

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ס"ז

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we dive deeper into the halachos of kosher fish and the specific sources for what is permitted and forbidden. The Gemara explores the limudim (derivations) of klal u'prat u'klal (generalization, detail, and generalization) and ribuy u'mi'ut (amplification and restriction) to determine which bodies of water require fish to have fins and scales. We learn how the Torah excludes still waters—like pits, ditches, and caves—as well as vessels, allowing one to drink from them without worrying about microscopic or small organisms that grow there.

We then move into a practical discussion of the prohibitions of sheratzim (creeping creatures) that grow in liquids and fruits. The Gemara discusses the halachos of filtering drinks like beer and eating fruits that may have become wormy while still attached to the ground, teaching us the delicate boundaries of when a creature is considered to have "crawled upon the earth" and become forbidden.

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

עמוד א' DAF 67A

EXPLANATION

הטל פֿרש ביניהם ודונים בכלל ופרט בכלל,

We must **place** the **detail between them**, between the two generalizations, and **expound them as a generalization**, and a **detail**, and a **generalization**.

EXPLANATION

"במים" – כלל, "במים ובנהלים" – פרט, "במים" – חזר וכלל.

The first instance of the phrase "**in the waters**" is a **generalization**; "**in the seas and in the rivers**" is a **detail**; and by the second instance of "**in the waters**", the verse **then generalized** again.

EXPLANATION

כלל ופרט וכלל – אי אמה דן אלא בעין הפרט,

And we have a rule: In any instance of a **generalization**, and a **detail**, and a **generalization**, you may **deduce** that the verse refers **only** to items **similar to the detail**.

EXPLANATION

מה הפרט מפורש מים נובעים, אף כל מים נובעים.

Just as the detail is explicitly referring to **flowing waters**, such as seas and rivers, **so too**, all other **flowing waters** are included in the prohibition of fish without fins and scales.

EXPLANATION

מאי רבי? חריצין ונעיצין לאיסורא, ומאי מיעט? בורות שיחין ומערות להתיירא.

What does this include? It includes trenches and water channels to prohibit fish without fins and scales found in them. And what does it exclude? It excludes pits, ditches, and caves to permit all fish found in them, since they are still waters.

QUESTION

ואימא: מה הפרט מפורש – מים גדלין על גבי קרקע, אף כל מים גדלין על גבי קרקע.

The Gemara asks: But why not say: Just as the detail is explicitly referring to water that grows, meaning is found, on the ground, so too, all water that grows on the ground is included in the prohibition?

QUESTION

ומאי רבי? אפילו בורות שיחין ומערות לאיסורא, ומאי מיעט? מיעט כלים!

And what would this include? It would include even pits, ditches, and caves to prohibit fish without fins and scales found in them. And what would it exclude? It would exclude only those found in vessels!

ANSWER

אם כן, "תאכלו" מאי אהני ליה?

The Gemara responds: If so, what use is the word "These may you eat"? Even without it, vessels would be excluded, since they are not at all similar to seas and rivers.

STATEMENT

דבי רבי ישמעאל תנא: "במים" "במים" שתי פעמים, אין זה כלל ופרט, אלא ריבה ומיעט.

The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: The verse's use of the phrase "in the waters" and "in the waters" twice is not to be interpreted as a generalization and a detail, but rather as an instance of amplification and restriction.

EXPLANATION

"במים" – ריבה, "במים ובנהלים" – מיעט, "במים" – חזר וריבה.

By the first phrase "in the waters", the verse amplified; by the phrase "in the seas and in the rivers", it restricted; and by the second instance of "in the waters", it then amplified again.

EXPLANATION

ריבה ומיעט וריבה – ריבה הכל.

And we have a rule: When a verse amplified, and restricted, and amplified, it amplified everything to include all categories, except for the specific matter excluded by the restriction.

EXPLANATION

מאי רבי? חריצין ונעיצין לאיסורא, ומאי מיעט? בורות שיחין ומערות להתיירא.

