

# III.

---

## BAVLI HULLIN CHAPTER THREE

### FOLIOS 42A-67B

#### 3:1

- A. These are the terefah [carcasses] among cattle:
- B. (1) one in which the gullet is pierced, (2) and one in which the windpipe is torn.
- C. (3) [If] the membrane of the brain is pierced, (4) [if] the heart is pierced up to the cavity thereof; (5) [if] the backbone is broken so that the spinal cord is severed; (6) [if] the liver is removed [missing], so that nothing whatsoever remains of it.
- D. (7) The lung that is pierced or lacking [any part thereof].
- E. R. Simeon says, “[It is not terefah] until its bronchial tubes are pierced.”
- F. (8) [If] the belly [abomasum] is pierced, (9) [if] the gallbladder is pierced, (10) [if] the intestines are pierced; (11) [if] the innermost belly [rumen] is pierced.
- G. (12) The greater part of the outer [exterior coating] which is pierced.
- H. R. Judah says, “In the case of a large [animal], a handbreadth, and in the case of a small one, its greater part.”
- I. (13) The omasum or the second stomach [reticulum] which are pierced on the outer side [exterior].
- J. (14) [If] it fell from the roof, (15) [if] the greater number of its ribs are broken.

J. And one which has been mauled by a wolf.

K. R. Judah says, “One mauled by a wolf, in the case of a small beast, and one mauled by a lion in the case of a large beast, one mauled by a hawk, in the case of small fowl, and one mauled by a falcon, in the case of large fowl.”

L. This is the general principle: Any the like of which does not live is terefah.

I.1 A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Where in the Torah is there an allusion to [the prohibition of eating an animal that is] *terefah*?”

B. Where [is there an allusion? There is an explicit rule]: “You shall not eat any flesh that is torn by beasts in the field” (Exo. 22:31). [Hence this rule is explicit.]

C. Rather [what did Simeon ask about]? Where in the Torah is there an allusion to [the principle that] a *terefah* is not considered to be alive?

D. *As it was taught in the concluding text of the Mishnah, [This is the general principle:] Any the like of which does not live is terefah [M. Hul. 3:1 L]. From there we may derive the principle that a terefah is not considered to be alive.*

E. *What is the source [in the Torah] of this assertion?* “[Say to the people of Israel], These are the living things which you may eat [among all the beasts that are on the earth]” (Lev. 11: 2). What is living, you may eat. What is not living, you may not eat. *You may derive the principle that a terefah is not considered to be alive.*

F. *And according to the authority who holds the view that a terefah is considered to be alive, what is the source of this assertion?*

G. *We derive it from, “These are the living things which you may eat.” [This implies that] “These are the living things” you may eat. Other living things you may not eat. You may derive the principle that a terefah is considered to be alive.*

H. *And how does the other authority [who holds that it is not considered to be alive] interpret this [word in the verse], “These”? It is necessary [for the verse to use the word] in accord with that which the House of R. Ishmael taught.*

I. *For the House of R. Ishmael taught: “These are the living things which you may eat” — this teaches us that the Holy One blessed be He held up one of each of the species and showed them to Moses and said to him, “This you may eat. This you may not eat.”*

J. *And does the other authority not need to interpret the verse in accord with that which the House of R. Ishmael taught? Of course. Accordingly what then is the source of the assertion that a terefah is considered to be alive?*

K. *You may derive it from another teaching of the House of R. Ishmael. For the House of R. Ishmael taught, “Between the living creature that may be eaten and the living*

creature that may not be eaten” (Lev. 11:47) — these [varieties of creatures] are the eighteen categories of *terefot* that were addressed to Moses at Sinai.

- L. *And are there no more [categories]? But lo there are the four more [categories in the Mishnah based on Tannaitic authority alluded to by a mnemonic] and the seven that were taught [by Amoraic authorities (Rashi)].*
- M. **[42b]** *This makes perfect sense according to the Tannaite authority of our Mishnah. We can say that the Tannaite authority taught [the rules in our Mishnah] and omitted [the other categories]. They are then subsumed in the general principle [M. Hul. 3:1 L].*
- N. *But according to the Tannaite authority of the House of R. Ishmael who said there are eighteen categories of terefot and no more, but lo there is [another category referred to in the following]: A beast, the [hind] legs of which are cut off [below the knee, is valid. If they are cut off] above the knee, it is invalid [M. 4:6 A-B].*
- O. *He [the Tanna] holds in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Eleazar who said, [If the bone broke and the juncture of the thigh-sinews is removed, it is invalid (M. Hul. 4: 6). And R. Simeon b. Eleazar declares valid,] because it can be cauterized and recover [T. 3:6 B-C].*
- P. *But even if it can be cauterized and recover, according to whom are we stating matters? According to the Tannaite authority of the House of Ishmael. And the Tannaite authority of the House of Ishmael reasons that a terefah is considered to be alive.*
- Q. *Rather he must reason in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Eleazar who said that it is valid. [The justification that it can be cauterized and recover is not essential to the view that it is valid.]*
- R. *But lo there is [another category of terefah — an animal that has an] abnormal deficiency of the spine. As it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah, How much is deemed a deficiency in the spine [of a skeleton so that it does not render unclean objects in a tent]? The House of Shammai say, “Two vertebrae.” And the House of Hillel say, “One vertebra” [M. Ohal. 2:3].*
- S. *And said R. Judah, said Samuel, “And the same [rule of deficiency in the spine applies] for [rendering the animal] a terefah.”*
- T. *[Count this deficiency of the spine is another category. Accordingly in order to preserve eighteen as the number of categories] The omasum or the second stomach [reticulum which are pierced on the outer side] [M. 3:1 H] that you*

*reckoned as two [categories], you should reckon them as one [category]. You take one out and add one in.*

U. *But lo there is [another category of terefah — an animal that] **has lost its hide [having been flayed] [M. 3:2 E].** You can reason in accord with the view of R. Judah who declares it valid.*

V. *But lo there is [another category of terefah — an animal whose] **[lung] is dried naturally [M. 3:2 D].***

W. *[If] **the gallbladder [is pierced] [M. 3:1 F],** who taught this rule? R. Yosé b. R. Judah [cf. b. 43a]. You can take out the gallbladder [from the list of eighteen] and put in the animal whose] **[lung] is dried naturally.***

X. *But lo there are [other categories of terefah, namely] the seven that were taught [by Amoraic authorities as follows]:*

Y. (1) For said R. Matna, “*This [case of an animal whose] femur slipped out of its socket [Cashdan] is terefah.*”

Z. (2) And said Rakhish bar Pappa in the name of Rab, “[An animal that was] *diseased in one kidney is terefah.*”

AA. (3) *And it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority, **[if] the spleen is removed [M. 3:2 C]** it is valid. And said R. Avira in the name of Raba, “They taught this rule only in the case where it was removed. But if it was pierced, it is terefah.”*

BB. (4) And said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said Samuel, “[If one of the throat] organs was for the most part [torn away and] dangling, it is *terefah.*”

CC. (5) And said Rabbah bar R. Shila, said R. Matna, said Samuel, “If a rib was torn away from its socket, [the animal] is *terefah.*”

DD. (6) And [if] the skull that was for the most part shattered, [the animal] is *terefah.*

EE. (7) And [if] the membrane that covers the rumen [that was for the most part torn], it is *terefah.*

FF. [How then do we maintain a list of eighteen categories of *terefah*?] *The eight [categories of terefah caused by] puncturing should be reckoned as one [category]. Take out seven and add seven others.*

GG. *If so then [the cases in M. of] severing are two categories that should be reckoned as one. You are then short [of eighteen by] one category.*

HH. *And further, the case of R. Avira in the name of Raba is also an instance of puncturing [and should be subsumed into this one category leaving us two categories short of eighteen].*

II. [43a] *Rather those two categories that you took out, you should not take them out.*  
[Then you are left with eighteen categories.]

**I.2** A. Said Ulla, “Eight kinds of *terefot* were stated to Moses at Sinai: [An animal with an organ that was damaged when it was] pierced, or severed, [of if the organ was] missing, or deficient, torn, or mauled, [of if the animal] suffered a fall, of suffered a fracture.”

B. *This excludes [as a category unto itself the case of] a diseased kidney, stated by Rakhish bar Pappa [above].*

C. Said R. Hiyya bar Rab [var. Raba], “There are eight [sub-categories of] *terefot* subsumed under the category of [an organ that was] pierced [enumerated in M. 3:1 B-H].”

D. *An if you say* [by way of objection] that there are nine [categories enumerated there, I can respond that the category of M. 3:1F,] the gallbladder [that was pierced is *terefah*, only] R. Yosé b. R. Judah *taught that one.*

E. *As it was taught on Tannaite authority*, If the belly [abomasum] was pierced, or if the intestines were pierced, it is *terefah*. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “Even if the gallbladder was pierced [it is *terefah*].”

F. [A mnemonic is given.] Said R. Isaac b. R. Joseph, said R. Yohanan, “The law follows in accord with R. Yosé b. R. Judah.”

G. And said R. Isaac b. R. Joseph, said R. Yohanan, “*What did the colleagues say in response to R. Yosé b. R. Judah?*” [They cited this verse where Job. proclaimed], “He pours out my gall on the ground” (Job. 16:13). And Job. went on living! [Therefore a pierced gallbladder is not a lethal wound.]

H. He said to them, “You cannot cite miraculous events [as proof regarding the laws of *terefah*]. *For if you do not state matters in this way* [then consider the first part of the verse], ‘He slashes open my kidneys, and shows no mercy.’ *Could someone live [with such a wound]? [Rather it must have been a miracle that Job. lived with a wound to his kidney.] And miracles are subject to different expectations. As it was written*, [‘And the Lord said to Satan, Behold, he is in your power;] only spare his life’ (Job. 2: 6). *Here too [in the case of his gallbladder] you say that miracles are subject to different expectations [and that is why Job. went on living].*

**I.3** A. And said R. Isaac b. R. Joseph, said R. Yohanan, “The law [concerning the liver that was removed (M. 3:1 C6)] is in accord with the authority who says [if] an olive’s bulk [of the liver remains it is valid].”

- B. *And did R. Yohanan say this?* But lo, said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Yohanan, “The law is in accord with the anonymous teaching in the Mishnah.” *And it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority, [If] the liver is removed so that nothing whatsoever remains of it [M. 3:1 C] [it is terefah].* Lo, if something remained it would be valid even if it was not an olive’s bulk.
- C. [Accordingly we must say that on this issue] *there is an Amoraic dispute about [the ruling of] R. Yohanan.*
- D. For said R. Isaac b. R. Joseph, said R. Yohanan, “A gallbladder that was pierced and the liver [rested on it and] closed it up, it is valid.”
- I.4** A. And said R. Isaac b. R. Joseph, said R. Yohanan, “If the gizzard was pierced and its membrane was intact, it is valid.”
- B. *They posed the question:* “If the gizzard was pierced and its membrane was intact, what is the law?”
- C. *Come and take note:* For said R. Nahman, “If this one was pierced [i.e., the gizzard] but not the other [i.e., the membrane], it is valid.”
- I.5** A. Said Raba, “The gullet has two layers of skin. The exterior one is red and the interior one is white. If this one was pierced but not the other, it is valid.”
- B. *Why must I state* that the exterior one is red and the interior one is white? [That has no bearing on the piercing of the organ.] [Because] if they are reversed in color [the organ is deemed defective and the animal is] *terefah*.
- C. *They posed the question:* *If the two of them [i.e., the skins of the gullet or the gizzard and its membrane] were pierced, but not opposite one another, what is the law?*
- D. *Said Mar Zutra in the name of R. Pappa, “In the case of the gullet, it is valid. In the case of the gizzard, it is not valid.”*
- E. *R. Ashi raised an objection to this. The contrary [conclusion makes more sense]. With regard to the gullet, the animal eats through it and breathes through it, and it contracts and expands. At times [the holes] may line up with one another [so it should not be valid]. The gizzard, that is always still, remains as it is [and the holes will not line up, so it should be valid].*
- F. *Said to him R. Aha the son of R. Joseph to R. Ashi, “This is what we have stated in the name of Mar Zutra who said in the name of R. Pappa in accord with your view.”*
- I.6** A. And said Rabbah, “A membrane that formed as a result of an injury to the gullet is not considered to be a membrane [with regard to the law of piercing].”

- B. And said Rabbah, “There is no valid external inspection of the gullet. It must be internal.” *In what case does this make a difference?* [43b] For the case of an animal about which there is a doubt whether it was mauled.
- C. *There once was a case of an animal about which there is a doubt whether it was mauled. It was brought before Rabbah. Rabbah was inspecting the gullet externally. Said to him Abbaye, “Was it not the master [i.e., you] who said, ‘There is no valid external inspection of the gullet. It must be internal?’”*
- D. *Rabbah turned it and inspected it [internally] and found on it two drops of blood and declared it to be terefah. And Rabbah did this [external inspection initially] in order to test the sharpness of Abbaye’s acumen.*
- I.7** A. Said Ulla, “If a thorn was lodged in its gullet we do not suspect that perhaps it [had pierced the gullet but then the wound] healed.”
- B. [A mnemonic is given.] *And according to the view of Ulla why is this case different from the case of a doubt as to whether the animal had been mauled?*
- C. *Ulla reasons that, “We are not concerned with the possibility of a case of a doubt as to whether the animal had been mauled.”*
- D. *And what is the difference between this [case of doubt whose significance he rejects] and [the case of doubt] concerning [two pieces of fat] — one of forbidden fat and one of permitted fat?*
- E. *There we have a definite presumption that a forbidden substance was present. [Here regarding the doubt about mauling, we are not sure that any forbidden substance exists.]*
- F. *And what is the difference between this case and the case of one who slaughters with a knife and afterward finds that it was defective?*
- G. *There the taint arose in the knife [not in the animal].*
- H. *And what is the difference between this case and the case of doubt concerning uncleanness in a private domain? [It should be deemed equivalent to that.] And a case of doubt in this instance is deemed to be unclean.*
- I. *But according to your logic we should compare this to a case of doubt concerning uncleanness in a public domain. And such a case of doubt is deemed to be clean. But there [in the case of these principles regarding doubt about uncleanness] we derive the rule from analogy to the laws for the suspected woman [see 9b above].*
- J. *A rabbi was sitting before R. Kahana. And he sat and he said, “[The law of A] was stated for a case where it [i.e., the thorn] was found [in the hollow of the gullet].*

*But where it was set [in the wall of the gullet] we do suspect [that perhaps it had pierced the gullet but then the wound healed].”*

K. *Said to them R. Kahana, “Pay no attention to him. [The law of A] was stated for a case where it was set [in the wall of the gullet]. But where it was found [in the hollow of the gullet], it was not necessary to state for Ulla [the rule] because [as a rule] all beasts that graze eat some thorns.”*

**I.8** A. *It was stated:* [To render the animal *terefah* the amount that must be pierced in] the pharynx [lit., the fore-court of the gullet (Cashdan), is a matter of dispute].

B. Rab said, “Any amount.”

C. And Samuel said, “The majority.”

D. Rab said, “Any amount” because it is a valid place [in the neck] to slaughter the animal.

E. And Samuel said, “The majority” because it is not a valid place [in the neck] to slaughter the animal.

F. *What is this pharynx?*

G. *Said Mari bar Mar Uqba, said Samuel, “Any place [in the gullet] where the opening widens as you cut, that is the pharynx. [Any place in the gullet] where the opening stays as it is as you cut, that is the gullet itself.”*

H. *Said to him R. Pappi, “The master did not state matters in this manner.”*

I. And who was [that master]? R. Bibi bar Abbayye. Rather [he said], “[Any place in the gullet] where the opening stays as it is as you cut it, that is the pharynx.”

J. Where then is the gullet itself? Any place where the opening contracts as you cut it.

K. *Jonah said [in the name of] Zira, “Where it swallows [that is the pharynx].”*

L. And how far [into the gullet does the pharynx extend]?

M. *Said R. Avya, “Less than the length of a grain of barley and more than the length of a grain of wheat.”*

**I.9** A. *There was an ox that belonged to the children of R. Uqba that they started to slaughter in the pharynx and completed [the incision] in the gullet itself. Said Raba, “I impose upon it the stringencies of the rulings of Rab and the stringencies of the rulings of Samuel and I rule that it is terefah.”*

B. *The stringencies of the rulings of Rab — for Rab said, “Any amount.” But did Rab not say that it a valid place [in the neck] for slaughter? This*



*accords with the rule of Samuel who says that it is not a valid place for slaughter.*

- C. *If you hold in accord with the view of Samuel, then did he not say [it is terefah only if he cut], “A majority”? This accords with Rab who said, “Any amount” [renders it terefah]. They went around and around on this matter [and there seemed to be no resolution].*
- D. *They brought it before R. Abba. He said to them, “Both in accord with Rab and in accord with Samuel an ox [slaughtered in this fashion] is permitted. Go and tell [Raba] the son of R. Joseph bar Hama to pay the value of the ox to the owner.”*
- E. *Said Mar the son of Rabina, “I can pose an objection to the enemies of Raba [from the following text]: **In general the law is in accord with the House of Hillel. But one who wishes to act [consistently] in accord with the words of the House of Shammai may do so. [One who wishes to act consistently in accord with] the words of the House of Hillel may do so. [One who wishes to act in accord with] the leniencies of the House of Shammai and the leniencies of the House of Hillel is evil. [44a] [One who wishes to act in accord with] the stringencies of the House of Shammai and the stringencies of the House of Hillel, about him Scripture says, “The fool walks in darkness” (Qoh. 2:14). But [it is proper] if one follows the House of Hillel [to follow both] their leniencies and their stringencies and if one follows the House of Shammai [to follow both] their leniencies and stringencies [T. Suk. 2:3].***
- F. *But this text itself contains a contradiction. It states, **In general the law is in accord with the House of Hillel. And then it teaches, But one who wishes to act [consistently] in accord with the words of the House of Shammai may do so.***
- G. *This is not a contradiction. This [latter statement that one may follow the House of Shammai was made] prior to the issuance of the heavenly echo [that proclaimed the law follows the House of Hillel]. And that [former statement that in general the law follows the House of Hillel was made] after the issuance of the heavenly echo.*
- H. *And if you prefer [both statements were made] even after the issuance of the heavenly echo. And this accords with the view of R. Joshua who said, “We do not pay heed to a heavenly echo.”*
- I. *In any case the objection stands [against Raba for ruling in accord with the stringencies of both Rab and of Samuel].*
- J. *Said R. Tabot, “[Raba] acted entirely in accord with the view of Rab.”*

K. *For when Rami bar Ezekiel came [from Israel] he said, "Pay no attention to these principles that Judah my brother brought in the name of Rab. This is what Rab said, 'For [defining the location of] the gullet the sages prescribed a fixed measure.'" We may derive [from this statement] the rule that the pharynx is not a valid place [in the neck] for slaughtering. And it states, "Any amount [makes it terefah]." [Accordingly Raba rules consistently in accord with Rab.]*

**I.10** A. At the top [of the gullet] how far [does the place valid for slaughter extend]? Said R. Nahman, "Up to [the place where there is enough left over] for the hand to grasp [the gullet at the top]."

B. At the bottom [of the gullet] how far [does the place valid for slaughter extend]? Said R. Nahman, said Rabbah bar Abbuha, "Up to the place where it has hair" [i.e., villi (Cashdan)].

C. *Is this the case?* Lo, said Rabina, said Geniba in the name of Rab, "The lower handbreadth in the gullet near the rumen, this is called the inner rumen."

D. *How* [could you say that the place where it has hair is a valid place for slaughter]? When he slaughters [the animal at that place] he is slaughtering in the rumen!

E. *It makes sense to maintain* that the handbreadth in the rumen near the gullet, this is called the inner rumen.

F. *If you prefer — what Rab spoke of was in reference to an ox where there is more hair [higher up on the gullet].*

**I.11** A. Said R. Nahman, said Samuel, "[In an animal even if] the pharynx is completely detached from the jaw, it is valid." *And our Tannaite authority teaches in accord with this: **And these are the valid [carcasses] among cattle: ... [if] the lower jaw is removed [M. 3:2].***

B. *R. Pappa objected [to the rule of Samuel], "But lo, there is [in such a case the defect of] the organs that are torn out."*

C. *But according to R. Pappa is there not a contradiction from the Mishnah itself: **And these are the valid [carcasses] among cattle: ... [if] the lower jaw is removed?***

D. *It is consistent to say that the Mishnah does not contradict the view of R. Pappa. Here [in the case where we declare it to be invalid the jaw] was torn away with force along with the surrounding flesh]. And here [in the case where we declare it valid the jaw] was torn away but remains embedded in the flesh near the organs. But according to Samuel the contradiction remains.*

E. *Do not say that all of it [was detached]. Say rather that a majority [was detached].*

- F. But lo, said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said Samuel, “[In a beast where the] organs were dangling, detached in the major part, it is *terefah*.”
- G. Said R. Shisha the son of R. Idi, “*Here [where we say it is valid] it was stripped apart [from the animal in a contiguous fashion]. Here [where we say that it is invalid] it was broken away [in various places from the flesh of the animal].*”

**II.1 A. [These are the *terefah* [carcasses] among cattle: (1) one in which the gullet is pierced,] (2) and one in which the windpipe is torn. It was taught:** How much constitutes a torn windpipe? A majority.

- B. And how much is a majority?
- C. Rab said, **[44b]** “A majority of the thickest part.”
- D. And others say, “A majority of [the circumference of] its cavity.”
- E. *An animal with a torn windpipe was brought before Rab. He sat and inspected it to see if a majority of the thickest part [was torn].* Said to him R. Kahana and R. Assi to Rab, “Did not our master instruct us that [it is rendered invalid if it was torn] in a majority of its cavity?”
- F. *He sent it before Rabbah bar bar Hannah who inspected it [to determine if it was torn through] a majority of its cavity. And he declared it valid. And he bought from it thirteen ordinary istirae’s worth of meat.*
- G. *But how could he have done this [reversing another sage’s decision]? For lo it was taught on Tannaite authority, **Once a sage has declared something unclean his colleague is not permitted to declare it clean. [Once a sage has] declared something forbidden his colleague is not permitted to declare it permitted [T. Ed. 1:5].***
- H. *This case is different because Rab did not declare it forbidden. [The general rule does not pertain to it.]*
- I. [Now what about the conflict of interest?] *Since the sage issued a ruling concerning [the meat], how could he eat from it?* But lo, it is written, “Then I said, ‘Ah Lord God! behold, I have never defiled myself; from my youth up till now I have never eaten what died of itself or was torn by beasts, nor has foul flesh come into my mouth’” (Eze. 4:14). “Behold, I have never defiled myself,” [means that I was so pious that] I never reflected during the day about becoming unclean at night. “From my youth up till now I have never eaten what died of itself or was torn by beasts,” [means, I was so pious that] I never in my life ate meat [from an animal at the point of death that was slaughtered in haste as they cried out], “Slaughter it, slaughter it.” “Nor has foul flesh come into my mouth,”

[means] that I never ate from an animal [about whose validity there was some question and] a sage pronounced it [was valid]. In the name of R. Nathan they said [the last phrase means], “I never ate from an animal whose priestly gifts had not been given.” [This was an act of piety because as a priest he could have eaten it anyway.]

- J. *This concern [that it is an act of piety not to eat meat that a sage pronounced valid] applies to a case [where there was a question and he declared it valid] based on an issue of logical reasoning.*
- K. *Rabbah bar bar Hannah [in C above] provided [additional] support [for his decision to reverse the ruling and to permit the meat].*
- L. *But let us exclude this [justification] because there is a suspicion [that the sage is taking compensation for a favorable ruling]. As it was taught on Tannaite authority, **[A judge] after he rendered the judgement, declared [the material] exempt or liable, unclean or clean, prohibited or permitted, and the witnesses who testified, all of them are permitted to purchase [a portion of the material about which they rendered judgement]. But the sages said, “Make yourself distant from what is ugly or what appears ugly” [T. Yeb. 4:7 and ARN 2].***
- M. *This concern applies to something that one purchases through an appraisal [of the value of the object]. Here [in the case of meat] its weight is the evidence [that he receives no benefit from his ruling].*
- N. *[This case is similar to] this one. Rabbah permitted [by his ruling the consumption of an animal that was thought to be] a terefah and he purchased meat from it. Said to him the daughter of R. Hisda, “My father permitted [by his ruling the consumption of an animal that was] a firstling and he did not buy meat from it.” He said to her, “This concern applies to a firstling that is sold by appraisal. Here [in the case of terefah] its weight is the evidence [that I received no benefit from my ruling]. What other [suspicion] is there? [Might they suspect] that I received the best cut of the meat? [That is not a pertinent suspicion.] Every day they sell me the best cut of the meat [out of respect].”*
- O. Said R. Hisda, “Who is considered a [true] disciple of the sages? He who sees [that it is proper to rule] that his own animal is *terefah*.” And said R. Hisda, “Who is [the true subject of the verse], [He who is greedy for unjust gain

makes trouble for his household, but] he who hates bribes will live' (Pro. 15:27)? He who sees [that it is proper to rule] that his own animal is *terefah*."

P. Mar Zutra expounded in the name of R. Hisda, "Anyone who recites the Scripture and repeats the Mishnah and who sees [that it is proper to rule] that his own animal is *terefah*, and who serves disciples of the sages, about him Scripture says, 'You shall eat the fruit of the labor of your hands; you shall be happy, and it shall be well with you' (Psa. 128: 2)."

Q. R. Zebid said, "He [who acts in this manner] merits and inherits both worlds — this world and the world to come. 'You shall be happy,' in this world. 'And it shall be well with you,' in the world to come."

R. *When they sent something to R. Eleazar from the Patriarch's house, he would not take it. And when they invited him [for a meal] he would not go. He said, "The master [by doing this shows that he] does not want me to live. For it is written, 'He who hates bribes will live' (Pro. 15:27)."*

S. *When they sent something to R. Zira [from the Patriarch's house,] he would not take it. And when they invited him [for a meal] he would go. He said, [45a] "They receive honor by honoring me [so when I go it is not a bribe for me]."*

**II.2** A. Said R. Judah, said Rab, "If [the windpipe] was pierced [with a number of perforations] like a sieve, they combine them together to constitute a majority [and render the animal a *terefah*]." [Holes combine to constitute the measure for a tear in the windpipe.]

B. R. Jeremiah posed a question, "And regarding a skull that has one long hole [this is a sign the animal is *terefah*]. Or if there were many holes, they combine them together to constitute [the minimum measure of the size of] a drill hole. *It seems [logical to conclude] that since the [minimum] measure is [the size of] a drill hole, they combine together to constitute [a measure the size of] a drill hole. Here as well [with regard to the measure of a hole in the windpipe that constitutes a terefah] since its [minimum] measure is [the size of] an issar [a small coin], they combine together to constitute [a measure the size of] an issar.*" [He argues that

you should reckon holes in regard to the measure for holes, not the measure for a tear in the windpipe.]

- C. *He [Jeremiah] must have neglected that said by R. Helbo, said R. Hama bar Gorla, said Rab, “Holes resulting from a loss [of a piece of bone or cartilage] combine together to constitute [a measure the size of] an issar. [Holes] not resulting from a loss [but rather from a piercing] combine together to constitute a majority [of the circumference, that is a tear that would invalidate the windpipe].” [Judah in A referred to a case of the latter kind of piercing.]*
- D. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Joshua b. Levi, “If he removed a strip [from the windpipe], it combines [with other holes] to constitute [a measure] the size of an *issar* [to invalidate the animal].”
- E. R. Isaac bar Nahmani *asked* R. Joshua b. Levi, “If [the windpipe] was pierced [with a number of perforations] like a sieve, what is the law?”
- F. He said to him, “Lo, they said, ‘Holes resulting from a loss [of a piece of bone or cartilage] combine together to constitute [a measure the size of] an *issar*. [Holes] not resulting from a loss [but rather from a piercing] combine together to constitute a majority.’”
- G. *What is the law for fowl?* [What is the minimum measure for holes that result from a loss in its windpipe?]
- H. Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani, “This was interpreted for me by R. Eleazar. [He cuts around all the holes in the windpipe until he can fold over the tissue with the holes.] He folds the tissue and places it over the opening of the windpipe. If it covers the majority of the windpipe, it is *terefah*. And if not then it is valid.”
- I. Said R. Pappa, “And the mnemonic [for this interpretation is]: a sieve. [When he folds the tissue with the holes over the opening it looks like a sieve.]”
- J. If it [the windpipe] was slashed [in three ways so that the tissue was hanging] like a door — said R. Nahman, “[It is *terefah* if there is enough room in the opening] so that an *issar* could pass through it across the width [of the opening, but not if it can pass through only diagonally].”
- II.3** A. If it [the windpipe] was slit lengthwise — said Rab, “Even if there remained only one ring intact at the top and one ring intact at the bottom [but all the other rings were split] it is valid.”

- B. *They said this before R. Yohanan. He said, "What is [the need for] this ring [to be intact at the top] and what is [the need for] this ring [to be intact at the bottom] that Rab spoke of? Rather it makes sense to maintain that even if there remained any amount [intact] at the top and any amount at the bottom, it is valid."*
- C. *They said this before R. Yohanan in this regard in the name of R. Jonathan. He said to them, "Those Babylonian associates know how to interpret things in a logical way."*

**II.4** A. *R. Hiyya bar Joseph taught in the name of R. Yohanan, "Any place in the neck is valid for slaughtering, from the large ring until the bottom lobe of the lung."*

- B. Said Raba, "The bottom [lobe actually] means the upper [lobe that is found at the bottom]. For I say that [you may slaughter anywhere that is accessible] as it [naturally] extends its neck to graze. But you may not force it [to extend its neck to find additional accessible places to slaughter]."
- C. *R. Hanina posed a question. And alternatively: R. Hanania. "What is the law if it forced itself [to extend its neck]?"*
- D. *The question stands unresolved.*
- E. *R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish were sitting and they jointly issued the following rule of law: If [an animal] was forced [to stretch] its organs and he slaughtered [at a place in the neck ordinarily inaccessible] it is invalid. If the windpipe was pierced below in the breast, it is judged to be [a puncture] in the lung.*
  - F. ***Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority, What is the breast? Whatever is visible from the ground and upward, through to the neck, and downward through to the belly. One cuts it off and removes it from between the two walls on either side [T. 9:13 A-C].***
  - G. And this is the breast that is given to the priests.

