

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ס"ו

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we continue our deep dive into the simanim of kosher grasshoppers, exploring how the Tanna of the school of Rav and the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael derive the halachos of kosher species. We will see how they apply different hermeneutical rules of klal u'prat (generalizations and details) to the pesukim, specifically debating whether a grasshopper with a long head is kosher.

We then move on to the next Mishnah, which introduces the simanim of kosher fish—fins (snappir) and scales (kaskeses). The Gemara discusses various species of fish that might grow scales later in life or shed them when taken out of the water, and clarifies the famous rule that any fish with scales is guaranteed to have fins.

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

עמוד א' DAF 66A

QUESTION

במאי קמיפלגי תנא דבי רב ותנא דבי רבי ישמעאל?

The Gemara asks: **In what** point of law **do** the **Tanna of the school of Rav**, who taught the first baraisa, **and** the **Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael**, who taught the second baraisa, **disagree**?

ANSWER

בראשו ארוך קמיפלגי.

The Gemara answers: **They disagree regarding** a grasshopper whose **head is long**, whether it is kosher.

EXPLANATION

תנא דבי רב סבר: "אשר לו כרעים" – כלל, "ארבה" "סלעם" "חרגל" "חגב" "למיניהו" – פרט,

The Gemara explains: The **Tanna of the school of Rav** holds that the phrase "which has jointed legs" is a **generalization**; and the specific names "arbeh," "solam," "chargol," "chagav," and the phrase "after its kind" that follows each of them, are a **detail**.

EXPLANATION

כלל ופרט אין בכלל אלא מה שבפרט, דמיניה – אין, דלאו (דמיניה) [מיניה] – לא, ומרבי דדמי ליה משני צדדין.

And there is a rule: In a case of a **generalization and a detail**, there is **in the generalization only** that which is **in the detail**. Thus, those grasshoppers **that are of its exact species** are **yes**, kosher, but those **that are not of its species** are **no**, not kosher. **And** the phrase "after its kind" **amplifies** the law to include only a grasshopper **that is similar to it in two aspects**, meaning it

must resemble the detailed species very closely. Since all the detailed species have short heads, a long-headed grasshopper is excluded.

EXPLANATION

תָּנָא דְּבֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל סָבַר: "אֲשֶׁר לוֹ כַּרְעִים" – כָּלֵל, "אַרְבֶּה" "סִלְעָם" "חֲרָגֵל" "חֲגָב" – פֶּרֶט, "לְמִינֵהוּ" – חִזּוּר וְכָלֵל,

Whereas the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael holds that the phrase "which has jointed legs" is a generalization; "arbeh," "solam," "chargol," "chagav" are a detail; and the phrase "after its kind" that follows then generalized again.

EXPLANATION

כָּלֵל וּפֶרֶט וְכָלֵל – אִי אַתָּה דִּין אֶלָּא כְּעֵין הַפֶּרֶט, וּמֵרַבִּי כָּל דְּדָמִי לֵיהּ בְּחֵד צַד.

And we have a rule: In a case of a generalization, a detail, and a generalization, you may judge only in accordance with the nature of the detail. This amplifies the law to include anything that is similar to it in even one aspect, meaning it only needs to possess the four signs of the detailed species, even if its head is long.

QUESTION

וְהָא לֹא דָּמִי כָּלֵל אֶלָּא חֲמָא לְכָלֵל אֶתְרָא?

The Gemara asks: But does the first generalization not resemble the latter generalization? Usually, to apply this rule, the two generalizations must be similar in scope.

EXPLANATION

כָּלֵל אֶלָּא חֲמָא – "אֲשֶׁר לוֹ כַּרְעִים" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, דְּאִית לֵיהּ אֶכּוּל, דְּלִית לֵיהּ לֹא תִיכּוּל. כָּלֵל אֶלָּא בְּתֵרָא – עַד דְּשׁוּוּ בְּאַרְבַּעָה סִימָנִין.

For in the first generalization, the Merciful One states: "which has jointed legs," implying that if it has them, eat it, and if it does not have them, do not eat it, regardless of other signs. Whereas in the latter generalization of "after its kind," it implies that a grasshopper is not kosher until they are equal in all four signs!

ANSWER

תָּנָא דְּבֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּכָלֵלִי וּפֶרֶטִי כִּי הָאִי גִּוּוֹנָא דָּאִין,

The Gemara answers: The Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael expounds generalizations and details in this manner as well, even if they are not completely similar.

