

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף מ"ג

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

THE SUGYA

Shalom aleichem! In this daf, we are zocheh to delve deeper into the sugyos of tereifos, specifically focusing on the list of eight categories of tereifos given to Moshe Rabbeinu at Har Sinai. We will learn about the status of a perforated gallbladder, the shiur of what must remain of a removed liver for the animal to be kosher, and the halachos of a perforated gizzard.

We will also learn the delicate halachos of the gullet (the veshet), which has two distinct linings—an outer red one and an inner white one. The Gemara discusses what happens when only one lining is perforated, or when both are perforated but the holes do not line up, as well as how we must inspect the gullet for signs of clawing by a predator.

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

עמוד א' DAF 43A

ANSWER

אֵלָא הֵנּוּ תְּרֵי דְאַפְקִי, לָא תְּפִיק.

Rather, those **two** cases **that you removed** from the count, namely, an animal whose hind legs were severed and one whose hide was removed, **do not remove** them, and the count of eighteen tereifot remains intact.

STATEMENT

אָמַר עוּלָא: שְׁמֹנֶה מִיְּנֵי טְרֵפוֹת נֶאֱמָרוּ לוֹ לְמַשָּׁה בְּסִינֵי – נִקְוָה, וּפְסוּקָה, נְטוּלָה, וְחִסּוּרָה, קְרוּעָה, וְדְרוּסָה, נְפוּלָה, וְשִׁבּוּרָה.

Ulla says: Eight categories of tereifot were stated to Moshe at Sinai: A perforated organ, and a severed organ, a removed organ, and a missing organ, a torn organ, and an animal clawed by a predator, a fallen animal, and an animal with broken bones.

EXPLANATION

לְאַפְוִקֵי לְקוּתָא דְרַכִּישׁ בַּר פָּפָא.

This list is compiled to the exclusion of the diseased kidney of Rakhish bar Pappa, which Ulla does not consider a tereifa.

STATEMENT

אָמַר חִיְיָא בַּר רָבָא: שְׁמֹנֶה טְרֵפוֹת יֵשׁ בְּנִקְוָה, אִם תֹּאמַר תִּשְׁעַ – מָרָה רַבִּי יוֹסִי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה קִתְּנֵי לָהּ.

Chiyya bar Rava says: There are eight tereifot in the category of a perforated organ. If you say there are nine, because a perforated gallbladder is also mentioned, one can answer that the case of the gallbladder, Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda teaches it, and it is the opinion of an individual.

PROOF

דַּתְנָא: נִיקְבָּה חֲגִיבָה, נִיקְבוּ הַדָּקִים – טֶרְפָּה, רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: אִף נִיקְבָּה הַמָּרָה.

As it is taught in a braisa: If the abomasum was perforated, or the intestines were perforated, the animal is a tereifa.
Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda says: Even if the gallbladder was perforated it is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

(הַלְכוֹת חֶבֶר פְּזִית מָרָה וְקוֹרְקָבָן – סִימָן).

The Gemara provides a mnemonic: Halakhot, friend, olive-bulk, gallbladder, and gizzard.

RULING

אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הַלָּכָה בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

Rabbi Yitzchak son of Rabbi Yosef says that Rabbi Yochanan says: The halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda that a perforated gallbladder is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מַאי אֲהֵדְרוּ לִיה חֲבֵרִיָּה לְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? "יִשְׁפּוּךְ לָאָרֶץ מִרְרֵתִי", וְעַדִּין אִיּוֹב קָיָים.

And Rabbi Yitzchak son of Rabbi Yosef says that Rabbi Yochanan says: What did his colleagues respond to Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda? They cited the verse: "He pours out my gall upon the ground," and yet Iyov was still alive. Thus, one can live with a perforated gallbladder.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לָהֶם: אֵין מְזַכֵּירִין מַעֲשֵׂה נִסִּים,

Rabbi Yosei said to them: We do not mention miraculous events as proof for natural halachic rulings.

EXPLANATION

דָּאִי לָא תִּימָא הָכִי "יַפְלֹחַ כְּלִיּוֹתַי וְלֹא יַחְמוּל" – מִי קָא חֵיִי?

For if you do not say so, then the other part of the verse: "He cleaves my kidneys asunder and does not spare" is difficult; does one with cleaved kidneys live?

EXPLANATION

אֵלָא נִיֶּסָא שְׂאֵנִי, דְּכֵתִיב: "רַק אֶת נַפְשׁוֹ שְׂמַר". הָכָא נָמִי נִיֶּסָא שְׂאֵנִי.