**III.1** A. **[If] the membrane of the brain is pierced [M. 3:1 C].** *Rab and Samuel, the two of them said, "[This rule refers to a case where] the exterior membrane [was pierced, the dura mater (Cashdan)], even if the interior membrane [pia mater (Cashdan)] was not pierced [it is terefah]."*

- B. *And there are those that say [it is not terefah] until the interior membrane is pierced.*
  - C. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani, "Your mnemonic for this is: The sack in which the brain rests." [The word for sack, *hyyt*, resembles the word for living, *hy*.]



- D. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Joshua b. Levi, “The same [structure of interior and exterior membranes] is observable in the [animal’s] testicles.”
- E. Said R. Simeon b. Pazzi, said R. Joshua b. Levi, in the name of Bar Qappara, “The brain is defined as all that is found in the cranium. Where it starts to draw away [from the cranium] that is defined as the spinal cord.”
- F. *And from what point* does it start to draw away?
- G. Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani, “R. Joshua b. Levi’s [rule] was explained to me. There are two bean [shaped objects, i.e., the occipital condyles that articulate the cranium to the first vertebra (Cashdan)] **[45b]** attached at the cranial opening. From the place of these beans and inside [the cranium] is defined as part of the [brain] inside. And from the place of these beans and outside [the cranium] is defined as [the spinal cord] outside. And at the place of these beans themselves, I do not know [the law]. But it makes sense that they are [defined as part of the brain] inside.”
- H. *R. Jeremiah examined a fowl and found objects like two beans attached at the cranial opening.*

**IV.1 A. [If] the heart is pierced up to the cavity thereof [M. 3:1 C].**

- B. *R. Zira posed the question: [Does this mean] the small cavity [the atrium] or the large cavity [the ventricle]?*
- C. *Said to him Abbaye, “What is your question? Was it not taught [in an analogous case] in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority, **R. Simeon says, ‘[It is not terefah] until its bronchial tubes are pierced’ [M. 3:1 E]?** And said Rabbah bar Tahlifa, said R. Jeremiah bar Abba, said Rab, [this means], “Until its large bronchial tube is pierced.”*
- D. [Zira answered], “*Are these cases comparable? There it is taught, **Bronchial tubes**, [lit., the housing of the tubes, which implies] to the place where the bronchial tubes all converge. And here it is taught, **The cavity**, [lit., the housing of the heart]. What is the difference to me if it refers to the large cavity or the small cavity?*” [In either case it is *terefah*.]

**IV.2 A. [Concerning a piercing of] the main artery of the heart [i.e., the aorta] —**

- B. Rab says, “Any amount [renders the animal *terefah*].”
- C. And Samuel says, “A majority [renders the animal *terefah*].”
- D. *Where is the aorta?*
- E. Said Rabbah bar Isaac, said Rab, “It is the fat [artery] adjacent to the walls [of the chest cavity].”



F. The walls? *Does that make sense?* Rather [say that it is the artery that is] adjacent to the walls of the lung [i.e., the mediastal cavity (Cashdan)].

G. Said Amemar in the name of R. Nahman, “*There are three [large] arteries. One diverges to the heart [i.e. the aorta]. One diverges to the lungs [i.e., the windpipe, not an artery]. And one diverges to the liver [i.e., the vena cava inferior (Cashdan)]. The one that diverges to the lung is considered to be part of the lung [with regard to defects in the animal]. The one that diverges to the liver is considered to be part of the liver. The one that diverges to the heart, is the subject of a dispute.*”

H. R. Hiyya bar Rab went and recited the teaching of Rab in front of Samuel. He said to him, “*If this is what Abba [Rab] said, then he knew nothing about [the laws of] terefot.*”

**V.1 A. [If] the backbone is broken [so that the spinal cord is severed] [M. 3:1 C].**

B. *It was taught on Tannaite authority, If the spinal cord was snapped [Talmud here adds: through a majority of the cord], it is invalid [Talmud adds: the words of Rabbi]. R. Jacob says, “Even if it [the spinal cord] was perforated, [it is invalid] [T. 3:1 F-G].”*

C. Rabbi taught [that the law was] in accord with R. Jacob.

D. Said R. Huna, “The law is not in accord with R. Jacob.”

E. And how much constitutes a majority [of the cord]? Rab said, “A majority of its skin [i.e., its membrane].”

F. *And some say,* “A majority of its inner matter [i.e., of the medulla (Cashdan) even if the membrane is intact].”

G. *According to the authority who says [it is terefah if severed in], “A majority of its inner matter,” certainly [it is terefah if severed in], “A majority of the skin” [because once the membrane breaks the spinal matter will cease to be intact].*

H. *But according to the authority who says [it is terefah if severed in], “A majority of its skin,” what is the law [if it is severed in], “A majority of its inner matter?”*

I. *Come and take note:* For said Nivli, said R. Huna, “The majority about which they spoke refers to the majority of the skin. [Severing] this inner matter makes no difference at all.”

- J. *R. Nathan bar Abin was sitting before Rab. He inspected [a spinal cord for severance] of the majority of its skin and he inspected it [for severance] of a majority of its inner matter.*
- K. He [Rab] said to him, "If the majority of the skin is intact, [severing of] this inner matter makes no difference at all."

**V.2** A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Joshua b. Levi, "[If the spinal matter] turned into liquid, it is invalid. [If the spinal matter] turned soft, it is invalid." What is the definition of "turned into liquid"? And what is the definition of "turned soft"? "Turned into liquid" [means] it can be poured. "Turned soft" [means] it cannot stand [on its own without a container].

B. R. Jeremiah *posed the question*: If it cannot stand [on its own] because of its own weight, *what is the law?*

C. *The question stands unresolved.*

- D. The House of Rab say, "If it turned soft, it is invalid. If it disintegrated [in part], it is valid."
- E. *They posed this objection*: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "An animal whose spinal matter disintegrated is *terefah*."
- F. [They responded:] That was stated [actually where it] turned soft.
- G. *Does that make sense? But lo, Levi was sitting in the baths. He saw a person who hit his head [and injured his spine].*
- H. *He said [about him], "This man's spine has disintegrated."*
- I. *Did he not imply [by saying this that because of the injury] the man could not continue to live?*
- J. *Said Abbaye, "No. He meant to say that he was rendered impotent [as a result of such an injury]."*

**V.3** A. *How long is the spinal cord [as far as the laws of defects are concerned]?* Said R. Judah, said Samuel, "[It extends] to the place where the [sacral] nerves branch off."

B. *R. Dimi bar Isaac had to go to Be Huzai. He came before R. Judah. He said to him, "Will the master please show me where is the place where the nerves branch off?"*

C. *He said to him, "Go fetch me a kid and I will show you."*

D. *He brought him a fattened kid. He said to him, "[The nerves] are embedded too much [in the fat] and I cannot identify them."*

- E. *He brought him a thin kid. He said to him, "[The nerves] are protruding too much [and are too close to the bones] and I cannot identify them."*
- F. *He said to him, "Come and I will teach you the rule [in any case even though I cannot demonstrate it for you]. This is what Samuel said, '[Any severing of the cord] up to the first branch [of the nerves] is terefah. After the third branch, it is valid. In the second branch, I do not know [the law].'"*
- G. R. Huna the son of R. Joshua *posed a question: [46a]* [Does Samuel in his ruling mean] up to and including [that place in the spinal cord] or perhaps [he means] up to but not including [that place]?
- H. R. Pappa *posed a question:* If you wish to say that [Samuel means] up to but not including [that place], then what is the law with regard to [severing at] the point it branches off? [Cashdan: the point in the cord where the first pair of sacral nerves is given off.]
- I. R. Jeremiah *posed a question:* If you wish to say that [Samuel means] up to and including [that place], then what is the law with regard to [severing in] the point it branches off itself?
- J. *Come and take note:* The branch is judged [to have the same rules] as the meat [of the animal, not as an organ]. *Does this not mean* the first or the second [point of] branching?
- K. No, [it means] the third [point of] branching.

- V.4** A. *In a fowl* [up to what point in the spinal cord does severing render it *terefah*]?
- B. R. Yannai says, "[Any place in the cord down to the area] below the wings [i.e., the bottom of the wings]."
- C. And Resh Laqish says, "Until [the area of the cord parallel to the area] between the wings [i.e., the top of the wings]."
- D. Said Ulla, "*I was standing before Ben Pazzi and they brought before him a fowl. And he inspected it [for defects of the spinal cord] up to the area between the wings. And the House of the Patriarch sent for him [before he could inspect any further]. And I did not know if [he stopped inspecting the cord] because held the view that you do not have to inspect [the cord for defects] any further or [whether he stopped inspecting at that point] out of respect to [the summons of] the House of the Patriarch."*

- VI.1** A. [If] the liver is removed [missing], so that nothing whatsoever remains of it [M. 3:1 C]. *Lo [this implies] that if any amount [of the liver] remains, it is valid, even if it was not equivalent to the volume of an egg's bulk. But lo, it was taught*

on Tannaite authority, **[It is valid if] the liver is removed, but an olive's bulk of which remains [M. 3:2 C]!**

B. Said R. Joseph, "*This is not a contradiction. One is the ruling of R. Hiyya and the other is the ruling of R. Simeon bar Rabbi. [Regarding an animal with less than an olive's bulk of liver] like this case, R. Hiyya used to discard it [because he ruled it was terefah], and R. Simeon b. Rabbi would dip it [i.e., eat it because he ruled that it was valid. Rashi interprets the views in reverse. R. Hiyya used to discard the liver. Accordingly he was lenient in rules regarding any defects in it. But R. Simeon used to dip the liver and eat it for his health. Accordingly he was stricter in rules regarding defects in the liver. But this is contradicted by the following.]*"

C. A mnemonic [for these rulings]: *the wealthy are stingy* [i.e., R. Simeon b. Rabbi was more lenient even though he could have afforded to discard the animal].

**VI.2** A. *There was a regiment that came to Pumbedita. Rabbah and R. Joseph fled. R. Zira met them. He said to them, "You who flee [should remember this teaching]: the olive's bulk about which they spoke [in the Mishnah] refers to [that amount] in the area of the gall-bladder."* [Perhaps this was an indirect chastisement that the rabbis remain in the town where it is bitter because of the occupation by a regiment.]

B. R. Ada bar Ahbah said, "[The olive's bulk referred to in the Mishnah is that amount] in the vital area [of the liver, i.e., by the falciform ligament (Cashdan)]."

C. *Said R. Pappa, "Therefore [because of these two rulings] we require [for the animal to be valid both] an olive's bulk in the area of the gall-bladder and an olive's bulk in the vital area [of the liver]."*

D. R. Jeremiah *posed a question*: What is the rule in the case of [an animal that has an olive's bulk of liver, but only] if he collects [smaller portions of liver together]? What is the rule in the case [of an animal that has] an olive's bulk [of liver in the thin shape] of a lace?

E. R. Ashi *posed a question*: What is the rule in the case of [an animal that has an olive's bulk of liver] that is flattened out?

F. *These questions remain unresolved.*

**VI.3** A. R. Zeriqa *posed a question to R. Ammi*: What is the rule in the case of an animal whose liver was dangling, but still attached to the diaphragm?

B. *He said to him, “I do not know [what problem there is] concerning this [case of a liver that is] dangling. If we hold in accord with the authority who says [to be valid the animal must have an olive’s bulk of liver] in the area of the gall-bladder, lo, you have it. And if we hold in accord with the authority who says [to be valid the animal must have an olive’s bulk of liver] in the vital area, lo you have it.”*

**VII.1** A. **The lung which is pierced...** [M. 3:1 D]. Rab and Samuel and R. Assi say, *“The exterior membrane [must be pierced to render it invalid].”*

B. *And others say about this, “The interior membrane [must be pierced].”*

C. Said R. Joseph bar Manyomi, said R. Nahman, *“A mnemonic: The red coat in which the lungs are situated [i.e., the interior membrane, parenchyma pulmonis (Cashdan)].”*

D. *It is obvious that if the exterior membrane is pierced and the interior membrane is not pierced, the interior membrane will protect [the lung]. This accords with the rule of Rabbah. For said Raba, “This [animal whose] lung had [its exterior membrane] peeled off so that it looked like [46b] a red date is valid.”*

E. *If the interior membrane was pierced but the exterior membrane was not pierced, does it protect [the lung] or not?*

F. *R. Aha and Rabina disputed. One said it does not protect and one said it does protect. And the law follows in accord with the authority who says it does protect [the lung].*

F. *And this is in accord with the view of R. Joseph. For said R. Joseph, “A lung that hisses [with a leak of air when inflated] — if we know where it is hissing, we put on it a feather or some saliva or straw, and if it bubbles [or wobbles, the animal] is terefah. If it does not, it is valid. And if we do not know where it is hissing, we bring a tub of warm water and we immerse [the lung] in it [to locate the leak]. It cannot be hot water because this would cause contraction [and we could not locate the leak]. It cannot be cold water because this would cause hardening [and the membrane might crack]. But we immerse it in warm water and we inflate it. If it bubbles, it is terefah. If it does not, it is valid. [We conclude in the latter case that] the interior membrane is pierced and the exterior membrane is not pierced. And the hissing sound is air flowing between the membranes.”*

**VII.2** A. [A mnemonic is given.] Reverting to the body of the prior text: Said Raba, *“This [animal whose] lung had [its exterior membrane] peeled off so that it looked like a red date is valid.”*

- B. And said Raba, “[If an animal’s] lung that turned partially red, it is valid. [If it turned] completely red, it is terefah.”
- C. Said Rabina to Raba, “On what basis [do we rule that if it turned] partially [red it is valid]? Because [an animal that has such a condition] will [ordinarily] return to health. [An animal with a lung that turned] completely [red] will also [ordinarily] return to health. Was it not taught on Tannaite authority, “[If one wounded on the Sabbath] other creeping or crawling animals [he is not liable for violating the Sabbath] unless they bleed.” [This implies that if the creature turned red without bleeding it is not considered an injury of any consequence. But if you maintain that we compare [our issue of a defect in the lung with the Sabbath law for] the eight [kinds of] creeping animals [this will also lead to an inconsistency]. For it was taught on Tannaite authority, If [he caused a wound so that] the blood coalesced [under the skin], even if it did not bleed [he is liable for violating the Sabbath]. If [you compare our case to this one] then [you should conclude] that even if [the lung turned red] partially it also [should be deemed terefah].
- D. Rather [in regard to the status of the animal whose lung turned either partially or completely red] there is no difference. [Some commentators interpret that this means in either case the animal is deemed valid. Some say, terefah.]

- VII.3** A. And said Raba, “An [animal with a] lung that dried up partially is terefah.” And how much [must dry up for it to be deemed terefah]?
- B. Said R. Pappi in the name of Raba, “[Dry enough] so that [scraping it with] a fingernail will crack it.”
- C. In accord with what authority is this rule? In accord with R. Yosé b. Meshullam. For it was taught on Tannaite authority, **What is the meaning of ‘dried up’ [in reference to the ear of a firstling that is deemed a blemish]? Such that if it is pierced it does not produce a drop of blood. R. Yosé b. Meshullam says, “‘Dried’ means that it crumbles [by scraping it with] a fingernail [M. Bekh. 6:1 C-E].”**
- D. You can even say [that the rule for a dried lung is consistent with the rule of] the rabbis [regarding a firstling]. [You can argue

*that] with regard to the ear of a firstling that is exposed to the air, [even a partially dried ear] will not return to health. But a [partially dried] lung that is not exposed to the air will return to health.*

- E. *And said Raba, "A lung that had scabs all over it, black spots all over it, white spots all over it, it is valid."*
- F. *Said Amemar in the name of Raba, "We do not make comparison tests of cysts." [If a burst cyst is found on the lung we do not compare it to another on the lung to determine whether it constitutes a defect.]*
- G. *And said Raba, "[Animals that have] these two lobes of the lung that adhere to one another cannot be inspected [without thereby tearing the tissue]."*
- H. *And we say this only with regard to [lobes that adhered to one another] that were not aligned properly. But concerning those [that adhered to one another] that were in their proper alignment, this is effective [for them to prevent defects].*
- I. **[47a]** *And said Raba, "These two cysts [on the lung] that are adjacent to one another are no subject to inspection. [They are definite symptoms of an underlying defect.]*
- J. *"If there is one [cyst] that looks like two, we take a thorn and lance it. If [the fluid] flows from one to the other, it is one [cyst] and it is valid. If not, it is two [cysts] and it is terefah."*
- K. *And said Raba, "The lung has five lobes. Facing the animal, there are three on the right and two on the left. If there are fewer or more or they are reversed, it is terefah."*
- L. *These [lungs of an animal with] an added lobe were brought before Meremar [for a ruling].*
- M. *R. Aha was sitting at the gate.*
- N. *He [Aha] said to him [the one who inquired], "What did he say to you?"*
- O. *He said to him, "He declared them valid."*
- P. *He said to him, "Take them before him again [for another ruling]."*



- Q. *He [Meremar] said to him [the inquirer], “Go tell the one who sits at the gate that the law does not follow in accord with Raba with regard to a case of an additional lobe [in the lung].”*
- R. *And this concern applies where it is found in among the lobes. But if it was found between the lungs, it is terefah.*
- S. *These [lungs of an animal with an added lobe] between the lungs were brought before R. Ashi [for a ruling]. R. Ashi reasoned that he should declare them terefah.*
- T. *Said to him R. Huna mar bar Avya, “All healthy grazing animal have this lobe. And the butchers call it the fragile little rose lobe.”*
- U. *And this concern applies when [the added lobe between the lungs] is found in the front. [47b] But when it is found behind [the lungs], even if it is [as small as] a myrtle leaf, it is terefah.*
- V. *Said Rafram, “This lung that resembles wood is terefah.” Some say [this means like wood] in appearance.*
- W. *Some say, in texture. Some say, pale [like wood]. Some say, hard [like wood].*
- X. *Some say, smooth [like wood] with no indentations in the lobe.*
- Y. *Said Raba, “If it [the lung] is blue, it is valid. But if it is inky black, it is terefah.”*
- Z. *For said R. Hanina, “A black [lung is but a] red [lung] that was diseased.”*
- AA. *A green [lung] is valid in accord with the view of R. Nathan. A red [lung] is valid in accord with the view of R. Nathan.*
- BB. *As it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Nathan says, “Once I went to the towns by the sea. A Woman came before me who had circumcised her first son and he died. [She circumcised] her second son, and he died. Her third son she brought before me [for a ruling]. I observed that he was flushed red. I said to her, ‘My daughter. Wait until his blood is circulating better.’ She waited for him [to improve], and then she circumcised him and he lived. And they named him after me, Nathan the Babylonian.*
- CC. *“And another time I went to the province of Cappadocia. A woman came before me who had circumcised her first son and he died. [She circumcised] her second son, and he died. Her third son she brought before me [for a ruling]. I observed that he was greenish [anemic (Cashdan)]. I examined him and determined that he did not have blood suitable for circumcision. I said to her, ‘My daughter.*



Wait until his blood pressure improves.’ She waited for him [to improve], and then she circumcised him and he lived. And they named him after me, Nathan the Babylonian.”

**VII.4** A. Said R. Kahana, “[A lung that looks in its color] like a liver is valid. [If it looks] like flesh, it is *terefah*.” And a mnemonic for this [rule is the verse where the words flesh and *terefah* appear together], “Therefore you shall not eat any flesh that is torn by beasts in the field (*terefah*)” (Exo. 22:31).

B. *Said R. Sama the son of Raba, “A lung that looks [in color] like cuscuta or like a crocus or like an egg [yolk] is terefah. Rather what is the definition of the green color that is [for a lung] valid? Green like a leek.”*

**VII.5** A. *Said Rabina, “[If there is] an obstruction in the lung, they take a knife and cut into it. If pus exudes then it is surely on account of the pus [that there was an obstruction, not another defect] and it is valid. And if none exudes then they place upon it a feather or some saliva. If it flutters or bubbles [because air passes through], then it is valid. And if not, it is terefah [because this is a substantive defect of the lung].”*

B. Said R. Joseph, “A membrane that forms as a result of an injury to the lung is not [a valid] membrane [and the animal is *terefah*].”

C. *And said R. Joseph, “A lung that hisses [with a leak of air when inflated] — if we know where it is hissing, we put on it a feather or some saliva or straw, and if it bubbles [or wobbles, the animal] is terefah. If it does not, it is valid. And if we do not know where it is hissing, we bring a tub of warm water and we immerse [the lung] in it [to locate the leak]. It cannot be hot water because this would cause contraction [and we could not locate the leak]. It cannot be cold water because this would cause hardening [and the membrane might crack]. But we immerse it in warm water and we inflate it. If it bubbles, it is terefah. If it does not, it is valid. [We conclude in the latter case that] the interior membrane is pierced and the exterior membrane is not pierced. And the hissing sound is air flowing between the membranes.”*

D. Said Ulla, said R. Yohanan, “A lung whose tissue flows like liquid [inside of its membranes] is valid. *It seems [logical to conclude] that he reasons that a defect inside [the tissue of the lung] does not have the status of a defect [that renders the animal terefah].”*

E. *R. Abba raised an objection to Ulla, “[The Mishnah says], **The lung which is pierced or lacking [any part thereof].** What does **lacking** mean? If you say it means lacking on the exterior, that is the same as **pierced**. So does it not mean lacking*

*on the interior. And so we may derive from this that any lack on the interior has the status of a lack [that renders the animal terefah].”*

- F. No. *[This objection does not stand.] It is consistent to say that **lacking** refers to the exterior. And what [about what] was stated [as an objection that this is redundant because] that is the same as **pierced**? It is necessary [to state both] in accord with the view of R. Simeon who said, “[It is not terefah] until its bronchial tubes are pierced.” This concern applies to a hole [puncture] that does not lack [any tissue, i.e., that it must go deep.] But with regard to a hole that does lack [tissue] even R. Simeon agrees [that it is terefah even if it does not pierce the bronchial tubes].*
- G. R. Hanina became infirm. R. Nathan and all of the great rabbis of the generation came up to visit him. They brought before him [for a ruling] a lung whose tissue flowed like liquid [inside of its membranes] and he declared it valid.
- H. Said Raba, “And this [is the rule in an instance where] the bronchial tubes are intact.”
- I. Said R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi, “How do we determine [whether they are intact]?” He said to him, “They bring a glazed pot and they pour [the liquified lung matter] into it. If there are white streaks in it, it is terefah. And if not, it is valid.”
- J. Said R. Nahman, “A lung whose tissue liquified but whose membranes are intact is valid.”
- K. It was taught on Tannaite authority also in this regard, A lung whose tissue liquified but whose membranes are intact, even if it [the cavity caused by the change] had the volume of a quarter log, it is valid.
- L. If its womb was missing [48a], it is valid. If its liver became worm-infested [the law is unclear]. [Regarding] this [case] was an incident where the residents of Asia Minor came up on three occasions to Yavneh [seeking a ruling on the matter]. On the third [occasion a decision was rendered] that permitted [such a case] for them.

- VII.6** A. Said R. Joseph bar Manyomi, said R. Nahman, “[Regarding] a lung that adjoins the wall [of the chest cavity], we are not concerned [that it is a sign of a terefah]. If ulcerations erupted [on the lung near the place it adjoins the chest], we are concerned [that this indicates it is a terefah].”
- B. Mar Judah in the name of Abimi said, “In both [of the above] cases we are concerned [that the animal is terefah].”

- C. *What is the procedure [for determining whether it is a sign of a terefah]? Said Raba, “Rabin bar Sheba explained to me that we bring a sharpened knife [i.e., a scalpel] and we detach it [the lung from the wall of the chest]. If there is a taint on the wall (Cashdan), we then presume that [some secretion from] the chest wall caused [the lung to adhere to the wall]. And if not, then [some secretion] from the lung caused [the adhesion] and it is terefah.”*
- D. *[And this is the case] even if air does not escape [from the lung after it is detached from the chest wall. Most MSS omit this last phrase.]*

- VII.7** A. *R. Nehemiah the son of R. Joseph inspected it [the lung detached from the chest wall] in warm water.*
- B. *Said Mar Zutra, the son of R. Huna, the son of R. Pappi to Rabina, “Do you cite this [procedure] of R. Nehemiah the son of R. Joseph in connection with this case? We cite it in connection with [this case taught by] Raba. For said Raba, ‘[Animals that have] these two lobes of the lung that adhere to one another cannot be inspected to render them fit [without thereby tearing the tissue].’”*
- C. *[And we cite the teaching:] R. Nehemiah the son of R. Joseph inspected it [the lung with two adhering lobes] in warm water.*
- D. *R. Ashi raised an objection [to citing this teaching in connection with this latter case]. What is the use of applying this rule here? it makes sense [to apply the rule] here [in the case of a lung that adhered to the wall of the chest]. [If we find a hole in the lung] we can attribute its cause to [adhesion resulting from a defect in] the wall and [the animal will be deemed] valid.. But there [in the case of the lung with two adhering lobes], if this one [lobe] has a whole, it is terefah, and if that one [lobe] has a hole, it is terefah.*
- E. *And did R. Nahman say this? [I.e., If ulcerations erupted [on the lung near the place it adjoins the chest], we are concerned [that this indicates it is a terefah] Lo, said R. Joseph bar Manyomi, said R. Nahman, “A lung that was pierced and the wall of the chest seals it [the hole], it is valid.”*
- F. *There is no contradiction. There [where we declare that it is valid, the hole is located] in a place they naturally abut. Here [where we declare that it is terefah, the hole is located in a place they do not naturally abut. [Though the wall seals off the hole in the lung, in this latter circumstance they likely will separate.]*
- G. *And where is the place that they naturally abut? Where the lobes split off [at the top of the chest].*

- VII.8** A. *Reverting to the body of the previous text [C, above]:* Said R. Joseph bar Manyomi, said R. Nahman, “A lung that was pierced and the wall of the chest seals it [the hole], it is valid.”
- B. Said Rabina, “[*And that is so*] where it fused into the flesh [and there was a symphysis of the lung and intercostal muscles (Cashdan)].”
- C. Said R. Joseph to Rabina, “[*And if they did not fuse what is the law? It is terefah. It seems [logical to conclude] that we say it is deemed to be pierced [prior to fusing]. When it has fused it should also [be deemed to be pierced]. For lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority, If [a man’s penis] was pierced he is invalid because he is languid [in ejaculating semen]. If it was closed up, he is valid because he can inseminate. And this is a defect [that renders invalid] that can return to validity. [T. Yeb. 10:4 E-G].*”
- D. [What does the phrase] “**And this is**” exclude? *Does it not exclude a case like this one [of a defect in the lung of an animal sealed up by contact with the chest wall]? No, it excludes [the case of] a membrane that formed as a result of an injury to the lung. For this is not deemed to be a valid membrane.*
- E. R. Uqba bar Hama raised an objection to this, “*If it was pierced in the chest wall at that spot, what would be the law? It would be deemed terefah. Let it teach [in the Mishnah the case of] the chest wall that was pierced [as one of the animals that is deemed terefah].*”
- F. *And according to your view that which* R. Isaac bar Joseph said in the name of R. Yohanan, “[If] the gallbladder that was pierced and the liver seals it up, it is valid.” *If the liver was pierced at that spot what would be the law? It would be deemed terefah. Let it teach [the case of] the liver that was pierced. Rather it must be that a case where if it was pierced [i.e., in the liver] not in this circumstance [where it seals a hole in another organ, such a hole does not render the animal terefah and accordingly such a case] is not*

*taught. Here as well because it is a case where [if it was pierced in the chest wall] not in this circumstance [where the chest seals a hole in the lung, such a hole does not render the animal terefah and accordingly such a case] is not taught.*

**VII.9** A. *Rabbah bar bar Hannah posed a question to Samuel, “If ulcerations erupt [on the lung] what is the law?”*

B. *He said to him, “It is valid.”*

C. *He said to him, “I also say this. But the students balked [at the ruling] in this matter.”*

D. *For said R. Matna, “If they [the ulcerations] are filled with pus, it is terefah. [If they are filled with] clear water, it is valid.”*

C. *He [Samuel] said to him, “This rule was stated with regard to the kidneys.”*

**VII.10** A. *R. Isaac bar Joseph was following R. Jeremiah through the butcher’s market. He saw some lungs that had upon them ulcerations. he said to him, “Does not the master want a fine piece.”*

B. *He said to him, “I have no money.”*

C. *He said to him, “I’ll vouch for you [that your credit is good].”*

D. *He said to him, “What will I do with you? [You are so persistent.]” [But he gave no indication of his view on the matter.]*

E. *When such [cases of lungs with ulcerations] came before R. Yohanan [for a ruling] he would send them before R. Judah b. R. Simeon who ruled regarding them in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon to permit them [for consumption]. But he [Yohanan himself] did not reason in accord with that view.*

F. *Said Raba, “When we walked behind R. Nahman in the leather market [48b], and some say [this took place] in the scholars’ market, we saw those [lungs] that had large growths on them. And he did not say anything to them [to indicate that he deemed these terefah].”*

G. *R. Ammi and R. Assi were traversing the market in Tiberias. They saw those [lungs] that had gigantic growths. And they did not say anything to them [to indicate that they deemed these terefah].*

**VII.11** A. *It was stated: If a needle was found in the lung,*

B. *R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar and R. Hanina declared it valid.*

C. *And R. Simeon b. Laqish and R. Mani bar Patish and R. Simeon b. Eliakim declared it terefah.*

- D. *May we say that they disputed this [principle of law]. Those masters [who say it is invalid] reason that a lack internal [to the lung] has the status of a lack [that renders it invalid]. And those masters [who say it is valid] reason that a lack internal [to the organ] does not have the status of a lack [that renders it invalid].*
- E. *No. All parties agree that a lack internal [to the organ] does not have the status of a lack [that renders it invalid]. And here it is over this [principle] that they dispute. Those masters [who say it is valid] reason it [could have] entered through the bronchial tubes [and not pierce the organ]. And those masters [who say it is invalid] reason it [must have] pierced the organ as it entered [the lung].*
- F. *A certain needle that was found in a slice of a lung. They brought it before R. Ammi [for a ruling]. He reasoned he could declare it valid. R. Jeremiah objected and some say R. Zeriqa [objected based on the text of the Mishnah]: **The lung which is pierced or lacking [any part thereof] [M. 3:1 D].** What does **lacking** mean? If you say it means lacking on the exterior, that is the same as **pierced**. So does it not mean lacking on the interior. And so we may derive from this that any lack on the interior has the status of a lack [that renders the animal terefah].”*
- G. *They then sent it before R. Isaac Nappaha [for a ruling]. He reasoned he could declare it valid. R. Jeremiah objected and some say R. Zeriqa [objected based on the text of the Mishnah]: **The lung which is pierced or lacking [any part thereof] [M. 3:1 D].** What does **lacking** mean? If you say it means lacking on the exterior, that is the same as **pierced**. So does it not mean lacking on the interior. And so we may derive from this that any lack on the interior has the status of a lack [that renders the animal terefah].”*
- H. *They then sent it before R. Ammi and he declared it terefah. They said to him, “But lo the Rabbis have declared it valid.”*
- I. *He said to them, “They who declared it valid know for what reason they declared it valid. On what basis shall we declare it valid? Perhaps if the entire lung was in front of us we would find that it was pierced.”*
- J. *The basis [for his declaring it terefah] was that it was not there [before him]. Lo [this implies that] if it was there before him and was not pierced, it would be valid. But lo said R. Nahman, “This bronchial tube of the lung that was pierced, it is terefah.” This was stated for [a case of] one next to another [at a branch point].*

- K. *But lo said R. Nahman, "This colon of an intestine that was pierced where it is next to another, it protects it [and seals the hole and so it is valid]."*
- L. *Said R. Ashi, "Can you compare [defects that render animals] terefot to one another? We do not say concerning [defects that render animals] terefot that this one resembles that one. For lo you may cut from this place [on an animal] and it will die. You may cut from here [an identical amount in another place on the animal] and it will live.*

**VII.12** A. *A certain needle was found in the main bronchial tube of the lung. They brought it before the rabbis who declared terefah [other cases of a needle found in the lung]. They did not declare it prohibited or permitted [in this instance]. They neither declared it permitted in accord with our account [above]. Nor did they declare it prohibited because it was found in the main bronchial tube [and not in the lung]. It made sense to say that it entered through the bronchial tube [and not through the esophagus].*

B. *A certain needle was found in a slice of liver. Mar the son of R. Joseph reasoned that he should declare it terefah. Said to him R. Ashi, "If such an object was found lodged in the flesh of the animal would our master declare it terefah? [The same should apply to the liver.]"*

C. *Rather said R. Ashi, "Let us take a look. If the head of the needle points toward the exterior [of the liver], then we may say that it pierced [other organs as it entered and the animal is terefah]. If the head of the needle points toward the interior [of the liver], then we may say that it entered through the tube [i.e., the ductus choledocus (Cashdan)]. And this concern applies in the case of a large needle. But in the case of a small needle it makes no difference whether the head points toward the exterior or toward the interior. [We presume that] it pierced [organs] as it entered."*

D. *And why is this different from the case of a needle that was found [49a] in the thick wall of the reticulum. [With regard to that we say if it protrudes] from one side it is valid; from two sides it is terefah. And we do not say let us take a look to see whether the head points toward the exterior or toward the interior. We may say there that because food and drink pass through, it makes sense to say that the food or*



*drink pushed it [into the wall of the reticulum and it is not of any use to inspect to see whether the head points inward or outward. It is terefah only if it pierced all the way through].*

- E. *A certain needle was found in the large portal vein of the liver [of an animal]. Huna the master the son of R. Idi declared it terefah. R. Ada bar Manyomi declared it valid. They went and asked Rabina [which view to follow]. He said to them, "Take the mantles [of authority] off those who declared it terefah."*
- F. *A certain [date] pit was found in the gallbladder [of an animal]. Said R. Ashi, "When I was in the house of R. Kahana he said this [object] certainly came in through the portal vein. Even though it cannot exit [naturally from the vein], the movements [of the animal as it walks] move it along [in the vein]. And this case applies to the pit of a date. But the pit of an olive surely can pierce [organs and lodge in the vein like a needle (Rashi)]."*

**VII.13** A. Said R. Yohanan, "Why do they call [the lung] *ry'h*? Because [of the play on the Hebrew words]: it lights up [*m'yrh*, from the same root] the eyes [of the person who eats it]."

