

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קכ"ז

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

THE SUGYA

We start off the daf continuing our sugya regarding the halachos of sheratzim, specifically looking at the source in the pesukim for the tumah of a mouse that is half-flesh and half-earth, which spontaneously generates from the ground. The Gemara brings a beautiful braisa about Rabbi Akiva, who would marvel at the wonders of Hashem's creation, noting how different creatures are designed to live only in their specific environments—whether in the sea, on dry land, or even in the fire, like the salamander. We also learn about the unique nature of the chulda (weasel), which is the only land creature that has no counterpart in the sea.

Moving into the next Mishnah, the focus shifts to the halachos of a limb or flesh that is dangling from a live animal but still slightly attached. The Mishnah discusses whether these dangling parts can contract tumas ochlin (the impurity of foods) while still on the animal, and what is required to make them susceptible to tumah. This leads into a machlokes between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon regarding whether the blood from the animal's shechitah is considered a liquid that makes these dangling parts susceptible to tumah.

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

עמוד א' DAF 127A

STATEMENT

תלמוד לומר "השורץ" – כל מקום ששורץ.

Therefore, **the verse states: "that creep"** to teach that they impart impurity in **any place that they creep**, including the sea.

OBJECTION

או אינו אלא "השורץ" – יכול כל המשריץ יטמא, שאין משריץ לא יטמא?

Or perhaps **it is not so, but rather "that creep"** is to be interpreted as follows: I **might** think that **any** creeping animal **that breeds** by laying eggs or giving birth **imparts impurity, but one that does not breed does not impart impurity?**

INFERENCE

אוציא עכבר שחציו בשר וחציו אדמה, שאין פרה ורבה.

If so, **I shall exclude** from the laws of impurity **a mouse that is half-flesh and half-earth**, which generates spontaneously from the ground, **as it does not reproduce.**

EXPLANATION

ודין הוא: טימא בחולדה וטימא בעכבר, מה חולדה – כל ששמה חולדה, אף עכבר – כל ששמו עכבר, אביא עכבר שחציו בשר וחציו אדמה.

But there is a logical **argument** to include it: The Torah **deemed a weasel impure and deemed a mouse impure**; just as a **weasel** refers to **any creature whose name is "weasel"**, so too a **mouse** should refer to **any creature whose name is "mouse"**, and **I shall therefore include a mouse that is half-flesh and half-earth**.

OBJECTION

או כִּלָּה לְדַרְךָ זֶה: מָה חוֹלְדָה פֶּרֶה וְרֶבֶה, אֵף עֲכָבֵר פֶּרֶה וְרֶבֶה?

Or perhaps you should **go this way** and argue: **Just as a weasel reproduces, so too a mouse must be one that reproduces**, excluding the spontaneously generated mouse?

ANSWER

תלמוד לומר "בשרץ".

Therefore, **the verse states: "among the creeping animals"** to include the half-earth mouse.

QUESTION

אמר ליה ההוא מדרבנן לרבא: אימא "בשרץ", לאתויי עכבר שחציו בשר וחציו אדמה, "השורץ" – כל שהוא שורץ, ואפילו עכבר שבים, ואי משום "על הארץ" – על הארץ טמא, ירד לים – לא טמא.

One of the Rabbis said to Rava: Say the interpretation differently: "**among the creeping animals**" comes to include a mouse that is half-flesh and half-earth; "**that creep**" teaches that **any creature that creeps** is impure, and even a sea mouse; and if you object **because of the words "upon the earth"**, which seem to exclude the sea mouse, we can say that when it is **upon the earth** it shall impart impurity, but if it descended to the sea, it shall not impart impurity.

REFUTATION

אמר ליה: ומאחר דשוייתה לים מקום טומאה, מַה לִּי הֵכָא, מַה לִּי הֵכָא.

Rava said to him: And since you have made the sea a place of impurity by ruling that a sea mouse is fundamentally tamei, **what difference is it to me** if it is **here** on land, and **what difference is it to me** if it is **here** in the sea? It makes no sense to say its impurity depends on its physical location.

QUESTION

והאי "על הארץ" מיבעי ליה להוציא ספק טומאה צפה, דאמר רב יצחק בר אבדימי: "על הארץ" – להוציא ספק טומאה צפה!

The Gemara asks: **But is this phrase "upon the earth" not needed to exclude a doubt of floating impurity from being tamei?** As Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi said: "**upon the earth**" is written to exclude a doubt of floating impurity, teaching that a doubt regarding floating tumah is tahor!

ANSWER

תיתי "על הארץ" כתיבי.