Rather, a miracle is different, as it is written that Hashem said to the Satan: "Only spare his life." Here too, regarding the gallbladder, a miracle is different.

RULING

וְאָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הַלָּכָה כְּדִבְרֵי הָאוֹמֵר פְּזִית.

And Rabbi Yitzchak son of Rabbi Yosef says that Rabbi Yochanan says: The halacha is in accordance with the words of the one who says that if the liver was removed, but an olive-bulk of it remains, the animal is kosher.

QUESTION

ומי אמר רבי יוחנן הכי? והאמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: הלכה כסתם משנה, ותנן: נישלח הכבד ולא נשתייר הימנה כלום – הא נשתייר כשרה, אף על גב דלא הוי כזית!

And did Rabbi Yochanan really say this? But didn't Rabba bar bar Chana say that Rabbi Yochanan says: The halacha is in accordance with an unattributed Mishnah; and we learned in our Mishnah: If the liver was removed and nothing remained of it, it is a tereifa. We infer: But if any of it remained, it is kosher, even though it is not an olive-bulk!

ANSWER

אמוראי נינהו ואליבא דרבי יוחנן.

The Gemara answers: They are Amoraim who disagree according to the opinion of Rabbi Yochanan as to what he held.

STATEMENT

דאמר רבי יצחק ברבי יוסף אמר רבי יוחנן: מרה שניקבה, וכבד סתמתה – כשרה.

For Rabbi Yitzchak son of Rabbi Yosef says that Rabbi Yochanan says: A gallbladder that was perforated, but the liver seals it, is kosher.

STATEMENT

ואמר רבי יצחק ברבי יוסף אמר רבי יוחנן: ניקב הקורקבן וכיס שלו קיים – כשר.

And Rabbi Yitzchak son of Rabbi Yosef says that Rabbi Yochanan says: If the gizzard was perforated but its inner lining is intact, it is kosher.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: ניקב הכיס וקורקבן קיים, מאי?

A dilemma was raised before them: If the inner lining was perforated but the gizzard flesh is intact, what is the halacha?

PROOF

תא שמע, דאמר רב נחמן: ניקב זה בלא זה – כשר.

Come and hear a proof, as Rav Nachman says regarding the gullet: If this was perforated without that being perforated, it is kosher. The same applies to the gizzard.

STATEMENT

אמר רבא: שני עורות יש לו לוושט, חיצון אדום ופנימי לבן, ניקב זה בלא זה – כשר.

Rava says: The gullet has two linings, the outer is red and the inner is white. If this was perforated without that being perforated, it is kosher.

EXPLANATION

למה לי למימר חיצון אדום ופנימי לבן? דאי חליף – טרפה.

Why do I need Rava to say that the outer is red and the inner is white? It is to teach that if they are reversed, the animal is a tereifa.

QUESTION

אבעיא להו: ניקבו שניהם זה שלא כנגד זה, מהו?

A dilemma was raised before them: If both of them were perforated, but not opposite one another, what is the halacha?

STATEMENT

אמר מר זוטרא משמיה... ביושט - פשר, בקורקבן - פסול.

Mar Zutra says in the name of Rav Pappa: In the gullet, it is kosher; in the gizzard, it is unfit.

OBJECTION

מתקיף לה רב אשי: אדרבה, וושט דאכלה ביה ופעיא ביה רוח, גמא ליה ופשטה ליה, זמנין דמיהנדיזין בהדי הדדי; קורקבן דמינח נייח, פדקאי קאי!

Rav Ashi objects to this: On the contrary! The gullet, with which the animal eats and calls, is spacious, and it contracts and stretches; there are times when the two holes align with one another. But the gizzard, which is at rest, stands as it stands and they will never align!

STATEMENT

אמר ליה רב אחא בריה דרב יוסף לרב אשי: הכי אמרינן משמיה דמר זוטרא, דאמר משמיה דרב פפא כוותיה.

Rav Acha son of Rav Yosef said to Rav Ashi: So we say in the name of Mar Zutra, who said in the name of Rav Pappa, in accordance with your objection.

STATEMENT

ואמר רבה: קרום שצלה מחמת מכה פיושט, אינו קרום.

And Rabba says: A membrane that arose due to a wound in the gullet is not considered a valid membrane to seal a perforation.

STATEMENT

ואמר רבה: וושט אין לו בדיקה מבחוץ, אלא בפנים.

