

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף ע"ו

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we dive into the critical halachos of tereifos concerning an animal's legs, specifically focusing on what happens when a limb is severed or when the bone is broken. The Mishnah sets the foundation by distinguishing between a cut below the leg joint, which is kosher, and a cut above the joint, which renders the animal a tereifa. We also introduce the concept of the צִמְתֵּי הַגִּידִים (the convergence of sinews), a vital anatomical area that, if removed or damaged, makes the animal unfit.

In the Gemara, our Chachamim analyze the exact anatomical definitions of these areas. We find a beautiful, deep discussion between Rav Yehuda and Ulla regarding which joint the Mishnah is referring to—whether it is the lower joint sold with the head or the upper joint that corresponds to the protruding joint of a camel. The Sugya also brings down the precise boundaries and physical characteristics of the צִמְתֵּי הַגִּידִים to help us identify this area in both large and small animals.

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

עמוד א' DAF 76A

MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי בְּהֶמָּה שֶׁנֶּחֱתְכוּ רַגְלֶיהָ מִן הָאֲרָכּוּפָה וּלְמַטָּה – כֹּשֶׁרָה,

An animal whose legs were severed from the leg joint and below is kosher, as this is not a fatal wound;

MISHNAH

מִן הָאֲרָכּוּפָה וּלְמַעְלָה – פְּסוּלָה,

but if they were severed from the leg joint and above, the animal is unfit as a tereifa.

MISHNAH

וְכֵן שְׁנֵיטֵל צִמְתֵּי הַגִּידִין.

And likewise, an animal whose convergence of sinews was removed is a tereifa.

MISHNAH

נִשְׁפָּר הָעֶצֶם, אִם רֹב הַבָּשָׂר קָיָם – שְׁחִיטָתוֹ מְטַהֲרָתוֹ, וְאִם לֹא – אֵין שְׁחִיטָתוֹ מְטַהֲרָתוֹ.

If the bone of a limb was broken but not completely severed, if the majority of the flesh surrounding the bone is intact, its slaughter purifies it from being neveilah and makes it permitted to eat; and if not, its slaughter does not purify it.

GEMARA

גמ' אמר רב יהודה אמר רב אמר רבי חייא: למטה – למטה מן הארכובה, למעלה – למעלה מן הארכובה.

GEMARA: Rav Yehuda said that Rav said that Rabbi Chiyya said: When the Mishnah says "below," it means below the leg joint; and when it says "above," it means above the leg joint.

STATEMENT

באיזו ארכובה אמרו? בארכובה הנמכרת עם הראש.

Regarding which leg joint did they say this? Regarding the leg joint that is sold with the head, which is the lowest joint of the leg.

STATEMENT

עולא אמר רבי אושעיא: כנגדו בגמל ניכר.

But Ulla said that Rabbi Oshaya said: It refers to the upper joint, whose corresponding joint in a camel is noticeable and protrudes.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה עולא לרב יהודה: בשלמא לדידי דאמינא כנגדו בגמל ניכר, היינו דקתני: וכן שניטל צומת הגידין,

Ulla said to Rav Yehuda: Granted according to my view, as I say it is the joint whose corresponding joint in a camel is noticeable, that is why it teaches: And likewise, an animal whose convergence of sinews was removed is a tereifa, because the convergence of sinews is located below that upper joint, so we need to be taught that even though a cut below the upper joint is kosher, if the convergence of sinews itself is removed, it is a tereifa.

QUESTION

אלא לדידך, מאי וכן שניטל צומת הגידין?

But according to your view that the Mishnah refers to the lower joint, and any cut above it is a tereifa, what is the purpose of teaching "And likewise, an animal whose convergence of sinews was removed"? Since the convergence of sinews is above the lower joint, it is already included in the rule of "above the joint"!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: רכובה בלא צומת הגידים, וצומת הגידים בלא רכובה.

Rav Yehuda said to him: The Mishnah is teaching two distinct cases: a cut at the joint without affecting the convergence of sinews, and the removal of the convergence of sinews without a cut at the joint.

OBJECTION

והא "נחתכו" קתני!

Ulla objected: **But doesn't** the Mishnah **teach** "**were severed**," which implies the entire leg was cut off, which would automatically include the convergence of sinews?

STATEMENT

אִשְׁתִּיק.

Rav Yehuda **was silent**, as he had no immediate answer.