- B. *They posed a question:* [Does the statement that the lung lights up the eyes mean] eating [the lung] or [applying it to the eyes along] with medications.
- C. *Come and take note:* For said R. Huna bar Judah, "A whole goose [may sell for] one zuz. But its lung [alone may sell for] four zuz." *And if you wish to conclude that [a lung helps the eyes] through eating, then buy it [the whole goose] for a zuz and eat it! Rather it must be that [it helps the eyes if applied] with medications.*

**VII.14** A. *If the lung was pierced in a place where the butcher [normally] handles it, do we impute [the defect to his handling] or not.*

- B. *R. Ada bar R. Nathan says, "We impute it [to him]."*
- C. *Mar Zutra the son of R. Mari said, "We do not impute it [to him]."*
- D. *And the law is that we do impute it [to him].*
- E. *Said R. Samuel the son of R. Abbahu, "My father was one of the head [spokesmen] of Rafram's seminars. And he said [the law is] that we do impute it [to the butcher]."*
- F. *They stated this before Mar Zutra the son of R. Mari and he would not accept this [as binding]. Said R. Mesharshayya, "It makes sense to accept the view of my*



*father's father. For we [hold the view that we may] impute [damage to intestines that are dragged away] to a wolf."*

- VII.15** A. A worm [that bored a hole in the lung of an animal] — *there is a dispute over this matter between R. Joseph bar Dostai and the rabbis.*
- B. *One said [we may presume that] it bored through before the animal was slaughtered [and so the defect is of consequence].*
- C. *And the other said [we may presume that] it bored through after the animal was slaughtered [and so the defect is of no consequence].*
- D. *And the law follows the view [that we presume] it bored through after the animal was slaughtered.*

- VIII.1** A. **R. Simeon** says, “[It is not *terefah*] until its bronchial tubes are pierced [M. 3:1 E].” Said Rabbah bar Tahlifa, said R. Jeremiah bar Abba, “[This means] until the major bronchial tube is pierced.”
- B. *R. Aha bar Abba sat before R. Huna. He sat and said, “Said R. Malokh, said R. Joshua b. Levi, ‘The law is in accord with the view of R. Simeon.’”*
- C. *He said to him, “You are stating the view of Malokh of Arabia. He has stated that the law is not in accord with R. Simeon.”*
- D. *When R. Zira departed [to the Land of Israel] he found R. Bibi sitting and stating, “Said R. Malokh, said R. Joshua b. Levi, ‘The law is in accord with R. Simeon.’”*
- E. *He said to him, “By the master’s life! For I and R. Hiyya bar Abba and R. Assi came to R. Malokh’s place and we said to him, ‘Did the master say that the law followed in accord with the view of R. Simeon?’ And he said to us, ‘The law does not follow in accord with the view of R. Simeon.’ And we [Bibi] said [to Zira], ‘And what [tradition] do you have in your hand?’ And he said to him as follows: ‘Said R. Isaac bar Ammi, said R. Joshua b. Levi, ‘The law follows in accord with R. Simeon.’”*
- F. *And the law does not follow in accord with R. Simeon.*

- IX.1** A. **[If] the belly [abomasum] is pierced [M. 3:1 F].** Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani, said R. Oshaia, “The fat attached to the abomasum, the priests were accustomed to treating it as permitted [for eating] in accord with the view of R. Ishmael, who stated the matter in the name of his ancestors.”
- B. *And your mnemonic [for this teaching] is, “Ishmael the priest helps support the priests.”*

- C. *What makes you say this? [We see that Ishmael supports the priests from the following.] For it was taught on Tannaite authority, “Thus you shall bless the people of Israel” (Num. 6:23).*
- D. R. Ishmael says, “We learned [from this phrase in the verse] of a blessing for Israel from the mouths of the priests. [A blessing] for the priests themselves we do not learn about [from this phrase]. When the verse states, ‘And I will bless them’ (Num. 6:27) you could say [that means] that the priests bless Israel and the Holy One blessed be He blesses the priests.”
- E. R. Aqiba says, “[From the first verse] we derived that there was a blessing for Israel from the mouths of the priests. We did not derive that there was a blessing for Israel from the mouth of the Almighty [from that verse]. When the verse states, ‘And I will bless them,’ you could say [that means] the priests bless Israel and the Holy One blessed be He concurs with them.”
- F. Then *where* [in Scripture] according to the view of R. Aqiba do we find that there is a blessing for the priests? Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “From ‘I will bless those who bless you’ (Gen. 12: 3).”
- G. [If there is support according to both for a blessing for the priests, then] *in what way does R. Ishmael support the priests? In that he upholds the view that the [evidence for the] blessing for the priests is in the same place [in Scripture] as the blessing for Israel.*
- H. *What is the point of [the teaching of] R. Ishmael who stated the matter in the name of his ancestors? As was taught on Tannaite authority, “**And all the fat that is on the entrails**” (Lev. 3: 3): **[49b] “This encompasses the fat which is on the abomasum,”** the words of R. Aqiba. R. Ishmael says, “**The fat which is on the maw.**” [And sages did not concur with him.] [T. 9:14 E-G].*
- I. *And they raised a contradiction:* “And all the fat that is on the entrails” (Lev. 3: 3): R. Simeon [var. Ishmael] says, “Just as that fat that is on the entrails is encased in a membrane and easily peeled away, likewise any [fat that is prohibited is] encased in a membrane and is easily peeled away.” [This includes as prohibited the fat that is on the abomasum in contradiction to Ishmael’s teaching at F.]
- J. R. Aqiba says, “Just as that fat that is on the entrails is layered [across the organ], encased in a membrane and easily peeled away, likewise any [fat that is prohibited is] layered, encased in a membrane and is easily peeled away.”
- K. *Sent Rabin in the name of R. Yohanan, “This is the correct presentation of the [views in the] Mishnah. And you must reverse the [attributions of the views] in the first [teachings].”*

- L. *Why is it more fitting to reverse [the attributions of the views] in the first [text]? Reverse [them in] the last [i.e., the second text]? That one is different because it teaches [more fully, spelling out the rule using the language], “Just as...” [hence] it is [more] specific.*
- M. *If so [why does it say above at A that they ruled leniently] in accord with the view of R. Ishmael, it is in accord with the view of R. Aqiba!*
- N. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “[The pericope in A hedges the attribution by saying] he stated the matter in the name of his ancestors. [This implies that] he himself did not reason in accord with this view.”

**IX.2** A. Said Rab, “Clean [i.e., permitted] fat can seal [a hole in an organ]. Unclean [i.e., forbidden] fat cannot.”

- B. And R. Sheshet, “Both can seal [a hole].”
- C. *R. Zira posed a question: What about fat from a wild beast? [Can it seal a hole?] Did it state specifically that clean fat can seal up a hole and this too is clean fat? Or perhaps [clean fat can seal up a hole] because it is sticky. And this [fat from a wild beast] is not sticky [enough to seal a hole].*
- D. *Said Abbaye, “What is his question? [Even] if it is permitted for eating, [if] it is not sticky [then it is not effective in sealing a hole].”*
- E. *There was [an organ with] a hole that had been sealed up by unclean [forbidden] fat that was brought before Raba [for a ruling]. Said Raba, “What shall we be concerned with. First, lo R. Sheshet [at A] said that unclean fat also can serve to seal a hole. And furthermore [we have a principle that] the Torah had mercy on the money of an Israelite.”*
- F. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, “[We should be concerned with two things. First there is the contrary view of] Rab. [And furthermore this is a case that involves] a prohibition based on the authority of the Torah. And yet you say [we should invoke the principle that] the Torah had mercy on the money of an Israelite!”*

**IX.3** A. *Manyomin, the pot merchant, left a pot of honey uncovered. They brought it before Raba [for a ruling].*

- B. *He said, “What shall we be concerned with. First, it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority, **Three [kinds of] liquids are forbidden [for consumption] on account of [danger of poisoning in an instance of being discovered in a vessel that is] uncovered: (1) water, (2) wine, and (3) milk. [But all other***

**liquids are permitted for consumption, even if left uncovered]** [M. **Ter. 8:4**]. And furthermore, [we should invoke the principle that] the Torah had mercy on the money of an Israelite.”

- C. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac to Raba, “[We should be concerned. First there is the contrary view of] R. Simeon. [And furthermore this is a case that involves] a life threatening danger. *And yet you say* [we should invoke the principle that] the Torah had mercy on the money of an Israelite!”
- D. *What [contrary view] of R. Simeon [do they refer to above]? That which was taught on Tannaite authority, **Five [liquids] are not subject to [the prohibition of consumption on account of danger of poisoning in an instance of being discovered in a vessel that is] uncovered: brine, vinegar, oil, honey and muries.** And R. Simeon says, “Even among these there are those [instances] when they are [prohibited for consumption on account of being discovered] uncovered [T. **Ter. 7:12, variant version]**.”*
- E. And said R. Simeon, “I saw a serpent drink brine in Sidon.”
- F. They said to him, “That snake was a blockhead. And you cannot adduce proof from the actions of blockheads.”
- G. *He [Raba] said to him [Nahman], “Admit I am right at least with regard to brine [that a serpent cannot poison it]. For lo R. Pappa and R. Huna the son of R. Joshua and the rabbis when they had [an instance of liquid that was uncovered] they would pour into it brine [to neutralize any poisons].”*
- H. *He [Nahman] said to him [Raba], “Admit I am right at least with regard to honey [that a serpent can poison it]. For R. Simeon b. Eleazar upholds his [i.e., Simeon’s] view. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: And likewise R. Simeon b. Eleazar used to prohibit honey [that was left uncovered].”*

**IX.4** A. Said R. Nahman, “Forbidden fat [on an organ] in the shape of a hat does not serve to seal up [a hole].”

- B. *What is this [fat]? Some say this is the fat nodules of the rectum. And some say that this is the pericardium (Cashdan).*
- C. *Said Raba, "I heard two rulings from R. Nahman regarding the himsa-fat and the bar-himsa-fat [on the abomasum]. [He rules that] one sealed [up a hole] and the other did not seal. And I do not know which is which."*
- D. *R. Huna bar Hinnena and R. Huna the son of R. Nahman said, "Bar-himsa-fat seals and himsa-fat does not seal."*
- E. *Said R. Tabot, "And the mnemonic for this is: 'The strength of the son [i.e., bar-himsa-fat] is superior to that of the father.'"*
- F. *Which is the himsa and which is the bar-himsa? Come and take note: For said R. Nahman, "They [in the Land of Israel] eat it. [50a] For us, should it not serve to seal [a hole]?"*
- G. *[The fat of the abomasum] on the greater curvature, everyone agrees that it is forbidden [to eat it]. Concerning what do they dispute? [Concerning the fat] on the lesser curvature.*
- H. *There are those that state [another version of the tradition]: [Concerning the fat] on the lesser curvature, everyone agrees that it is permitted [to eat it]. Concerning what did they dispute? [Concerning the fat] on the greater curvature.*
- I. *This follows in accord with that which was said by R. Avya, said R Ammi, "They pare [away a thin layer of the fat and may eat the rest]." And so said R. Yannai in the name of one elder, "They pare [away a layer]."*
- J. *Said R. Avya, "I was attending before R. Ammi. They pared away [a layer] and gave him [from the remaining fat] and he ate it."*
- K. *The attendant of R. Hanina was attending R. Hanina. He said to him, "Pare away [a layer]. Bring me [from the remaining fat] so that I may eat it." He saw that [the attendant] was balking.*
- L. *He said to him, "You are a Babylonian [and hold the view that it is all forbidden fat]." Carve it all away and toss it out.*

**IX.5** A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "The intestines which were perforated, but which the fluid stops up — it is valid [T. 3:11 A]."*

- B. *What is the fluid?*
- C. *Said R. Kahana, "[It is] the liquid that can be squeezed out of the intestines."*

- D. *The associate of R. Abba learned from R. Abba. And who was this? R. Zira. And some say the associate of R. Zira learned from R. Zira. And who was this? R. Abba. Said R. Abba the son of R. Hiyya bar Abba, "This was said by R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, 'The law follows in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel with regard to terefah [i.e., declaring a perforated intestine valid if the fluid sealed the hole]. And [the law follows] R. Simeon with regard to mourning.'"*
- E. *The law follows in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel with regard to terefah as we stated [in A that a perforated intestine is valid if the fluid sealed the hole].*
- F. And what is [the case where the law follows] R. Simeon with regard to mourning? *As it was taught on Tannaite authority, **During the first three days [of mourning] he who came from a nearby place counts [the days of mourning] with them [the other mourners]. [If he came] from a distant place he counts [the days] for himself. From that point onward [after the third day] even if he came from a nearby place, he counts for himself. R. Simeon says, "Even [if he comes] on the seventh day, he who came from a nearby place counts with them [b. M.Q. 21b]."***
- G. *Someone once said, "May I merit that I may go [to the land of Israel] and learn the tradition from the mouth of the master." When he did go [to the land of Israel] he found R. Abba the son of R. Hiyya bar Abba. He said to him, "Did the master say that the law follows in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel with regard to terefah?"*
- H. *He said to him, "Lo, the law does not follow [in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel]."*
- I. [He said], *"They say, '[The law follows] in accord with R. Simeon with regard to mourning.' What about that?"*
- J. *He said to him, "That is a matter of dispute. For it was stated, 'R. Hisda said the law follows [in accord with R. Simeon]. And likewise R. Yohanan said the law follows [in accord with R. Simeon]. But R. Nahman said the law does not follow [in accord with R. Simeon]."*
- K. And the law does not follow in accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel with regard to *terefah*. But the law does follow in accord with the view of R. Simeon with regard to mourning.

- L. For said Samuel, “The law follows in accord with the lenient view in matters of mourning.”

**IX.6** A. Said R. Shimi bar Hiyya, “They may compare [defects] of the intestines [to determine if the defect arose before or after the animal was slaughtered].”

B. *There were intestines brought before Raba [for a ruling]. He compared them [with others] and they were not similar. R. Mesharshayya his son came and manipulated them until they were similar. He [Raba] said to him, “Where do you get [the idea that you may manipulate them to make them appear similar]?”*

C. *He said to him, “How many hands manipulated these before they came before the master [for a ruling]?”*

D. *He said to him, “My son is as learned in [the laws of] terefot as R. Yohanan.”*

**IX.7** A. R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar *both said*, “They may compare [defects of] the lung.”

B. Said Raba, “They said this only [for defects in lungs] of the same side [right or left]. But from one side to the other they may not [compare defects].”

C. *And the law is* [that they may compare defects] even from one side to the other [in the same animal], from one small animal to another, or from one large animal to another. But they may not [compare defects of the lung] neither from a large animal to a small animal, nor from a small animal to a large animal.

D. Abbaye and Raba *both said*, “They may compare [defects of] the windpipe.”

E. Said R. Pappa, “They said this only [for defects in the windpipe] of the same cartilage-region. But from one region to another they may not [compare defects].”

F. *And the law is* [that they may compare defects] even from one cartilage-region to another and from one membrane-region to another. But they may not [compare defects of the windpipe] from a cartilage-region to a membrane-region or from a membrane-region to a cartilage-region.

**IX.8** A. Said Ziri, “If the rectum was pierced it is valid because the hips support it.”

B. And how much [must be pierced before it is deemed *terefah*]?

C. Said R. Ilai, said R. Yohanan, “In the part [of the rectum] that is attached [to the hip it must be torn in] a major portion. In a part that is not attached, any amount [that is torn renders it *terefah*].”

D. *The rabbis stated this before Raba in the name of R. Nahman. He said, “Has not someone told you not to attribute [50b] nonsensical views to him?” This is what R. Nahman said, “In the part that is attached [to the hip] even if it is entirely torn away, it is valid as long as there remained a part that can be grasped.”*

E. And how much is this?



F. Said Abbaye, “*As [much as] the size of a finger [suffices even in the largest] ox.*”

**X.1 A. [If] the innermost belly [rumen] is pierced [M. 3:1 F].** Said R. Judah, said Rab, “Nathan Ben Shila, head of the butchers of Sepphoris, testified before Rabbi in the name of R. Nathan, ‘This is the mucal sieve’ [cf. T. 3:2 E].”

B. And so said R. Joshua b. Levi, “This is the mucal sieve.”

C. R. Ishmael said, “It is the stomach [entrance] of the rumen.”

D. R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “This is a narrow part of the rumen. But I do not know which one.”

E. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “The rumen might as well have fallen into a well. [This last statement clarifies nothing.]”

F. Said R. Aha bar R. Ava, said R. Assi, “From where it narrows and below [that is the innermost belly].”

G. R. Jacob bar Nahmani, said Samuel, “In the part that has no furry lining.”

H. R. Abina, said Geniba in the name of Rab, “The part of the windpipe within a handbreadth of the rumen is the inner rumen.”

I. *They said in the West in the name of R. Yosé bar Hanina*, “The entire rumen is called the inner rumen. And what then is the outer rumen? The fleshy membrane that covers the major part of the rumen.”

J. Rabbah bar R. Huna said, “[The outer rumen is] *the exposed part.*”

K. *What is the exposed part?*

L. *Said R. Avya, “That part which is exposed by the butcher [when he slits open the abdomen to remove the intestines].”*

M. *In Nehardea they acted in accord with Rabbah bar R. Huna. R. Ashi said to Amemar, “What do we do with all the other views?”*

N. *He said to him, “They are all subsumed in the view of Rabbah bar R. Huna.”*

O. *[He said], “But [what about the view] of R. Assi said R. Yohanan [in C]?” He said to him, “That was explained by R. Aha bar Ava [in D].”*

P. *[He said], “[But what about the views] of R. Abina and the people of the West?”*

Q. *He said to him, “These views are certainly in dispute [with Rabbah bar R. Huna].”*

**XI.1 A. R. Judah says, “In the case of a large animal, a handbreadth, and in the case of a small one, its greater part [M. 3:1 H].”**

B. Said R. Benjamin bar Yapet, said R. Eleazar, “Neither does large mean actually in a large animal. Nor does small mean actually in a small animal. But in any case

where if the size of a handbreadth was torn and this did not constitute the major part, this is what we meant by, **In the case of a large animal, a handbreadth.** [And in any case where if] a major part was torn and this did not constitute the size of a handbreadth, this is what we meant by, **In the case of a small one, its greater part.”**

- C. [The case where if] a major part was torn and this did not constitute the size of a handbreadth, *this is obvious* [that it is *terefah*]! *It is necessary to state it. For this is where it was [torn through a major part and would have been torn through] a handbreadth with just a small amount more. What might you have said? Until it is torn a handbreadth it is not terefah. It makes the point [that even so it is terefah].*

**XI.2** A. Said Geniba said R. Assi, “If it [a circular part of the rumen] was cut out in the size of a large coin, it is *terefah*. For it you stretch it out [the circumference] will equal a handbreadth.”

- B. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, “*The teaching of Geniba was explained to me on the bridge of Nehardea: [If a hole was found] as large as a large coin, it is valid. Larger than a large coin, it is terefah.*” And how much is more than a large coin? Said R. Joseph, “*Big enough for three date pits with fruit on them to pass through with pressure, or without fruit on them to pass through with space.*”

**XII.1** A. The omasum or the second stomach [reticulum] which are pierced on the outer edge [M. 3:1 H].

- B. *The rabbis taught, A needle which is found in the thick wall of the reticulum [M. Hul. 3:2 C6], when it protrudes from one side, it [the animal] is valid. [When it protrudes] on both sides, it is invalid. If there is in its place a coagulated drop of blood, [51a] one may be certain that [the needle was in place] before slaughter. [If] there is not in its place a coagulated drop of blood, one may be certain that [the needle was in place] after slaughter. [If] the surface of a wound formed a scab, one may be certain that [it was there] three days before slaughter. [If] the surface of a wound did not form a scab, [then] he who makes a claim against his fellow must bring proof [that the animal is invalid] [T. 3:11 B-D].*

- C. *And why is this [case of the needle in the reticulum] different from all other [instances of] piercing where even if there is no blood the master may declare it terefah?*

- D. *There [in the other cases] there was nothing [for the blood] to adhere to. Here [in our case] since there is a needle [in the hole], if it was there before the slaughtering, [the blood] would surely have adhered to it.*

- E. *Said R. Safra to Abbaye, "Has the master seen the great rabbi who came from the West and says his name is R. Avira? And he said it once happened that a [case of a] needle that protruded from one side of the thick wall of the reticulum came before Rabbi [for a ruling]. And he declared it terefah."*
- F. *He sent for him [Avira]. But he did not come to him.*
- G. *He [Abbaye] himself went to him [Avira]. He was standing on the roof. He [Abbaye] said, 'Come Down Master.' He did not come down.*
- H. *He [Abbaye] went up to him.*
- I. *He said to him, 'Tell me what were the main points of the incident.'"*
- J. *"He said to him, 'I was at the back of the assembly of the most high great Rabbi. And R. Huna from Sepphoris and R. Yosé of Medea were sitting before him. And there came to Rabbi [a case for a ruling] of a needle found in the thick wall of the reticulum [protruding] from one side. And Rabbi turned it over and found on it a coagulated drop of blood and declared it terefah. And he said, "If there is no wound there, where did the coagulated drop of blood come from?"'"*
- K. *He [Abbaye] said to him, "You put me through so much trouble [with this lengthy story to relate such an obvious rule]. It is in the Mishnah: **The omasum or the second stomach [reticulum] that are pierced on the exterior [M. 3:1 H].**"*

- XIII.1** A. **[If] it fell from the roof [M. 3:1 I].** Said R. Huna, "If he left an animal above [on the roof] and came and found it below [on the ground], we do not suspect there is any [hidden] injury to its limbs." [If we did suspect so, we would require that he wait for twenty-four hours before slaughtering the animal.]
- B. *Rabina had a kid [on his roof]. It saw peeled barley through the skylight [in the house]. It jumped and fell from the roof to the ground.*
- C. *He [Rabina] came before R. Ashi [for a ruling]. He said to him, "Lo, R. Huna said, 'If he left an animal above [on the roof] and came and found it below [on the ground], we do not suspect there is any [hidden] injury to its limbs.' [Is this] because it had something [i.e., the wall of the house] to rub against [to slow it as it fell]. But here [because it jumped through a skylight] it had nothing to rub against. Or perhaps [we do not suspect injury where it jumped from the roof] because it estimated itself [that it could make the jump safely] and here too it estimated itself [that it could make the jump safely]."*

- D. *He said to him, "[It was that we do not suspect injury where it jumped from the roof] because it estimated itself [that it could make the jump safely] and here too it estimated itself [that it could make the jump safely]."*
- E. *In R. Habiba's house there was a ewe that dragged its hind legs behind it.*
- F. *Said R. Yemar, "This one is afflicted with sciatica." [But it is not terefah.] Rabina objected, "Perhaps its spine is broken."*
- G. *They inspected it and found [its spine was broken] in accord with Rabina. And even so the law follows in accord with R. Yemar [because] sciatica is common but [a broken] spine is not common.*
- G. *Said R. Huna, "[In the case of] rams that butt one another we do not suspect there is any [hidden] injury to its limbs. Even though they groan in pain [we generally may assume that] the intensity of the contest has overcome them. If they fall to the ground [as a result of the butting] then we certainly should suspect [they suffered serious injury]."*
- H. *Said R. Menashe, "These rams that were stolen by burglars [who must have dropped them over an enclosure to steal them] — we do not suspect that there is any [hidden] injury to their limbs."*
- I. *What is the basis for this [conclusion]? When they throw them [over the enclosure], they throw them on their sides [so they will not be injured and] so they will be ready to run. If they threw them [the rams] back [to the enclosure], we certainly suspect [injury because under such circumstances the burglars would not care about them].*
- J. *And this is the case only where they threw them back out of fear [of being caught with stolen goods]. But where they threw them back out of remorse [over the burglary, we assume that because of their] remorse they would do so in the best way they could [without injuring the animals].*

- XIII.2** A. *Said R. Judah, said Rab, "If he hit it [an animal] on its head and it [the reflex from the blow] travelled to its tail, or if he hit it on the tail and it travelled to the head, or if [the reflex went] through the entire spine, we do not suspect there is any [hidden] injury to its limbs."*
- B. *And if [he hit an animal] with a thick stick [on the back] we suspect that he broke the back [of the animal]. And if [the stick] has on it nodes, we suspect [there is hidden injury to its limbs]. And if [he hit the animal with a stick that] is fresh [i.e., not brittle], we suspect the spine was broken.*
- C. *Said R. Nahman, "[As a result of a newborn passing out of] the womb, we do not suspect there is any [hidden] injury to its limbs."*

- D. Said Raba to R. Nahman, “*There is a Tannaite teaching that supports your view: An infant one day old [51b] becomes unclean on account of his seminal flow [M. Nid. 5:3 C]. And if you might have concluded that [we do suspect] there is [hidden] injury to its limbs, then we should apply here the verse, “[When any man has a discharge] from his body, [his body is unclean]” (Lev. 15: 2) [which implies he does not become unclean] because of [emission that may be attributable to] another force.*”
- E. *In that case [in M. Nid.] what are we dealing with? The case in question may be one where [the offspring was born] by caesarian section.*
- F. *Come and take note: A calf that was born on the festival, they may slaughter it on the festival [b. Shab. 136a, b. Bes. 6b]. [This implies that we do not suspect there was any hidden injury to the animal.]*
- G. *Here too the case in question may be one where [the offspring was born] by caesarian section.*
- H. *Come and take note: And they agree [concerning a firstling] that if he is born with a blemish on him, this is [a case of an animal] that is ready [for eating on the festival] [b. Bes. 26b]. And if you say that this too is a case of an animal born through caesarian section, is an animal born through caesarian section sanctified [as a firstling]?*
- I. But lo, said R. Yohanan, “R. Simeon agreed with regard to Holy Things, that [an firstling born through caesarian section] is not holy [b. Nid. 40a].” [So we must reject the suggestion that the animal had no serious injury because it was born by caesarian section.]
- J. *In that case what are we dealing with? Where the animal [after birth] placed its hooves on the ground [to stand up]. [This demonstrates that it had no serious injury.]*
- K. And said R. Nahman, “In the slaughter house [if an animal falls] we do not [suspect that] there is any [hidden] injury to its limbs.”
- L. *A certain ox fell [in the slaughter house] and the sound of its groaning was heard [when it fell]. R. Isaac bar Samuel bar Marta went up and bought the choicest cuts [of meat from this animal]. Said to him the rabbis, “On what basis do you do this?”*
- M. *He said to them, “Here is what Rab said, ‘It digs in its hooves [to break the fall] prior to reaching the ground.’”*

**XIII.3** A. Said R. Judah, said Rab, “If [an animal that had fallen] stood up, it is not necessary to wait twenty-four hours [to see if it suffered a serious injury in the

fall]. *It certainly requires an inspection.* If it walked [after falling], it is not even necessary to perform an inspection.”