And Rabba says: The gullet cannot be inspected from the outside, but only from the inside.

QUESTION

למאי נפקא מינה?

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference of this statement?

עמוד ב' DAF 43B

ANSWER

לספק דרוסה.

The Gemara answers: The halacha of checking the inner lining of the gullet is necessary for a doubt of clawing by a predator, where we must verify if the inner lining turned red.

STATEMENT

הָהִיא סִפֵּק דְּרוּסָה דְּאַתָּאי לְקַמֵּיה דְּרַבָּה, הָוָה קָא פְּדִיק לִיה רַבָּה לְוֹשֵׁט מֵאַבְרָאי.

The Gemara relates: **A certain animal with a doubt of clawing** that came before Rabba, Rabba was checking the gullet **from the outside** to see if there was any mark.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה אַבְי: וְהָא מָר הוּא דְּאָמַר: וְוֹשֵׁט אֵין לוֹ פְּדִיקָה אֶלָּא מִבְּפָנִים!

Abaye said to him: But isn't it the Master himself who said: The gullet has no valid inspection except from the inside, because the outer lining is always red?

STATEMENT

אַפְכִיָּה רַבָּה וּבְדַקְיָה, וְאִישְׁתַּכַּח עָלֶיהָ תְּרֵי קוּרְטֵי דָמָא, וְטַרְפָּה.

Rabba turned it inside out and checked it, and there were found on it two drops of blood, and therefore he declared it a tereifa.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבָּה נָמִי לְחַדוּדֵי לְאַבְי הוּא דְּבָעֵי.

The Gemara notes: **And Rabba also** knew this halacha, and **only to sharpen** Abaye was what he desired, to see if his disciple would notice and correct him.

STATEMENT

אָמַר עוּלָא: יָשָׁב לוֹ קוּץ בְּוֹשֵׁט, אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין שְׂמָא הִבְרִיא.

Ulla said: **If a thorn sat in the gullet**, we assume it did not perforate the outer wall, and **we do not fear** that perhaps it perforated it and then the wound **healed**, which would make it a tereifa.

STATEMENT

(דָּרַס חֲתִיכוֹת בְּסַפִּין טִמְאַה, סִימָן)

The Gemara provides a **mnemonic** for the upcoming questions on Ulla's ruling: **Clawed, pieces, with a knife, ritually impure**.

QUESTION

וְלְעוּלָא, מָאי שְׁנָא מְסַפֵּק דְּרוּסָה?

The Gemara asks: **And according to Ulla**, what is the difference between this case of doubt and the case of **a doubt of clawing**, where we do fear and require an inspection?

ANSWER

קָסָבַר עוּלָא אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְסַפֵּק דְּרוּסָה.

The Gemara answers: **Ulla holds** that fundamentally **we do not fear for a doubt of clawing**, and an inspection is not biblically required.

QUESTION

וּמָאי שְׁנָא מְשַׁתִּי חֲתִיכוֹת, אַחַת שֶׁל חֶלֶב וְאַחַת שֶׁל שׁוֹמֵן?

The Gemara asks: **And what is the difference** between this and the case of **two pieces, one of forbidden fat and one of permitted fat**, where if one ate one of them, he must bring an asham talui because we are stringent in a case of doubt?

ANSWER

הָתָם אֵיתָחִזַּק אִיסוּרָא.

The Gemara answers: **There, a prohibition was established**, since one of the two pieces was definitely forbidden. Here, no prohibition was ever established.

QUESTION

וּמַאי שָׁנָא מִהַשְׁוִיחַט בְּסַפִּין, וְנִמְצְאָת פְּגוּמָה?

The Gemara asks: **And what is the difference** between this and the case of **one who slaughters with a knife, and afterwards the knife is found to be notched**, where we rule that the animal is forbidden because of the doubt?

ANSWER

הָתָם אֵיתִי לֵיד לֵה רִיעוּתָא בְּסַפִּין.

The Gemara answers: **There, a defect was born in the knife** itself, so we must suspect it was notched during the shechita. Here, the gullet wall is currently whole, so no defect is present.

QUESTION

וּמַאי שָׁנָא מִסַּפֵּק טוּמְאָה בְּרִשּׁוֹת הַיָּחִיד, דְּסַפֵּקוּ טָמֵא?

The Gemara asks: **And what is the difference** between this and **a doubt of ritual impurity in a private domain, whose doubt is ruled impure**?