EXPLANATION

לְבַתֵּר דְּנִפְק אָמַר: מָאִי טַעְמָא לָא אָמַרִי לֵיהּ, "לְמַטָּה" – לְמַטָּה מִן הָאֲרָכּוּפָה, "לְמַעְלָה" – לְמַעְלָה מִצּוּמַת הַגִּידִין?

After Ulla left, Rav Yehuda **said** to himself: **What is the reason I did not say to him** the following answer: "**Below**" means **below the leg joint**, and "**above**" means **above the convergence of sinews**? Thus, the area of the convergence of sinews itself would not be included in "above," and the Mishnah had to teach that if the convergence of sinews itself was removed, it is a tereifa.

REFUTATION

הֲדַר אָמַר: וְלֹא אָמַרִי לֵיהּ, וְאָמַר לִי: "נִחְתְּכוּ" קִתְּנִי? הֲכָא נָמִי, "מִן הָאֲרָכּוּפָה וְלְמַעְלָה" קִתְּנִי.

He then said: But had I said it to him, would he not have said to me, just as he said "'were severed' is taught," here too, "**from the leg joint and above**" is taught, which implies immediately above the joint, including the convergence of sinews?

STATEMENT

רַב פָּפָא מִתְּנִי הֵכִי: אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא: "לְמַטָּה" – לְמַטָּה מִן הָאֲרָכּוּפָה וּמִצּוּמַת הַגִּידִין, "לְמַעְלָה" – לְמַעְלָה מִן הָאֲרָכּוּפָה וּמִצּוּמַת הַגִּידִין, וְכֵן שְׁנִיטַל צוּמַת הַגִּידִין.

Rav Pappa taught the discussion this way: Rav Yehuda said that Rav said that Rabbi Chiyya said: "**Below**" means **below the leg joint and below the convergence of sinews**; "**above**" means **above the leg joint and above the convergence of sinews**; and the Mishnah adds, "**likewise, if the convergence of sinews was removed**" it is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

וְאֲרָכּוּפָה גּוּפָה כְּדַעוּלָא אָמַר רַבִּי אוֹשְׁעָנָא.

And the leg joint itself is defined in accordance with what Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Oshaya, referring to the upper joint.

QUESTION

וּמִי אִיכָא מִיָּדִי, דְּאִילוּ מְדָלִי פָּסִיק לֵיהּ וְחָיָה, מִתְּתִי פָּסִיק לֵיהּ וּמֵתָה?

The Gemara asks: **But is there any such thing**, that if one goes **higher up** the leg and **cuts it**, the animal **lives**, but if one goes **lower down and cuts it**, the animal **dies** and is a tereifa? This seems illogical!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב אָשִׁי: טְרֵפוֹת קָא מְדַמִּית לְהֶדְדִי? אֵין אוֹמְרִין בְּטְרֵפוֹת זֹו דּוּמָה לָזוּ, שְׁהָרִי חוֹתְכָה מְכָא וּמֵתָה, חוֹתְכָה מְכָאן וְחָיָה.

Rav Ashi said: Are you comparing different tereifot to one another? We do not say regarding tereifot that this one is similar to that one, for behold, in one place one cuts it from here and it dies, and in another place one cuts it from there and it lives.

QUESTION

ואלו הן צומת הגידין?

The Gemara asks: **And which are** the boundaries of **the convergence of sinews**?

STATEMENT

רבה אמר רב אשי: דאגרא וזכר,

Rabba said in the name of **Rav Ashi**: It is the area **from** where the sinews separate from **the bone and outward**, where they enter the flesh.

STATEMENT

רבה בר רב הונא אמר רב אשי: דאגרא וזכר,

Rabba bar Rav Huna said in the name of **Rav Ashi**: It is the area **from** where they lie on **the bone and inward**, before they separate.

STATEMENT

רבא בריה דרבה בר רב הונא אמר רב אסי: דעילוי ערקומא.

Rava the son of Rabba bar Rav Huna said in the name of **Rav Assi**: It is the area **that is above the arkuma** bone.

STATEMENT

יתב ההוא מרבנן קמיה דרבי אבא, ויתב וקאמר: דערקומא גופה.

A certain one of the Rabbis sat before Rabbi Abba, and he sat and said: The convergence of sinews includes the area of the arkuma bone itself.

RULING

אמר ליה רבי אבא: לא תציתו ליה, הכי אמר רב יהודה: היכא דפרעי טפחי.

Rabbi Abba said to his students: **Do not listen to him!** This is what **Rav Yehuda** said: It is where the butchers split open the meat to expose the sinews.

