבי יוחנן: אכל חלב מן החי מן הטרפה – חייב שתים.

Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: If one ate forbidden fat from a living animal which was also from a tereifa animal, he is liable to receive two sets of lashes.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רבי אמי: ולימא מר שלש, שאני אומר שלש.

Rabbi Ami said to him: But let the Master say three sets of lashes, for I say that the correct version of Rabbi Yochanan's ruling is that he is liable to three sets of lashes.

STATEMENT

אֵיתָמַר נָמִי, אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָהוּ, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: אֶחָד מִן הַחַי מִן הַטְּרֵפָה – חַיִּיב שְׁלֹשׁ.

It was also stated: Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yochanan said: If one ate forbidden fat from a living animal which was also from a tereifa animal, he is liable to receive three sets of lashes.

QUESTION

בְּמַאי קָמִיפְלָגִי, כְּגוֹן שֶׁנִּטְרָפָה עִם יְצִיאַת רוּבָה.

The Gemara asks: In what principle do they disagree, Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba and Rabbi Ami? They disagree, for example, where the animal became a tereifa with the emergence of the majority of its body from the womb.

EXPLANATION

מֵאֵן דָּאֵמַר שְׁלֹשׁ, קָסָבַר: בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיֶּיהָ לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, דְּאִיסוּר חֵלֶב וְאִיסוּר אֶבֶר וְאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה בְּהֵדִי הֵדְדִי קָאָתוּ.

The one who says three sets of lashes holds: An animal during its life stands to be divided into limbs. Therefore, the prohibition of forbidden fat, the prohibition of a limb from the living, and the prohibition of tereifa come together at birth, and all three take effect simultaneously.

EXPLANATION

וּמֵאֵן דָּאֵמַר שְׁתֵּי, קָסָבַר בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיֶּיהָ לָאוּ לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, וְאִיסוּר חֵלֶב וְאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה – אֵיכָא, אִיסוּר אֶבֶר – לָא אָתִי חַיִּיל.

And the one who says two sets of lashes holds: An animal during its life does not stand to be divided into limbs. Therefore, the prohibition of forbidden fat and the prohibition of tereifa are indeed present, as they both take effect at birth, but the prohibition of a limb from the living does not come and take effect later when the limb is severed, because of the existing prohibitions.

ANSWER

וְאִי בְּעִית אֵימָא, דְּכוּלִּי עֲלֵמָא בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיֶּיהָ לָאוּ לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, וּבְמִיתִי אִיסוּר אֶבֶר וְחַיִּיל וְאִיסוּר חֵלֶב וְאִיסוּר טְרֵפָה קָא מִיפְלָגִי, מָר סָבַר אָתִי חַיִּיל, וּמָר סָבַר לָא אָתִי חַיִּיל.

And if you wish, say instead that everyone agrees that an animal during its life does not stand to be divided into limbs. But with regard to the coming of the prohibition of a limb from the living to take effect upon the already existing prohibition of forbidden fat and upon the prohibition of tereifa, they disagree. One Master, Rabbi Ami, holds: It comes and takes effect. And one Master, Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba, holds: It does not come and take effect.

ANSWER

וְאִי בְּעִית אֵימָא, דְּכוּלִּי עֲלֵמָא בְּהֵמָה בְּחַיֶּיהָ לְאַבְרִים עוֹמְדָת, וּכְגוֹן שֶׁנִּטְרָפָה לְאַחַר מָכָאן, וּבְמִיתִי אִיסוּר טְרֵפָה מִיחַל אִיסוּר אֶבֶר קָא מִיפְלָגִי.

And if you wish, say instead that everyone agrees that an animal during its life stands to be divided into limbs, and this is a case where it became a tereifa after this, meaning after birth. And with regard to the coming of the prohibition of tereifa to take effect upon the already existing prohibition of a limb from the living, they disagree.

EXPLANATION

מִרְסָּבֵר: אֶתִּי חֲיִיל, מִיַּדִּי דְּחָוָה אַחֲלָב, דְּאָמַר מָר: הַתּוֹרָה אָמְרָה יָבֵא אִיסוּר נִבְלָה יָחוּל עַל אִיסוּר חֲלָב, וְיָבֵא אִיסוּר טְרֵיפָה יָחוּל עַל אִיסוּר חֲלָב.

One Master, Rabbi Ami, holds: It comes and takes effect, just as it is with regard to forbidden fat. As the Master said: The Torah said, let the prohibition of neveilah come and take effect upon the prohibition of forbidden fat, and let the prohibition of tereifa come and take effect upon the prohibition of forbidden fat. So too, it can take effect over the limb prohibition.