The Gemara answers: **Two instances of "upon the earth" are written** in the parsha, so we can derive both halachos.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: "הצב למינהו" – להביא הערוֹד, וכן הנפילים וסלמנדרא.

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: The verse says "the great lizard after its kinds", which comes to include the arvad, and likewise the nefilim and the salamander under the category of sheratzim.

STATEMENT

וּבְשֵׁהָיָה רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא מַגִּיעַ לְפָסוּק זֶה, אָמַר: "מָה רַבּוּ מַעֲשֵׂיָהּ הִיא!"

And when Rabbi Akiva would reach this verse, he would say: "How manifold are Your works, Hashem!"

EXPLANATION

יֵשׁ לָהּ בְּרִיּוֹת גִּדְלוֹת בַּיָּם, וְיֵשׁ לָהּ בְּרִיּוֹת גִּדְלוֹת בַּיַּבֶּשֶׁה.

You have creatures that grow in the sea, and you have creatures that grow on the dry land.

EXPLANATION

שָׂפָיִם – אֵילָמָלִי עוֹלוֹת (בַּיַּבֶּשֶׁה) [לַיַּבֶּשֶׁה] מִיָּד מֵתוֹת, שְׂבִיבָשָׁה – אֵילָמָלִי יוֹרְדוֹת לַיָּם מִיָּד מֵתוֹת.

Those that are in the sea, if they were to ascend to the dry land, they would immediately die; and those that are on the dry land, if they were to descend into the sea, they would immediately die.

EXPLANATION

יֵשׁ לָהּ בְּרִיּוֹת גִּדְלוֹת בָּאוּר, וְיֵשׁ לָהּ בְּרִיּוֹת גִּדְלוֹת בְּאֵוִיר.

Similarly, you have creatures that grow in the fire, like the salamander, and you have creatures that grow in the air.

EXPLANATION

שְׂבָאוּר – אֵילָמָלִי עוֹלוֹת לְאֵוִיר מִיָּד מֵתוֹת, שְׂבָאֵוִיר – אֵילָמָלִי יוֹרְדוֹת לְאוּר מִיָּד מֵתוֹת.

Those that are in the fire, if they were to ascend to the air, they would immediately die; and those that are in the air, if they were to descend into the fire, they would immediately die.

STATEMENT

"מָה רַבּוּ מַעֲשֵׂיָהּ הִיא."

Therefore, we must exclaim: "How manifold are Your works, Hashem!"

BRAISA

תָּנּוּ רַבָּנָן: כֹּל שֵׁיִשׁ בַּיַּבֶּשֶׁה יֵשׁ בַּיָּם, חוּץ מִן הַחוּלְדָּה.

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: Everything that exists on the dry land exists in the sea, except for the weasel.

PROOF

אָמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא: מַאי קָרָאָהּ? "הַאֲזִינוּ כָּל יֹשְׁבֵי חֶלֶד."

Rabbi Zeira said: What is the verse that hints to this? "Give ear, all you inhabitants of the world [cheled]", implying that the dry land is called cheled because the chulda lives only there.

RULING

אָמַר רַב הוֹנָא בְּרִיה דְּרַב יְהוֹשָׁע: בִּיבְרִי דְנֶרֶשׁ אֵינָן מִן הַיָּשׁוּב.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said: The beavers of Neresh are not from the settled land, because they live only in the water, and therefore they are not subject to the prohibition of creeping things of the earth.

STATEMENT

אמר רב פפא: בשמתא נרש, תרבייה משכיה ואליתיה.

Rav Pappa said: Under excommunication is Neresh, its fat, its hide, and its tail, meaning all its inhabitants are wicked.

STATEMENT

”ארץ ארץ ארץ שמעי דבר ה’” – אמר רב פפא: לא אבה נרש שמוע דבר ה’.

Regarding the verse, “O land, land, land, hear the word of Hashem,” Rav Pappa said: Neresh did not want to hear the word of Hashem.

STATEMENT

אמר רב גידל, אמר רב: נרשאה נשקיה – מני פכיה; נהר פקודאה לויה – מגלימא שפירא דחוי עליה; פומבדיתאה לויה – אשני אושפיוה.

Rav Giddel said that Rav said: If a resident of Neresh kisses you, count your teeth to make sure he did not steal one; if a resident of Nehar Pekod accompanies you, it is because of the beautiful cloak that he sees on you and wants to steal; if a resident of Pumbedita accompanies you, change your lodging place so he does not rob you.

STATEMENT

אמר רב הונא בר תורתא: פעם אחת הלכתי לנעוד, וראיתי נחש שהוא כרוך על הצב, לימים יצא ערוך מביניהם.