STATEMENT

והיינו רבא בריה דרבה בר רב הונא אמר רב אסי.

And this is the same as what **Rava the son of Rabba bar Rav Huna said** in the name of **Rav Assi**.

STATEMENT

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: צומת הגידים שאמרו – מקום שהגידין צומתין, ועד כמה?

Rav Yehuda said that **Shmuel said**: The convergence of sinews that they spoke of is the place where the sinews converge. **And until how far** does this area extend?

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיהֵא הָהוּא מְדַרְבְּנָן, וְרַב יַעֲקֹב שְׁמִיָּה: כִּי הוֹיָנוּ בִּי רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר לָן: שְׁמַעוּ מִנִּי מִלְתָּא דְּמַגְבָּרָא
רַבָּה שְׁמִיעַ לִי, וּמִנּוּ? שְׁמוּאֵל:

A certain one of the Rabbis, and Rav Yaakov was his name, said to him: When we were in the academy of Rav Yehuda, he said to us: Hear from me a matter that I heard from a great man, and who is he? Shmuel:

STATEMENT

צוּמַת הַגִּידִין שְׁאָמְרוּ – מְקוֹם שֶׁהַגִּידִין צוּמְתִין בּוֹ, וּמִמְקוֹם שֶׁצוּמְתִין עַד מְקוֹם שֶׁמִּתְפַּשְׁטִין.

The convergence of sinews that they spoke of is the place where the sinews converge, and from the place where they converge until the place where they spread out into the flesh.

STATEMENT

וְכַמָּה? אָמַר אַבְי: אַרְבָּעָה בְּטָדֵי בְּתוֹרָא.

And how much is this length? Abaye said: Four fingerbreadths in an ox.

STATEMENT

בְּדָקָה מַאי? אָמַר אַבְי: בְּלִיטֵי – הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים, בְּלִיעֵי – לֹא הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים.

In a small animal, what is the rule? Abaye said: Those parts of the sinews that protrude are considered the convergence of sinews, but those that are absorbed and hidden in the flesh are not considered the convergence of sinews.

STATEMENT

אֲשׁוּנֵי – הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים, רַכִּיכֵי – לֹא הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים,

Those that are hard are considered the convergence of sinews, but those that are soft are not considered the convergence of sinews.

STATEMENT

אֲלִימֵי – הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים, קְטִינֵי – לֹא הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים,

Those that are thick are considered the convergence of sinews, but those that are thin are not considered the convergence of sinews.

STATEMENT

חֲוָירִי – הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים, לֹא חֲוָירִי – לֹא הֵווּ צוּמַת הַגִּידִים.

Those that are white are considered the convergence of sinews, but those that are not white are not considered the convergence of sinews.

עמוד ב' DAF 76B

STATEMENT

מַר בַּר רַב אָשִׁי אָמַר: כִּיּוֹן דְּזִיגִי – אַף עַל גַּב דְּלֹא חֲוָירִי.

Mar bar Rav Ashi said: Once the sinews are translucent, even though they are not yet fully white, they are already considered halachically to be part of the convergence of sinews.

STATEMENT

אמר אמימר משמיה דרב זביד: תלתא חוטי הוו, חד אלימא ותרי קטיני.

Ameimar said in the name of Rav Zevid: There are three strands, i.e., sinews, in the convergence; one is thick and two are thin.

EXPLANATION

איפסיק אלימא – אדא רוב בנן, איפסיק קטיני – אדא רוב מנן.

If the thick one was severed, the majority of the structure is gone, since it is thicker than the other two combined; if the thin ones were severed, the majority of the number of sinews is gone. If either type of majority is severed, the animal is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

מר בר רב אשי מתני לקולא: איפסיק אלימא – האיכא רוב מנן, איפסיק קטיני – האיכא רוב בנן.

Mar bar Rav Ashi teaches a version of this ruling to be lenient: If the thick one was severed, behold there is still a majority of the number remaining intact, so it is kosher; if the thin ones were severed, behold there is still a majority of the structure remaining, so it is kosher.

STATEMENT

בעופות שיתסר חוטי הוו, איפסיק חד מינייהו – טרפה.

The Gemara notes: In birds, there are sixteen strands; if even one of them was severed, it is a tereifa.

STATEMENT

אמר מר בר רב אשי: הוה קאימנא קמיה דאבא, ואיתו לקמיה עופא, ובדק ואשכח ביה חמיסר.