What, then, does it include? It includes trenches and water channels to prohibit fish without fins and scales found in them. And what does it exclude? It excludes pits, ditches, and caves to permit them.

QUESTION

אימא: מאי רבי? בורות שיחין ומערות לאיסורא, ומאי מיעט? מיעט כלים.

The Gemara objects: Why not say: **What does it include?** It includes **pits, ditches, and caves to prohibit** fish found in them if they do not have fins and scales. **And what does it exclude?** It **excludes** only fish found in **vessels**.

ANSWER

אם כן, "תאכלו" מאי אהני ליה?

The Gemara responds: **If so, what use is** the word "**These may you eat**"? Even without it, vessels would be excluded. Rather, it indicates that pits, ditches, and caves are excluded by the restriction.

OBJECTION

ואיפוך אנא, כדתני מתניה, דתני מתניה בר יהודה:

The Gemara objects: **But perhaps I should reverse** the statement and claim that fish in pits, ditches, and caves are prohibited, and those in trenches and water channels are permitted? The Gemara responds: One must say as **Mattitya taught**, as **Mattitya bar Yehuda taught** in a baraita:

EXPLANATION

מאי ראית לרבות בורות שיחין ומערות להתיירא, ולהוציא חריצין ונעיצין לאיסורא?

What did you see that caused you to include pits, ditches, and caves to permit them, and to exclude trenches and water channels to prohibit them?

EXPLANATION

מרבה אני בורות שיחין ומערות שהן עצורים ככלים, ומוציא אני חריצין ונעיצין שאין עצורין ככלים.

I include pits, ditches, and caves, which contain still water like vessels, and are therefore permitted like vessels; and I exclude trenches and water channels, which are not still like vessels, as water flows through them.

QUESTION

הי סתום והי מפורש?

The Gemara asks regarding the baraita on the previous amud: **Which** verse is the **implicit** source permitting fish in vessels, **and which** is the **explicit** source?

STATEMENT

פליגי בה רב אחא ורביןא:

Rav Acha and Ravina disagree with regard to it:

STATEMENT

חד אמר: יש לו – מפורש, ואין לו – סתום, וחד אמר: אין לו – מפורש, ויש לו – סתום.

One says: The verse permitting "**whatever has**" fins and scales is the **explicit** source, **and** the verse prohibiting "**whatever has not**" fins and scales is the **implicit** source. **And one says:** The verse prohibiting "**whatever has not**" fins and scales is the **explicit** source, **and** the verse permitting "**whatever has**" fins and scales is the **implicit** source.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא דמאן דאמר יש לו מפורש?

What is the reasoning of the one who says that "whatever has" fins and scales is the explicit source?

ANSWER

אמר לך: מינייה הוא דקא משתרו פלים.

He could have said to you: It is from this verse that fish in vessels are permitted.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא דמאן דאמר אין לו מפורש?

What is the reasoning of the one who says that "whatever has not" fins and scales is the explicit source?

ANSWER

דהאי הוא דקמזכח אהאי, דאי מהאי הוה אמינא: בכללים, אף על גב דאית ליה – נמי לא תיכול.

His reasoning is that it is this verse that proves the meaning of the other verse. As, if we derived it only from the other verse, I would say: In vessels, even if it has fins and scales, you may still not eat it.

RULING

אמר רב הונא: לא לשפי אינש שיכרא בצבייתא באורתא, דילמא פריש לעיל מצבייתא וחדר נפיל לכסא, (והוי) [וקא] עובר משום "שרץ השרץ על הארץ".

Rav Huna says: A person should not pour beer through straw to filter it at night, lest a creeping animal emerge above the straw and then fall into the cup, and the drinker will violate the prohibition because of "every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth".

OBJECTION

אי הכי, במנא נמי, דלמא פריש לדפנא דמנא וחדר נפיל למנא?

The Gemara objects: If so, with regard to beer in a vessel also, we should be concerned that perhaps a creature emerged onto the side of the vessel and then fell back into the vessel, thereby becoming forbidden?

RESOLUTION

התם היינו רביתיה.