ANSWER

וְלִיטַעְמֵיהּ, נִידְמִיָּיה לְסַפֵּק טוּמְאָה בְּרִשּׁוֹת הָרַבִּים, דְּסַפֵּקוּ טָהוֹר!

The Gemara answers: **And according to your reasoning**, let us compare it instead to a doubt of ritual impurity in a **public domain, whose doubt is ruled pure**!

EXPLANATION

אַלָּא הָתָם, הִלְכְּתָא גְמִירִי לֵה מְסוּטָה.

Rather, **there**, regarding the laws of tumah, **it is a received halacha that they learned from** the case of a **sota**, and we cannot derive other areas of halacha from it.

STATEMENT

יְתִיב הָהוּא מְרַבֵּן קָמִיָּה דְּרַב כְּהֵנָּא, וְיְתִיב וְקֹאֲמֵר: "נִמְצְאָת" אֶתְמַר, אֲבָל יָשֵׁב – תִּיְשִׁינָן.

A certain one of the Rabbis sat before Rav Kahana, and he sat and said: 'Was found' was stated by Ulla, meaning if the thorn was found loose in the gullet we do not fear, **but** if it **sat** embedded, **we do fear** that it perforated and healed.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לָהּ רַב כְּהֵנָּא: לָא תַצִּיתוּ לֵיהּ, "יָשֵׁב" אֵיתְמַר, אֲבָל נִמְצְאָת – לָא אֵיצְטְרִיךְ לֵיהּ לְעוּלָא,
דְּכוּלָּהּ חַיִּי בְּרִייתָא קוּצִי אֲכָלָן.

Rav Kahana said to them: Do not listen to him! 'Sat' was stated by Ulla, that even if it was embedded we do not fear. But if it was merely found loose, it was not necessary for Ulla to teach that it is kosher, as all outdoor animals eat thorns and we obviously do not declare them terefos for that.

STATEMENT

איתמר: תורפץ הנושט – רב אמר: במשהו, ושמואל אמר: ברובו.

It was stated: Regarding a perforation in the entrance of the gullet, Rav said: It renders the animal a tereifa with any amount of perforation. And Shmuel said: Only with its majority.

EXPLANATION

רב אמר במשהו: מקום שחיטה הוא, ושמואל אמר ברובו: לאו מקום שחיטה הוא.

Rav said 'with any amount' because he holds it is a place of slaughter, so it is treated like the gullet itself. And Shmuel said 'with its majority' because he holds it is not a place of slaughter, so it is treated like the pharynx.

QUESTION

הי ניהו תורפץ הנושט?

The Gemara asks: Which is the entrance of the gullet?

ANSWER

אמר מרי בר מר עוקבא אמר שמואל: כל שחותכו ומרחיב – זה הוא תורפץ הנושט, חותכו ועומד במקומו – זהו נושט עצמו.

Mari bar Mar Ukva said that Shmuel said: Any part that when one cuts it, it widens and retracts, this is the entrance of the gullet. But any part that when one cuts it, it stands in its place, this is the gullet itself.

OBJECTION

אמר להו רב פפי: מר לא אמר הכי, ומנו? רב ביבי בר אבאי.

Rav Pappi said to them: The Master did not say so. And who is this Master? It is Rav Beivai bar Abaye.

ANSWER

אלא כל שחותכו ועומד במקומו – זה תורפץ הנושט, אלא איזהו נושט עצמו? כל שחותכו וכניץ.

Rather, any part that when one cuts it, it stands in its place, this is the entrance of the gullet. But then, which is the gullet itself? Any part that when one cuts it, it constricts and closes.

STATEMENT

יונה אמר זירא: מב לעתא, וכמה?

Yona said in the name of Rabbi Zeira: It is the swallowing area of the throat. And how much is this area?

ANSWER

אמר רב אביא: פחות משערתא ועדיף מחיטתא.

Rav Avya said: Less than the length of a barleycorn, and more than the length of a wheat grain.

STATEMENT

ההוא תורא דהנה לבני רב עוקבא, דאתחיל ביה שחיטה בתורפץ הוושט, וגמר בוושט.

There was a certain bull that belonged to the sons of Rav Ukva, in which the slaughter began in the entrance of the gullet, and finished in the gullet itself.

RULING

אמר רבא: רמינא עליה חומרי דרב וחומרי דשמואל, וטריפנא ליה.

Rava said: I cast upon it the stringencies of Rav and the stringencies of Shmuel, and therefore I declare it a tereifa.

EXPLANATION

חומרי דרב, דאמר רב: במשהו.