Mar bar Rav Ashi said: I was standing before father, Rav Ashi, and they brought before him a bird, and he examined it and found in it only fifteen sinews.

STATEMENT

הוה חד דהוה שני מחבריה, נפציה ואשכח תרי.

There was one sinew that was different from its fellows in thickness; he split it apart and found that it was actually two sinews joined together, making sixteen.

STATEMENT

אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: צומת הגידין שאמרו ברובו; מאי רובו? רוב אחד מהן.

Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The convergence of sinews of which the Sages spoke, stating that if it is severed the animal is a tereifa, refers to when the majority of it is severed. What is the meaning of 'the majority of it'? The majority of one of them, i.e., the majority of any single sinew.

STATEMENT

כי אמריתה קמיה דשמואל, אמר לי: מכדי תלתא הוו, כי מיפסיק חד מינייהו לגמרי, הא איכא תרי.

Rav Yehuda added: **When I stated this halakha before Shmuel, he said to me: Since they are three sinews, when one of them is severed entirely, behold there are still two remaining, which is a majority of the convergence, so it is kosher.**

INFERENCE

טעמא דאיכא תרי, הא ליכא תרי – לא, ופליגא דרבנאי, דאמר רבנאי אמר שמואל: צומת הגידים, אפילו לא נשתייר בה אלא כחוט הסרבל – כשרה.

The Gemara infers: **The reason** it is kosher **is because there are two remaining**; but if there are not two remaining, it is not kosher. **And** this version of Shmuel **disagrees with** the opinion of Rabbenai, as Rabbenai says that Shmuel says: **Regarding the convergence of sinews, even if there remains of it only like the thread of a cloak [hasarbal], it is kosher.**

STATEMENT

ואיכא דאמרי: מאי רובו? רוב כל אחד ואחד.

And some say there is another version of this discussion: **What is the meaning of 'the majority of it'?** The majority of each and every one of the three sinews.

STATEMENT

כי אמריתה קמיה דשמואל, אמר לי: מכדי תלתא הוו, האיכא תלתא דכל חד וחד מסייע ליה לרבנאי, דאמר רבנאי אמר שמואל: צומת הגידין שאמרו, אפילו לא נשתייר בה אלא כחוט הסרבל – כשרה.

Rav Yehuda added: **When I stated this halakha before Shmuel, he said to me: Since they are three sinews, behold there is a third of each and every one remaining, and that is sufficient.** The Gemara notes: This version of Shmuel **supports** the opinion of Rabbenai, as Rabbenai says that Shmuel says: **The convergence of sinews of which they spoke, even if there remains of it only like the thread of a cloak, it is kosher.**

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

נשבר העצם כו'.

We learned in the Mishnah: **If the bone was broken etc.**

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רב: למעלה מן הארפוכה, אם רוב הבשר קיים – זה נזה מותר, ואם לאו – זה נזה אסור.

Rav said: **If the bone was broken above the leg joint, if the majority of the flesh is intact, both this, the animal, and that, the limb, are permitted; but if not, both this and that are prohibited.**

STATEMENT

למטה מן הארפוכה, אם רוב הבשר קיים – זה נזה מותר, אם לאו – אבר אסור ובהמה מותרת.

If the bone was broken below the leg joint, if the majority of the flesh is intact, both this and that are permitted; if not, the limb is prohibited, but the animal is permitted.

STATEMENT

ושמואל אומר: בין למעלה בין למטה, אם רוב הבשר קיים – זה וזה מותר, אם לאו – אבר אסור, ובהמה מותרת.

And Shmuel said: Whether above or below the leg joint, the halakha is the same: if the majority of the flesh is intact, both this and that are permitted; if not, the limb is prohibited, and the animal is permitted.

OBJECTION

מתקור לה רב נחמן לשמואל: לאמרו "אבר ממנה מוטל באשפה ומותרת"?

Rav Nachman challenged Shmuel: Will people not say, 'A limb from it is cast in the garbage, and yet the animal itself is permitted'? This will lead to confusion.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רב אחא בר רב הונא לרב נחמן: לרב נמי לאמרו "אבר ממנה מוטל באשפה ומותרת"!

Rav Acha bar Rav Huna said to Rav Nachman: According to Rav as well, in a case below the joint where the flesh is not intact, will people not say, 'A limb from it is cast in the garbage, and yet the animal itself is permitted'?

RESOLUTION

אמר ליה: הכי קאמינא, אבר שחיה ממנה מוטל באשפה, ומותרת?