The Gemara responds: There, that is its normal manner of growth, to attach itself to the sides of the vessel, and it is not considered to have emerged.

PROOF

ומנא תימרא, דתנא: מנין לרבות בורות שיחין ומערות, ששוחה ושותה מהן ואינו נמנע? תלמוד לומר: "תאכלו מכל אשר במים".

And from where do you say this? As it is taught in a baraita: From where is it derived to include pits, ditches, and caves, that one may bend down and drink from them and need not refrain from drinking the creeping creatures inside them? The verse states: "These may you eat of all that are in the waters".

QUESTION

וליחוש דלמא פריש לדפנא וחדר נפיל?

And yet, should we not be concerned lest a creature emerged onto the side of the pit and then fell back in?

ANSWER

אַלָּא הֵינָנוּ רְבִיתִיהּ. הָכָא נָמִי הֵינָנוּ רְבִיתִיהּ.

Rather, we must say that is its normal manner of growth. Here too, in a vessel, that is its normal manner of growth.

PROOF

אָמַר לִיה רַב חֲסִידָא לְרַב הוּנָא: תִּנָּא דְמַסִּיעַ לָהּ, "כָּל הַשָּׂרֵץ הַשָּׂרֵץ עַל הָאָרֶץ" – לְרִבּוֹת יִבְחוּשֵׁין שְׂסִינָנִין; טַעְמָא דְסִינָנִין, הָא לֹא סִינָנִין – שָׂרִי.

Rav Chisda said to Rav Huna: There is a baraita that supports you: "Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth" serves to include gnats that one filtered, to prohibit them; the reason is that one filtered them, but if one did not filter them, they are permitted.

STATEMENT

אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: קִישוּת שְׁהֵת לִיעָה

Shmuel said: A cucumber that became wormy while attached to the ground...

עמוד ב' DAF 67B

STATEMENT

בְּאַפִּיָּה אֲסוּרָה מְשוּם "הַשָּׂרֵץ הַשָּׂרֵץ עַל הָאָרֶץ".

A worm found in a cucumber while it is still attached to the ground is prohibited due to the prohibition of: "Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth."

QUESTION

לִימָא מְסִיעַ לִיה, דְּתַנִּי חֲדָא: "עַל הָאָרֶץ" – לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַזִּיזִין שֶׁפְּעָדָשִׁים, וְאֶת הַיִּתּוּשִׁים שֶׁכָּפְלִיסִים, וְתוֹלַעַת שְׁבֵתִמָּרִים וְשִׁבְגָרוֹגְרוֹת.

Let us say that a comparison of the following two baraitot supports him, Shmuel's opinion. As it is taught in one baraita: The words "upon the earth" serve to exclude the zizin insects that are in lentils, and the mosquitoes that are in kelisim beans, and the worms that are in dates and in dried figs, which are all permitted because they did not swarm on the ground.

QUESTION

וְתִנָּא אִידָּהּ: "כָּל הַשָּׂרֵץ הַשָּׂרֵץ עַל הָאָרֶץ" – לְרִבּוֹת תּוֹלַעַת שֶׁפְּעָקְרִי זֵיתִים וְשֶׁפְּעָקְרִי גִפְנִים.

And it is taught in another baraita: When the verse states "Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth," the word "every" serves to include as forbidden the worms that are in the roots of olive trees and that are in the roots of vines.

QUESTION

מֵאִי לָאוּ, אִידֵי וְאִידֵי בְּפִירָא, וְהָא בְּאַפִּיָּה, וְהָא שְׁלֹא בְּאַפִּיָּה?

What, is it not that both this and that baraita are referring to fruit, and this latter baraita, which forbids them, refers to fruit while attached to the ground, and that former baraita, which permits them, refers to fruit that is not attached to the ground? This would support Shmuel's ruling.

ANSWER

לא, אידי ואידי באפיה, ולא קשיא: הא בפירא, הא באילנא גופא.

The Gemara rejects this: No, both this and that baraita are referring to vegetation while attached to the ground, and yet it is not difficult: This former baraita, which permits, refers to worms in the fruit, whereas that latter baraita, which forbids, refers to worms in the tree itself.