- B. R. Hiyya bar Ashi said, “In both cases it is necessary to perform an inspection [to see if there was a serious injury].”
- C. Said R. Jeremiah bar Aha, said Rab, “If it stretched forth its foreleg to stand, even if it did not stand [that is enough of a sign that there was no serious injury]. If it lifted up its hind leg to walk, even though it did not walk [that is enough of a sign that there was no serious injury].”
- D. And R. Hisda said, “If it stirred as if to stand, even though it did not stand [that is enough of a sign that there was no serious injury].”
- E. *And the law is for an animal that fell off a roof and he did not know [how it fell], if it stood but did not walk, it is necessary to inspect it, but it is not necessary to wait twenty-four hours. And if it walked, it is not necessary even to inspect it.*
- F. *Said Amemar in the name of R. Dimi from Nehardea, “The animal that fell about which they spoke, it is necessary to inspect it [for injury] near the intestines.”*
- G. *Said to him Mar Zutra, “Here is what they said in the name of R. Pappa, ‘It is necessary to inspect all the internal areas.’”*
- H. *Said Huna Mar the grandson of R. Nehemiah to R. Ashi, “What about the throat organs?”*
- I. He said to him, “[You do not need to inspect the animal.] The throat organs are too hard to be injured by a fall.”

- XIII.4** A. Said R. Judah, said Samuel, “A bird that accidentally fell into the water — if it propelled itself one body length, that is enough [to show that there was no serious injury]. “ And they said this only in the case of where [it propelled itself] from downstream to upstream. But upstream to downstream [we may say] the water that propelled it.”
- B. *And if the water was still [with no current], then it makes no difference [which way the bird goes].*
  - C. *And if it was littered with twigs and [the bird] overtook them [even while going downstream], it overtook them [and this is a sign that there was no serious injury to the bird].*
  - D. *And if there was a sheet stretched out [and a bird flew into it] we suspect [there is hidden injury to its limbs]. If it was not taut, we do not suspect.*

- E. *And if it was folded [and stretched taut], we do not suspect [because it cannot be made taut enough to do serious injury to the bird].*
- F. *[A bird that flew into] a tightly knotted net, we do suspect [there is injury to its limbs]. [If it flew into] a loosely knotted net, we do not suspect."*
- G. *[A bird that flew into the top of] a bundle of flax, we do suspect [injury].*
- H. *[If it flew] into one side or the other [of the bundle], we do not suspect [injury]. [If it flew into] a bundle of reeds, we do suspect [injury].*
- I. *[If it flew into] flax that was pounded and corded, we do not suspect injury. [If it flew into flax that was] pounded, but not corded, we do suspect [injury].*
- J. *[If it flew into flax] that had seed pods, because it has in it knots, we do suspect [injury]. [If it flew into] coarse tow (Cashdan), we do suspect [injury]; fine tow, we do not suspect.*
- K. *Dried bark, we do suspect; crushed bark, we do not suspect. Sifted ashes, we do suspect [because it hardens]; unsifted ashes, we do not suspect.*
- L. **[52a]** *Fine sand, we do not suspect; coarse sand, we do suspect. Dirt from the road, we do suspect [because it too hardens].*
- M. *[If it flew into] straw that was bundled into sheaves, we do suspect [injury]; [straw that was] not bundled, we do not suspect. [If it flew into stacks of] all the various types of wheat, we do suspect [injury]. All the various types of barley, we do suspect injury [some var.: we do not or the phrase is omitted].*
- N. *All the various types of legumes — they are not subject to [suspicion that if a bird flew into a pile of them] there is hidden injury to its limbs, except for fenugreek.*
- O. *For chick peas, we do not suspect there is hidden injury to its limbs. For lentils, we do suspect there is hidden injury to its limbs. This is the general rule for this issue:*
- P. *For any goods that are slippery, we do not suspect there is hidden injury to its limbs.*
- Q. *For any goods that are not slippery, we do suspect there is hidden injury to its limbs.*
- XIII.5** A. *[A bird whose wings are] clipped [Rashi interprets that its wings were attached to a slat to prevent it from flying off] —*
- B. *R. Ashi permits [consumption of the bird if it crashed to the ground when it tried to fly off and might have injured itself in the process].*
- C. *Amemar prohibits [consuming it since he suspects there is hidden injury to its limbs].*
- D. *[If the case is that it was clipped] in one wing, all the authorities would agree that [if it tried to fly and crashed] it is permitted [to eat this bird for there is not*



*sufficient cause to assume it was injured]. Where to they dispute? In [a case where] both wings were clipped [and the bird tried to fly and crashed].*

- E. *The authority who declares it prohibited [to eat the bird] would say to you, "How can it stay aloft [with its wings clipped]?"*
- F. *And the authority who declares it permitted [to eat it] would say to you, "It is possible for it to stay aloft [by the force created] at the joint of its wing [even if they are clipped at the ends]."*
- G. *Another version: [If the case is that it was clipped] in both wings, all the authorities would agree that [if it tried to fly and crashed] it is prohibited [to eat this bird for there is sufficient cause to assume it was injured]. Where to they dispute? In [a case where] one wing was clipped [and the bird tried to fly and crashed].*
- H. *The authority who declares it permitted [to eat the bird] would say to you, "It is possible to fly with one wing clipped."*
- I. *And the authority who declares it prohibited [to eat it] would say to you, "Since with one wing it cannot fly [because it is clipped], with the other it cannot fly [either]."*
- J. *And the law is [ a bird that is clipped] in both wings [and tried to fly and crashed] is prohibited [for consumption because of suspicion of injury]. [A bird that is clipped] in one wing [and tried to fly and crashed] is permitted [for consumption].*

**XIV.1 A. [If] the greater number of its ribs are broken [M. 3:1I]:** *Our rabbis taught:* These constitute the majority of the ribs: Six on one side and six on the other. Or eleven on one side and one on the other. [Twelve of the twenty-two ribs must be broken.]

- B. Said Ziri, "[The ribs must be broken] in that half nearest the spine."
- C. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Yohanan, "[The ribs that must be broken are] those big ribs that have in them marrow."
- D. Said Ulla, Ben Zakkai said, "If the majority [of the ribs] were dislocated on one side [or] if the majority [of the ribs] were broken on both sides [it is *terefah*]."
- E. R. Yohanan said, "Whether [we deal with a case of ribs that were] dislocated or broken [it must be] a majority of them on both sides."
- F. Said Rab, "If a rib was dislocated along with its vertebra, it is *terefah*."
- G. Said R. Kahana and R. Asi to Rab, "If the rib on both sides were dislocated and the vertebra remains intact, what is the law?"

- H. He said to them, “*You have stated the case [equivalent in the law to the case] of the cleaved animal* [cf. b. 21a, M. 1:4, V.2 C].” [The rule there is that the animal is deemed to be carrion.]
- I. *But has not Rab also stated [a case equivalent in the law to the case of] the cleaved animal? Rab stated [a case of the dislocation of] a rib without its vertebra.*
- J. *But lo he stated, “A rib along with its vertebra.” [Rab’s statement was], “A rib along with half its vertebra.”*
- K. *We may derive the rule that R. Kahana and R. Asi stated [a case of the dislocation of] a rib without its vertebra. And he [Rab] stated to them [that it was equivalent to a case of] the cleaved animal. [This would not be a valid objection.]*
- L. But lo, said Ulla, Ben Zakkai said, “If the majority [of the ribs] were dislocated on one side [or] if the majority [of the ribs] were broken on both sides [it is *terefah*].”
- M. He would say to you, “There [where we require a majority, the case is where the ribs are] not opposite one another. Here [where we say it is equivalent to a case of a cleaved animal and is carrion, the case is where the ribs are] opposite one another.”
- N. [But this leads to an inconsistency.] For said R. Yohanan [in C], “[It must be] a majority of them on both sides.” And in [the case of] a majority of them on both sides *it is impossible that there not be at least one pair of ribs that [are broken that are] opposite one another.*
- O. [We can explain that this is not a direct contradiction] *There [in the case referred to by Yohanan he speaks of the dislocation of] the rib but not its facet. Here [in the case of Kahana and Asi they speak of the dislocation of] the rib with its facet. If so [this leads to another inconsistency, to wit] this is Rab’s [rule]! [We can respond that indeed it is but that] they had not heard Rab’s [rule].*
- P. *Why did they not pose the question to them as they did to Rab [as in D-E above]?*
- Q. *They reasoned they would pose to him one question that would lead to an explanation of two matters. For if they posed to him a question about [the case of] one [rib that was dislocated] it would settle the matter [as follows]. If he*

said it is terefah [in the case of one rib] then certainly [in the case of] two [ribs it would be terefah]. [But] if he said it is valid [in the case of one rib] then the case of two ribs would still be a problem for us.

- R. But if this is the case, then even now that they have posed to him the question regarding the case of two [ribs] it would settle the matter [as follows]. If he said it is valid [in the case of two ribs], then certainly [in the case of] one [rib it would be valid]. [But] if he said it is terefah [in the case of two ribs], then the case of one rib would still be a problem for us.
- S. They reasoned [that if they posed the question in this way] he would become angry [and answer them concerning both, to wit], "If one [is dislocated and declared] terefah, is there any question concerning [the case of] two [dislocated ribs]?" But lo they did state matters to him in this way and he did not get angry with them. [Actually he did get angry.] When he said to them, "You have stated the case of an animal that was cleaved," this was his way of expressing anger to them.

- XIV.2** A. Said Rabbah bar Rab Shila, said R. Matna, said Samuel, "If a rib was dislocated from its socket, or if a majority of the skull was shattered, or if a majority of the membrane that covers the rumen [was torn], it is terefah."
- B. "If a rib was dislocated from its socket... it is terefah." And they raised in contradiction to this: **[52b]** [As it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah], **How much is deemed a deficiency in the spine [of a skeleton so that it does not render unclean objects in a tent]? The House of Shammai say, "Two vertebrae." And the House of Hillel say, "One vertebra" [M. Ohal. 2:3].** And said R. Judah, said Samuel, "And the same [rule of deficiency in the spine applies] for [rendering the animal] a terefah." [Cf. b. 42b, M. 3:1, I.1 O-P.]
- C. [There is no contradiction.] Here [the case is] a rib [dislocated] without its vertebra. There the vertebra [is dislocated] but not its rib.
- D. It is consistent [to say the case of a dislocated] rib without its vertebra does occur. But where does it occur that a vertebra [is dislocated] without its rib? In the lumbar region (Cashdan: where there are vertebrae but no ribs).

- E. *R. Oshaia raised an objection to this: This case should be taught as one of the lenient rulings of the House of Shammai and one of the stringent rulings of the House of Hillel.*
- F. *Said to him Raba, "When this was brought up [as a dispute] it was brought up as an issue of [whether the spine with a missing vertebra transmits] uncleanness where it is the case that the House of Shammai rule more stringently [that the spine is complete enough to transmit uncleanness]."*

**XIV.3** A. [Said Rabbah bar Rab Shila, said R. Matna, said Samuel, "If a rib was dislocated from its socket,] or if a majority of the skull was shattered..

B. R. Jeremiah *posed a question*, "[Does this mean] the majority of the diameter or of the circumference?"

C. *The question remains unresolved.*

D. "... or if a majority of the membrane that covers the rumen [was torn], it is *terefah*."

E. R. Ashi *posed a question*, "[Does this mean] the majority was torn or the majority was removed?"

F. *Let us resolve this from what was taught on Tannaite authority, [If] the innermost belly [rumen] is pierced or the greater part of the outer [exterior coating] which is pierced [M. 3:1 F-G].* And they said in the West in the name of R. Yosé bar Hanina, "The entire rumen is called the inner rumen. And what then is the outer rumen? The fleshy membrane that covers the major part of the rumen."

G. *But the basis for [posing a question regarding] this matter* [is not according to Yosé bar Hanina]. Rather it is according to Samuel. And lo, said R. Jacob bar Nahmani, said Samuel, "[The innermost belly is] in the part that has no furry lining." [Because the Mishnah does not refer to the membrane it cannot be used as proof.]

**XV.1** A. **And one which has been mauled by a wolf [M. 3:1 J].** Said R. Judah, said Rab, "For beasts [that were mauled, the Mishnah means] by a wolf or [by any animal] larger than that [in size]. And for birds [that were mauled, the Mishnah means] by a hawk or [by any bird of prey] larger than that [in size]."

B. *What does this [statement] exclude?*

C. *If it excludes [the case of] a cat [that mauls] it was taught, **And one which has been mauled by a wolf.***

- D. *And if you wish to say this [particular statement of the Mishnah] makes the novel point that a wolf can maul even a large animal [but as to a cat we might assume it could maul a small animal], but lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority, R. Judah says, “One mauled by a wolf, in the case of a small beast, and one mauled by a lion in the case of a large beast [M. 3:1 K].”*
- E. *And if you wish to say that R. Judah is in dispute [with J of M.], lo said R. Benjamin bar Yefet, said R. Ila [var. Eleazar], “R. Judah only comes to interpret the words of the sages [not to dispute them].”*
- F. *Now is it your intent merely to point out a contradiction between the teachings of this man [Rab] and that man [Ila or Eleazar]? [Rab assumes that Judah does dispute J of M. Accordingly he teaches the rule of A to exclude animals smaller than a wolf that maul small cattle.]*
- G. *If you prefer: it is consistent [to say that the Mishnah] excludes [mauling by] a cat. What might you have said? That it just taught the more common [case of a wolf]. It comes to make the novel point [that it means specifically a wolf and that a cat is excluded].*

- XV.2** A. Said R. Amram, said R. Hisda, “Mauling by a cat or a marten [renders the animal *terefah*] in the case of goats and lambs. Mauling by a weasel [renders the animal *terefah*] in the case of fowl.”
- B. *They raised an objection:* Mauling by a cat, hawk or marten [does not render an animal *terefah*] until it pierces the abdominal cavity. But [this implies that] the mauling [itself without piercing] *does not render it [terefah]*.
- C. *And how do you make sense of this? Is a hawk not capable of mauling? But lo it is taught on Tannaite authority, One mauled by a hawk [M. 3:1 K].*
- D. *Lo this is not a contradiction. This one [in M.] refers to fowl and this one [in B] refers to goats and lambs.*
- E. *But in any case it does contradict the view of R. Hisda.*
- F. *Not at all, for he stated matters in accord with this Tannaite authority. For it was taught on Tannaite authority, Beribbi says, “They only stated [that a cat] does not maul in an instance where there is no one trying to save [the animal or bird. For then the cat is not as vicious.] But in an instance where there is someone trying to save [the animal or bird, a cat becomes more vicious and] does maul.”*
- G. *[But is it true that cat] does not maul in an instance where there is no one trying to save [the animal or bird]? But lo [consider this case]: There was a chicken in the house of R. Kahana. A cat ran after it and it went into a room and the door slammed in the cat’s face and it scratched the door in anger. And they found on it*

*five drops of blood* [Rashi: the poison of five fingers of the cat, indicating that the cat could have mauled the chicken]. [We can respond to this objection that when the animal tries] to save itself, it is the same as if others tried to save it [from the mauling].

- H. *And [how do we explain this poison on the door in accord with the view of] the rabbis [who say that a cat does not maul]? [They say that a cat] has poison but that it does not contaminate [enough to constitute a mauling of the organs that would render the animal or bird terefah].*
- I. *There are those that say [that R. Hisda says that even where no one tries to save the animal, there is mauling. And the Mishnah specifies a wolf for a case of mauling of large sheep. And the baraita that says it must pierce the abdominal chamber] in accord with whom is this [rule that it must penetrate]? In accord with Beribbi.*
- J. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority: Beribbi says, “They only stated [that a cat] does maul in an instance where there is someone trying to save [the animal or bird. For then the cat is vicious.] But in an instance where there is no one trying to save [the animal or bird, a cat becomes less vicious and] does not maul.”*
- K. [But is it true that cat] does not maul in an instance where there is no one trying to save [the animal or bird]? *But lo [consider this case]: There was a chicken in the house of R. Kahana. A cat ran after it and it went into a room and the door slammed in the cat’s face and it scratched the door in anger. And they found on it five drops of blood* [Rashi: the poison of five fingers of the cat, indicating that the cat could have mauled the chicken]. [We can respond to this objection that when the animal tries] to save itself, it is the same as if others tried to save it [from the mauling].

**XV.3** A. R. Kahana *posed a question* to Rab, **[53a]** “Does the rule of mauling [that renders an animal *terefah*] apply to a cat or not?”

- B. He said to him, “The rule of mauling applies even to a weasel.”
- C. [He said to him,] “Does the rule of mauling apply to a weasel?”
- D. He said to him, “The rule of mauling does not apply even to a cat.”
- E. [He said to him,] “Does the rule of mauling apply to a cat or to a weasel or not?”
- F. He said to him, “The rule of mauling applies to a cat but not to a weasel.”
- G. *And all this is not contradictory.* That which he said, “The rule of mauling applies even to a weasel,” [refers to a case where it mauled] birds. That which he said, “The rule of mauling does not apply even to a cat,” [refers to a case of] large sheep. That which he stated, “The rule of mauling applies to a cat but not to a weasel,” [refers to a case of] kids and lambs.

**XV.4** A. R. Ashi *posed a question*, “Does the rule of mauling apply to other kinds of unclean birds [of prey] or not?”

B. Said R. Hillel to R. Ashi, “*When I was in the house of R. Kahana he said that the rule of mauling applies to other unclean birds.*”

C. *But lo we have taught on Tannaite authority, One mauled by a hawk in the case of small fowl [M. 3:1 K].* [That means] the mauling of a hawk [renders *terefah* a bird] *even its own size. But other [birds render terefah by mauling] only those birds that are smaller than them.*

D. *And some say:* [That means] the mauling of a hawk [renders *terefah* a bird] *even large than its own size. But other [birds render terefah by mauling] up to their own size.*

**XV.5** A. Said R. Kahana in the name of R. Shimi bar Ashi, “The rule of mauling does not apply to a fox.”

B. *Is it not the case [that the rule does apply]? But lo when R. Dimi came [from Israel] he said,* “There was an instance where a fox mauled a ewe in the bath house of Bet Hini. And the instance came before the sages [for a ruling]. And they said that the rule of mauling does apply [to the case of a fox].”

C. *Said R. Safra, “This was [a case of] a cat [that mauled a ewe].”*

D. *Another version:* Said R. Kahana in the name of R. Shimi bar Ashi, “The rule of mauling does apply to a fox.”

E. *Is it not the case [that the rule does apply]? But lo when R. Dimi came [from Israel] he said,* “There was an instance where a fox mauled a ewe in the bath house of Bet Hini. And the instance came before the sages [for a ruling]. And they said that the rule of mauling does not apply [to the case of a fox].”

F. *Said R. Safra, “This was [a case of] a dog [that mauled a ewe].”*

G. *Said R. Joseph, “We hold as a tradition that the rule of mauling does not apply to a dog.”*

H. *Said Abbaye, “We hold as a tradition that the rule of mauling applies only [where the animal mauled with its] fore leg.”*

I. *This excludes [any case where it mauled with] its hind leg [where the rule of mauling] does not apply.*

J. *The rule of mauling only applies [where the animal mauled with its] claw. This excludes [any case where it mauled with] its teeth [where the rule of mauling] does not apply.*



- K. The rule of mauling only applies [where the animal mauled] with intent. *This excludes [any case where it mauled] without intent [where the rule of mauling] does not apply.*
- L. The rule of mauling only applies [where the animal mauled] while alive. *This excludes [any case where it mauled by falling on the prey] after it died [where the rule of mauling] does not apply.*
- M. *They said there: You said [any case where it mauled] without intent [the rule of mauling] does not apply. Is it necessary to state [that in any case where it mauled by falling on its prey] after it died [the rule of mauling does not apply]? [This appears to be redundant.]*
- N. *No. It is necessary [to state both rules so as to include under the rule of mauling the case of an animal that] mauled and then its leg was cut off [before it could withdraw the leg from the animal]. What would you like to say? That in the act of mauling it injects the poison [into the prey]. [By teaching both rules] it makes the novel point that in the act of withdrawing [its leg from the prey] it injects the poison [that kills the prey].*

- XV.6** A. Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, said Rab, “If a lion entered the midst of a herd of oxen and then a claw was found in the back of one of them, we are not concerned that perhaps the lion mauled it.”
- B. *What is the basis [for this conclusion]? [It is based on the principle that] the majority of lions do maul and the minority do not maul. And for any [species of] animal that mauls, its nail is not likely to come off [even if that particular animal is not wont to maul].*
  - C. And this [ox] — since a nail was found in its back, we should say that it rubbed up against a wall [and a nail of a lion that had become stuck in the wall, became lodged in the back of the ox].
  - D. *But the opposite conclusion is more reasonable [based on another principle, namely] the majority of oxen rub [their back] and the minority do not rub. And any animal that rubs [its back], it is not likely that a nail will remain lodged in its back. And this one since it has a nail lodged in its back, we should say that [it became lodged there when] a lion mauled it.*
  - E. *There is a basis to say [the inference must be drawn in accord with] this [line of reasoning] and there is a basis to say that [the inference must be drawn in accord] with that [line of reasoning]. Let us uphold the [validity of] the animal*

*according to its presumptive status. It then is a case of an animal about which there is a doubt whether it was mauled. And Rab rules in accord with his own view [elsewhere]. For he said, “We are not concerned with the possibility of a case of a doubt as to whether the animal had been mauled.”*

- F. Said Abbayye, “We only said [that we are not concerned if in the animal’s back they found] a nail. But if [they found a wound on the animal’s back] the size of a nail, then we are concerned [that the animal was mauled].”
- G. *And with regard to the nail itself [that was found in the animal’s back] we only said [that we are not concerned it was mauled] if it was moist [with blood and it is unlikely that a vital nail would come loose even during a mauling]. But if it was dried out, it is likely to be dislodged [from the animal’s claw during a mauling].*
- H. *And with regard to a moist nail we only said [that we are not concerned it was mauled] in the case where [they found in the animal’s back] one nail. But where they found two or three [nails in its back] we are concerned [that it was mauled]. And this applies only where they were [lodged in the back] in a row, like a claw.*

**XV.7** A. *It was stated:*

- B. Rab said, “We are not concerned with the possibility of a case of a doubt as to whether the animal had been mauled.”
- C. And Samuel said, “We are concerned with the possibility of a case of a doubt as to whether the animal had been mauled.”
- D. *They all agree [regarding an animal that mauls, that in a case where] there is a doubt whether or not it went up [into the herd], it makes sense to say it did not go up. Where there is a doubt [about an instance of mauling] whether it was done by a dog or a cat, it makes sense to say that it was done by a dog. If it went up quietly and lay down among them, it makes sense to say that it made peace [with them and did not harm any of the herd]. If it decapitated one of them [it makes sense to say that its fierceness then subsided].*
- E. *[And they all agree that] if it [the lion] was roaring and they [the oxen] were lowing [that means] they are facing off [53b] against one another [and no mauling has taken place yet]. Where do they dispute? Where it [the lion] is quiet and they [the oxen] are lowing. One authority [Samuel] reasons that [we must conclude the lion] has done the deed [i.e., attacked]. And the other authority [Rab] reasons that they are doing so as a response [to the presence of the lion but he has not yet attacked them].*

- F. *Said Amemar, "The law follows in accord with the view that we are concerned with the possibility of a case of a doubt as to whether the animal had been mauled."*
- G. *Said R. Ashi to Amemar, "What about this opinion of Rab?"*
- H. *He said to him, "I did not hear it." That is to say, "I do not reason in accord with it."*
- I. *And if you prefer, Rab retracted his view in favor of Samuel's.*
- J. *For there was a basket of birds about which there was a doubt as to whether they had been mauled that came before Rab [for a ruling]. They sent it before Samuel. He strangled them and threw them into the river. And if you conclude that he [Rab] did not retract his view [that they not to be deemed as if they were mauled] then he should have declared them permitted [for consumption].*
- K. *Rather what [should he have done if he had retracted his view]? He should have declared them prohibited [on his own].*
- L. *But this case was in the jurisdiction of Samuel [and Rab wanted to allow him to render the opinion].*
- M. *Why did he have to strangle them? Why not throw them into the river as they were?*
- N. *Because they might fly off [and be consumed by another Israelite]. And why did he not leave them and wait twelve months [to see if they would live]?*
- O. *He might thereby transgress [in the interim by consuming them].*
- P. *And why did he not sell them to an idolater?*
- Q. *He might go and sell them back to an Israelite.*
- R. *And why did he not strangle them and throw them into the trash?*
- S. *And on this basis you could allow him to throw them to the dogs.*
- T. *[That is correct.] But [he threw them into the river] to publicize his prohibition.*

**XV.8** A. *A duck that was at the house of R Ashi went up into the reeds. It came out with its neck covered with blood.*

B. *Said R. Ashi, "Did we not say, 'Where there is a doubt [about an instance of mauling] whether it was done by a dog or a cat, it makes sense to say that it was done by a dog'? Here too [we should say], 'Where there is a doubt [about an instance of mauling] whether it was done by a reed or a cat, it makes sense to say that the injury was done by a reed.'"*

C. *Said the sons of R. Hiyya, "The mauled animal that they spoke of must be inspected around its intestines."*

D. *Said R. Joseph, "This rule of R. Joseph was already specified by Samuel." For said Samuel in the name of R. Haninah b. Antigonus, "The mauled animal that they spoke of must be inspected around its intestines."*

**XV.9** A. *Ilfa posed a question: Does the rule of mauling apply to the organs [of the throat] or not?*

B. *Said R. Zira, "The rule for that question which Ilfa posed was already specified by R. Hanan bar Raba." For said R. Hanan bar Raba, said Rab, "The mauled animal that they spoke of must be inspected around the entire abdominal cavity including the organs [of the throat]."*

C. *Ilfa posed a question: Concerning the organs [of the throat] that were dangling: how much [must they dangle out of their normal position to render the animal terefah]?*

D. *Said R. Zira, "The rule for the question which Ilfa posed was already specified by Rabbah bar bar Hannah." For said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said Samuel, "Concerning the organs that were dangling: a majority [that dangles renders the animal terefah]."*

E. *R. Ammi posed a question: What is the rule regarding putrefaction [of the animal's flesh caused by mauling].*

F. *Said R. Zira, "The rule for the question which R. Ammi posed was already specified by R. Judah." For said R. Judah, said Rab, "In regards to an animal that was mauled [there is no consequence unless the flesh around the intestines turns red. If the flesh putrefied we regard it as if it were not there at all]."*

G. *What is the definition of putrefaction? Any instance [of non-vital tissue] in which the physician would scrape it away to help restore the living flesh.*

H. *Said R. Ashi, "When we were in the house of R. Kahana they brought before us [for a ruling] a lung that when it was set down it sat perfectly*

*well. But when they lifted it up it disintegrated. And we declared it terefah in accord with the rule of R. Huna the son of R. Joshua.”*

**XV.10** A. R. Nahman said, “A thorn — [the animal is not *terefah*] unless it has pierced the abdominal cavity. A mauling — [The animal is *terefah*] when the flesh around the intestines turns red.”

B. R. Zebid taught as follows, “A mauling — [The animal is *terefah*] when the flesh around the intestines turns red. The organs [of the throat] — [the animal is not *terefah*] until the organs themselves turn red.”

C. Said R. Pappa, “R. Bibi bar Abbayye posed the question: [54a] The gullet — any amount of piercing at all [renders it *terefah*]. Any amount of mauling at all [renders it *terefah*]. The windpipe — a piercing the size of an *issar* [renders it *terefah*]. How much mauling [renders it *terefah*]?”

D. *After he posed the question, he then answered it:* In either case any amount at all [of mauling renders it *terefah*].

E. *What is the basis for this view? The venom [of the animal from the mauling] will continue to burn [a larger hole even after the mauling itself].*

**XV.11** A. R. Isaac bar Samuel bar Marta sat before R. Nahman and he sat and said, “The mauled animal that they spoke of must be inspected around its intestines.”

B. R. Nahman said, “By God! Rab ruled concerning it [that an animal must be inspected] from the pan to the hips [so Cashdan].” *What is the [location of the] pan? If you say the pan of the fore-leg, this is [the same as saying] around the intestines. Rather [it must mean] from the pan of the brain to the hips.*

C. *When R. Hiyya bar Joseph went up to the Land of Israel, he found R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish who were sitting and saying,* “The mauled animal that they spoke of must be inspected around its intestines.”

D. *He said to them,* “By God! Rab ruled concerning it [that an animal must be inspected from the pan to the hips].”

E. *Said to him Resh Laqish,* “Who is Rab? Who is Rab? I do not know who he is.”

F. Said R. Yohanan, “Do you not remember that student who served the Great Rabbi and R. Hiyya. And by God! All those years that student [sat and] served in the academy, I served standing up. *And in what [subject] was his strength? He was strong in all [subjects].*”

G. Resh Laqish immediately spoke and said, “Now may that man be well remembered indeed! For a teaching was stated in his name: [If an organ of the neck was found]

dislocated and slaughtered, it is valid. For it is impossible to slaughter a dislocated organ. [Thus it must have been dislocated after it was slaughtered.]”

H. And R. Yohanan said, “Let him bring it and compare it [to a properly slaughtered organ before he declares it valid].”

I. Said R. Nahman, “They only taught this law in regard to a case of one who did not take hold of the organs of the neck. But in the case of one who did take hold of the organ and slaughtered, it is possible that a displaced organ can be slaughtered. [Thus we have no proof that it was slaughtered prior to the organ becoming displaced.]”