Rav Huna bar Torta said: One time I went to the city of Va'ad, and I saw a snake that was wrapped around a lizard; after some days, an arvad emerged from between them.

STATEMENT

וכשבאתי לפני רבי שמעון הקסיד, אמר לי: אמר הקדוש ברוך הוא: הם הביאו בריה שלא בראתי בעולמי, אף אני אביא עליהם בריה שלא בראתי בעולמי.

And when I came before Rabbi Shimon the Pious, he said to me: The Holy One, Blessed is He, said: They brought into existence a creature that I did not create in My world, so I too will bring upon them a creature that I did not create in My world to punish them.

QUESTION

והאמר מר: כל שתשמישו ועיבורו שוה – יולדין ומגדלין זה מזה, וכל שאין תשמישו ועיבורו שוה – אין יולדין ומגדלין זה מזה.

The Gemara asks: But did the Master not say: Any two species whose mating and gestation periods are equal can give birth and raise offspring from one another, but any whose mating and gestation periods are not equal cannot give birth and raise offspring from one another? A snake and a lizard have different gestation periods!

ANSWER

אמר רב: נס בתוך נס!

Rav said: It was a miracle within a miracle that they were able to breed.

QUESTION

האי פורענותא הוא? מאי נס בתוך נס – לפורענות.

The Gemara asks: But **is this** not a **punishment**? Why call it a miracle? The Gemara answers: **What is** meant by "a miracle within a miracle"? It means a supernatural event **for punishment**.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' האבר והבשר המדולדלין בבמה, מטמאין טומאת אכלין במקומן, וצריכין הקשר.

MISHNAH: An organ or flesh that are **dangling** from an animal but are still slightly attached, **impart the impurity of foods** while in their place on the animal, and they require **preparation** by being wet with water to become susceptible to tumah.

עמוד ב' DAF 127B

MISHNAH

נשחטה הבמה – הוכשרו בדמיה, דברי רבי מאיר.

If **the animal was slaughtered**, even though this shechitah does not permit it for eating, the hanging limb and flesh **were rendered susceptible** to tumah **by its blood**; this is **the statement of Rabbi Meir**.

MISHNAH

רבי שמעון אומר: לא הוכשרו.

Rabbi Shimon says: They were **not rendered susceptible** by the animal's own blood, but only if they were wet with another liquid.

MISHNAH

מתה הבמה – הבשר צריך הקשר,

If **the animal died** without shechitah, **the hanging flesh needs** to be rendered susceptible to tumah by a liquid in order to become tamei, because its status is that of flesh severed from a living animal, which is not tamei on its own like a carcass;

MISHNAH

האבר מטמא משום אבר מן החי, ואינו מטמא משום אבר נבלה – דברי רבי מאיר,

and **the limb imparts tumah** as a limb from a living animal, but it does not impart tumah as a limb of a carcass; this is **the statement of Rabbi Meir**,

MISHNAH

ורבי שמעון מטהר.

and Rabbi Shimon deems the limb completely **pure**.

INFERENCE

גְּמִ' טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין – אִין, טוּמְאַת נְבִלָה – לֹא.

GEMARA: The Gemara infers from the first clause of our Mishnah: **Tumah of food, yes**, the hanging limb can contract; but **tumah of a carcass, no**, it does not transmit.

QUESTION

הִיכִי דְמִי? אִי דְמַעְלִין אַרוּכָה – אֶפִּילוּ טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין נָמִי לֹא לִיטְמוּ,

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances?** If we are dealing with a case **where** the limb **can heal** and reattach, then **even tumah of food also it should not contract**, since it is still considered a fully attached part of the living animal!

QUESTION

וְאִי דְאִין מַעְלִין אַרוּכָה – טוּמְאַת נְבִלָה נָמִי לִיטְמוּ!

And if we are dealing with a case **where it cannot heal**, then **tumah of a carcass also it should transmit**, since it is considered completely severed!

ANSWER

לְעוֹלָם, דְּאִין מַעְלִין אַרוּכָה, וְשֵׁאֲנֵי טוּמְאַת נְבִלָה, דְּרַחֲמָנָא אָמַר "כִּי יָפֹל", עַד שְׂיָפֹל.

The Gemara answers: **Actually**, we are dealing with a case **where it cannot heal**, and yet **tumah of a carcass is different**, **because the Merciful One** says in the Torah regarding carcass tumah, "**if any of their carcass falls**," which teaches that it does not transmit carcass tumah **until it completely falls off**.