EXPLANATION

וְאִידָּהּ, אַחֲלָב הוּא דְּחָיִיב, דְּהוּתֵּר

And the other Master, Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba, holds: It is specifically with regard to forbidden fat that he is liable for the additional prohibition, because it was permitted from its general prohibition for certain uses, making it weaker, whereas the limb prohibition was never permitted.

עמוד ב' DAF 103B

EXPLANATION

מִבְּלָלּוֹ, אֲכָל אֶבֶר דִּלָּא הוּתֵּר מִבְּלָלּוֹ – לֹא.

from its general prohibition, but regarding a limb from a living animal, which was not permitted in any circumstances from its general prohibition, the prohibition of tereifa does not take effect upon it.

STATEMENT

כִּי אֶתָּא רַב דִּימִי אָמַר: בְּעָא מִינֵיהּ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ מִרְבִּי יוֹחָנָן:

When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish inquired of Rabbi Yohanan as follows:

QUESTION

חֲלָקוּ מִבְּחוּץ, מַהוּ? אָמַר לֵיהּ: פֶּטוּר.

If one divided a kezayis of a limb from a living animal outside his mouth and ate the pieces separately, what is the halakha? Rabbi Yohanan said to him: He is exempt.

QUESTION

מִבְּפָנִים, מַאי? אָמַר לֵיהּ: חַיִּיב.

If he divided it inside his mouth and swallowed the pieces separately, what is the halakha? Rabbi Yohanan said to him: He is liable.

STATEMENT

כִּי אֶתָּא רַבִּין אָמַר: חֲלָקוּ מִבְּחוּץ – פֶּטוּר, מִבְּפָנִים – רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר חַיִּיב, וְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ אָמַר פֶּטוּר.

When Ravin came, he said a different version of this dispute: If one divided it outside his mouth, everyone agrees he is exempt; but if he divided it inside his mouth, Rabbi Yohanan says he is liable, and Reish Lakish says he is exempt.

EXPLANATION

רבי יוחנן אמר: חייב, הרי נהנה גרונו בכזית.

Rabbi Yoḥanan says he is liable because behold, his throat derived pleasure from a kezayis of forbidden food at one time.

EXPLANATION

וריש לקיש אמר: פטור, אכילה במעיו בעינו וליכא.

And Reish Lakish says he is exempt because we require eating to be in his stomach as a kezayis all at once, and here there is not a kezayis entering his stomach at one time.

QUESTION

אלא לרבי שמעון בן לקיש, היכי משפחת לה דמחייב?

The Gemara asks: But according to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, how do you find a case where he is liable for eating a limb from a living animal? Since a person normally chews and breaks up his food before swallowing, it will never enter his stomach as a whole kezayis!

ANSWER

אמר רב כהנא: בגרומיתא זעירתא.

Rav Kahana said: You can find such a case with a small bone that has a kezayis of meat, bone, and sinew on it, which is small enough that he can swallow it whole.

STATEMENT

ורבי אלעזר אמר: אפילו חלקו מבחוץ נמי חייב, מחוסר קריבה לאו כמחוסר מעשה דמי.

And Rabbi Elazar said: Even if he divided it outside his mouth, he is also liable, because being lacking in proximity of the pieces is not considered like lacking an action of eating the required amount.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: כזית שאמרו – חוץ משל בין השנים, ורבי יוחנן אמר: אף עם בין השנים.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: The kezayis of which the Sages spoke regarding forbidden foods must be swallowed, excluding that which remains stuck between the teeth. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even with that which remains stuck between the teeth, it is included in the shiur.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב פפא: בשל בין שנים – דכולי עלמא לא פליגי, כי פליגי – בין החניכיים.

Rav Pappa said: Regarding that which is between the teeth, everyone agrees that they do not dispute that it is not included. When they dispute, it is regarding food that remains stuck between the palate and the throat, which he tastes but does not swallow.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר: הרי נהנה גרונו בכזית, ומר סבר: אכילה במעיו בעינו.

One Master, Rabbi Yoḥanan, holds: Behold, his throat derived pleasure from a kezayis, so he is liable. And one Master, Reish Lakish, holds: We require eating to enter his stomach.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אסי אמר רבי יוחנן: אכל חצי זית והקיא, וחזר ואכל חצי זית אחר – חייב. מאי טעמא?
הרי נהנה גרונו בכזית.

Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: If one ate half a kezayis of forbidden food and vomited it, and then went back and ate another half a kezayis, he is liable. What is the reason? Behold, his throat derived pleasure from a kezayis of forbidden food.

QUESTION

בעא רבי אלעזר מרבי אסי: אכל חצי זית והקיא, וחזר ואכלו, מהו?

Rabbi Elazar raised a dilemma before Rabbi Asi: If one ate half a kezayis and vomited it, and then went back and ate it again, what is the halakha?

QUESTION

מאי קא מיבעיא ליה? אי הוי עיכול אי לא הוי עיכול, ותיבעי ליה כזית!