**XVI.1 A. This is the general principle: Any the like of which does not live is *terefah* [M. 3:1 L].** *What does this statement encompass? It encompasses the seven categories [of terefot] that were taught [on Amoraic authority, see above b. 42b].*

B. *Members of the house of Joseph the trapper used to hit [the animal on] the sciatic nerve to kill [their catch]. They brought this case before R. Judah b. Betera for a ruling.*

C. *He said to them, “Is there a need to add to the [list of those circumstances that render animals] terefot? You only need [to enumerate] those [cases] that the sages specified.”*

D. *Members of the house of R. Papa bar Abba the trapper used to hit [the animal on] the kidneys to kill [their catch]. They brought this case before R. Abba for a ruling.*

E. *He said to them, “Is there a need to add to the [list of those circumstances that render animals] terefot? You only need [to enumerate] those [cases] that the sages specified.”*

F. *But lo we can see that it dies [from a blow to the kidneys]! We learn from this that if you applied medication to it, it would live. [Therefore it is not included with the other conditions that render animals terefot].*

### 3:2

A. **And these are the valid [carcasses] among cattle:**

(1) **[if] the windpipe is pierced or is slit [lengthwise] —**

B. **How large may the hole be? Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “So much as an Italian issar” —**

C. (2) **[if] the skull is damaged, but the membrane of the brain is not pierced,**

(3) **[if] the heart is pierced, but not up to the empty space [cavity] thereof,**

- (4) [if] the backbone is broken, but the spinal cord is not severed,
- (5) [if] the liver is removed, but an olive's bulk of it remains,
- (6) the omasum or the second stomach [reticulum] that are pierced [so that the holes lead] one into the other,
- (7) [if] the spleen is removed,
- (8) [if] the kidneys are removed,
- (9) [if] the lower jaw is removed,
- (10) [if] the womb is removed.

D. (11) And one [the lung] of it is dried naturally.

E. (12) One that has lost its hide [having been flayed] —

F. R. Meir declares valid.

G. And sages declare invalid.

**I.1** A. *It was stated:* R. Yohanan said, **These are the terefah [carcasses] [M. 3:1 A]** specifies [all the cases].

B. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, **These are the valid [carcasses]** specifies [all the cases].

C. *Concerning what did they dispute? Concerning the rule of R. Matna. For said R. Matna, "This [case of an animal whose] femur slipped out of its socket [Cashdan] is terefah."*

D. R. Yohanan said, **These are the terefah [carcasses] [M. 3:1A]** specifies [all the cases]. *The Mishnah taught, These are the terefah [carcasses] [3:1 A], and it taught, This is the general principle [3:1L]. [54b] And it seems reasonable for the rule of R. Matna to be subsumed in the general principle.*

E. *What is the basis for this conclusion? Because it resembles a case where [an organ] was removed [from the animal rendering it terefah]. The Tannaite authority taught These are the terefah [carcasses] [to teach us] these are terefah. That case of [the rule of] R. Matna is valid.*

F. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, **These are the valid [carcasses]** specifies [all the cases]. *The Mishnah taught, These are the terefah [carcasses] [3:1A], and it taught, This is the general principle [3:1L]. And it seems reasonable for the rule of R. Matna not to be subsumed in the general principle.*

G. *What is the basis for this conclusion? Because it does not resemble a case where [an organ] was pierced. Nor does it resembles a case*



where [an organ] was severed. And neither does it resemble a case where [an organ] was removed. The Tannaite authority taught, **These are the valid [carcasses] [to teach us] these are valid.** That case of [the rule of] R. Matna is terefah.

**I.2** A. Reverting to the body of the prior text: Said R. Matna, “This [case of an animal whose] femur slipped out of its socket is terefah.” And Raba said, “It is valid. But if its ligaments were severed it is terefah.”

B. And the law is: if they were severed it is valid anyway, unless they [the ligaments] disintegrated.

**II.1** A. How large may the hole be? [Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “So much as an Italian issar.”]

B. Said Zeiri, “You who are not familiar with this measure [of an Italian issar] may take the measure of a Gordian dinar. And that is the same as a small peshitta [coin]. And it is found [circulating] among the peshittas of Pumbedita.”

C. Said R. Hanna the money changer, “[Yohanan] bar Nappaha was standing before me. And he asked me for a Gordian dinar to measure [the size of a defect that might render an animal] terefah. And I wanted to stand up before him [as a sign of respect]. And he would not let me. He said to me, ‘Sit my son, sit.’ Professionals [such as money changers] are not permitted to stand up on account of disciples of the sages while they are engaged in their professional activities.”

D. But are they not [supposed to stand up before a sage]? For lo it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaitic authority, **All of the craftsmen of Jerusalem stand before them and greet them [saying], “Brothers, men of such and such a place, you have come in peace [M. Bik. 3:3J-K].”**

E. Said R. Yohanan, “Before them [those who bring first fruits to the Temple] they stand up. Before disciples of the sages, they do not have to stand up.”

F. Said R. Yosé bar Abin, “Come and see how beloved is the performance of a commandment in its proper time. For lo, ‘Before them [those who bring first fruits to the Temple] they stand up. Before disciples of the sages, they do not have to stand up.’”

G. But why draw this conclusion? Perhaps [they acted in this way] so as not to discourage them [from bringing the first fruits] in the future. [It does not prove that one who brings first fruits is inherently more deserving of respect than a sage.]

- II.2** A. Said R. Nahman, “[A measure] the size of a *sela* [exactly] is treated as if it were larger than a *sela*. [A measure] the size of an *issar* [exactly] is treated as if it were larger than an *issar*.”
- B. *It seems [logical to conclude] that R. Nahman reasons in accord with the principle that in measures of size, ‘So much as’ a certain size means not equal to [that size].*
- C. *Raba raised an objection to R. Nahman, **The rope that hangs over from [the webbing of] the bed — up to five handbreadths is clean [if the bed itself becomes unclean. M. Kel. 19:2 A-B]. Do we not conclude that five [handbreadths] is the same as any amount below this measure?***
- D. *No. [We conclude that] five [handbreadths] is the same as any amount above this measure.*
- E. *Come and take note: **From five handbreadths up to ten is unclean [M. Kel. 19:2 C]. Do we not conclude that ten [handbreadths] is the same as any amount below [this measure]?***
- F. *No. [We conclude that] ten [handbreadths] is the same as any amount above this measure.*
- G. *Come and take note: **[As to] the smallest [size] of earthenware vessels: their [rimmed] bottoms or their sides [that can] set without supports [are unclean if] [55a] their measure is as much [oil as needed for] anointing a small finger of a child. [And this measurement applies to vessels that, when whole, hold] up to a log [M. Kel. 2:2 A]. Do we not conclude that a log is the same as any amount below this measure?***
- H. *No. [We conclude that] a log is the same as any amount above this measure.*
- I. *Come and take note: **[If, when whole, such vessels held] from a log to a seah, [the uncleanness will persist if the remnant may hold] a quarter-log [M. Kel. 2:2 B]. Do we not conclude that a seah is the same as any amount below this measure?***
- J. *No. [We conclude that] a seah is the same as any amount above this measure.*
- K. *Come and take note: **From a seah to two seahs, a half-log [M. Kel. 2:2C]. Do we not conclude that two seahs is the same as any amount below this measure?***
- L. *No. [We conclude that] two seahs is the same as any amount above this measure.*
- M. *But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority, [In rulings regarding the uncleanness of vessels, exactly] a log is the same as any amount below this measure. [Exactly] a seah is the same as any amount below this measure. [Exactly] two seahs is the same as any amount below this measure.*

- N. *There [in ruling regarding the uncleanness of utensils] we judge in accord with the more strict alternative.* For said R. Abbahu, said R. Yohanan, “All of the measures specified by the sages are meant to accord with the stricter alternative except for the [measure of] the size of a bean for [blood stains on] test rags [used for determining menstrual uncleanness where the measure is meant] to accord with the more lenient view.”
- O. *And you may derive this as well from this that was taught on Tannaite authority concerning the matter, [Exactly] five is the same as any amount above this measure... [Exactly] ten is the same as any amount below this measure [T. Kel. B.M. 9:3 C, E, commenting on M. Kel. 19:2].*

- III.1** A. (7) **[If] the spleen is removed [M. 3:2 C]** [according to R. Meir, it is valid]. And said R. Avira in the name of Raba, “They taught this rule only in the case where it was removed. But if it was pierced, it is *terefah*”
- B. *R. Yosé bar Abin, and some say it was R. Yosé bar Zabeda, objected: [If] one cuts off part of the offspring which is in its womb — it [that which is cut off and left inside the mother when it is slaughtered] is permitted to be eaten. [If he cut off] part of the spleen or kidneys [of the beast itself], it is prohibited to be eaten [M. 4:1 D-F]. Lo [this implies that if he cut from the spleen] the animal itself is permitted.*
- C. *[No.] The law is that even the animal itself is also prohibited. Since the former text taught, it is permitted to be eaten, the latter text taught, it is prohibited to be eaten. [But it does not mean that only the parts of the spleen that cut off are prohibited. The animal is terefah because he cut off from the spleen.]*
- D. *And if you prefer [we could argue that the animal itself is not terefah. The rule for] piercing [the organ] is independent, and [the rule for] cutting [the organ] is independent.*
- IV.1** A. (8) **[If] the kidneys are removed [M. 3:2 C].** Said R. Akhish bar Pappa in the name of Rab, “If the animal was diseased in one kidney, it is *terefah*.”
- B. They said in the West [in Israel], “*And this is the case only if the disease reached [55b] the hilum.*”
- C. *And where is the hilum? [Cashdan:] At the white calyces in the middle of the kidney immediately below the loins.*
- D. *Said R. Nehuniah, “I inquired of those who issue rulings from the West [regarding the defects that render an animal] terefah. And they said to*

*me, 'The law follows in accord with the view of R. Akhish bar Pappa. And the law does not follow in accord with the view of R. Avira.'"*

- E. *We say this only [if the spleen was pierced] in its thin section. But if it was [pierced] in its thick section, it is terefah [in accord with Avira]. And if there remained [in the spleen some thickness not pierced] as much as the thickness of a gold dinar, it is valid.*

**IV.2** A. *They said in the West [in the Land of Israel]: All that renders unfit in regard to the lung is valid in regard to the kidney. For lo, a hole renders unfit in regard to the lung and it is valid in regard to the kidney. And all the more so that which is valid in regard to the lung, is valid in regard to the kidney.*

B. *R. Tanhuma raised this by way of contradiction: Is this the general rule? But lo, consider the case of pus that is valid in regard to the lung and unfit in regard to the kidney. But lo, [consider on the other hand the case of] clear water that is considered valid in both [if found in either the lung or the kidney].*

C. *But said R. Ashi, "Can you compare [defects that render animals] terefot to one another? We do not say concerning [defects that render animals] terefot that this one resembles that one. For lo you may cut from this place [on an animal] and it will die. You may cut from here [an identical amount in another place on the animal] and it will live [b. 48b]."*

D. *And in the case of clear water we only say [it is valid] if the water is unclouded. But if it was murky it is unfit. And even if it is unclouded we do not say that it is valid unless it was not foul. But if it was foul, it is unfit.*

E. *The [rule concerning the] kidney that shrunk — for a small beast [it is valid unless it shrank smaller than] a bean; for a large beast [it is valid unless it shrank smaller than] a medium size grape.*

**V.1** A. [This passage is omitted in some editions.] **(9) [If] the lower jaw is removed [M. 3:2 C] [according to Meir, it is valid].**

B. *Said R. Zira, "They taught this only where it could survive by force feeding. But where it could not survive by force feeding [such a case is terefah]."*

**VI.1** A. **(10) [If] the womb is removed [M. 3:2 C] [according to Meir, it is valid].**

B. *It was taught, The womb, that is the tarpahat, that is the slpwhyt [cf. b. 48a above].*

**VII.1** A. **(10) And one whose [lung] dried naturally [M. 3:2 D].**

B. *Our rabbis taught, What is the case of a dried [lung]? Any animal whose lung shrunk [cf. T. 3:12]. [If it] dried naturally it is valid. [If it was dried] by human intervention it is terefah.*

- C. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “Even if it was [dried out] by the intervention of any creature [it is *terefah*].”
- D. *They posed a question: Does R. Simeon b. Eleazar’s statement apply to the former text and state a lenient rule? Or does it apply to the latter text and state a stricter rule? [We have translated in accord with this second alternative.]*
- E. *Come and take note: It was taught on Tannaite authority, If it dried out by human intervention, it is terefah. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “Even if it was [dried out] by the intervention of any creature [cf. T. 3:6 D-E].”*
- F. *Rabbah bar bar Hannah was walking in the wilderness. He found some rams whose lungs were shrunk. He went and ask [for a ruling regarding them] in the house of study.*
- G. *They said to him, “In the summer [this is the procedure to determine if the animals are valid]. Bring white glazed basins and fill them with cold water and put [the lungs] in them for twenty-four hours. If they return to normal [then they were shrunk] by natural causes and they are valid. And if not, they are terefah. In the winter [this is the procedure]. Bring dark glazed basins and fill them with warm water and put [the lungs] in them for twenty-four hours. If they return to normal, they are valid. And if not, they are terefah.”*

**VIII.1 A. (12) One that has lost its hide [having been flayed] [M. 3:2 E].**

- B. *Our rabbis taught: One that lost its hide — R. Meir declares valid. And sages declare invalid [M. 3:2 E-G].*
- C. *And Eleazar the scribe and Yohanan b. Gudguda already testified concerning the animal that lost its hide that it is invalid.*
- D. *Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “R. Meir retracted his view on this.” We may derive the conclusion that according to R. Simeon b. Eleazar R. Meir did [earlier] dispute [the view of sages regarding] one that lost its hide. But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said, “R. Meir and sages did not dispute concerning one which has lost its hide, that it is invalid.” R. Oshaia the son of R. Judah [T.: Judah b. Isaiah] the spice maker already testified before R. Aqiba, speaking in the name of R. Tarfon, concerning one which has lost its hide, that it is invalid [T. 3:7 B-C]. But if there remained on it [hide] the size of a sela it is valid.*
- E. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “What does it mean that they did not dispute? R. Meir did not stand by his [conflicting view] in dispute [with sages].”*

**VIII.2** A. Said the master: But if there remained on it [hide] the size of a *sela* it is valid [D above].

B. *Where [must there remain this amount]?*

C. Said R. Judah, said Samuel, “All along the backbone [of the animal].”

D. *They posed a question: [Does this mean] a long and thin [piece of hide along the backbone] that when combined adds up to the size of a sela? Or perhaps does it mean [there must be a strip of hide] the width of a sela along the entire backbone?*

E. *Come and take note: R. Nehorai explained in the name of Samuel, “[There must be a strip of hide] the width of a sela along the entire backbone.”*

F. Rabbah bar bar Hannah said, “At the top of each joint [there must be hide the size of a *sela*.]”

G. R. Eleazar b. Antigonus in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Yannai said, “At the navel [there must be hide the size of a *sela*.]”

H. R. Yannai b. R. Ishmael *posed a question*: If the [hide] was removed along the length of the backbone and the rest [of the hide] was intact; if the [hide] was removed from the navel and the rest was intact; if the [hide] was removed from the tops of the joints and the rest was intact, what is the law? *The question stands unresolved.*

I. Said Rab, “All of the hide serves to rescue [the animal] from the status of **one that has lost its hide** except for the hide on the hooves.”

J. And R. Yohanan said, “Even the hide on the hooves serves to rescue it.”

K. *R. Assi posed a question of R. Yohanan*, “What is the rule with regard to whether the hide of the hooves rescues it from the status of **one that has lost its hide**?”

L. He said to him, “It rescues it.”

M. He said to him, “But our master taught us, ‘These are the places where the hide has the status of the flesh: the hide of the hooves [b. 122a].’”

N. He said to them, “Stop annoying me. For I teach this as my personal view.”

- O. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority, He who slaughters the burnt-offering [with the intention] to eat an olive's bulk of the hide from under the tail outside of its proper place [M. Zeb. 2:2 E], it is unfit and there is for this no punishment of extirpation. [If he did so with intention to eat it] after its proper time, it is refuse. And they are liable on its account to the punishment of extirpation [T. Zeb. 2:3 A-D].*
- P. **Eliezer b. Judah of Eiblayim said in the name of R. Jacob, and so R. Simeon b. Judah of Kefar Akkum says in the name of R. Simeon, "The same applies to the hide of the hooves, or the soft skin of the head of a calf, or the skin under the tail, or all [the places] that were listed by the sages regarding uncleanness whose hide has the same status as the flesh [of those places] [cf. T. Zeb. 2:3 F-G]."**
- Q. **[56a]** This includes [by inference] the skin of the pudenda [of an animal that he slaughtered with intention to eat it] **outside of its proper place, it is invalid but there is for this no punishment on account of extirpation. [If he did so with intention to offer it] after its proper time, it is refuse and they are liable to punishment on account of extirpation [cf. T. Zeb. 2:3 H-I].**

### 3:3

- A. **And these are the terefah [carcasses] among fowl:**  
    **(1) one the gullet of which is pierced,**  
    **(2) one the windpipe of which is torn.**
- B. **(3) [If] the weasel pierced its head at a point which renders it terefah;**  
    **(4) [if] the gizzard is pierced;**  
    **(5) [if] the small intestines are pierced.**
- C. **(6) [If] it fell into the fire and the intestines were scorched — if they are green, they are invalid. If they are red, they are valid.**
- D. **(7) [If] one trampled it or knocked it against the wall,**



**E. or [if] a beast trampled on it, and it flutters — if it remains alive for twenty-four hours, and one [then] slaughtered it, it is valid.**

- I.1** A. *Rab and Samuel and Levi said, “He inserts his hand inside and inspects it [i.e., the mouth of a bird whose head was pierced by a weasel]. If it oozes [from a hole in the skull] it is terefah. And if not, it is valid.”*
- B. *This is reasonable according to the authority who holds the view [that it is not terefah] until the interior membrane is pierced [b. 45a]. But according to the authority who holds the view that [it is terefah] if the exterior membrane is pierced even though the interior membrane is not pierced, we should suspect that perhaps [in our case] the exterior membrane was pierced but the interior membrane was not pierced. [That is why there is no oozing from the skull. Accordingly, this form of inspection would not be an effective means to determine if the animal is terefah.]*
- C. *[This is not likely.] If it is the case that the exterior membrane is pierced, the interior membrane on account of its delicacy will surely rupture. [Thus the inspection is valid.]*
- I.2** A. Said Ziri, “There is no effective inspection for [piercing by] a weasel because its teeth are thin.”
- B. *But what difference does it make if its teeth are thin?*
- C. Said R. Oshaia, “[There is no effective inspection for piercing by a weasel] because its teeth are thin and curved.” [There will be no oozing because the holes it makes do not align.]
- D. *When he departed to Nehardea he sent to them, “The matters that I spoke before you were errors on my part. In fact this is what they said in the name of R. Simeon b. Laqish, ‘They inspect [for signs of piercing by] a weasel by hand, but not with a nail [or needle or straw].’ And R. Yohanan said, ‘[They may inspect] even with a needle.’”*
- E. *And this is [the same as] the dispute between R. Judah and R. Nehemiah. One inspected by hand and one inspected with a needle.*
- F. *The one who inspected by hand would say to the one who inspected with a needle, “How long will you go on losing money for Israel?” [The inspection with a needle resulted in the discovery of many more signs of defects.]*

G. *Said the one who inspected with a needle to the one who inspected by hand, “How long will you go on feeding the Israel carrion?” [Your method of inspection does not discover the defects.]*

H. *Is it carrion? But lo the animal was slaughtered [and should not be categorized as carrion in any case]! Rather [he means] terefah for perhaps the membrane of the brain was pierced.*

I. *We have proof that R. Judah was the one who inspected by hand. For it was taught on Tannaite authority, **R. Simeon b. Eleazar says in the name of R. Judah, “They inspect it by hand, but they do not inspect it with a needle. If the bone is pierced, [it is invalid, and if not, it is valid] [T. 3:15 D]”** even if the membrane of the brain was not pierced. This is proof.*

J. *Lo the body of this text itself contains a contradiction. It says, **They inspect [for signs of piercing by hand, but not with a nail.** It seems [logical to conclude from this] that it you need to inspect [for the defect]. And then it teaches, **If the bone is pierced [it is invalid]** even if the membrane of the brain was not pierced. It seems [logical to conclude from this] that you do not need to inspect it.*

K. *[You can explain that there is no contradiction.] The latter text refers to a water bird since it has no membrane. Can you conclude that it has no membrane? Rather because its membrane is delicate [it would rupture if you inspected it].*

**I.3** A. *Said R. Nahman to R. Anan, “Did not the master say, ‘Samuel inspected by hand and declared it valid [if he found no defect].’ And did not Huna our associate say, ‘Rab inspected by hand and declared it valid.’ But Levi taught, ‘The terefot that the sages enumerated for an animal all have equivalents for a fowl. There is an additional one for fowl: **If the bone is pierced [it is invalid]** even if the membrane of the brain was not pierced.”“*

B. *He [Anan] said to him, “The latter text refers to a water bird since it has no membrane. Can you conclude that it has no membrane? Rather because*

*its membrane is delicate [it would rupture if you inspected it].”*

**I.4** A. *A certain hen that was in the house of R. Hana [and] they sent [it for a ruling] before R. Matna [because it fell under the rule of]: **If the bone is pierced [it is invalid]** even if the membrane of the brain was not pierced. And he declared it valid!*

B. *They said to him, “But lo Levi taught, ‘The terefot that the sages enumerated for an animal all have equivalents for a fowl. There is an additional one for fowl: **If the bone is pierced [it is invalid]** even if the membrane of the brain was not pierced.’”*

C. *He [Matna] said to him, “The latter text refers to a water bird since it has no membrane. Can you conclude that it has no membrane? Rather because its membrane is delicate [it would rupture if you inspected it].”*

**I.5** A. *R. Shizbi inspected [the membrane for signs of piercing] in the sun. R. Yemar inspected it [for leaks] in water. R. Aha bar Jacob inspected it with a [56b] stalk of wheat [i.e., as they did with a nail or needle].*

B. *Said R. Shizbi, “Our geese are like water birds [with respect to this rule].”*

**II.1** A. **[If] it fell into the fire [and the intestines were scorched — if they are green, they are invalid. If they are red, they are valid] [M. 3:3 C].**

B. *Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Yosé b. Joshua, “The [minimum] quantity that must turn green [to render it invalid] is the same as the [minimum] quantity that must be pierced [to render it invalid]. Just as the [minimum quantity that must] turn green [to render it invalid] is any amount at all, the [minimum quantity that must] be pierced [to render it invalid] is any amount at all.”*

C. *R. Joseph the son of R. Joshua b. Levi posed a question to R. Joshua b. Levi: If the liver near the intestines turned green, what is the law?*

- D. He [Joshua] said to him, "It is *terefah*."
- E. [Joseph asked,] "Should it not be treated as if it were removed [and thus valid]?"
- F. Said Raba, "Because the liver near the intestines turned green, we know that it fell into the fire and that the intestines were scorched and it is *terefah*."

**II.2** A. *Rabbi Joshua b. Levi had a certain hen [that had fallen into a fire] that he sent before R. Eleazar Haqappar beribbi [for a ruling]. He said to him, "They are green." And he declared them valid.*

- B. *But lo we were taught, **If they are green, they are invalid.*** [This is not a contradiction.]
- C. *They only said, **If they are green, they are invalid** regarding the gizzard, the heart and the liver.*
  - D. *R. Isaac bar Joseph had a certain hen [that had fallen into a fire] that he sent before R. Abbahu [for a ruling].*
  - E. *He said to him, "They [the intestines] are red." And he declared them terefah.*
  - F. *But lo we were taught, **If they are red, they are valid.*** [This is not a contradiction.]
  - G. *He said to him, "Red ones that turned green or green ones that turned red are terefah. They only said that red ones are valid regarding the heart, the gizzard and the liver."*
  - H. *Said R. Samuel bar Hiyya, said R. Mani, "Red ones [intestines] that turned green [after the hen fell into the flame] and he boiled them and they turned red again are valid."*
    - I. *What is the basis for this rule? Smoke had contaminated them [and made them look green].*
    - J. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Even I said, 'Red ones that had not turned green [after the hen fell into the flame] and he boiled them and they turned green are terefah.'"*
    - K. *What is the basis for this rule? Their true status is revealed [by boiling them].*
    - L. *Said R. Ashi, "Therefore a person should only eat [from a hen that fell into a fire after the intestines are] boiled."*
    - M. *-But this is not the case! We do not surmise the presence of a taint [that would render the animal defective].*

**III.1** A. [If] one trampled it or knocked it against the wall, or [if a beast trampled on it... [M. 3:3 D-E].

B. Said R. Eleazar b. Antigonus in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Yannai, “In any case it must be inspected [for defects that would render it *terefah*].”

**3:4**

A. And these are valid [carcasses] among fowl:

(1) [if] the windpipe is pierced or severed [lengthwise],

B. (2) [if] the weasel pierced its head at a point which does not render it *terefah*,

C. (3) [if] the crop was pierced,

D. Rabbi says, “Even if it is removed” —

E. (4) [if] the intestines protrude but are not pierced,

(5) [if] its wings are broken,

(6) [if] its legs are broken,

(7) [if] its wing feathers are plucked.

F. R. Judah says, “If the fuzz is removed, it is invalid.”

**I.1** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* Once R. Simai and R. Zadok went to intercalate the year in Lod and they spent the Sabbath in Ono. And they ruled regarding [defects in a bird’s] womb in accord with the view of Rabbi regarding [defects in a bird’s] crop.

B. *They posed a question [concerning this teaching at A]: Did they rule to prohibit [regarding defects] in a womb in the same manner that Rabbi ruled to permit [regarding defects] in a crop? Or perhaps, did they rule to permit [regarding defects] in a womb in the same manner that Rabbi ruled [to permit regarding defects] in a crop? But [at the same time] did they not reason in accord with the view of Rabbi [regarding defects in a] crop?*

C. *The question stands unresolved.*

D. Said Rabbah and some say R. Joshua b. Levi, “The top of the crop is treated with regard to the law as if it were part of the gullet.”

E. *Where is [the top of the crop]?*

F. *Said R. Bibi bar Abbaye, “Any part of it that contracts along with [the gullet].”*

**II.1** A. (4) [If] the intestines protrude [but are not pierced] [M. 3:4 E].

- B. Said R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “They taught this only where he did not twist them. But if he twisted them, it is *terefah*, *as it is written*, “[Is not he your father, who created you,] who made you and established you?” (Deu. 32: 6). This teaches us that the Holy One, blessed be He, established order [in the organs] in a person. And if one of them should become twisted, he cannot live.
- C. *It was taught on Tannaite authority*: R. Meir used to say, “[The verse], ‘[Is not he your father, who created you,] who made you and established you?’ (Deu. 32: 6) [implies that the people of Israel are like] a village that has it all. From it come its priests, prophets, officers and kings. As it states, “Out of them shall come the cornerstone, out of them the tent peg, out of them the battle bow, out of them every ruler” (Zech. 10: 4).

**II.2** A. *A certain Aramean [alt.: Roman, but from the context: illusionist] saw a certain man fall from the roof to the ground. His abdomen burst and his intestines protruded. He brought the man’s son and created the illusion that he was slaughtering him [the son] before him [the father]. [57a] He [the father, upon seeing the apparition,] swooned and sighed deeply and drew [his intestines] back into his abdomen and they stitched up his belly.*

**III.1** A. (6) [If] its legs are broken [M. 3:4 E].

- B. *A certain basket of crippled birds was brought before Raba [for a ruling]. Raba inspected them at the nexus of the sinews and he declared them fit.*
- C. Said R. Judah, said Rab, “[A case of] a dislocated fore-leg in an animal is valid. [A case of] a dislocated femur in an animal is *terefah*. [A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is *terefah*. [A case of] a dislocated wing in a bird is *terefah*. [In that case] we suspect that perhaps the lung was pierced.”
- D. And Samuel said, “Let it [i.e., the lung of a bird with a dislocated wing] be inspected.”
- E. And so said R. Yohanan, “Let it [i.e., the lung of a bird with a dislocated wing] be inspected.”
- F. Hezekiah said, “There are no [defect that renders *terefah* in the] lungs in a bird.”
- G. And R. Yohanan said, “There are. And they are like the petals of a rose between the wings.”
- H. *What does it mean*: There are not lungs in a bird? *If you say it means that they have none at all, but lo we can see that they do have.*
- I. *Rather it must mean that they are not rendered terefah by [defects in] them.*

- J. *But lo, Levi taught, ‘The terefot that the sages enumerated for an animal all have equivalents for a fowl. There is an additional one for fowl: **If the bone is pierced [it is invalid]** even if the membrane of the brain was not pierced’*“ [M. 3:3 I:3 A, b. 56a].
- K. *Rather what does it mean?* There are no [defects in the lungs in a bird that affect its status], neither if it falls [from a roof], nor if it is scorched [in a flame].
- L. *What is the basis for this view?*
- M. Said R. Hanna, “Because the majority of its ribs protect them [from becoming defective].”
- N. But lo what [is the implication of what] R. Yohanan said, “There are. And they are like the petals of a rose between the wings?”
- O. *We may derive from this the conclusion that Hezekiah reasons that they have no [lungs].*
- P. *But they said in the West [Israel] in the name of R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “From the words of Beribbi [i.e., Hezekiah] it is understood that he is not knowledgeable in [the anatomy of] fowls.”*

**III.2** A. Said R. Huna, said Rab, “[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is valid.”

B. Said to him Rabbah bar R. Huna to R. Huna, “*But lo the rabbis who came from Pumbedita said [that] R. Judah in the name of Rab said, ‘[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is terefah.’*”

C. *He said to him, “Every river runs its own course.” [Every place has its own customs.]*

D. *R. Abba went and found R. Jeremiah bar Abba inspecting the nexus of the sinews. He [Abba] said to him, “Why is the master doing all this? But lo [said] R. Huna, said Rab, ‘[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is valid.’*”

E. *He [Jeremiah] said to him, “I know the Mishnah [that says], **A beast, the [hind] legs of which are cut off below the knee, is valid. [If they are cut off] above the knee, it is invalid. And so [if] the juncture of the thigh sinews was removed [it is invalid]. [M. 4:6 A-C].**” And Rab said regarding this, ‘The same applies to a bird.’*”

F. *If this is the case, then we have a contradiction between one statement of Rab [cited in C] and the other [cited in D].*

G. *He [Jeremiah] was silent.*



- H. He [Abba] said to him, "Perhaps he [Rab] differentiated between a dislocated [femur] and one that had been cut."
- I. He [Jeremiah] said to him, "Are you explaining the teaching of Rab? Rab said explicitly, 'A dislocated [femur] is valid. A cut [femur] is invalid.' And do not be surprised [by these rules]. For lo, you may cut from this place and [the animal] will die. You may cut this [other] place and [the animal] will live."
- J. When R. Abba departed [for the Land of Israel] he found R. Zira sitting and saying, "Said R. Huna, said Rab, '[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is *terefah*.'" He said to him, "By the master's life! Since the time you departed to come here [57b] we had a chance to speak before R. Huna. And we asked him [about this matter]. And he said to us, '[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is valid.' And we also found R. Jeremiah bar Abba who was sitting and inspecting the nexus of the sinews. And we asked him, 'Does not the master reason in accord with that which R. Huna said in the name of Rab: [A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is valid?'"
- K. He said to us, "I know the Mishnah [that says], **A beast, the [hind] legs of which are cut off below the knee, is valid. [If they are cut off] above the knee, it is invalid. And so [if] the juncture of the thigh sinews was removed [it is invalid]. [M. 4:6 A-C].**" And Rab said regarding this, "The same applies to a bird."
- L. And we said to him, "If this is the case then we have a contradiction between one statement of Rab and the other." He [Jeremiah] was silent. And we asked him, "Perhaps he [Rab] differentiated between a dislocated [femur] and one that had been cut." He [Jeremiah] said to me, "Are you explaining the teaching of Rab? Rab said explicitly, 'A dislocated [femur] is valid. A cut [femur] is invalid.'"
- M. And what more do you [Zira] have [to contribute to this discussion]?
- N. [He said,] "This is what R. Hiyya bar Ashi said, said Rab, '[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is *terefah*.' And so said R. Jacob bar Idi, said R. Yohanan, '[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is *terefah*.'" And said R. Jacob bar Idi, "If R. Yohanan had been in that place when the associates ruled that it was permitted, he would not dare to raise a finger to oppose the ruling [because of the greatness of those sages]."
- O. For said R. Hanina, said Rabbi, "[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is valid." And R. Hanina had a hen that had a dislocated femur. And he brought it before Rabbi [for a ruling]. And he ruled to permit it to him. And R. Hanina pickled it [to keep it

as an exhibit]. And he would teach the law to his students with it [saying], “This is what Rabbi ruled to permit for me. This is what Rabbi ruled to permit for me.”