PROOF

תִּנָּיֵא נָמִי הֵכִי: הָאֵכָר וְהַבָּשָׂר הַמְּדוּלָּדֵלִין בְּכֹהֶמָה וּמַעוּרִין בְּחוּט הַשְּׁעָרָה, יָכוֹל יִטְמְאוּ טוּמְאַת נְבִלָה? תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "יָפֹל" – עַד שְׂיָפֹל, וְאֶפִּילוּ הֵכִי טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין מִטְמוּ.

It is also taught this way in a Braisa: A limb and flesh that are hanging from an animal and are connected only by a hair-thin strand, I might have thought they should transmit carcass tumah? Therefore, the verse states "falls" to teach: **until it completely falls**. And even so, they contract tumah of food.

STATEMENT

מְסִייע לִיה לָרַב חִייא בַר אֲשִׁי, דְּאָמַר רַב חִייא בַר אֲשִׁי אָמַר שְׂמוּאֵל: תֵּאֲנִים שְׂצֻמְקוּ בְּאִיבֵיהֶן – מִטְמְאוֹת טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין, וְהַתּוֹלֵשׁ מֵהֶן בְּשִׁבְתָּ חֵיִיב חֲטָא.

The Gemara notes: This **supports Rav Chiyya bar Ashi**, as Rav Chiyya bar Ashi said that Shmuel said: **Figs that dried on their tree**, even though they are still attached, **contract tumah of food** as if they were detached; **but one who detaches them on Shabbos is liable for a sin-offering** because they are still considered attached.

PROOF

לִימָא מְסִייע לִיה: יִרְקוֹת שְׂצֻמְקוּ בְּאִיבֵיהֶן, כְּגוֹן הַכְּרוּב וְהַדְּלָעַת – אִין מִטְמְאִין טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין; קַצְצוֹ וְיִבְשׁוּ – מִטְמְאִין טוּמְאַת אֶכָּלִין.

Let us say another Braisa supports him: Vegetables that dried on their roots, such as cabbage and gourd, do not contract tumah of food; but if one cut them and dried them, they contract tumah of food.

QUESTION

קִצְצוּ וַיִּבְשּׁוּ, סָלָקָא דַּעְתָּךְ? ! עַץ בְּעֵלְמָא הוּא!

The Gemara asks: If one cut them and dried them, does it enter your mind that they contract tumah? Once dried, it is mere wood and completely inedible!

ANSWER

וַאֲמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק: בְּעַל מִנַּת לִיבְשׁוּ.

And Rabbi Yitzchak said: The Braisa means that he cut them with the intent to dry them, but they are still moist and edible now.

INFERENCE

טַעֲמָא דְכְּרוּב וְדִלְעַת הוּא, כִּיּוֹן דִּיבְשׁוּ לֹא בְּנִי אֲכִילָה נִינְהוּ, הָא שְׂאָר פִּירוֹת מְטַמְּאִי.

The Gemara infers: The reason they do not contract tumah when dried on the tree is specifically because they are cabbage and gourd, since once they dry they are not edible; but other fruits, which are edible when dried, do contract tumah even when dried on the tree.

QUESTION

הִכִּי דְמִי? אִי דִיבְשׁוּ הֵן וְעוֹקְצִיהֶן – פְּשִׁיטָא! אֶלָּא לֹא – בְּלֹא עוֹקְצִיהֶן.

What are the circumstances? If both they and their stems dried, it is obvious that they are considered detached! Rather, is it not a case where they dried without their stems drying? This would prove Shmuel's rule that they are considered detached for tumah but attached for Shabbos.

ANSWER

לְעוֹלָם הֵן וְעוֹקְצִיהֶן, וְקִצְצוּן עַל מִנַּת לִיבְשׁוּ אֵינְטֵרִיקָא לִיה.

The Gemara rejects this: Actually, it refers to where both they and their stems dried, and the case of cutting them with the intent to dry them was needed to be taught, which is why the Braisa was formulated this way.

OBJECTION

תָּא שְׁמַע: אֵילָן שֶׁנִּפְסָח וּבֹ פִירוֹת – הֲרִי הֵן פְּתִלוּשִׁין, יָבֵשׁוּ – הֲרִי הֵן פְּמַחוּבְרִין.

Come and hear a challenge from a Braisa: A tree that was broken, and there are fruits on it, they are considered detached; but if the branch did not break and the fruits dried on the tree, they are considered attached.

QUESTION

מֵאִי לָאוּ: מָה תְּלוּשִׁין לְכָל דְּבָרֵיהֶן, אַף מְחוּבְרִין לְכָל דְּבָרֵיהֶן?

Is it not to say: Just as "detached" in the first clause means for all matters—both Shabbos and tumah—so too "attached" in the second clause means for all matters, which would refute Shmuel?