STATEMENT

וּדְאָמְרִינוּ נָמִי בְּעֶלְמָא דְּדָאִין תָּנָא דְּבֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּכָלֵלִי וּפֶרֶטִי כִּי הָאִי גִּוּוֹנָא מִהֲכָא.

And that which we also say generally in the Talmud, that the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael expounds generalizations and details in this manner, is derived from here.

STATEMENT

אָמַר מָר: אִי שָׁמוּ "חֲגָב", יָכוּל אִין בּוּ כָּל הַסִּימָנִין הֵלְלוּ? תִּלְמוּד לּוֹמַר "לְמִינֵהוּ" – עַד שִׁיחּוּ בּוּ כָּל הַסִּימָנִין הֵלְלוּ.

The Gemara analyzes the baraisa: The Master said above: If its name is "chagav," one might have thought it is kosher even if it does not have all these signs? Therefore, the verse states: "after its kind," to teach that it is not kosher until all these signs are present in it.

QUESTION

אין בו כל הסימנים הללו מהיכא תיתי? "ארבה" ו"חרגול" כתיב!

The Gemara asks: But that it is kosher when it does not have all these signs—from where would it come to your mind to suggest this? "Arbeh" and "chargol" are written in the verse, which teaches that all kosher grasshoppers must share the signs common to both of them!

ANSWER

אי לא כתיב "סלעם" – כדקאמרת, השתא דכתיב "סלעם" – לרבוויי ראשו ארוך, אימא לירבי נמי כל דהו – קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: If "solam" were not written, it would indeed be as you said. But now that "solam" is written, which comes to include a grasshopper whose head is long even though it differs from the others, I might say: Let us also include any grasshopper whatsoever that is called a chagav, even without the signs. Therefore, the verse teaches us that this is not so.

QUESTION

מאי שנא הָתָם דְּאִמְרַת: "סלעם" – זה "רשון", "חרגל" – זה "ניפול", ומאי שנא הָכָא דְּאִמְרַת: "סלעם" – זה "ניפול", "חרגל" – זה "רשון"?

The Gemara asks: What is different there in the baraisa of the school of Rav that you say: "solam" is the "rashon" and "chargol" is the "nippul"; and what is different here in the baraisa of the school of Rabbi Yishmael that you say: "solam" is the "nippul" and "chargol" is the "rashon"?

ANSWER

מר כי אתריה ומר כי אתריה.

The Gemara answers: One Master named them according to the custom of his place, and the other Master named them according to the custom of his place.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ובדגים כל שיש לו סנפיר וקשקשת.

§ The Mishnah stated: And among fish, any fish that has a fin and a scale is kosher.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: אין לו עכשיו ועתיד לגדל לאחר זמן, כגון הסולתנית והעפזאן – הרי זה מותר.

The Rabbis taught in a baraisa: If a fish **does not** have scales now, but is destined to grow them after a time, such as the sultanis and the afyan fish, **this is permitted**.

BRAISA

יש לו עכשיו ועתיד להשירן בשעה שעולה מן המים, כגון

Similarly, if it has scales now, but is destined to shed them at the time it rises from the water, such as

עמוד ב' DAF 66B

RULING

אֲקוּנָס וְאַפּוּנָס כְּסַפְתִּיאָס וְאַכְסַפְתִּיאָס וְאַטוּנָס – הֲרִי זֶה מוּתָר.

The fish known as the akunas, and the afunas, and the kesaftiyas, and the akhsaftiyas, and the atunas – behold, this is **permitted** to be eaten, as they do have scales even if they are not easily visible.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

תִּנּוּ הֵתָם: כָּל שֵׁשׁ לוֹ קִשְׁקָשׁ יֵשׁ לוֹ סִנְפִיר, וְיֵשׁ שֵׁשׁ לוֹ סִנְפִיר וְאֵין לוֹ קִשְׁקָשׁ.

We learned in a Mishnah there in Maseches Niddah: Any fish that has scales certainly has fins, but there are fish that have fins and do not have scales.

MISHNAH

יֵשׁ לוֹ קִשְׁקָשׁ וְיֵשׁ לוֹ סִנְפִיר – דָּג טָהוֹר, יֵשׁ לוֹ סִנְפִיר וְאֵין לוֹ קִשְׁקָשׁ – דָּג טָמֵא.

If it has scales and it has fins, it is a kosher fish; but if it has fins and does not have scales, it is a non-kosher fish.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

מִכַּדִּי אֶקְשָׁקֶשֶׁת קָא סְמַכִּינוּ, לִיכְתּוּב רַחֲמָנָא קִשְׁקָשׁ וְלֹא לִיכְתּוּב סִנְפִיר!