- P. *And the law does not follow in accord with any of these teachings. Rather [it is in accord] with what R. Yosé b. Nehorai asked R. Joshua b. Levi, “How large must the hole be in the windpipe [to render it terefah]?”*
- Q. He said to him, “We learned a absolute [rule in the] Mishnah about this: **So much as an Italian issar [M. 3:2 B].**”
- R. He [Yosé] said to him, “But there was a lamb in our neighborhood that had a hole in its windpipe and they made for it a tube of a reed [and inserted it in the windpipe] and it lived [that way].”
- S. He [Joshua] said to him, “*But can you rely on that [single case as proof of the law]? But lo the law was disseminated in Israel that, ‘[A case of] a dislocated femur in a bird is terefah.’ And [yet] R. Simeon b. Halafta had a hen whose femur was dislocated. And they made for it a tube of a reed [to replace it] and it lived [that way].*”
- T. *But what can you say regarding this [latter case]? It [lived] less than twelve months [that way]. Here too [in the former case] it [lived] less than twelve months. [And the principle is that if it can live less than twelve months with an injury it is terefah.]*

**III.3** A. They said concerning R. Simeon b. Halafta that he was a scientist. And he performed an act to dissuade R. Judah [from his view]. For R. Judah used to say, **If the fuzz is removed, it is invalid [M. 3:4 F].**

- B. And R. Simeon b. Halafta had a hen whose fuzz had been removed. And he put it in an oven and he dressed it in a leather apron of bronze workers [that is constantly hot]. And it grew more new feathers than it had originally.
- C. *But perhaps [this was not valid proof that the condition is not a severe enough defect to render the bird terefah because] R. Judah reasons that a terefah may show [temporary] signs of improvement. But is this so [that it would improve] in the very manner in which it became terefah? It grew more new feathers than it had originally!*
- D. *What does it mean that he was a scientist?*
- E. Said R. Mesharshayya, “As it is written, ‘Go to the ant, O sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise. Without having

any chief, officer or ruler, she prepares her food in summer, and gathers her sustenance in harvest' (Pro. 6: 6-8). *He [Simeon] said, 'I will go and see if it is true that he [the ant] has no ruler.'* He went at the season of Tammuz [the summer solstice] *and spread his cloak [over an ant hill]. One of them came out. He marked it with a sign. It went back in and said to them [the other ants], 'The shade has descended.'* They all came out. He removed his cloak [from the hill] *and the sun shined upon them. So they pounced on that ant [that misled them like a mob] and killed him. He [Simeon] said, "We may derive from this that they have no ruler. For if they had, would they not have had to seek the authority of the ruler [before killing that ant]?"*

F. *Said R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi, "But perhaps there was a ruler among them. Or perhaps they did have the authority of the ruler. Or perhaps it was between the reign of one ruler and another. As it is written, 'In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes' (Jud. 17: 6). [No. You must reject all these alternatives.]*

G. *Rather, you must rely on Solomon's integrity [in his statement about the ants. Accordingly, it must be that they had no king.]"*

**III.4** A. Said R. Huna, "A sign [that an animal with a physical defect is *not* to be deemed a] *terefah* [is that it lives] twelve months [after developing the defect]."

B. *They posed an objection:* [Another source says,] A sign [that an animal with a physical defect is to be deemed a] *terefah* [is that] it does not give birth. [That is, if it gives birth, it is not deemed to be a *terefah*.]

C. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "If its health improves, we know that it is valid. If its health deteriorates, we know that it is *terefah*."

D. Rabbi [var. R. Meir] says, "A sign [that an animal with a physical defect is *not*] *terefah* [is that it lives] thirty days."

E. They said to him [by way of objection], "But lo, many live two or three years."

F. *This [issue] is the [principle behind] a Tannaite dispute.*

- G. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority:* And regarding a skull that has one long hole [this is a sign the animal is *terefah*]. Or if there were many holes, they combine them together to constitute [a sign that it is *terefah* if they exceed the minimum measure of the size of] a drill hole.
- H. Said R. Yosé b. Meshullam, “Once at Ayn Ibl a person’s skull was broken. And they used a gourd hull as a splint for it. And he lived.” Said to him R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “From this we have no proof. It was during the summer. [The weather was mild and there was no stress on the person.] As soon as winter came, he died.”
- I. Said R. Aha bar Jacob, “The law is in accord with the view that [an animal with a physical defect may be deemed a] *terefah* [even if] it gives birth or if its health improves.”

**III.5** A. Said Amemar, “*Regarding these eggs laid by a bird that was deemed terefah [58a]: the first batch [produced after the bird became terefah] are prohibited. [Any eggs produced] thereafter are deemed to fall under the principle of two antecedent causes [i.e., the prohibited-mother and permitted-father produce the offspring] and [therefore the eggs] are permitted.*”

B. R. Ashi raised an objection to Amemar, “[The Mishnah rules:] **But they agree that an egg from a bird that is *terefah* is forbidden, since it grew in what was forbidden [M. Ed. 5:1 F].**” [That ruling makes no distinction between the first and subsequent batches.]

C. *[We can explain that the Mishnah refers to a case where the hen] was impregnated by [rubbing in] the soil.*

D. *But why not explain that [rule refers to] the first batch [of eggs]?*

E. *In that case [the Mishnah should not have stated,] it grew. It should have [stated,] it finished [growing].*

F. *Rather [consider] this that was taught on Tannaite authority: [Concerning] the offspring of [an animal that was deemed] terefah — R. Eliezer says, “It is not to be offered [as a sacrifice] on the altar.” And R. Joshua [M.: sages] says, “It may be offered [M. Tem. 6:5 B-D].” Concerning what [circumstance] do they dispute? Where [the animal] first became terefah and then became pregnant. R. Eliezer reasons [in accord with the principle that] where there are two antecedent causes [one permitted and one prohibited] we rule the result is prohibited. And R. Joshua reasons [in accord with the principle that] where there are two*

antecedent causes [one permitted and one prohibited] we rule the result is permitted.

- G. *If this is the case then why is the dispute formulated in relation to consecrated [animals]? They ought to dispute regarding ordinary [animals]. This will inform you of the authority of R. Joshua. For even in regard to consecrated [animals we rule in accord with his view that the offspring of a terefah-animal] is permitted.*
- H. *But why is the dispute not formulated in relation to ordinary [animals]? And this would inform you of the authority of R. Eliezer. For even in regard to ordinary [animals we rule in accord with his view that the offspring of a terefah-animal] is prohibited. [The reason we do not formulate it in this way is that we follow the principle that] the authority of the rule that permits takes precedence [over the authority of the rule that prohibits].*
- I. And they agree that the egg produced by a *terefah*-bird is prohibited [where the hen] was impregnated by [rubbing in] the soil because there is one antecedent cause [in that case, i.e., the forbidden mother bird].
- J. R. Aha reasons in accord with the view of R. Aha bar Jacob [I] and taught the ruling of Amemar as was stated above. Rabina did not reason in accord with the view of R. Aha bar Jacob and accordingly taught this version of the ruling of Amemar:
- K. Said Amemar, “Regarding these eggs laid by a bird about which there was a doubt whether it was *terefah*: the first batch [produced after the bird became *terefah*] must be held in abeyance. If she goes on to lay more eggs, they are permitted. And if not, they are forbidden.”
- L. R. Ashi raised an objection to Amemar, “[The Mishnah rules:] **But they agree that an egg from a bird that is *terefah* is forbidden, since it grew in what was forbidden [M. Ed. 5:1 F].**”
- M. He [Amemar] said to him, “[We can explain that the Mishnah refers to] the first batch [of eggs]? In that case [the Mishnah should not have stated,] **it grew. It should have [stated,] it finished [growing].**”
- N. [Indeed] you should teach [the version], **It finished [growing].**
- O. Rather [consider] this that was taught on Tannaite authority: [Concerning] the offspring of [an animal that was deemed] *terefah* — R. Eliezer says, “It is not to be offered [as a sacrifice] on the altar.” And R. Joshua [M.: sages] says, “It may be offered [M. Tem. 6:5 B-D].” Concerning what [circumstance] do they dispute? Where [the animal]

first became pregnant and then became *terefah*. R. Eliezer reasons [in accord with the principle that as regards to the law] the foetus is considered to be a thigh of the mother [and thus it too is *terefah*]. And R. Joshua reasons [in accord with the principle that] the foetus is not considered to be a thigh of the mother.

P. *If this is the case then why is the dispute formulated in relation to consecrated [animals]? They ought to dispute regarding ordinary [animals]. This will inform you of the authority of R. Joshua. [For even in regard to consecrated [animals] we rule in accord with his view that the offspring of a terefah-animal] is permitted.]*

Q. *But why is the dispute not formulated in relation to ordinary [animals]? And this would inform you of the authority of R. Eliezer. [For even in regard to ordinary animals we rule in accord with his view that the offspring of a terefah-animal is prohibited. The reason we do not formulate it in this way is that we follow the principle that] the authority of the rule that permits takes precedence [over the authority of the rule that prohibits].*

R. And they certainly agree that the egg produced by a *terefah*-bird is prohibited *where it was part of the first batch. On what basis? It is part of the [mother's] body.*

S. And the law is for a male [it is deemed *terefah* if it lives less than] twelve months. And for a female [it is deemed *terefah* if it] does not give birth.

**III.6** A. Said R. Huna, “Any creature that does not have a bone [i.e., and invertebrate] does not live longer than twelve months.”

B. *Said R. Pappa, “We may derive from the statement of R. Huna the following [rule]: For said Samuel, ‘A cucumber that was infested with worms while on the vine — it is forbidden [to eat it because the worms have the status of forbidden crawling creatures].’*

C. **[58b]** *“Those [worm-infested-] dates in a barrel after twelve months of a year they are permitted [because the worms could not have entered the dates while on the tree and then lived that long].”*

D. *Said Rab, “No gnat lives more than a day. No fly lives more than a year.”*

E. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, “Lo, the folk tell [this story]: For seven years the female gnat bickered with the male gnat. She said to him, ‘I have seen a person from Mehoza who was bathing and came out of the water and*

*wrapped himself in a sheet. And you alit on him and sucked his blood and did not tell me about it.” [Apparently, gnats can live more than a day.]*

- F. *He [Abbayye] said to him, “According to your logic [consider this tale]. Lo, the folk tell [this story]: Sixty minas [weight] of iron can be hung from the proboscis of a gnat. Could this be for real? By itself how much does it weigh? Rather [what is the explanation of this statement]? It refers to their scale of mina-weights [of the gnats]. Here too [regarding the first story] it must refer to their measure of years [i.e., much less than ours].”*

**III.7** A. *It was taught there in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: A beast with five legs or that has only three... lo these are deemed blemishes [M. Bekh. 6:7].*

- B. *Said R. Huna, “They taught this only if a fore-leg was missing or added. But if a hind-leg was missing or added, it is also deemed to be a terefah.” One what basis? [It is based on the principle that] we treat every added limb like a missing limb [and that renders the animal terefah].*
- C. *A certain animal had two inner rumens. They brought it before Rabina [for a ruling]. And he declared it terefah on the basis of the ruling of R. Huna. But if [the two rumens] empty from one to the other it is valid [i.e., we treat them as if they were one].*
- D. *A certain tube that went from the reticulum to the omasum — R. Ashi reasoned to declare it terefah. Said R. Huna Mar bar Hiyya to R. Ashi, “All grazing animal have this.”*
- E. *A certain tube that went from the reticulum to the rumen — Mar bar R. Ashi reasoned to declare it valid. Said to him R. Oshaia, “Will you weave all [the laws] together into one fabric? Where it is stated [that the law deems it valid], it is stated. And where it is not stated, it is not stated.”*

**III.8** A. *Nathan bar Shila, the chief butcher of Sepphoris, testified before Rabbi that if two intestines protrude from an animal at the same time it is terefah. And the equivalent case for a bird is valid.*

- B. *Under what circumstances? If they protrude from two different places.*
- C. *But if they protrude from the same place and end within a finger’s breadth or each other, it is valid.*
- D. *R. Ammi and R. Assi dispute [regarding the interpretation of “end within a finger’s breadth”]. One said, “They must merge back together.” And the other said, “Even if they do not merge back together.”*



E. *Now this is consistent according the authority that holds the view that [to be valid] they must merge back together that they taught [this must be] “within a finger’s breadth.” But according to the authority that holds the view that [to be valid it is acceptable] even if they do not merge back together, what is the meaning of the stipulation, “within a finger’s breadth?” It means, “within a finger’s breadth below [i.e., near the rectum they must merge (Rashi)].”*

**IV.1 A. R. Judah says, “If the fuzz is removed, it is invalid [M. 3:4 F].”**

B. Said R. Yohanan, “R. Judah and R. Ishmael said the same thing. R. Judah, as we stated [in the Mishnah].

C. And R. Ishmael, *as it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority, R. Ishmael says, ‘The down joins together [i.e., the fuzz combines with other parts of the carcass to constitute the minimum quantity to render unclean and to contract uncleanness] [M. Toh. 1:2 B].’*”

D. *Said Raba, “Perhaps this is not a valid assertion. On this point only regarding the matter of terefah R. Judah stated [that the fuzz is significant because without it] there is nothing to protect the bird [from the elements and it will die]. But with regard to matters that spoil the animal [i.e., uncleanness] he holds in accord with the view of the rabbis. And on this point only regarding the matters that spoil the animal [i.e., uncleanness] R. Ishmael stated [that the fuzz is significant]. But with regard to the matter of rendering the animal terefah [he would argue that] it does not afford any protection [for the bird and thus is of no consequence].”*

**3:5**

- A. (1) [A beast which suffers from] congestion of blood,  
(2) and one [which has suffered from] smoke,  
(3) and one [which has suffered from] cold,  
(4) and one which has eaten oleander,  
(5) and one which has eaten chicken excrement,  
(6) or which has drunk dirty water

B. is valid.

C. [If] it ate deadly poison, or if a snake bit it, it is permitted [to eat it] in respect to [the laws of] terefah, but it is prohibited as a danger to life.

**I.1** A. Said Samuel, “If it chewed asafoetida, it is *terefah*.” *On what basis? [On the assumption that it is so strong it] perforated [the animal’s] internal organs.*

- B. *R. Shizbi posed an objection: [A beast which suffers from] congestion of blood, and one [which has suffered from] smoke, [and one which has suffered from cold] [M. Hul. 3:5A1-3] — [if] one force fed it asafoetida, root of crowfoot, oleander, deadly poison, [or] chicken excrement — it is valid. One bitten by a snake, or bitten by a rabid dog in respect to terefah it is permitted, but it is prohibited as a danger to life [M. Hul. 3:5 C] [T. 3:19 A-C].*
- C. *There is a contradiction with regard to asafoetida [between Samuel's rule and T.] And there is a contradiction with regard to deadly poison [between M. and T.].*
- D. *We may explain that there is no contradiction with regard to asafoetida. This one [Samuel] refers to the extract [that is potent] and this one [T.] refers to the leaves [that are milder].*
- E. *We may explain that there is no contradiction with regard to deadly poison. This one [T.] refers to [a beast that ate] animal-poison and this one [M.] refers to [a beast that ate] human-poison [that poses danger if one eats the animal that ingested it].*
- F. *But animal-poison is oleander! [The text of T. is repetitive if we accept this interpretation.] [We can say] there are two distinct kinds of animal-poison [listed by T.].*
- G. *What is the root of crowfoot [listed by T.]? Said R. Judah, [59a] "The root of succory (Cashdan)."*
- H. *Said R. Judah, "Any person who eats three tiqlas of asafoetida on an empty stomach will shed his skin (Cashdan)."*
- I. *Said R. Abbahu, "It once happened to me that I ate one tiqla of asafoetida and had I not immersed in water I would have shed my skin. So I fulfilled for myself the verse, '[For the protection of wisdom is like the protection of money; and the advantage of knowledge is that] wisdom preserves the life of him who has it' (Qoh. 7:12)."*
- J. *Said R. Joseph, "Any person who eats sixteen eggs, forty nuts, and seven caperberries, and who drinks a quarter [log] of honey during the season of Tammuz [i.e., the summer] on an empty stomach — he will have a heart attack [lit.: snaps his heart strings asunder (Cashdan)]."*
- K. *A certain young deer whose hind legs had been broken was brought before the Exilarch [for a ruling].*
- L. *Rab inspected it at the nexus of the sinews and declared it valid. He planned to eat it barbecued.*

- M. *Said to him Samuel, "Does not the master suspect it might have been bitten [by a snake and the poison will pose a danger to you if it is not cooked properly]?"*
- N. *He said to him, "What is the procedure [I must follow to see if this is the case]?"*
- O. *[He said to him,] "Let us put it into the oven [to cook]. For [if it has poison in it] it will become evident."*
- P. *They put it in and it fell apart.*
- Q. *Samuel recited concerning Rab, "No ill befalls the righteous, [but the wicked are filled with trouble]" (Pro. 12:21).*
- R. *And Rab recited concerning Samuel, "[O Belteshazzar, chief of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in you and that] no mystery is difficult for you, [here is the dream which I saw; tell me its interpretation]" (Dan. 4: 9).*

### 3:6-7

#### 3:6

- A. **The tokens [by which we know whether or not animals are deemed clean or fit] of cattle and wild beasts have been stated by the Torah (cf. Lev. 11: 3).**
- B. **And the tokens of fowl have not been so stated.**
- C. **But sages have ruled: "Any fowl that seizes is unclean. Any [fowl] that has an extra talon [the hallux] and a craw, and the skin of the stomach of which [can] be stripped off is clean."**
- D. **R. Eleazar b. Sadoq says, "Any bird that parts its toes evenly [two in front and two in back] is unclean" (Lev. 11: 3).**

#### 3:7

- A. **And among locusts: Any that has (1) four legs, (2) four wings, and (3) jointed legs (Lev. 11:21), and (4) the wings of which cover the greater part of its body.**
- B. **R. Yosé says, "And (5) the name of which is locust."**
- C. **And among fish: Any that has fins and scales.**
- D. **R. Judah says, "Two scales and a single fin [are sufficient]."**
- E. **And what are scales?**

**F. Those that are immovable.**

**G. And fins?**

**H. Those with which it swims [but not propelling itself on dry land with them].**

**I.1** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: These are the tokens of cattle [by which we know whether or not animals are deemed fit] [M. Hul. 3:6A]:* “Whatever parts the hoof and is cloven-footed and chews the cud among animals you may eat” (Lev. 11: 3). **Whatever chews the cud [we know] has no upper teeth [T. 3:20 A-B]** and it is clean.

B. *But is this the rule? For lo, [consider by way of counter example] the camel. For it chews the cud and has no upper teeth and is unclean!*

C. *[The reason for this is] the camel has canines (Cashdan).*

D. *But lo, [consider] the young camel that does not even have canines! And furthermore [consider as support for the rule that] the rock-badger and the hare chew the cud and they have upper teeth and they are unclean.*

E. *And moreover [why should this rule be stated at all]? Are teeth even mentioned in the Torah [as a sign of a clean or unclean animal]?*

F. *Rather here is what you should say: Any animal that does not have upper teeth, we know that it chews the cud and it has split hooves and is clean.*

G. *But why not just inspect the hooves? [What is the value of this generalization?]*

H. *The case in question may be one where the hooves were cut up. And this accords with the view of R. Hisda.*

I. *For said R. Hisda, “If he was walking in the wilderness and came across an animal whose hooves were cut up [so that he could not determine if they were split], he should inspect its mouth. If it does not have upper teeth, we know that it [chews the cud and it has split hooves and] is clean. And if not, then we know it is unclean.”*

J. *[This rule applies] as long as he is able to identify a camel [since that is an exception to the rule]. But a camel has canines! [We should say then,] as long as he is able to identify a young camel [that has no canines and is unclean].*

K. *Is there any other kind [of animal] like the young camel [with no upper teeth that is unclean]?*

L. *No. You cannot have concluded that. For the house of R. Ishmael taught: “[Nevertheless among those that chew the cud or part the hoof, you shall not eat these:] The camel, because it chews the cud [but does not part the hoof, is unclean to you]” (Lev. 11: 4). He who rules over the world knows*

that the only [kind of animal] that chews its cud and is unclean is the camel. Therefore scripture singles it out [with the pronoun,] “it.”

- M. And said R. Hisda, “If he was walking in the wilderness and came across an animal whose mouth was mangled, he should inspect its hooves. If it has split hooves, we know that it is clean. If it does not, we know that it is unclean.”
- N. [This rule applies] as long as he is able to identify a swine [since that is an exception to the rule].
- O. *Do you not state that there is the swine [that is an exception to the rule]? Are there not other kinds that are like the swine?*
- P. *No. You cannot have concluded that. For the house of R. Ishmael taught: “And the swine, because it parts the hoof and is cloven-footed [but does not chew the cud, is unclean to you]” (Lev. 11: 7). He who rules over the world knows that the only [kind of animal] that parts the hoof and is unclean is the swine. Therefore scripture singles it out [with the pronoun,] “it.”*
- Q. And said R. Hisda, “If he was walking in the wilderness and came across an animal whose mouth was mangled, and whose hooves were cut up, he should inspect its flesh [under its tail]. If it [has a pattern that is] crisscross, we know that it is clean. If not, we know that it is unclean.”
- R. [This rule applies] as long as he is able to identify the wild ass. *Do you not state that there is the wild ass [that is an exception to the rule]? Are there not other kinds that are like the wild ass? We have a tradition that there are not.*
- S. *And where does he inspect [the flesh]? Said Abbaye, and some say, R. Hisda, “[In the hind quarter] under the tail.”*

**I.2 A. The tokens [by which we know whether or not animals are deemed clean or fit] of cattle and wild beasts [M. 3:6 A].** *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: What are the tokens [by which we know whether an animal is] a wild beast? [Any that has horns and [pointed] hooves] [T. 3:21 A-B]. Are not the wild beasts subsumed in the [same] rules as cattle with regard to the tokens [that signify whether they are clean]?*

B. Said R. Zira, [59b] “[We stipulate separate rules for wild beasts] so as to render it permissible to use their fats.” *So here is what you should say [in the rule in T.]:*

**What are the tokens [by which we know whether an animal is] a wild beast, whose fats are permissible? Any that has horns and [pointed] hooves.**

- C. R. Dosa says, "If it has horns you do not have to look for its [pointed] hooves. If it has [pointed] hooves, you still need to look for its horns."
- D. And the antelope, even though it has only one horn [its fat] is permitted.
- E. *Is this a fixed rule [that the fats from an animal with horns and pointed hooves is permitted]? Behold the goat has horns and [pointed] hooves and its fats are forbidden.*
- F. *You must have layered [horns on the animal to be a valid sign that the fats are permitted].*
- G. *But behold an ox has layered [horns] and its fats are forbidden.*
- H. *You must have notched [horns]. But behold the goat has notched [horns] and its fats are forbidden.*
- I. *You must have branched [horns, i.e., antlers].*
- J. *But behold the deer does not have branched [horns] and its fats are permitted. [Cashdan: this may refer to the pronghorn antelope.] You must have pointed [horns, alt.: cylindrical].*
- K. *Therefore where [the animal has] branched [horns] there is not the slightest doubt [that it is a wild beast]. Where [the animal] does not have branched [horns], you must have [horns that are] layered, pointed and notched. And the notches must intersect with one another.*
- L. *And this Karkuz goat [possibly: gazelle] is a case of doubt. [Rashi: It has the signs of a wild beast but it is called a "goat."]*
- M. *A certain Karkuz goat was [slaughtered] in the house of the Exilarch. A basket full of fat was removed from it. R. Ahai prohibited [its use].*
- N. *R. Samuel the son of R. Abbahu ate from it. He recited about himself, "From the fruit of his mouth a man is satisfied; [he is satisfied by the yield of his lips]" (Pro. 18:20). [Based on the ruling he learned, he had a good meal.]*
- O. *They sent forth [the ruling]: The law follows in accord with the view of Samuel the son of R. Abbahu. But take care [to account for the view of] R. Ahai. For he lights up the eyes [of the Jews living in] the exile.*

- I.3** A. And the antelope, even though it has only one horn [its fat] is permitted.
- B. Said R. Judah, *“The antelope is [called] the deer in Be Ilai. The tiger is [called] the lion in Be Ilai.”*
- C. Said R. Kahana, *“There were nine cubits between the ears of the lion of Be Ilai.”*
- D. Said R. Joseph, *“The lion of Be Ilai was sixteen cubits long.”*

### **God, Creator of the Wild Beasts**

The allusion at the concluding stich of the foregoing accounts for the insertion of the following set of four stories about Caesar and Joshua, beginning with a reference to the lion. Other aspects of God’s work as creator then come under discussion.

- I.4** A. Said Caesar to R. Joshua b. Hananiah, “Your God is like a lion. As it is stated, ‘The lion has roared; who will not fear? [The Lord God has spoken; who can but prophesy?]’ (Amo. 3: 8).” *What is exceptional about this? Any horseman can kill a lion. He [Joshua] said to him, “He is not like any lion. He is like the lion of Be Ilai.”*
- B. *He said to him, “You must show it to me.”*
- C. *He [Joshua] said to him, “You cannot see it. [That lion is too terrifying.]”*
- D. *He said to him, “Really! Show it to me!”*
- E. *He [Joshua] prayed.*
- F. *It was uprooted from its place [and started to be transported toward them]. When it was four hundred parsangs away it gave out a single roar. All of the pregnant women of Rome miscarried [from fright] and all the walls fell down [from the vibrations]. When it was three hundred parsangs away it gave out another roar. All of the teeth of the people [of Rome] fell out [of their mouths from the impact of the sound]. And he [Caesar] himself fell from his throne to the ground.*
- G. *He said to him [Joshua], “I beg you. Pray that it go back to its place.”*
- H. *He prayed and it went back to its place.*
- I. *The Caesar said to R. Joshua b. Hananiah, “I want to see your God.”*
- J. *He said to him, “You cannot see Him.” He said to him, “Really! [60a] Show him to me!” He went and pointed him towards the sun during the*



*season of Tammuz [i.e., the summer]. He [Joshua] said to him, "Look at it."*

K. *He said, "I cannot."*

L. *He said, "The sun is one of the attendants that attend the Holy One, blessed be He. You say you cannot look at it. All the more [is it impossible to look at] the Divine Presence."*

M. *The Caesar said to R. Joshua b. Hananiah, "I want to make a dinner for your God."*

N. *He said to him, "You cannot."*

O. *[He asked,] "Why not?"*

P. *[He said,] "Because he has too many in his entourage." [He said,] "Really! [I insist!]"*

Q. *[He said,] "Go set it up on the widest banks of the great sea." He worked for the six months of the summer [preparing the dinner]. A storm came up and washed it all into the sea. He worked for the six months of the winter. The rains came and washed it all into the sea. He said to him, "What is the meaning of this?" He [Joshua] said to him, "These [storms] are like the [workers] who sweep and wash in preparation for his arrival." He said to him, "If that is the case, then I cannot do it."*

R. *The daughter of the Caesar said [mockingly] to R. Joshua b. Hananiah, "Your God must be a carpenter. For it is written, 'Who hast laid the beams of thy chambers on the waters, [who makest the clouds thy chariot, who ridest on the wings of the wind]' (Psa. 104: 3). Tell him to make a spool for me."*

S. *He said, "On my life!" He prayed and she was smitten with leprosy. They took her into the market place of Rome and they brought her a spool. For it was the custom that in Rome they brought a spool to anyone who was smitten with leprosy. And they sat her in the market place and she wound skeins of yarn so that people would see this and pray for her. One day he [Joshua] was passing there and she was sitting and winding skeins of yarn in the market place of Rome. He said to her, "Did my God give you a good spool?"*

T. *She said to him, "Tell you God to take back what he gave me."*

U. *He said to her, "Our God gives but does not take back."*

**I.5** A. *Said R. Judah, "An ox has a wide belly and wide hooves, a large head and a large tail. And the ass has the opposite." What difference does it make [to know this]? For buying and selling [one needs to know the signs of identification].*

B. And said R. Judah, "The ox that Adam offered had one horn on its forehead. As it says, 'This will please the Lord more than an ox or a bull with horns and hooves' (Psa. 69:31)."

C. [But] 'With horns' implies two. Said R. Nahman, "It is written defectively (*mqrn*) [implying there was a single horn]."