Rav Nachman said to him: This is what I meant to say: Will they say, 'A limb upon which the animal's life depends, i.e., which if severed entirely renders it a tereifa, is cast in the garbage, and yet the animal is permitted'? This concern only applies above the joint, as Shmuel rules.

STATEMENT

שלחו מתם: הלכתא כוותיה דרב, הדור שלחו: כוותיה דשמואל, הדור שלחו: כוותיה דרב, ואבר עצמו מטמא במשא.

They sent from there, Eretz Yisrael: The halakha is in accordance with Rav. They sent again: The halakha is in accordance with Shmuel. They sent again: The halakha is in accordance with Rav, and furthermore, the limb itself imparts tumah through carrying as a limb from a living animal.

OBJECTION

מתיב רב חסדא: לא, אם טיהרה שחיטת טרפה אותה ואת האבר המדולדל בה – דבר שגופה, תטהר את העובר – דבר שאינו גופה?

Rav Chisda challenged this from a Mishnah: 'No, if the slaughter of a tereifa purifies it and the dangling limb on it from the tumah of nevelah, because the limb is something that is part of its body, shall it also purify the fetus, which is something that is not part of its body?' This implies that slaughtering purifies a dangling limb, contrary to the ruling sent from Eretz Yisrael!

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רבה: הדורי אפירכי למה לך? אויב ממתניתין!

Rabbah said to him: Why do you need to go around to find difficulties from a kal vachomer in a Mishnah? Object directly from our Mishnah itself, which says that slaughtering renders it permitted!

PROOF

נִשְׁחָטָה בְּהֶמָּה – הוֹכְשָׁרוּ בְּדַמֶּיהָ, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמֵר: לֹא הוֹכְשָׁרוּ.

Rabbah continued: For we learned in a Mishnah: If the animal was slaughtered, the dangling limb is made susceptible to tumah by its blood; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Shimon says: They are not made susceptible because the slaughterer does not affect the limb. Thus, Rabbi Meir holds the limb is purified from nevelah.

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיה: מִתְּנִיתִין אִיכָּא לְדַחוּי, כְּדָדְחִינוּ.

Rav Chisda said to him: That Mishnah can be deflected, as we deflect it elsewhere, whereas my proof was more absolute.

STATEMENT

כִּי סָלִיק רַבִּי זֵירָא, אֲשָׁפְחִיה לְרַב יִרְמְיָה דִּיתֵיב וְקָאָמַר לֵהּ לְהָא שְׁמַעְתָּא.

When Rabbi Zeira went up to Eretz Yisrael, he found Rav Yirmeyah sitting and stating this halakha of Rav.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיה: יִישָׁר, וְכֵן תִּרְגְּמָה אַרְיוֹךְ בְּבָבֶל. אַרְיוֹךְ מָנוּ? שְׁמוּאֵל. וְהָא מִיפְלָג פְּלִיג! הָדָר בִּיה שְׁמוּאֵל לְגַבִּיה דְּרַב.

Rabbi Zeira said to him: May your strength be straight, and so did Aryoch explain it in Bavel. Who is Aryoch? Shmuel. The Gemara asks: But did he not disagree with Rav? The Gemara answers: Shmuel retracted his opinion to agree with Rav.

BRAISA

תְּנוּ רַבָּנָן: נִשְׁבֵּר הָעֶצֶם וְיָצָא לַחוּץ, אִם עוֹר וּבָשָׂר חוֹפִין אֶת רוּבוֹ – מוּתָר, אִם לֹא – אָסוּר.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: If the bone was broken and protruded outward, if skin and flesh cover the majority of it, it is permitted; if not, it is prohibited.

STATEMENT

וְכַמָּה רוּבוֹ? כִּי אֶתָּא רַב דִּימִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: רוּב עוֹבֵי, וְאָמַרִי לֵה: רוּב הָקִיפוּ.

And how much is 'the majority of it'? When Rav Dimi came, he said that Rabbi Yochanan said: The majority of its thickness; and some say: The majority of its circumference.

RULING

אָמַר רַב פָּפָא: הִלְפָּה, בְּעֵינֵן רוּב עוֹבֵי וּבְעֵינֵן רוּב הָקִיפוּ.

Rav Pappa said: Therefore, we require both the majority of its thickness and we require the majority of its circumference to be stringent.

STATEMENT

אָמַר עוּלָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: עוֹר הָרִי הוּא כְּבָשָׂר.