The Gemara asks: Now, since we rely only on scales to determine if a fish is kosher, let the Merciful One write only 'scales' in the Torah and let Him not write 'fins' at all!

ANSWER

אִי כָּתַב רַחֲמָנָא קִשְׁקָשׁ וְלֹא כָּתַב סִנְפִיר, הֲוָה אֲמִינָא: מַאי קִשְׁקָשׁ? סִנְפִיר, וְאַפִּילוּ דָּג טָמֵא.

The Gemara answers: If the Merciful One had written 'scales' and had not written 'fins', I would have said: What is the meaning of 'scales'? It means fins, and I would have permitted even a non-kosher fish that has only fins.

ANSWER

כתב רחמנא סנפיר וקשקשת.

Therefore, the Merciful One wrote both 'fins' and 'scales' to prevent this error.

QUESTION

והשתא דכתב רחמנא סנפיר וקשקשת, ממאי דקשקשת לבושא הוא, דכתיב "ושריון קשקשים הוא לבוש", וליכתוב רחמנא קשקשת ולא ליכתוב סנפיר?

The Gemara objects: But now that the Merciful One has written 'fins' and 'scales', and we know from where we derive that 'scales' refers to a garment of armor, as it is written regarding Golyas, 'And he was clad with a coat of scale armor', then the meaning of the word is clear; so let the Merciful One write 'scales' and let Him not write 'fins'!

ANSWER

אמר רבי אבהו, וכן תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: "יגדיל תורה ויאדיר".

Rabbi Abbahu said, and so it was taught in the school of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written, 'Hashem was pleased, for His righteousness' sake, to make Torah great and glorious.' Hashem wrote extra words to increase the reward of those who study it.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: ממשמע שנאמר "אכול את שיש לו", שומע אני "אל תאכל את שאין לו",

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: From the implication of that which is stated, 'Eat that which has' these signs, I hear and derive the negative: 'Do not eat that which does not have' them.

BRAISA

וממשמע שנאמר "אל תאכל את שאין לו", שומע אני "אכול את שיש לו".

And from the implication of that which is stated, 'Do not eat that which does not have' them, I hear and derive the positive: 'Eat that which has' them.

BRAISA

ולמה שנאן? לעבור עליו בעשה ולא תעשה.

And why did the Torah repeat them both explicitly? It is to make one who transgresses and eats a non-kosher fish violate both a positive commandment and a negative commandment.

BRAISA

"תאכלו מכל אשר במים", מה תלמוד לומר?

The Baraisa continues: When the verse says, 'These may you eat of all that are in the waters,' what is the teaching of these words?

BRAISA

שיכול הואיל והתיר במפורש והתיר בסתם,

For one might have thought: Since the Torah permitted creeping water creatures explicitly, and permitted them implicitly,

BRAISA

מה פשהתיר במפורש לא התיר אלא בכלים, אף פשהתיר בסתם לא התיר אלא בכלים.

just as when it permitted them explicitly, it only permitted them when they are grown in vessels, so too, when it permitted them implicitly, it only permitted them when they are in vessels.

BRAISA

מַיִין לְרַבּוֹת בּוֹרוֹת שִׁיחִין וּמַעְרוֹת, שְׁשׂוּחָה וְשׂוֹתָה מֵהֶן וְאֵינּוּ נִמְנָע? תִּלְמוּד לומר "תֹּאכְלוּ מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם".

From where do we derive to include the water in pits, ditches, and caves, that one may bend down and drink from them and need not refrain from swallowing the tiny organisms in them? The Torah teaches: 'These may you eat of all that are in the waters.'

QUESTION

הֵיכָן הַתִּיר בְּכֵלִים?

The Gemara asks: **Where did** the Torah **permit** creeping creatures **in vessels**?

ANSWER

דְּכַתִּיב: "אֵת זֶה תֹּאכְלוּ מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם וְגו'" , בַּיָּמִים וּבְנֶחָלִים הוּא דְּכִי אֵת לִיה – אָכּוּל, דְּלִית לִיה – לֹא תִיכּוּל, הָא בְּכֵלִים – אֵף עַל גַּב דְּלִית לִיה – אָכּוּל.

As it is written: 'These may you eat of all that are in the waters...' which implies: It is specifically in the seas and in the rivers that when it has fins and scales, eat it, and when it does not have them, do not eat it; but in vessels, even though it does not have fins and scales, eat it.