D. And said R. Judah, "The ox that Adam offered produced horns before it produced hooves. As it says, 'This will please the Lord more than an ox or a bull with horns and hooves' (Psa. 69:31)." [It states,] 'With horns' *first and then* 'hooves.'"

E. *This supports the view of R. Joshua b. Levi.* For said R. Joshua b. Levi, "All the creatures formed at the beginning were created fully mature in size, in accord with their own will, and in accord with the form they desired." As it says, "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" (Gen. 2: 1). Do not read the word *sb'm*, "all the host of them." Rather read it *sbywnm*, "with the form they desired."

F. R. Hanina bar Pappa interpreted [the verse], "May the glory of the Lord endure for ever, may the Lord rejoice in his works" (Psa. 104:31). This verse the angel of the world spoke. [Why?] At the time that the Holy One, blessed be He said, "[Let the earth put forth vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed,] each according to its kind, upon the earth" (Gen. 1:11). [He juxtaposed "Each according to its kind" to the trees.] The plants argued for themselves *a fortiori*: If the Holy One, blessed be He wants disarray [in the species] why did he say regarding the trees, "Each according to its kind?" And furthermore it is an argument *a fortiori*. What is the case? Regarding the trees that normally do not emerge in disarray, the Holy One, blessed be He said, "Each according to its kind." Regarding us [the plants] how much more so [should he say this]! Immediately each one emerged according to its kind. And the Angel of the world uttered, "May the glory of the Lord endure for ever, may the Lord rejoice in his works" (Psa. 104:31).

G. *Rabina posed a question:* If a person grafted two kinds of plants **[60b]** what would the status of the product be according to the view of R. Hanina bar Pappa? *Since*

*he did not write about them, "Each according to its kind" will he not be liable [for a transgression]? Or perhaps because he assented to their [logic] is it as if he wrote about them, "Each according to its kind?" The question stands unresolved.*

- I.6** A. *R. Simeon b. Pazzi raised a contradiction: It is written, "And God made the two great lights." And it is written, "The greater light [to rule the day], and the lesser light [to rule the night; he made the stars also]." (Gen. 1:16). Said the moon to the Holy One, blessed be He, "Master of the Universe. it is possible to have two kings serve with one crown?" He said to her, "Go and be smaller." She said to him, "Master of the Universe. [Is it fair that] because I said to you something that is proper, that I have to make myself smaller?" He said to her, "Go and rule over both the day and the night."*
- B. *She said to him, "What is the purpose of this? What good is a lamp in the daylight?" He said to her, "Go so that Israel will be able to calculate through you the days and the years." She said to him, "It is not possible to calculate the seasons without the sun. For it is written, 'Let them be for signs and for season and for day and for years' (Gen. 1:14).*
- C. *[He said to her,] "Go forth. And righteous men shall be called by your name." [The moon was named the "lesser light," i.e., the small light. Jacob the Patriarch, the Tannaite authority Samuel and King David were called "small."]* Jacob was called small ["When they had finished eating the grass of the land, I said, 'O Lord God, forgive, I beseech thee! How can Jacob stand? He is so small!'" (Amos 7: 2)]. Samuel [the Tannaite authority was called] the small one. David was called small ["David was the youngest [i.e., smallest]; the three eldest followed Saul" (I Sam. 17:14)].
- D. *He saw that she was not placated.* Said the Holy One, blessed be He, "May I attain atonement because I made the moon smaller."
- E. *And about this said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "What is different about the goat offering for the new moon. For it is said regarding it, '[Also one male goat for a sin offering] to the Lord; [it shall be offered besides the continual burnt offering and its drink offering]' (Num. 28:15). Said the Holy One, blessed be He, "May I attain atonement because I made the moon smaller."*
- I.7** A. *R. Assi raised a contradiction: It is written, "The earth brought forth vegetation" (Gen. 1:12) on the third day of the week. And it is written, "When no plant of the field was yet in the earth" (Gen. 2: 5) at the end of the week. This teaches us that the plants came forth but remained just beneath the surface of the ground until*

Adam came and prayed for them. And rain fell and they sprouted forth. This will teach you that the Holy One, blessed be He yearns for the prayers of the righteous.

B. *R. Nahman bar Pappa had a garden. He planted in it seeds but they did not grow. He prayed. It rained. And they grew. He said, "This is what R. Assi meant."*

**I.8** A. Said R. Hanan bar Raba, "*The ssw'h is another category of creature unto itself.*" [The verse is: "Yet of those that chew the cud or have the hoof cloven (the Hebrew is *hssw'h*, taken to mean another type of creature) you shall not eat these: the camel, the hare, and the rock badger, because they chew the cud but do not part the hoof, and are unclean for you" (Deu. 14: 7).] It has two backs and two back bones. [And how did Moses know about all the creatures?] Was Moses a hunter or was he an archer [who would know all this]? This serves as a refutation of anyone who says that the Torah is not divinely inspired."

B. *Said R. Hisda to R. Tahlifa bar Abina, "Go and write homilies about the [Greek term for] 'hunter' and the [Latin term for] 'archer' and interpret the terms."* [Cashdan: Tahlifa was advised to note these words as foreign words.]

C. [And consider another verse that uses a foreign term:] "There are five rulers of the Philistines, those of Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron, and those of the Avvim" (Jos. 13: 3). *It states there are five and lists six! Said R. Jonathan, "They had five potentates."*

D. *Said R. Hisda to R. Tahlifa bar Abina, "Go and write a homily about the [term for] potentate [ʿrwnqy] and interpret the term."*

E. *And this view disputes the view of Rab. For said Rab, "The Avvim came from Yemen." There is another Tannaite teaching to this effect, "The Avvim came from Yemen. And why were they called Avvim? [Based on these plays on the Hebrew name.] Because they despised [ʿwtw] their place."* Another matter: [They were called] Avvim because they lusted [ʿyww] for many gods. Another matter: [They were called] Avvim because anyone who saw them was seized by shivering [ʿwyt]. *And said R. Joseph, "Every one of them had sixteen rows of teeth."*

F. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "There are many verses that seem to merit suppression [lit.: burning] but they are essential to the Torah."

G. [For example:] "As for the Avvim, who lived in villages as far as Gaza, [the Caphtorim, who came from Caphtor, destroyed them and settled in their stead]" (Deu. 2:23). *What do we derive from this verse? Because Abimelech swore to Abraham, "Now therefore swear to me here by God that you will not deal falsely with me or with my offspring or with my posterity, [but as I have dealt loyally with you, you will deal with me and*

with the land where you have sojourned” (Gen. 21:23). *Said the Holy One, blessed be He, “Let the Kaftorim take [the land] from the Avvim, who are the Philistines. And let Israel take [the land] from the Kaftorim.”*

H. In the same manner you should state [regarding this verse]: “For Heshbon was the city of Sihon the king of the Amorites, who had fought against the former king of Moab and taken all his land out of his hand, as far as the Arnon” (Num. 21:26). *What do we derive from this verse? For the Holy One, blessed be He said to Israel, “And the Lord said to me, ‘Do not harass Moab [or contend with them in battle, for I will not give you any of their land for a possession, because I have given Ar to the sons of Lot for a possession]’ (Deu. 2: 9). Said the Holy One, blessed be He, “Let Sihon take [the land] away from Moab. And let Israel take [the land] away from Sihon.”*

I. *And about this R. Pappa stated, “[The territories of] Ammon and Moab were made clean [for conquest by Israel] through [the conquest of that land by] Sihon.”*

J. [Regarding this verse:] “The Sidonians call Hermon Sirion, [while the Amorites call it Senir]” (Deu. 3: 9), *it was taught*, Senir and Sirion are names of mountains of the Land of Israel. This teaches that every one of the nations of the world went and built for itself a great city and named it after a mountain of the Land of Israel. This teaches you that even the mountains of the Land of Israel are beloved to the nations of the world.

K. In the same manner [you may interpret this verse:] “And as for the people, he removed them to the city [from one end of Egypt to the other]” (Gen. 47:21). *What do we derive from this verse? So that [the Egyptians] will not call his brothers [exiles, since they themselves were moved from their cities].*

**II.1 A. And the tokens of fowl have not been so stated [M. 3:6 B].** *Have they not? But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority, “The eagle” (Lev. 11:13) — [61a] just as the eagle is distinctive in that it does not have an extra claw, [and it does not have]*

a crop, and [the skin of] its gizzard cannot be peeled off, and it mauls [its prey] and eats it, [and the eagle is] unclean. So too all [birds] similar to it are unclean.

- B. “Turtle doves” (Lev. 1:14) — they have an extra claw, [and they have] a crop, and [the skin of] its gizzard can be peeled off, and they do not maul [their prey] and eat it, [and they are] clean. So too all [birds] similar to it are clean. [Apparently, the tokens of clean fowl are in the Torah.
- C. Said Abbaye, “The specifics [of the tokens] were not matters stated in the Torah. Rather they were matters stated by the scribes.”
- D. *Taught R. Hiyya, “A bird that has one token is clean. Because it does not resemble the eagle.”*
- E. [We reason as follows:] *The eagle that has none [of the tokens], that is the [kind of bird] that may not be eaten. Lo, if there is one [kind of bird] that has one [token of cleanness] may be eaten.*
- F. *But why not derive the rule from [the principle regarding] turtle doves? [And let us reason as follows:] What is the case regarding turtle doves? They have all four [tokens of cleanness]. So these too [may be eaten] only if they have all four [tokens of cleanness].*
- G. *If this is the case [that we follow this line of reasoning] then what is the purpose of [listing] all of the other unclean birds that are written in the Torah? Let us derive the inference from these [listed birds]. What is the case regarding those that have three [tokens]? We do not eat them. So all those with three [tokens] we do not eat. And all the more so [in the case of a bird that has only] two [tokens] or one [token].*
- H. *If this is the case, then what purpose is served by the Torah stating [as unclean] the raven [that has two tokens]? Now those that have three [tokens], we do not eat them. Must we state the rule for [a bird] that has only two [tokens]?*
- I. **[61b]** *Then let us derive [the rule] from the [inclusion of the] raven. What is the case there? [A bird that has] two [tokens of cleanness] we do not [eat]. So all those with two [tokens] we do not [eat]. If so, “The vulture and the osprey” (Lev. 11:13), that the Torah stated [are unclean], why must we have these [specified]? Now those that have two [tokens], we do not eat them. Must we state the rule for [a bird] that has only one [token]?*
- J. *Then let us derive [the rule] from the [inclusion of the] vulture and the osprey. If this is the case, then why do we need to have the Torah state [that] the eagle [is unclean]? Now those that have one [token], we do not eat them. Must we state the rule for [a bird] that has none?*

- K. *Rather [it must be the case that] an eagle that has no [tokens] at all, [that is the type of bird] we do not eat. But lo, one that has one [token], we do eat!*
- L. *But [it must be the case] that the reason the Torah state the eagle [is unclean is because] if it did not so specify I would have reasoned that we derive the rule from [the specification in the verse] of the vulture and the osprey. But the [references to the] vulture and the osprey [come under the principle of] concurrent scriptural references [that teach the same rule]. And [we say that from] concurrent scriptural references [that teach the same rule] we do not derive any conclusions [about other cases].*
- M. *[But we may argue that they do not teach exactly the same rule.] We have a tradition that [the token] that is present in this one [bird] is not present in that one. And [the token] that is present in that [bird] is not present in this one.*
- N. *[But we may object to this solution.] Consider: there are twenty-four unclean birds [specified in the Torah]. It is not possible that one [token] that is present in some is missing in all the others. So it would be [certain that we have an instance of] concurrent scriptural references [that teach the same rule]. [Thus we should not be able to derive any conclusions at all about other cases from this list.]*
- O. *[But we may argue that they do not teach exactly the same rule.] We have a tradition that there are twenty-four unclean birds and there are four tokens. Three are present in all [twenty-four as follows]: Twenty have all three of them; two are present in raven; one of these is present in the vulture and one in the osprey. The one that is present in this one is absent in that one. [Accordingly one of these is not “concurrent” in that it has a token unique from the others.]*
- P. *It would make sense to say that we should derive from this one [some general conclusion about the others]. [But we do not because] the Torah wrote concerning the eagle. [You conclude from this that] the eagle that has no [tokens] at all you may not eat. Lo any [bird] that has one [token] you may eat.*
- Q. *But then why did the Torah write about turtle doves?*
- R. *Said R. Uqba bar Hama, “[To teach us which bird may be brought as a] sacrifice. [But not to teach us anything in regard to tokens of uncleanness.]”*

**II.2** A. *Said R. Nahman [62a], “[To] one who is knowledgeable of them [i.e., the various kinds of birds] and their names, [a bird that has] one token is deemed clean. To one who is not knowledgeable of them and their names, [a bird that has] one token is deemed unclean. [A bird that has] two tokens is deemed clean.”*

B. *[And that is so] as long as he can identify a raven.*



- C. *[Does this mean that he needs to be able to identify] just a raven and no other [kind of bird]?*
- D. *But lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: “Every raven [according to its kind]” (Lev. 11:15) — this means the raven itself. “[Every raven] according to its kind” — R. Eliezer says, “This subsumes [under the category of the raven] the starling.” They said to R. Eliezer, “But lo, the people of the village of Tamrata in Judea used to eat [starlings] because they have crops.” [The raven does not have this token.]*
- E. He said to them, “In the future they will have to be judged [for this questionable action].”
- F. Another version: “[Every raven] according to its kind” — “this subsumes [under the category of the raven] the white bellied swallow,” the words of R. Eliezer. They said to him, “But lo, the people of the Upper Galilee used to eat them because their gizzards can be peeled.” [The raven does not have this token.]
- G. He said to them, “In the future they will have to be judged [for this questionable action].” Rather [the verse specifies] the raven [and subsumes under that] every kind of raven.

**II.3** A. Said Amemar, “*The law is that any bird that has one token is deemed clean as long as [in addition] it does not maul its prey.*”

B. *Said R. Ashi to Amemar, “Lo, what of the rule of R. Nahman?” He said to him, “I did not hear it.” That is to say [he meant], “I do not reason in accord with it.”*

C. *For which ones are there [that we should be concerned with identifying]? The vulture and the osprey. But they are not common in settled areas.*

**II.4** A. Said R. Judah, “A bird that can scratch [with its talon] is valid [for the sacrifice one must bring] for the purification of the leper. And this is the white bellied swallow about which there is a dispute between R. Eliezer and the sages.”

B. *Said Amemar, “Concerning the white bellied [swallow] there is a consensus that it is permitted. Where do they dispute the matter? Regarding the green bellied [swallow]. R. Eliezer prohibits and the sages permit. And the law follows in accord with R. Eliezer.”*

C. *Mar Zutra taught as follows: With regard to the green bellied [swallow] there is a consensus that it is prohibited. Where do they dispute? Regarding the white bellied [swallow]. R. Eliezer prohibits and the sages permit. And the law follows in accord with the sages who permit.*

- D. *It is consistent, according to the authority who holds the view that they disputed over the status of the white bellied [swallow], with that stated above [in A], “This is the white bellied swallow [about which there is a dispute between R. Eliezer and the sages].”*
- E. *But according to the authority who says that [Eliezer and sages] disputed over the status of the green bellied [swallow] what [can we say to harmonize this with A that says,] “This is the white bellied swallow [about which there is a dispute between R. Eliezer and the sages]?” This [dispute over the white bellied swallow] excludes the black house swallow [that is prohibited according to both authorities].*

- II.5** A. Said Rehaba, said R. Judah, “The tasil-dove is invalid [for a sacrifice requiring] a turtle dove. But it is valid [for a sacrifice requiring] a young pigeon. Daziye and the Rehaba-doves are valid [for a sacrifice requiring] a turtle dove. But they are invalid [for a sacrifice requiring] a young pigeon.”
- B. R. Daniel bar R. Qatina *posed a question: All the fowl [62b] render unfit [the purification water if they drink from it] except for the dove, because it sucks it up [not drooling into it] [M. Parah 9:3C-D]. And if you accept this [rule in A] then it should teach, Except for the dove and the tasil-dove.*
- C. Said R. Zira, “This one [the tasil-dove] sucks it up and drools [and thereby renders the water unfit]. This one [the ordinary dove] sucks it up and does not drool.”
- D. Said R. Judah, “These Zuzinian doves (Cashdan) are valid [as sacrifices] upon the altar. And these are identical with Rehaba-doves.”
- E. *They posed this objection: “[And the priest shall take cedarwood and] hyssop [and scarlet stuff, and cast them into the midst of the burning of the heifer]” (Num. 19: 6) — and not Greek hyssop, and not blue hyssop, and not Roman hyssop, and not desert hyssop, and not any kind of hyssop that has a distinct name [cf. M. Par. 11:7].*
- F. Said Abbaye, “Any kind that had different names [for its various kinds] before the giving of the Torah [at Mt. Sinai], and the Torah was consistent about [using the generic name in all instances] — [then a kind] that has a distinct name — it is invalid. *But these [doves] did not have different names [for the various kinds] before the giving of the Torah.*” [Accordingly, all kinds are valid.]
- G. *Raba said, “The Zuzinian doves are called ordinary doves in their native locale.”*
- II.6** A. Said R. Judah, “The winged creatures of the rushes are permitted. Those of the cabbages are prohibited.” [Rashi interprets: locusts. Tosafot: birds.]

- B. Said Rabina, "And [if one eats them] *he is flogged on account of violating the prohibition (Lev. 9:23) against the creeping things that fly.*"
- C. *And said R. Judah, "The linnet [zrd'] is permitted. The white jay [brd'] is prohibited. And the mnemonic is: let not the linnet [br mynyh]."* [As to the] moor-cock [mrd'] there is a doubt.
- D. Said R. Assi, "There are eight cases of doubt [regarding these kinds of birds]: the crested lark, the lark, the wren, the mountain chaffinch, the wood lark, the moor-hen, the black woodpecker, and the partridge."
- E. *And what doubt is there about them?* Clean birds have gizzards that can be skinned. Unclean birds have gizzards that cannot be skinned. And these have gizzards that can be skinned with a knife [but not by hand].
- F. *But lo, there was a duck in the house of mar Samuel whose gizzard could not be skinned. So they left it out in the sun. And as soon as it softened, it could be skinned. [The circumstances are different in that case.] There as soon as it softened it could be skinned by hand. Here even after it softened it could be skinned only with a knife.*
- G. Said Abbaye, "The moor-cock is one of the eight cases of doubt [listed in D]. For it is in the same category as the moor-hen."
- H. Said R. Pappa, "The moor-cock is prohibited. The moor-hen is permitted. And the mnemonic is: An 'Amonite' (Deu. 23: 4) [is prohibited from entering the congregation of Israel] and not an Amonitess."
- I. Meremar interpreted, "The moor-hen is prohibited. We can see that it mauls and eats its prey. And this is also called the giruta."
- J. Said Rab, "The domesticated parrot is permitted. The wild (Hebrew: prwz) parrot is prohibited. And its mnemonic is: Peroz is evil."
- K. Said R. Huna, "The penguin is permitted. The sea-mew is prohibited. [A mnemonic is given:] the sea-mew is a Magus."
- L. Said R. Pappa, "A moor-hen that stands and eats is permitted. A moor-hen that bends over and eats is prohibited. And the mnemonic for this is: 'For you shall bow down to no other God' (Exo. 34:14)."
- M. Said Samuel, "The redwing thrush [lit.: wine-drinker] is prohibited. And the mnemonic for this is: 'Those [priests] drunk with wine are invalid' (b. San. 22b)." And said Samuel, "The lapwing is prohibited. [63a] And the stock pigeon is permitted. And the mnemonic for this is: the power of the offspring is greater than the power of the father [b. 49b]." [The literal meaning of the Hebrew names are: wine-mixer and daughter of the wine-mixer.]

- N. Said R. Judah, “The pink flamingo with long legs is permitted. And the mnemonic for this is: *murzama* [i.e., another permitted pink bird with long legs (Rashi)]. And the pink flamingo with short legs is prohibited. And the mnemonic for this is [the legal principle]: **the dwarf is invalid [M. Bekh. 7:6 T(5)]**. The green flamingo with long legs is prohibited. And the mnemonic for this is: **If they are green — they are invalid [M. 3:3 C(6)]**.”
- O. Said R. Judah, “The cormorant (Lev. 11:17), this is [a bird] that snatches fish from the sea. The hoopoe (Lev. 11:19), this is [a bird] with a double crown.”
- P. *It was taught on Tannaite authority in accord with this:* The hoopoe (Lev. 11:19), this is [a bird] with a double crown. And this is the bird that brought the shamir-worm to the Temple [b. Git. 68b]. *When R. Yohanan would see a cormorant he would recite*, “Thy judgments are like the great deep” (Psa. 36: 6). And when he would see an ant he would recite, “Thy righteousness is the like the mountains of God” (*ibid*).
- Q. Said Amemar, “The pelican and the gannet *are permitted*. The bustard and the black gannet — in a place where they are accustomed to eat them, they may eat them. In a place where they are not accustomed to eat them, they may not eat them.” *Is it that the matter depends on the custom [and not on the law]? Yes. And there is no contradiction [between the two customs]. This one [custom that prohibits] is in a place where the vulture and the osprey are common [and we fear lest they confuse the birds and eat a prohibited kind]. This one [custom that permits] is in a place where the vulture and the osprey are not common [and we have no such fear].*
- R. Said Abbaye, “The large screech owl and the small screech owl are prohibited. The owl is permitted. In the West [Israel] they gave lashes [to one who ate it] and they called it the night screecher.”
- S. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* The *tnsmt* [RSV: the water hen (Lev. 11:18)] is the ugliest of the birds [Rashi: the bat; Cashdan: the night bird or owl]. Do you say it is the ugliest of the birds? Or do you say that it is the ugliest of the creeping things? [The same name is used to describe one of the prohibited kinds of creeping things in Lev. 11:30. RSV translates the chameleon.] You may say we may go forth and determine this from [one of] the thirteen principles by which the Torah is interpreted: [This is] a matter that may be determined from its context. Of what is Scripture speaking? Of birds. This too [must refer to] birds.
- T. *It was taught also with regard to creeping things in the same manner:* The *tnsmt* is the ugliest of the creeping things. Do you say it is the ugliest of the creeping things? Or do you say that is it the ugliest of the birds? You may say we may go

forth and determine this from [one of] the thirteen principles by which the Torah is interpreted: [This is] a matter that may be determined from its context. Of what is Scripture speaking? Of creeping things. This too [must refer to] creeping things.

- U. *Said Abbaye, "The ugliest of the birds is the bat and the ugliest of the creeping things is the mole."* Said R. Judah, "The *q't* is the sea crow. The *rh**m* is the vulture." Said R. Yohanan, "Why is it called the *rh**m* [meaning mercy, but implying rain]? Because when the *rh**m* comes [around it is a sign that] rain [lit. mercy] will come to the world."
- V. *Said R. Bibi bar Abbaye, "[The coming of the vulture is a sign] if he sets down someplace and squawks. And we have a tradition that if he sets down on the land and squawks the messiah will come. As it says, 'I will signal [lit. squawk] for them and gather them in, [for I have redeemed them, and they shall be as many as of old]' (Zech. 10: 8)."*
- W. *Said R. Ada bar Shimi to Mar bar R. Idai, "But lo, this one [vulture] set down on a plowed field and squawked. And a stone rolled down on it and split open its head."*
- X. *He said to him, "This one [vulture] was a quack."*

- II.7** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* [The verse says, "Every raven according to its kind" (Lev. 11:15).] "Raven" is the raven itself. "Every raven" includes [in the category] the raven of the valley. "According to its kind" includes [in the category] the raven that travels in front of the doves.
- B. *Said the master, "[You said], 'Raven' is the raven itself. It is right here before us. Rather you should say: 'Raven' is the black raven. And so it says [in the verse], 'His head is the finest gold; his locks are wavy, black as a raven' (Son. 5:11).*
- C. *The raven of the valley [in A, that is] the magpie [a white spotted raven]. And so it says [in the verse], "[The priest shall examine it, and if the hair in the spot has turned white] and it appears deeper than the skin, [then it is leprosy, it has broken out in the burn, and the priest shall pronounce him unclean; it is a leprous disease]" (Lev. 13:25). As [they say]: the appearance of sun is deeper than shade. [This is a play on the words for valley and deep from 'mq. The white raven is the deeper- or the valley-raven.]*
- D. *[And concerning] the raven that travels in front of the doves [in A]: Said R. Pappa, "Do not maintain that it means it travels in front of the doves. Rather [maintain that it means] its head resembles that of a dove [i.e., the cuckoo (Cashdan)]."*

**II.8** A. *Our rabbis taught:* [The verse says, “The hawk according to its kind” (Lev. 11:16).] “The hawk” is the hawk according to its kind. This includes the *bar hyry*’.

B. What is the *bar hyry*? Said Abbayye, “It is the falcon.”

C. Said R. Judah, “‘The stork, [the heron according to its kind, the hoopoe, and the bat]’ (Lev. 11:19): This is the white stork.

D. And why is it called the *hsydh* [lit. merciful]? Because it performs merciful acts for its fellows.”

E. The ‘*nph* is the heron. And why is it called ‘*nph* [lit. angry]? Because it is quarrelsome with its fellows.

**II.9** A. Said R. Hanan bar R. Hisda, said R. Hisda, said R. Hanan the son Raba, said Rab, “There are twenty-four [categories of] unclean birds.”

B. Said R. Hanan bar R. Hisda to R. Hisda, “*Where are they? If you refer to Leviticus, there are twenty [categories there]. If you refer to Deuteronomy, there are twenty-one [categories] there. And if you maintain that [you should take the category of] the kite (Lev. 11:14) that is written in Leviticus but not written in Deuteronomy and add it to the others [that are listed], you still have only twenty-two!*”

C. *He [Hisda] said to him, “This is what your mother’s father said in the name of Rab, ‘[You must count as separate categories] the four times [in chapter 11] that it says, After its kind.’ There are your other four.”*

D. *[He said,] “If this is so then you have twenty-six [categories]!”* Said Abbayye, “The kite (d’h, Lev. 11:13) and the buzzard (r’h, Deu. 14:13) are one category. For if you wished to conclude that they are two [categories], [63b] then let us consider this. Deuteronomy [repeats the laws] so as to add to them. Why then there [in Leviticus] does it write d’h and there [in Deuteronomy] does it write r’h but not d’h? Rather we must derive from this that they are one category.”

E. *You still have twenty-five [categories]!*

F. Said Abbayye, “Just as d’h and r’h are one category. So too ‘yh [RSV: the falcon, Lev. 11:14 and and dyh [RSV: the kite, Deu. 14:13] are one category. For if you wished to conclude that they are two [categories], then let us consider this. Deuteronomy [repeats the laws] so as to add to them. Why then there [in Leviticus] does it write ‘according to its kind’ regarding the ‘yh and there [in Deuteronomy] does it write ‘according to its kind’ regarding the dyh? Rather we must derive from this that they, ‘yh and dyh, are one category.”