PROOF

דיקא נמי, דקתני "תולעת שבעיקרי זיתים ושבעיקרי גפנים", שמע מינה.

The Gemara notes: The language of the baraita is also precise, as it teaches: "worms that are in the roots of olive trees and in the roots of vines," which are parts of the tree itself. The Gemara concludes: Learn from it that this is indeed the correct interpretation.

QUESTION

בעי רב יוסף: פרשה ומתה, מהו?

Rav Yosef raises a dilemma: If a worm emerged from the fruit and died before reaching the ground, what is the halakha? Is it considered to have swarmed on the earth?

QUESTION

מקצתה, מהו?

If only part of it emerged, what is the halakha?

QUESTION

לאויר העולם, מהו?

If it emerged into the air of the world and flew without landing, what is the halakha?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara responds: The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

QUESTION

בעי רב אשי: לגג תמרה מהו?

Rav Ashi raises a dilemma: If a worm crawled to the roof of a date, its outer skin, what is the halakha? Is this considered its normal place of growth, or is it like swarming on the earth?

QUESTION

לגג גרעינתה מהו?

If it crawled to the roof of its pit, what is the halakha?

QUESTION

מתמרה לתמרה מהו?

If it crawled **from date to date** that were touching, without emerging into the air, **what is** the halakha?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara responds: The dilemma **shall stand** unresolved.

STATEMENT

אמר רב ששת בריה דרב אידי: קוקיאני אסירי, מאי טעמא? מעלמא אתו.

Rav Sheshet, son of Rav Idi, says: **Kukeyanei**, worms found in the liver and lungs of animals, **are forbidden**. What is the reason? They came **from the** outside **world** by being swallowed, and thus already swarmed on the earth.

OBJECTION

מתקרי לה רב אשי: אי מעלמא אתו, לישתכחו דרך בית הריעי.

Rav Ashi objects to this: If they came **from the** outside **world**, they should be found also by way of the digestive tract. Since they are not, they must have generated inside the animal.

STATEMENT

איכא דאמרי, אמר רב שישא בריה דרב אידי: קוקיאני שרו. מאי טעמא? מיניה גבלי.

Some state the exchange differently: Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, says: **Kukeyanei** are permitted. What is the reason? They **originate from** the animal **itself**.

STATEMENT

אמר רב אשי: פשיטא, דאי מעלמא קא אתו – לישתכחו דרך בית הריעי!

Rav Ashi said: This is obvious, for if they came **from the** outside **world**, they should be found by way of the digestive tract!

RULING

והלכתא: קוקיאני אסירי, מאי טעמא? מינם ניים ועיילי ליה באוסייה תולעים.

And the halakha is: **Kukeyanei** are forbidden. What is the reason? While the animal sleeps, worms enter it through its **snout** and travel to the lungs, bypassing the digestive tract.

RULING

דרני דבשרא – אסירי, דכוורי – שריין.

Worms **found in meat** between the skin and flesh **are forbidden**, but those found **in fish** are permitted.

STATEMENT

אמר לה רבינא לאימיה: אכלע לי ואנא איכול,

Ravina said to his mother: Conceal the fish's worms inside the fish **for me**, and I will eat them.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב משרשייא בריה דרב אחא לרבינא: מאי שנא מהא דתנא "ואת נבלתם תשקצו" לרבות את הדרגים שבבהמה?

Rav Mesharshiyya, son of Rav Acha, said to Ravina: How is this different from that which is taught in a baraita: "And their carcasses you shall have in detestation" serves to include the worms that are in an animal as forbidden? Why are fish worms permitted?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: הכי השתא? בהמה בשחיטה הוא דמשתריא, והני מדלא קא מהניא להו שחיטה – באיסורייהו קיימו,

Ravina said to him: How can you compare them? An animal is permitted only through ritual slaughter, and since slaughter does not affect these worms inside the flesh, they remain in their forbidden state as part of a living animal.