OBJECTION

אִמָּא: בְּכֵלִים – אֵף עַל גַּב דְּאֵית לִיה לֹא תִיכּוּל?

The Gemara objects: But why not say the opposite: **In vessels, even though it has** fins and scales, **do not** eat it?

RESOLUTION

לֹא סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּהּ, דְּכַתִּיב: "וְכָל אֲשֶׁר אֵין לוֹ סִנְפִיר וְקַשְׂקֶשֶׁת בַּיָּמִים וּבְנֶחָלִים מִכָּל שָׂרֵץ הַמַּיִם" – בַּיָּמִים וּבְנֶחָלִים דְּלִית לִיה לֹא תִיכּוּל, הָא בְּכֵלִים – אֵף עַל גַּב דְּלִית לִיה אָכּוּל.

The Gemara responds: This should not enter your mind, as it is written: 'And all that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that swarm in the waters...' which shows that only in the seas and in the rivers, when it does not have them, do not eat it; but in vessels, even though it does not have them, eat it.

OBJECTION

וְאִמָּא: "בַּיָּמִים" – כָּלָל, "בַּיָּמִים וּבְנֶחָלִים" – פֶּרֶט, כָּלָל וּפֶרֶט – אֵין בְּכָלָל אֶלָּא מַה שְּׁבִפְרֵט; יָמִים וּנְחָלִים – אֵין, נִעֲיֵצִין וְחֲרִיצִין – לֹא.

The Gemara objects: **But** say instead: 'In the waters' is a generalization; 'in the seas and in the rivers' is a specification; and we have a rule that with a generalization and a specification, there is only that which is in the specification. Thus, in seas and rivers, yes, the restriction applies, but in water channels and trenches, no, it does not apply. If so, pits and caves are already excluded, and the extra verse is not needed!

RESOLUTION

”במים” – חֹר וְכָלֵל.

The Gemara answers: The word ‘**in the waters**’ appears again, so the Torah **then generalized again**. This makes it a generalization, a specification, and a generalization, which includes everything similar to the specification, including channels and pits.

QUESTION

הֲנִי תִירִי כָּלֵלִי דְסֻמִּיכִי לְהִדָּדִי נִינְהוּ,

The Gemara asks: But **these two generalizations are adjacent to each other** at the beginning of the verse, which makes it a generalization, a generalization, and a specification!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּינָא: כְּדָאֻמְרִי בְּמַעְרְבָא, כָּל מְקוֹם שֶׁאֵתָּה מוֹצֵא שְׁנֵי כָּלִלוֹת הַסְּמוּכִין זֶה לָזֶה –

Ravina said: As they say in the West, Eretz Yisrael: Wherever you find two generalizations juxtaposed one with the other followed by a specification...

SUMMARY

The Gemara explains that the school of Rav and the school of Rabbi Yishmael disagree on whether a long-headed grasshopper is kosher, based on whether they expound the pesukim as a klal u’prat (generalization and detail) or a klal u’prat u’klal (generalization, detail, and generalization). Turning to the halachos of fish, the Gemara teaches that fish like the sultanis, which grow scales later, or the akunas, which shed them upon leaving the water, are kosher. Finally, the Gemara analyzes the rule that any fish with scales also has fins, explaining that the Torah wrote ‘fins’ alongside ‘scales’ to avoid linguistic confusion and to make the Torah great and glorious, increasing the reward for our learning.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara asks a powerful question about the signs of a kosher fish: since we have a rule that any fish with scales always has fins, why did the Torah need to write the word “fins” at all? We could have just looked for scales! Rabbi Abbahu answers with a beautiful principle: “Yagdil Torah V’ya’adir”, the Torah wrote it to magnify the Torah and make it glorious. Hashem wants to give us more words of Torah to study, more details to cherish, and more opportunities to connect with His wisdom, even when a detail seems technically redundant.

This teaches us a profound lesson about our own avodah. Sometimes in life, we look for shortcuts. We ask ourselves, “What is the bare minimum I need to do to get by? If I already accomplished the main point, why do I need to worry about the extra details?” But the Aibershter does not look at our relationship that way. He gives us extra details, extra mitzvos, and extra opportunities for holiness not to burden us, but to beautify our lives and expand our connection to Him.

When you do a mitzvah, don’t just look for the bare minimum “scales” of the obligation. Look for the “fins” too, the extra care, the pleasantness, and the hiddur mitzvah that makes your service of Hashem beautiful and glorious.

Today, choose one small mitzvah or daily halachah and do it with extra care and attention to detail, going beyond the bare minimum to make your avodah beautiful.