- G. And after we concluded that 'yh and dyh, are one category *why then does it need to write both 'yh and dyh? As it was taught on Tannaite authority: Rabbi says, "I call it 'yh. Why then does it say dyh? So as not to give an opening for lawyers to dispute the law. So that you do not call it one name, and he call it the other, or vice versa. Therefore it is written in Deuteronomy, 'The buzzard, the kite (hr'h w't h'yh whdyh lmynh) after their kinds' (Deu. 14:13)."*
- H. *They raised an objection: Why were they [i.e., the lists of clean and unclean animals] repeated [i.e., in Leviticus and Deuteronomy]? For [the list of prohibited] beasts, it was on account of the addition of the ssw'h. And for [the list of prohibited] birds, it was on account of the addition of the r'h. Is it not the case that regarding [the list in Deuteronomy of unclean] beasts that it adds [a new category]. [In the list in Deuteronomy of unclean] birds does it not also add [a new category]?*
- I. *No. There [for beasts] it adds. Here [for birds] it explains [a category that was already stated].*
- J. *And this disputes the view of R. Abbahu. For said R. Abbahu, "The r'h is the same as the 'yh. And why was it called that? Because it has acute eyesight [a reference to the Hebrew root for seeing, r'h]. And so it says [in the verse], 'That path no bird of prey knows, and the falcon's ['yh] eye has not seen it' (Job. 28: 7)."*
- K. *It was taught, "It can be in Babylonia and see carrion in the Land of Israel."*
- L. *Since we said r'h is identical to 'yh, we may derive the rule that d'h is not identical to r'h. Then let us consider this. Deuteronomy [repeats the laws] so as to add to them. Why then there [in Leviticus] does it write d'h and there [in Deuteronomy] does it not write d'h? Rather we must derive from this that they, d'h, r'h and 'yh, are one category."*
- M. *And since r'h is identical to 'yh we may derive the rule that dyh is not identical to 'yh. What then is the difference between the verse there that writes according to its kind in regard to 'yh and the verse here that does not write according to its kind for 'yh, but only for dyh? Rather we must derive from this that they, d'h, r'h, dyh and 'yh, are one category.*
- II.10** A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: Isi b. Judah says, "There are one hundred categories of unclean birds in the East and all of them are kinds of 'yh."*
- B. *Taught Abimi the son of R. Abbahu, "There are seven hundred kinds of [unclean] fish and eight hundred kinds of [unclean] locusts. And there is an infinite number of the kinds of [unclean] birds."*
- C. *[But we learned in that] there are twenty-four [kinds of unclean birds]!*



- D. *[You should say that it means here that] there is an infinite number of clean birds.*
- E. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:* Rabbi says, “It is apparent to the Creator that the [categories of] clean beasts outnumber the [categories of] unclean beasts. Therefore Scripture listed the clean beasts. It was apparent to the Creator that the [categories of] clean birds outnumber the [categories of] unclean birds. Therefore Scripture listed the unclean birds.”
- F. *What novel point does this make?*
- G. *In accord with R. Huna in the name of Rab [it makes a novel point].*
- H. *And some say, in accord with R. Huna in the name of Rab in the name of R. Meir, “A person should always teach something to his student in the most concise way possible.”*
- II.11** A. Said R. Isaac, “A clean bird may be eaten on the basis of the received tradition. The hunter is trusted to say, ‘This bird is clean. My master passed the tradition on to me.’”
- B. *Said R. Yohanan, “And this is the case if he is expert in [identifying] them and their names.” It is consistent if you say that his master was a hunter. Then it makes perfect sense [to say that he was an expert in identifying them and their names]. But if you say his master was a sage, it is consistent to conclude that he was learned in their names. But [is it consistent to assume] that he knew how to identify them. Rather must we not then derive that his master was a hunter?*
- C. *We must derive it.*

### **The Rules Governing Clean and Unclean Eggs**

- II.12** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* They may buy eggs from idolaters anywhere. And they need not suspect that they are from carrion nor from *terefot*.
- B. *But perhaps they are from an unclean bird?*
- C. *Said the father of Samuel, “[This rule applies] where he [the seller] said, ‘They are from such-and-such a bird that is clean.’”*
- D. *But [why not] let him say, “They are from a clean bird?” If he does this, he might prevaricate. [Later he might be tempted to change his story (Rashi)].*
- E. *But why not let him [the buyer] inspect for the tokens [of cleanness]? For it was taught on Tannaite authority:* The tokens [of cleanness] for eggs are like the tokens for fish. *Does it make sense to conclude that they are like [the tokens for] fish? The Torah said [the tokens for fish are] fins and scales!*

- F. *Rather say*, [The tokens of cleanness for birds' eggs] are like the tokens [64a] for fish roe.
- G. *And it was taught on Tannaite authority with regard to eggs*: These are the tokens [of cleanness] for eggs: Any [egg] that is arched and rounded, [that is] with one end broad and one end narrow, is clean. [Any eggs that have] both ends broad or both ends narrow are unclean. [Any egg] with the white on the outside and the yolk on the inside, is clean. [Any egg] with the yolk on the outside and the white on the inside, is unclean. **[T. has this version: Any [egg] that is arched (on top, not pointed) and rounded, one may be certain, derives from an unclean bird, and any that is not arched and rounded, one may be certain, derives from a clean bird [T. 3:23 C].]**
- H. [If we have tokens of cleanness for eggs, why then does the hunter need to state that the eggs come from a clean bird?]
- I. *It is necessary for him to state it for eggs that were cut up [and the external tokens would not be visible anymore].*
- J. *But then let him inspect the white and the yolk [to see if the egg is clean].*
- K. *[He cannot do this if we speak of a case where the eggs were already] scrambled in a bowl.*
- L. *But because of this very matter do we buy [eggs] from them [i.e., gentiles]? For lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: [They purchase eggs from any source and do not scruple lest they are of carrion- or terefah-birds.] They do not sell eggs [of carrion-birds or] of terefah-birds to a gentile unless they were cracked open into a dish. Therefore they said, "They do not purchase from a gentile eggs that are cracked open into a dish [T. 3:24 A-C]."*
- M. *But said R. Zira, "The tokens [for eggs] do not derive from the authority of the Torah. For if you do not maintain this view, lo [consider] that which, said R. Assi, 'There are eight cases of doubt [regarding these kinds of birds]...' [above V.6 D]. [In those cases] let him inspect their eggs [and if they have the tokens of cleanness, then the birds are clean]. But we may derive from this [i.e., from the fact that they do not suggest this course of action] that the tokens [of cleanness for eggs] do not derive from the authority of the Torah."*
- N. *Then [if they are not based on the authority of the Torah] what is the legal implication [of the statement of these tokens for eggs]?*
- O. *This is how you should state the matter*: If both its ends were broad or both its ends were narrow, or if the yolk was on the outside and the white on the inside, it is surely unclean. If one end was broad and one end was narrow, or if the white was

on the outside and the yolk on the inside, and he said to you, “This comes from such-and-such a bird and it is clean,” you may rely on them [i.e., the tokens along with the statement].

P. *In ordinary circumstances [where he says nothing] you may not rely on them [i.e., the tokens alone are not sufficient]. For there are eggs from a raven that resemble the eggs of a dove.*

**II.13** A. Said the master, “[Any egg] with the yolk and the white intermingled, it is known that this is an egg from [an unclean] creeping thing [D, above].”

B. *What is the legal implication of this [statement that is is from a creeping thing]?*

C. *Said R. Uqba bar Hama, “This tells us that if [the embryo in the egg] formed and [the shell] was pierced, it conveys uncleanness in [any amount more than] a lentil’s-bulk.”*

D. *Rabina posed an objection, “But perhaps it is [the egg of] a serpent [and that does not convey uncleanness].”*

E. *Rather said Raba, “If it [the embryo] formed and he ate it, he is flogged for eating it on account of [the prohibition against eating] any creeping thing that crawls on the earth.”*

F. *If this is the case, then why specify that it is an unclean [creeping thing]? [If he eats from] even a clean one [he should be flogged].*

G. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority: “Every creeping thing that crawls upon the earth” (Lev. 11:41) — [64b] this [use of the word ‘all’] includes [under the prohibition] chicks whose eyes are not yet opened. [But this is not probative.]*

H. *[The ruling is] based on the authority of the rabbis and the verse is merely a [secondary] support for it.*

**II.14** A. *Our rabbis taught: [Clean eggs] boiled together with [unclean] eggs are permitted [because the unclean eggs do not contaminate the clean ones in this manner (Rashi)]... Eggs that were addled [by the mother] — one with a strong constitution may eat them. If a drop of blood was found upon it, he may wipe away the blood and eat the rest. [T. Ter. 9:5 D, K-L].*

B. Said R. Jeremiah, “And this is so if [the drop of blood] was found on its knot [in the tip of the white of the egg (Rashi)].”

C. *Taught* Dostai the father of R. Aptoriqui, “They taught this [rule] only where it [the blood] was found in its white. But if it was found in its yolk, all of the egg is prohibited.”

D. *What is the basis for this? The taint has spread throughout [the egg].*

E. *Said R. Gabihah of Be Katil to R. Ashi, “A Tannaite authority taught the opposite before Abbayye. But Abbayye rejoined him [in accord with our rule].”*

**II.15** A. Said Hezekiah, “What is the source of the assertion that an unclean egg is prohibited by the Torah?” As it states, “The ostrich” (Lev. 11:16) [*bt hy’nh*, lit.: the daughter of the Ya’anah]. And does the Ya’anah have a daughter? [No.] But what then is this [that the verse refers to]? This is an unclean egg.

B. *But perhaps this is the name [of a kind of bird]. No, you cannot have concluded that. For it is written, “[Even the jackals give the breast and suckle their young,] but the daughter of my people has become cruel, like the ostriches [y’nym, not bt y’nym] in the wilderness” (Lam. 4: 3).*

C. Is it not the case [that a verse does refer to *bt*, the daughter]? *But lo, it is written, “For this I will lament and wail; I will go stripped and naked; I will make lamentation like the jackals, and mourning like the ostriches [here: bnwt, daughters]” (Micah 1: 8). [That does not prove it is the name of a kind of bird. It could mean here]: as the ostrich that mourns over its offspring.*

D. *But lo, it is written, “[But wild beasts will lie down there, and its houses will be full of howling creatures;] there ostriches [here again: bnwt, daughters] will dwell, [and there satyrs will dance]” (Isa. 13:21). [It could mean here]: as the ostrich that dwells with its offspring.*

E. *But lo, it is written, “The wild beasts will honor me, the jackals and the ostriches [again: bnwt]; [for I give water in the wilderness, rivers in the desert, to give drink to my chosen people]” (Isa. 43:20). [Now this must be the name of a kind of bird.] For if you wish to conclude that this is an egg, can an egg sing [praise]?*

F. *But it is written both ways [in that verse, i.e., two scribal alternatives]: the Ya’anah and the daughter of the Ya’anah. And this case is different because the scribe left a space between the two words. And since the scribe left a space [65a] between the two words, we may derive from this that there are two separate names [in the verse].*

G. *But then consider this: “[In the days of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar,] Ched-or-laomer [king of Elam, and Tidal king of Goiim]” (Gen. 14: 1), where the scribe left a space between the two words, will you say that here too there are two separate names [in the verse]? You could say [there is a difference*

*between the two examples]. Here he left a space between the two words. He did not put them on two separate lines. But there he even put them on two separate lines. [So there is more justification in the former case to say they are separate names.]*

- III.1** A. But sages have ruled: “Any fowl that seizes is unclean. Any [fowl] that has an extra talon [the hallux] and a craw, and the skin of the stomach of which [can] be stripped off is clean.” R. Eleazar b. Sadoq says, “Any bird that parts its toes evenly [two in front and two in back] is unclean” (Lev. 11: 3):
- B. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:* Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Any fowl that has an extra talon [and a craw, and the skin of the stomach of which can be stripped off] is clean. Any fowl that seizes [prey] is unclean” [M. Hul. 3:6 C].
- C. R. Eleazar bar Sadoq says, “They stretch out a cord for it. Any that, when placed on a cord divides [its toes], two before it and two behind it, is unclean” [M. Hul. 3:6 D]. [Any bird that divides its toes] three on one side and one on the other, is clean [T. 3:22 A-C].
- D. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “Any bird that can catch in mid-air [an object thrown to it] is unclean.”
- E. *[But consider:] A humming-bird also can catch [an object in mid-air]!*
- F. *Said Abbayye, “We speak of [the ability of the bird] to catch [food in mid-air] and to eat it.”*
- G. Others say, “That which nests among unclean [birds] and is like unclean [birds] is unclean. That which nests among clean ones and is like clean ones is clean” [T. 3:22 D].
- H. *In accord with whose view is this? In accord with R. Eliezer. For it was taught on Tannaite authority:* R. Eliezer says, “It is not an accident that the starling [nests] near the raven. But it is because it is of the same kind [as the raven].”
- I. *You might even maintain that this is in accord with the view of the Rabbis. For we speak of nesting among and looking like [unclean birds].*
- IV.1** A. And among locusts: Any that has (1) four legs, (2) four wings, and (3) jointed legs (Lev. 11:21), and (4) the wings of which cover the greater part of its body [M. 3:7 A].
- B. *What is the greater part of its body?*
- C. Said R. Judah, said Rab, “The greater part of its length.” And some say, “The greater part of its circumference.”

- D. Said R. Pappa, “Therefore, we must have [them cover both] the greater part of its length and the greater part of its circumference.”
- E. Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: [R. Eleazar bar Yosé says,] “[If] it does not now have [these signs] but is going to produce them after a while, for example, the *zahal*, it is valid [T. 3:25 E].”
- F. R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé says, “[Yet among the winged insects that go on all fours you may eat] those which have legs [above their feet, with which to leap on the earth]’ (Lev. 11:21) — even though it does not now have them, but is going to produce them after a while.” [The verse is written *l’*, that is, have no legs, but is read *lw*, that is, have legs. Eleazar’s rule accounts for both, that is, now it has none but later it will.]
- G. What is the *zahal*?
- H. Said Abbaye, “The ‘*sqrn*.”

**IV.2** A. Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “Of them you may eat: the locust according to its kind, the bald locust according to its kind, the cricket according to its kind, and the grasshopper according to its kind” (Lev. 11:22). [Following Cashdan who relies on Lewysohn:] “The locust,” this is the migratory locust. “The bald locust,” this is the bald locust. “The cricket,” this is the green grasshopper. And “the grasshopper,” this is the cricket.

B. What does it come to teach by repeating “according to its kind” four times? To include [in the rules] the vine-hopper, the Jerusalem *ywhn*, the ‘*rwby*’, and the *rbny*.

**IV.3** A. The House of R. Ishmael taught: Some of these are general rules added to general rules. And some of these are specific rules added to specific rules. [Here is how you should interpret the verse.] “The locust,” this is the migratory locust. “According to its kind” includes [65b] the vine-hopper.

B. I only have [a rule that includes a locust] that migrates and is not bald. Based on what [would I have a rule for a locust] that migrates and is bald? It comes to teach, “The bald locust [*sl’m*],” this is the *nypwl*.

C. “According to its kind” includes the ‘*yskp* [that is bald].

D. I only have [a rule that includes a locust] that migrates and is not bald, or that migrates and is bald. Based on what [would I have a rule for a locust] that migrates and has no tail or that migrates and has a tail? It comes to teach, “The cricket,” that is the *rswn*. “According to its kind” includes the *krspt* and the *slhpt* [that have tails].

E. I only have [a rule that includes a locust] that migrates and is not bald, or that migrates and is bald or that migrates and has no tail or that migrates and has a tail. Based on

what [would I have a rule for a locust] that migrates and has not got a long head or that migrates and has got a long head?

- F. *State then*, lo you should deduce this from the generative principle of all three. The locust does not resemble [in all its features] the cricket. And the cricket does not resemble the locust. And the two of them do not resemble the bald cricket. And the bald cricket does not resemble the two of them. The common denominator of all of them is that they have four legs and four wings and jointed legs and wings that cover the greater part of their bodies. So all those that have four legs and four wings and jointed legs and wings that cover the greater part of their bodies.
- G. But do not the *zarzor* have four legs and four wings and jointed legs and wings that cover the greater part of their bodies? You might infer that it is permitted. It comes to teach us [with a fourth category,] “the grasshopper” [that includes in the rule] any that is called a grasshopper [in ordinary parlance]. If it is called a grasshopper, you might infer that [it comes under the rule] even if it does not have all these tokens [as discussed]. It comes to teach us, “according to its kind” [it does not come under the rule] unless it has all these tokens.
- H. *R. Ahai asked, “What about those that do not have a long head? And if you maintain that since they match four of the tokens, we may subsume it [in the rule] and we may not question [its appropriateness], then [based on this logic] the cricket as well that matches them [in the other tokens], let it not be written [in the verse], and derive it from the locust and the bald locust. But you can question [this inference as follows:] what is the case regarding those? It is the case that they have no tails. Here too [in our case] we can question [this inference on the basis that] what is the case regarding those? It is the case that their heads are not long.”*
- I. *But said R. Ahai, “[Including in the verse] the bald locust is superfluous. The Torah need not have written the bald locust and we could have derived it by inference from the inclusion of the locust and the cricket. For what question did you have? What is the case regarding the locust? It is not bald. Lo, we have the cricket that is bald. What is the case regarding the cricket. It has no tail. Lo, we have the locust that has a tail. The bald locust that the Torah wrote, why do I need [to state it]? If it is not a matter stated for its own sake, then apply it to the matter of [a case of a locust] whose head is long.”*

**IV.4 A. [66a]** *On what principle do the Tannaite authority from the house of Rab and the Tannaite authority of the house of Ishmael dispute? In the case of [a locust*



*that has] a long head they dispute. The Tannaite authority of the house of Rab reasons [as follows]: “[Yet among the winged insects that go on all fours you may eat] those which have legs above their feet, [with which to leap on the earth]” (Lev. 11:21) — this is a general rule. “[Of them you may eat:] the locust according to its kind, the bald locust according to its kind, the cricket according to its kind, and the grasshopper according to its kind” (Lev. 11:22) — this is a specification [of the rule]. Where you have a general rule and a specification of the rule, you can only subsume under the rule what you have in the specifications. [This then means] if it is of the same kind, yes [you may subsume it under the rule]. But if it is not of the same kind, no [you may not subsume it]. And we encompass [in the rule] all [kinds] that match it in all manners.*

- B. *The Tannaite authority of the House of Ishmael reasons [as follows]: “[Yet among the winged insects that go on all fours you may eat] those which have legs above their feet, [with which to leap on the earth]” (Lev. 11:21) — this is a general rule. “[Of them you may eat:] the locust ... the bald locust ... the cricket ... and the grasshopper...” (Lev. 11:22) — this is a specification [of the rule]. “According to its kind” — this is another general rule. Where you have a general rule and a specification of the rule, and another general rule, you may judge [what is subsumed] only according to the specifications. And we encompass [in the rule] all [kinds] that match it in one manner.*
- C. *But lo, here the first general rule does not match the latter general rule. According to the first rule, the Torah said, “Those which have legs above their feet.” [This implies that] those that have [legs], you may eat. Those that do not have, you may not eat. According to the latter general rule [you cannot eat them] unless they match in the four tokens [of cleanness].*
- D. *The House of R. Ishmael explicates [issues] based on general rules and specifications like this very matter. And what we say in general that the House of R. Ishmael explicates [issues] based on general rules and specifications like this very matter, [we derive that statement] from this instance here.*

**IV.5** A. Said the master : If it is called a grasshopper, you might infer that [it comes under the rule] even if it does not have all these tokens [as discussed]. It comes to teach us, “according to its kind” [it does not come under the rule] unless it has all these tokens.

- B. If it does not have all these tokens — *from what source could we derive this inference? It is written: the locust... and the cricket. If it did not also write, the bald locust, [we might have concluded] as you said. Now that it*

*did write, the bald locust, [does it make sense to maintain] this comes to encompass [a locust whose] head is long? It makes sense to maintain that it comes to encompass any [match of the tokens] at all. It makes the novel point [that this is not the case].*

- C. *What is the difference between that version that states the bald locust, that is the rswn; the cricket, that is the nypwl, and this version that states the bald locust, that is the nypwl; and the cricket, that is the rswn? This master follows [the interpretation of] his locality. And this master follows [the interpretation of] his locality.*

**V.1 A. And among fish: Any that has fins and scales [M. 3:7 C].** *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: If [a species of fish has no fins and scales] now but is going to grow them later on, for example, the sultanit fish and the aphis fish, lo, this [species of fish] is permitted. If it has [fins and scales] now but is going to slough them off when it is taken out of the water, for example, [66b] the colias, scomber, swordfish, anthias, and tunny, it is permitted [b. A.Z. 39a].*

B. *It was taught there on Tannaite authority: **Whatever has scales has fins, but there is that which has fins and does not have scales [M. Nid. 6:9 A].** Whatever has scales and has fins is a clean fish. If it has a fin but does not have scales, it is an unclean fish.*

C. *Since we rely on the presence of scales, why did the Torah have to make mention of fins at all?*

D. *If the Torah had not made reference to fins, I might have supposed that the word translated as scales refers to fins, so even an unclean fish would be permitted. It was necessary for the Torah to refer explicitly to both fins and scales.*

E. *And now that the Torah has written both fins and scales, how do we know that the word translated as scales actually means a covering? As it is written, “[He had a helmet of bronze on his head,] and he was covered with a coat of mail [qsqsym], [and the weight of the coat was five thousand shekels of bronze]” (1Sa. 17: 5).*

F. *So why did the Torah not write just scales and there would have been no need to make mention of fins at all?*

G. *Said R. Abbahu, and so taught a Tannaite authority of the house of R. Ishmael, “To magnify his teaching and make it glorious” (Isa. 42:21).*

**V.2 A. Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:** From what was stated that one may eat [those fish] that do have them [fins and scales], I derive that one may not eat those that do not have them. And from what was stated that one may not eat those that

do not have them, I derive that one may eat those that do have them. *So why did it teach both? [To inform us that if he eats a fish that is prohibited] he transgresses for that both a positive and a negative commandment.* [The verses are: “These you may eat, of all that are in the waters. Everything in the waters that has fins and scales, whether in the seas or in the rivers, you may eat. But anything in the seas or the rivers that has not fins and scales, of the swarming creatures in the waters and of the living creatures that are in the waters, is an abomination to you” (Lev. 11: 9-10).]

- B. “These you may eat, of all that are in the waters” — what does this come to teach us? You might have inferred that since it permitted specific [water creatures] and permitted them in general, just as when it permitted them in specific it permitted only those that were [grown] in vessels, so too when it permitted them in general it permitted only those that were [grown] in vessels. On what basis do we include [the rule] that from cisterns, ditches and caverns one may bend down and not refrain from drinking [even though he may swallow a creature from the water]? It comes to teach [in the verse], “These you may eat, of all that are in the waters.”
- C. *In what source does it permit [water creatures] found in vessels? As it is written, “These you may eat, of all that are in the waters. Everything in the waters that has fins and scales, whether in the seas or in the rivers, you may eat.” Those that have [fins and scales], you may eat. Those that do not have, you may not eat. Lo, those that are found in vessels, even though they do not have [fins and scales], you may eat them. But it makes [just as much] sense to say those that are found in vessels, even though they do have [fins and scales], you may not eat them. No, you cannot have concluded that. For it is written, “But anything in the seas or the rivers that has not fins and scales, of the swarming creatures in the waters...” — [that implies] whatever is in the seas or the rivers that does not have [fins and scales], you may not eat. Lo, those that are found in vessels, even though they do not have [fins and scales], you may eat them.*
- D. *But it makes sense to say that “in the waters” is a general rule, “in the seas or the rivers” is a specification. Where there is a general rule and a specification of the rule, there can be in the general rule on those features that are found in the specifications. [You should then conclude that] yes, [it refers to creatures] in the seas or the rivers, but no, [it does not refer to creatures] in gutters or trenches. [Scripture says,] “That are in the waters,” once again stating a general rule. These then are two general rules that are juxtaposed to one another.*
- E. *Said Rabina, “This is what they stated in the West [i.e., Israel]: In every instance where you find two general rules juxtaposed to one another [67a], you may place*

the specifications between them and treat this as if it constituted a general rule, a specification and a general rule.” [Accordingly here you have] “in the waters” that it a general rule; “in the seas or the rivers” that is a specification; “that are in the waters” that is once again a general rule. [Where you have] a general rule, a specification and a general rule [the principle we follow is that] you can only subsume under the rule what you have in the specification. What does the specification define? That you have flowing water. So all [instances where you have] flowing water. *What does this subsume? [Creatures without fins and scales that are found in] gutters and trenches that are prohibited. And what does it exclude? [Creatures without fins and scales that are found in] cisterns, ditches, or caverns that are permitted.*

- F. *But why does it not make sense to say [the following]? What does the specification define? That you have water that emanates from the ground. So all [instances where you have] water that emanates from the ground. What does this subsume? [Creatures without fins and scales that are found] in cisterns, ditches or caverns that are prohibited. And what does it exclude? [Creatures that are in] vessels [that are permitted].*
- G. *[This alternative line of reasoning in F does not make sense because you could object to it:] If this is the case, what is the implication of the phrase, “you may eat?”*
- H. *The Tannaite authority of the house of R. Ishmael taught, “In the waters... in the waters,” [it is written] two times. This does not represent an general rule followed by specification, but rather, an inclusionary and exclusionary usage [b. Bekh. 51a (Neusner)].*
- I. [Accordingly here you have] “in the waters” that it an inclusionary usage; “in the seas or the rivers” that is an exclusionary usage; “that are in the waters” that is once again an inclusionary usage. Where it stated and inclusionary usage, an exclusionary usage and an inclusionary usage, it included all [possibilities in the rule]. *What does this subsume? [Creatures without fins and scales that are found in] gutters and trenches that are prohibited. And what does it exclude? [Creatures without fins and scales that are found in] cisterns, ditches, or caverns that are permitted.*
- J. *But why does it not make sense to say [the following]? What does this subsume? [Creatures without fins and scales that are found in] cisterns, ditches or caverns that are prohibited. And what does it exclude? [Creatures that are in] vessels [that are permitted].*

- K. *[This alternative line of reasoning in F does not make sense because you could object to it:] If this is the case, what is the implication of the phrase, “you may eat?”*
- L. *And why not let me teach the opposite? In accord with that taught by Mattiah. For taught Mattiah bar Judah, “Why did you see fit to include [creatures without fins and scales that are found in] gutters and trenches that are permitted. And [why do you see fit] to exclude [creatures without fins and scales that are found in] cisterns, ditches, or caverns that are prohibited? I prefer to include [creatures without fins and scales that are found in] gutters and trenches because they are closed up [and hence] in the same category with vessels. And I prefer to exclude [creatures without fins and scales that are found in] cisterns, ditches, or caverns because they are not closed up like vessels.”*
- M. *In which phrase is it [referring back to B, permitted to eat the creatures without fins and scales found in vessels] in general and in which phrase is it [permitted] in specific? There is a dispute regarding this between R. Aha and Rabina. One authority said, “There is a specific, but not a general [permission].” And the other authority said, “There is no specific, but there is general [permission].”*
- N. *What is the basis for the view of the authority who holds there is a specific [permission]? He would say to you, “From [the verse] itself we derive the permission [for creatures found] in vessels.”*
- O. *What is the basis for the view of the authority who holds there is a general [permission]? [He would say to you,] “This one [verse] demonstrates what the other one means. For if we derived it from the other [verse] alone, I would have reasoned that in regards to [creatures found in] vessels even if they have [fins and scales], you should not eat them.”*

### **Prohibited Creeping Things**

- V.3** A. *Said R. Huna, “A person should not pour his beer through a filter at night lest a worm fall off from the filter into the cup. And he would thereby transgress [the prohibition in Scripture against eating it, to wit], ‘Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth is an abomination; it shall not be eaten’ (Lev. 11:41).” [Once the worm crawls on the filter it is forbidden to eat it.]*
- B. *If this is the case then even [when he pours it without filtering directly] into the container [it should be forbidden because we should fear] lest [a worm] fell off onto the side of the container and then fell into the container itself. [It crawls when it falls on the side of the container.] This is the normal process [of pouring*

*the liquid and so we do not consider that the worm separated from the liquid and crawled on the surface].*

- C. *And based on what source do I say this? From what was taught on Tannaite authority: On what basis do we include [the rule] that from cisterns, ditches and caverns one may bend down and not refrain from drinking [even though he may swallow a creature from the water]? It comes to teach [in the verse], “These you may eat, of all that are in the waters.”*
- D. *And why not suspect that perhaps [a worm] fell off onto the side of the container and then fell [back into the container itself]. But [we say] this is the normal process [and a worm that falls on the side of the container does not take on the status of a creature that creeps on the ground]. Here too it is the normal process [when he pours the beer and we say that we do not take into account the possibility that the worm would crawl on the side of the container].*
- E. *Said R. Hisda to R. Huna, “There is a teaching on Tannaite authority that supports you: ‘Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth is an abomination; it shall not be eaten’ (Lev. 11:41) — this includes [in the rule of forbidden creatures] insects [gnats found in wine (Rashi)] after it was strained. The basis for this is that he strained it [and the insects crawled on the strainer before they entered back into the wine]. Lo, if he did not strain it, it is permitted [to drink these insects].”*
- V.4** A. *Said Samuel, “A cucumber that became infested with worms [67b] while growing on the vine is prohibited on account of [the verse], ‘Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth is an abomination; it shall not be eaten’ (Lev. 11:41).”*
- G. *Let us say there is support for this view as one Tannaite authority taught on Tannaite authority: ‘[Every swarming thing that swarms] upon the earth [is an abomination; it shall not be eaten’ (Lev. 11:41)] — this excludes the mites in lentils, and the mosquitoes in peas, and the worms in the dates and the dried figs.*
- H. *But there is another teaching on Tannaite authority: ‘Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth is an abomination; it shall not be eaten’ (Lev. 11:41) — this includes [as prohibited] the worms that are found in the roots of olive trees and in the roots of grape vines.*
- I. *What then [can we say to explain the apparent contradiction between these two teachings]? Both refer to [insects found in] produce. And this one [refers to produce] still growing and the other refers to [produce] no longer growing.*

J. *No. Both refer to [produce] still growing. And there is no contradiction. This one refers to [insects found in the] produce [and that is prohibited]. And this one refers to [insects found in the] tree [and that is permitted].*

K. *Let us revert to the body of the prior text [H]: You may derive this as well from what was taught, “The worms that are found in the roots of olive trees and in the roots of grape vines.” You may indeed derive this [conclusion because it refers to roots].*

**V.5** A. R. Joseph posed questions [regarding the definition of a prohibited creeping thing]: If it [i.e., and insect] detached [from the produce] and died [without ever crawling on the ground], what is the law? If part [of the insect detached and crawled on the ground], what is the law? [If it detached, but a person ate it before it touched the ground, i.e.,] while in mid-air, what is the law?

B. *These questions stand unresolved.*

C. R. Ashi posed questions [regarding the definition of a prohibited creeping thing]: [If it crawled from the inside of the fruit] to the surface of a date, what is the law? [If it crawled] to the surface of the date pit, what is the law? [If it crawled] from one date into another [without going outside], what is the law?

D. *These questions stand unresolved.*

E. Said R. Sheshet the son of R. Idi, “Parasites [found in an animal or in a fish] are prohibited.”

F. *What is the basis for this rule? [It is because] they came [into the animal or fish] from the exterior [and must have crawled in the process]. [If so] they should be found in the intestinal passages [where we presume they entered the animal].*

G. *Another version:* Said R. Shisha the son of R. Idi, “Parasites [found in an animal or in a fish] are permitted.” *What is the basis for this rule? [It is because] they grow within [the animal] spontaneously.*

H. *Said R. Ashi, “This is obvious. For if they came in from the exterior, they should be found in the intestinal passages.”*

I. *And the law is that parasites are prohibited. What is the basis for this rule? When the animal is asleep they may enter through its snout [and accordingly they would not be found in the intestinal passages].*

J. *Worms [Cashdan: maggots; Lewysohn: gadfly] under the skin [of an animal] are prohibited. [Worms found] in fish are permitted. Rabina said to his mother, “Hide them for me [in the fish] and I will eat them.”*



- K. Said R. Mesharshayya the son of R. Aha to Rabina, “*What is the difference [between this case] and that taught on Tannaite authority, ‘[They shall remain an abomination to you; of their flesh you shall not eat,] and their carcasses you shall have in abomination’ (Lev. 11:11) — this serves to include [in the prohibition] maggots that are found in a beast.*”
- L. *He said to him, “Are these cases [of meat and fish] comparable? A beast is made permitted through the act of slaughter. But [concerning] these [maggots on the beast they grow before the beast is rendered permitted]. Since the act of slaughter has no effect on them, they remain prohibited. But fish are made permitted [for eating] by the mere act of catching them. And [so concerning] these [maggots on a fish], when it grows them, it grows them after it was rendered permitted.”*
- V.6** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* “[Scripture states: Whatever goes on its belly, and whatever goes on all fours, or whatever has many feet, all the swarming things that swarm upon the earth, you shall not eat; for they are an abomination” (Lev. 11:42).] “Whatever goes on its belly” — this includes the snake; “whatever” — this includes the earthworm and any like it; “on all fours” — this is the scorpion; “and whatever goes” — this includes the beetle and any like it; “has many feet” — this is the centipede; “or whatever” — this includes any like it or any like those that are like it.
- B. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:* The Leviathan is a clean fish as it says, “His back is made of rows of shields” (Job. 42:15 RSV):
- C. “His underparts are like sharp potsherds” (Job. 42:30 RSV). “His back is made of rows of shields” — these are its scales.
- D. “His underparts are like sharp potsherds” — these are the fins with which it propels itself.