ANSWER

אבל דגים באסיפה בעלמא מישתרו, והני כי קא גבול – בהיתרא קא גבול.

But fish are permitted by mere gathering, and are not subject to the prohibition of eating a limb from a living animal; therefore, when these worms originate, they originate in a permitted state.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: "הולך על גחון" – זה נחש, "כל" – לרבות השילשול ואת הדומה לשילשול,

The Rabbis taught in a baraita: The phrase "goes upon the belly" refers to the snake. The word "every" preceding it serves to include the earthworm and that which is similar to the earthworm.

BRAISA

"על ארבע" – זה עקרב, "כל הולך" – לרבות את החיפושית ואת הדומה לחיפושית,

The phrase "upon all fours" refers to the scorpion. The phrase "whatever goes" serves to include the beetle and that which is similar to the beetle.

BRAISA

"מרבה רגלים" – זה נדל, "עד כל" – לרבות את הדומה ואת הדומה לדומה.

The phrase "has many feet" refers to the centipede. The phrase "even all" serves to include that which is similar to it, and that which is similar to that which is similar to it.

BRAISA

תנא, רבי יוסי בן דורמסקית אומר: לויתן דג טהור הוא, שנאמר: "גאווה אפיקי מגנים", "תחתיו חודי חרש";

It is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yosei ben Durmaskit says: The Leviathan is a kosher fish, as it is stated: "His armor is his pride," and "Sharpest pots herds are under him."

EXPLANATION

”אִפְיָקִי מִגְנִים” – אֵלֹהֵי קַשְׁקָשִׁים שָׁבוּ, ”תַּחֲתֵי חֲדוּדֵי חֶרֶשׁ” – אֵלֹהֵי סַנְפִּירִין שְׁפוּרְחַ בָּהֶן.

"His armor" refers to the scales that are on him, and "sharpest potsherds are under him" refers to the fins with which he swims.

STATEMENT

הָדָרְנוּ עֲלֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵי טְרֵפוֹת.

May we return to you, "Elu Treifot"!

SUMMARY

The daf begins by analyzing the opinions of the Chachamim and the school of Rabbi Yishmael regarding the double expression of "in the waters" to permit fish without fins and scales in still waters like pits, ditches, and caves, while prohibiting them in flowing trenches and water channels. We then examine a machlokes between Rav Acha and Ravina regarding which pasuk serves as the explicit source for permitting fish in vessels. Finally, the Gemara discusses the halachos of sheratzim, with Rav Huna warning against filtering beer through straw at night due to the risk of a creature crawling out and falling back in, which leads to a broader discussion of the status of worms in vessels and those found in fruits while still attached to the ground.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

Our sugya teaches us a profound lesson about the power of environment and boundaries. The Gemara discusses the status of tiny organisms, explaining that as long as they remain inside their natural environment, whether inside a piece of fruit, a fish, or a water vessel, they are permitted. But the moment they crawl out, even for a split second, and then fall back in, they become forbidden as a 'swarming thing that swarms upon the earth.' The physical creature did not change, but its relationship to its boundary did.

This is a powerful mashal for our own spiritual lives. Hashem created us with a beautiful, holy framework of Torah and mitzvos that serves as our natural, healthy environment. Within these boundaries, we can live, grow, and elevate the physical world in a permitted and holy way. But the moment we step outside of those boundaries, even if we think we are just 'dipping our toes' into the outside world and will immediately jump back in, we change our spiritual status. What was once healthy and pure can quickly become spiritually damaging once we cross that line.

We must cherish the boundaries the Torah sets for us, recognizing that they are not there to restrict us, but to protect our neshama's purity. Just as Rav Huna warns us to be careful when filtering beer at night so we do not accidentally cause something to cross a boundary, we must be vigilant about the environments we place ourselves in, especially in moments of darkness or distraction.

Today, identify one spiritual boundary you have set for yourself, such as a guardrail around your speech, your screen time, or your davening, and reinforce it. Remind yourself that staying inside the Torah's boundaries is what keeps your neshama pure and connected to the Aibershter.