Ulla said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Skin is like flesh for the purpose of covering the break.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רב נחמן לעולא: ולימא מר עור מצטרף לבשר, דהא "עור ובשר" קתני!

Rav Nachman said to Ulla: But let Master say that skin combines with flesh, as the Braisa teaches 'skin and flesh' together!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אנן "עור או בשר" תנינן.

Ulla said to him: We learned the Braisa as 'skin or flesh', meaning either one alone is sufficient.

STATEMENT

איכא דאמרי [אמר עולא], אמר רבי יוחנן: עור מצטרף לבשר.

Some say a different version: Ulla said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Skin combines with flesh.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רב נחמן לעולא: ולימא מר עור משלים לבשר לחומרא!

Rav Nachman said to Ulla: But let Master say that skin only completes the flesh as a stringency, but skin alone is not enough!

PROOF

אמר ליה: אנא עובדא ידענא, דההוא בר גוזלא דההוה בי רבי יצחק, דעור מצטרף לבשר הוה, ואתא לקמיה דרבי יוחנן ואכשריה.

Ulla said to him: I know of an actual case, of a certain young pigeon that was in the house of Rabbi Yitzchak, where only skin combined with the flesh, and it came before Rabbi Yochanan and he declared it kosher.

REFUTATION

אמר ליה: בר גוזלא קאמרת? בר גוזלא דרביה שאני.

Rav Nachman said to him: You speak of a young pigeon? A young pigeon is different because its skin is soft and like flesh, but this does not apply to other animals.

STATEMENT

הנהו גידין רבין דאתו לקמיה דרבא, אמר רבא: למאי ליחוש להו? תדא, דאמר רבי יוחנן: גידין שסופן להקשות

Regarding certain soft sinews that came before Rabbah, Rabbah said: For what should we concern ourselves with them? Firstly, as Rabbi Yochanan said: Sinews that are destined to harden are considered hard already.

SUMMARY

The daf begins with the Mishnah's ruling that severing an animal's leg below the joint is kosher, while severing it above the joint, or removing the convergence of sinews (צמח הגידים), makes it a tereifa. If a bone is broken but the majority of the surrounding flesh remains intact, shechitah still purifies the animal from being neveilah and permits it for eating. The Gemara then debates the definition of the "leg joint," contrasting the view of Rav Yehuda (who identifies it as the lower joint) with

Ulla's view in the name of Rabbi Oshaya (who identifies it as the upper joint). Finally, the Gemara explores the exact boundaries of the convergence of sinews, bringing various opinions from Rabba, Rav Assi, and Shmuel, and provides practical physical signs—such as hardness, thickness, and whiteness—to identify these crucial sinews in both oxen and smaller animals.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In today's sugya, the Gemara asks a question that seems to make perfect sense to our human minds: how can it be that if you cut an animal's leg higher up it lives, but if you cut it lower down, at the convergence of the sinews, it dies? This seems completely backwards! To this, Rav Ashi gives us a fundamental rule in the laws of tereifos: "We do not compare different tereifot to one another, for behold, in one place one cuts it from here and it dies, and in another place one cuts it from there and it lives." The physical reality of what causes a fatal wound is a decree of the Torah, and our own human logic cannot always map out why one vulnerability is fatal while another is not.

This deep principle is not just about the physical anatomy of a kosher animal; it is a profound guide for our own avodah and how we look at our spiritual lives. So often, we try to apply our own logical calculations to our spiritual health. We think to ourselves, "If I can handle this major challenge, surely this small compromise won't hurt me," or "If that person fell from a seemingly minor test, then I must be in total danger." But Hashem created the human neshama with its own hidden spiritual anatomy. What keeps one person spiritually alive might be different from what causes another to stumble, and a small, seemingly minor point of vulnerability, like the small convergence of sinews, can sometimes be the very thing upon which our entire spiritual vitality depends.

We must stop comparing our spiritual struggles and situations to those of others, or even to our own past experiences. Hashem knows exactly how He designed your neshama and what it needs to stay healthy and whole. Instead of trying to rationalize why a certain mitzvah or fence is so critical, we must treat every single detail of halacha and every personal boundary with the utmost care, recognizing that we do not always see where the vital lifelines of our connection to Hashem truly run.

Today, identify one small spiritual boundary or halachic detail that you usually overlook because it seems "minor" or illogical to you, and guard it with absolute care, trusting that Hashem knows exactly what keeps your neshama alive.