ANSWER

מִיָּדִי אִירִיא? הָא כְּדֹאִיתָא, וְהָא כְּדֹאִיתָא.

The Gemara answers: **Are the cases comparable? This is as it is, and that is as it is**; the first clause is detached for all laws, but the second clause is attached only for Shabbos, not for tumah.

QUESTION

נִשְׁחַטָּה הַבְּהֵמָה [וְכוּי']. בְּמַאי קָא מִיפְלִגִּי?

The Gemara returns to the Mishnah: "If the animal was slaughtered..." In what principle do they dispute?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבָּה: בְּבִהְמָה נַעֲשִׂית יָד לְאַבְרָ קָמִיפְלִגִּי: מֶר סָבַר אֵין בְּהֵמָה נַעֲשִׂית יָד לְאַבְר, וּמֶר סָבַר בְּהֵמָה נַעֲשִׂית יָד לְאַבְר.

Rabbah said: They dispute whether the animal can serve as a handle for the limb to bring it tumah: One Master, Rabbi Shimon, holds that the animal does not serve as a handle for the limb, and one Master, Rabbi Meir, holds that the animal does serve as a handle for the limb.

ANSWER

אָבַי אָמַר: בְּאוֹחִז בְּקֶטֶן וְאֵין גָּדוֹל עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ קָמִיפְלִגִּי.

Abaye said: They dispute the rule of one who holds the small part and the large part does not rise with it.

EXPLANATION

מֶר סָבַר: אוֹחִז בְּקֶטֶן וְאֵין גָּדוֹל עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ – הֲרִי הוּא פְּמוֹהוּ, וּמֶר סָבַר: אֵינוּ פְּמוֹהוּ.

One Master, Rabbi Meir, holds that if one holds the small part and the large part does not rise with it, it is still considered connected like it; and one Master, Rabbi Shimon, holds it is not considered connected like it.

STATEMENT

וְאַף רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן סָבַר, בְּאוֹחִז בְּקֶטֶן וְאֵין גָּדוֹל עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ קָא מִיפְלִגִּי.

And even Rabbi Yochanan holds that they dispute the rule of one who holds the small part and the large part does not rise with it.

QUESTION

דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן רַמִּי דְּרַבִּי מַאִיר אֲדַרְבֵּי מַאִיר: מִי אָמַר רַבִּי מַאִיר, אוֹחִז בְּקֶטֶן וְאֵין גָּדוֹל עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ הֲרִי הוּא פְּמוֹהוּ?

For Rabbi Yochanan pointed out a contradiction between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Meir: Did Rabbi Meir really say that if one holds the small part and the large part does not rise with it, it is considered connected like it?

OBJECTION

וּרְמִינָהוּ: אוֹכֵל שְׁנַפְרָס וּמַעוֹרָה בְּמַקְצֵת,

And he raised a contradiction from a Mishnah: Food that was sliced and is partially connected...

SUMMARY

The daf begins by using the pesukim of "upon the earth" and "that creep" to delineate the boundaries of tumah for sheratzim, including the half-earth mouse and the sea mouse, while also establishing that a doubt regarding floating tumah is tahor.

After a series of aggadic teachings about the unique creatures of the world and the untrustworthy residents of certain towns, the Gemara transitions to a new Mishnah. This Mishnah rules that dangling limbs or flesh still attached to a live animal can contract tumas ochlin, but they require hechsher (preparation by liquid) to become susceptible; Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon then argue over whether the blood of shechitah itself can serve as this hechsher.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara brings down that when Rabbi Akiva would reach the pesukim of the sheratzim and see the incredible variety of creation, from creatures that live only in the sea to the salamander that grows in the fire, he would cry out with deep emotion, "Mah rabu ma'asecha Hashem!" How manifold are Your works, Hashem! Rabbi Akiva didn't just look at the halachos of tumah and taharah as dry, technical details. He saw them as a window into the breathtaking wisdom of the Borei Olam, Who created every single creature with its own precise environment, its own purpose, and its own boundaries.

This is a massive yesod for our daily avodah. It is so easy to go through life on autopilot, looking at the world around us, and even our own daily learning, without really seeing it. We get used to the routine. But Rabbi Akiva is teaching us that a Yid has to live with open eyes. When you look at the world, whether it is the wonders of nature, the intricate design of the human body, or the beautiful precision of a sugya in the Gemara, you should be moved to recognize the Yad Hashem. Everything was designed b'davka with infinite wisdom.

Today, take thirty seconds to step out of your routine, look at something in Hashem's creation, even something as simple as a tree, the weather, or the complex way your own body functions, and say those words with real kavanah: "Mah rabu ma'asecha Hashem!"