I apply the stringencies of Rav, as Rav said: A perforation in the entrance of the gullet is with any amount, and here the cut began there.

QUESTION

והאמר רב: מקום שחיטה הוא!

The Gemara asks: But didn't Rav say: It is a place of slaughter, so the initial cut should be considered valid slaughter and not a rendering of tereifa?

ANSWER

כשמואל, דאמר: לאו מקום שחיטה הוא.

Rava answers: I rule like Shmuel, who said: It is not a place of slaughter, so the initial cut was a damaging perforation.

QUESTION

אי שמואל, האמר: ברובו!

The Gemara asks: If you rule like Shmuel, didn't he say: It is a tereifa only with its majority, and here the cut in the entrance was not a majority?

ANSWER

כרב, דאמר: במשהו.

Rava answers: I rule like Rav, who said: It is a tereifa with any amount.

RULING

איגלגל מילתא, מטאי לקמיה דרבי אבא, אמר להו: תורא, בין לרב בין לשמואל שרי.

The matter rolled on and reached before Rabbi Abba. He said to them: The bull, whether according to Rav or according to Shmuel, is permitted, because you cannot combine two opposing stringencies to forbid it.

RULING

זילו אמרו ליה לבריה דרב יוסף בר חמא, דלשלים דמי תורא למריה.

He said: **Go and say to the son of Rav Yosef bar Chama**, who is Rava, **that he must pay the value of the bull to its owner** because he erroneously declared it forbidden.

OBJECTION

אמר מר בריה דרביןא: מותביןא תיובתא כלפי סנאיה דרבא, לעולם הלכתא כדברי בית הלל,
והרוצה לעשות כדברי בית שמאי – עושה, כדברי בית הלל – עושה. מקולי בית שמאי ומקולי בית
הלל – רשע.

Mar the son of Ravina said: I can raise an objection against the enemy of Rava, meaning in defense of Rava, from a Braisa: **Actually, the halacha is like the words of Beis Hillel. But one who wishes to act according to the words of Beis Shammai may do so, and one who wishes to act according to the words of Beis Hillel may do so.** However, one who adopts the leniencies of Beis Shammai and the leniencies of Beis Hillel is a wicked person. This implies that one who adopts the stringencies of both is permitted to do so, defending Rava's ruling.

SUMMARY

The Gemara begins by clarifying Ulla's list of eight Sinaitic categories of tereifos, and then discusses whether a perforated gallbladder is a tereifa, bringing the beautiful exchange where Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda defends his view against his colleagues by explaining that Iyov's survival of a spilled gall was a miracle, and we do not bring halachic proofs from miracles. We then learn that if the liver is removed, an olive-bulk must remain for the animal to be kosher, and that a perforated gallbladder is kosher if the liver seals it. Finally, the Gemara details the halachos of the gullet and gizzard, explaining that the gullet's two linings must be intact, that a membrane from a wound does not seal a hole in the gullet, and that a doubt of clawing requires a careful inspection of the gullet's inner lining, which Rabba demonstrated to sharpen his talmid, Abaye.

In our sugya, we see a beautiful exchange between Rabba and his prime disciple, Abaye. Rabba was inspecting an animal's gullet from the outside to see if it had been clawed by a predator. Abaye immediately questioned him: "But didn't the Master himself teach us that the gullet can only be inspected from the inside?" Rabba did not get defensive. He immediately turned the animal over, inspected it from the inside, found two drops of blood, and ruled it treifah. The Gemara adds that Rabba actually did this on purpose "to sharpen Abaye", to test if his student was paying attention and had the courage to speak up for the truth of the Torah.

What a powerful lesson in the avodah of teaching and learning. Rabba, one of the greatest sages of the Talmud, deliberately set up a situation where his student would have to correct him. He wanted to build Abaye's confidence, to teach him that the truth of the Torah belongs to everyone, and that a true talmid chacham must always be awake, alert, and ready to speak up for what is right, even in front of his own rebbe.

In our own lives, we often find ourselves in positions of authority, as parents, teachers, employers, or mentors. The yetzer hara wants us to protect our ego and demand absolute, unquestioning compliance. But the Torah way is different. A true leader doesn't want blind followers; he wants to build independent, thinking bnei Torah. We must create an environment where those under us feel safe to ask, to challenge, and to point out mistakes with respect.

Today, encourage someone you teach or guide, whether it is your child at the Shabbos table or a colleague at work, to share their perspective or ask a challenging question, and show them how much you value their honesty and sharpness.