The Gemara asks: What is the dilemma he is raising? If it is whether it is considered digested by being in his stomach briefly, or if it is not considered digested, then let him raise the dilemma with a full kezayis!

OBJECTION

אלא, אי בתר גרונו אזלינן, אי בתר מעיו אזלינן. ותפשוט ליה מדרבי אסי!

Rather, his dilemma must be whether we follow his throat or whether we follow his stomach. But let him resolve it from that which Rabbi Asi himself said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan, which shows we follow the throat!

RESOLUTION

רבי אסי גמריה איצקור ליה, ואתא רבי אלעזר לאדכוריה, והכי קאמר ליה:

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Asi's learning had become forgotten to him, and Rabbi Elazar came to remind him of it, and this is what he was saying to him:

EXPLANATION

למה לי חצי זית אחר? לימא מר בדידיה, דאיכא למשמע מינה תרתין:

Why do I need a case of another half-kezayis? Let the Master state the ruling with the very same half-kezayis itself, as there would be to learn from it two things:

EXPLANATION

שמעינן מינה דלא הוי עיכול, ושמעינן מינה דהרי נהנה גרונו בכזית.

We would learn from it that it is not considered digested, and we would learn from it that behold, his throat derived pleasure from a kezayis.

STATEMENT

אישתיק ולא אמר ליה ולא מידי, אמר ליה: מופת הדור, לא זימנין סגיאין אמרת קמיה דרבי יוחנן, ואמר לה: הרי נהנה גרונו בכזית?

Rabbi Asi remained silent and did not say anything to him. Rabbi Elazar said to him: Wonder of the generation! Did you not say this many times before Rabbi Yoḥanan, and he said to you: Behold, his throat derived pleasure from a kezayis?

STATEMENT

הֲדָרוּ עֲלֶיךָ גִיד הַנָּשֶׁה.

May we return to you, Pereg Gid HaNasheh.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי' כָּל הַבֶּשֶׂר אָסוּר לְבַשֵּׁל בְּחֶלֶב, חוּץ מִבֶּשֶׂר דָּגִים וְחִגְבִּים,

MISHNAH: All meat is forbidden to cook in milk, except for the meat of fish and grasshoppers;

MISHNAH

וְאָסוּר לְהַעֲלוֹת עִם הַגִּבִּינָה עַל הַשֻּׁלְחָן, חוּץ מִבֶּשֶׂר דָּגִים וְחִגְבִּים.

and it is forbidden to place meat with cheese on the same table, except for the meat of fish and grasshoppers.

SUMMARY

The Gemara presents a machlokes between Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish regarding one who eats a limb from a living tereifa animal. Rabbi Yochanan holds he receives two sets of lashes because both prohibitions apply, while Reish Lakish holds he only receives one. Abaye and Rava offer different ways to set up the case and explain the dispute, focusing on whether the animal is considered omed lachasoch (standing to be divided into limbs) and whether the issurim of eiver min hachai and tereifa came into existence simultaneously at birth or at the moment of tearing. Finally, the Gemara discusses a parallel machlokes regarding one who eats forbidden fat (chelev) from a living tereifa animal, where Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Abbahu quote Rabbi Yochanan as ruling that the person is actually liable for three sets of lashes, while Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba holds he is only liable for two.

In our sugya, the Gemara is deeply bothered by how we define the act of eating. Reish Lakish holds that "achilah b'me'av ba'enan", for an act of eating to be complete, the food must actually reach the stomach. But Rabbi Yochanan is me'chadesh a powerful yesod: "harei nehenah grono b'chazayis", the moment the throat derives pleasure from the volume of a kezayis, the essence of the eating has already happened. The throat's experience of pleasure is itself the defining moment of the act.

Think about this lichaira abstract lomdus as a guide for our own avodah. We often think that the only things that "count" in our spiritual lives are the big, final results, when we finish a whole masechta, when we completely master a difficult middah, or when we see the final, successful outcome of our tefillos. We focus so much on the "stomach," on the final digestion and completion of our efforts, that we overlook the journey itself.

But Rabbi Yochanan is teaching us a deep lesson for life: "harei nehenah grono." The immediate, present moment of connection, the sweetness of a single line of Gemara you just understood, the warmth of one sincere word of tefillah, the small victory of holding back your temper for just one minute, that is where the real spiritual reality is created. Hashem does not only value the final, completed package. Every single second of spiritual pleasure and effort you experience along the way is a complete, independent world of holiness.

Today, don't wait for the "completion" to feel like your avodah matters. When you sit down to learn or daven, take ten seconds to pause and consciously enjoy the sweetness of the words. Let your neshama feel the pleasure of being close to Hashem right now, in this very moment, because that connection is already a complete and eternal success.