



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Falling birds (cont.)

The Gemara continues to discuss the status of a bird thrown against other surfaces.

The Gemara relates that R' Ashi and Ameimar disagree about the status of a bird that was caught on a glue board.

Two explanations of the dispute are presented and the Gemara rules that if both wings were caught the bird is prohibited.

2) Broken ribs

A Baraisa elaborates on the tereifah condition of most of the ribs of an animal being broken.

Zeiri and Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan qualify this ruling.

Ulla reports that Ben Zakai and R' Yochanan disagree whether uprooted ribs are the same as broken ribs.

Rav rules that if the rib is uprooted together with the vertebra the animal is tereifah. Rav rules that if two ribs opposite one another break the animal is a neveilah.

The Gemara explains why one case is considered a neveilah and the second case is a tereifah.

This leads to a thorough discussion of Rav's opinion and the Gemara clarifies Rav's rationale behind the two rulings.

3) Tereifah conditions

Rabbah bar R' Sheila in the name of R' Masna in the name of Shmuel issues three rulings regarding tereifah conditions.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges his first ruling that if the rib is uprooted from its base the animal is a tereifah.

Shmuel's second ruling was that if the greater part of the skull was crushed the animal is a tereifah.

R' Yirmiyah asks for a more precise definition and his inquiry is left unresolved.

The last tereifah discussed by Shmuel was damage to the

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

A missing rib and its vertebra

כי קאמר רב צלע בלא חוליא, והא צלע וחוליא קאמר, צלע וחצי חוליא

The Gemara discusses the status of an animal whose ribs are either uprooted or broken.

Rav issued a ruling that if a rib became uprooted together with the vertebra to which it is attached, the animal is a tereifah. The other rib which had been attached to that vertebra on the other side of the animal remained in its place. Rav Kahana and Rav Assi asked Rav what the halacha would be in a case where both ribs connected to a vertebra from both sides of the animal became uprooted, and the vertebra itself remained intact. Rav responded that this animal, although still "alive" is a neveilah. The animal is, in effect, split into two and is legally a neveilah which can even convey tum'ah.

The Gemara notes that Rav had just taught that if a rib and its vertebra are uprooted the animal is a tereifah. This should necessarily mean that the rib on the other side is no longer attached to its vertebra either, as the vertebra has been uprooted with the first rib. Yet, now Rav is saying that such an animal is a neveilah. The Gemara answers that although Rav did say that the case is where the rib was uprooted with its vertebra, he actually meant that the animal is a tereifah where the rib on one side was uprooted together with half its vertebra, and the other half of the vertebra remained connected to the rib on the other side. Because the rib on the other side has not been moved, the animal is a tereifah and not a neveilah.

Maharam Shi"f points out that according to the Gemara's first approach, that Rav actually meant that the rib was removed with the entire vertebra, we know that in regard to the skeleton of a person, Beis Hillel later (52b) says that when a single vertebra is removed the bones no longer can transmit tum'ah in an enclosure (a "tent") because the skeleton is legally deficient. The Gemara extends this rule and says that the same is true in regard to a tereifah, that once one vertebra is missing, the animal is a tereifah. How, then, can the Gemara even think that Rav only deems the animal a tereifah when the animal is missing a rib together with its vertebra, when Beis Hillel is on record as saying that the lacking of a vertebra alone results in a tereifah?

Maharam Shi"f answers that the original statement of Beis Hillel was only said in reference to the skeleton of a person and its status of tum'ah. It was Rav Yehuda in the name of Shmuel who extended the implication of a missing vertebra to consequences regarding an animal's being a tereifah. The Gemara thought that Rav, however, did not agree with the extended application of Beis Hillel's rule. Rav holds that missing a vertebra does not make it a tereifah, unless it is also missing the rib to which it is connected. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the definition of "most of its ribs"?
.....
2. How were R' Kahana and R' Assi going to interpret Rav's anger?
.....
3. What part of the skull must be crushed to render the animal a tereifah?
.....
4. What is the difference between the two versions of the response to the challenge to R' Chisda?
.....

HALACHAH Highlight

Is a bird tereifah if the majority of its ribs are broken?

נשתברו רוב צלעותיה

If the majority of its ribs are broken

The Gemara discusses the kosher status of an animal whose ribs are broken. Pri Megadim¹ writes that just as there is a halacha that if the majority of its ribs are broken an animal is a tereifah, so too, if the majority of a bird's ribs are broken it is a tereifah. However there is a difference between animals and birds regarding this halacha. Regarding animals the Gemara explains how many ribs must be broken for an animal to be a tereifah but regarding birds it is not known how many ribs must be broken for the bird to be a tereifah. He further wonders about another potential difference in this halacha between animals and birds. The Gemara later declares that the halacha that if the majority of ribs are broken the animal is a tereifah is limited to those ribs that contain marrow. Does the same halacha apply to birds and we would only take into account the ribs of the bird that contain marrow or not?

Elsewhere² Pri Megadim cites Rashi³ who writes that even if a bird survived twenty-four hours it must be examined after it is slaughtered out of concern that it may have broken a majority of its ribs. The topic in the Gemara there is birds and since Rashi did not specify otherwise the implication is that a bird could be rendered a tereifah if the majority of its ribs are broken regardless of whether the ribs contain marrow. Kesav Sofer⁴ writes that although an animal is not a tereifah if the ribs that don't have marrow break, a bird is a tereifah if its ribs that do not have marrow break. The reason is that animals

flesh that covers most of the paunch.

R' Ashi asks for a more precise definition.

An unsuccessful attempt to resolve this inquiry is presented and the matter is left unresolved.

4) Clawed by a wolf

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav states that regarding animals that were clawed if the predator is the size of a wolf and larger it is a tereifah and in the case of birds the predator must be at least the size of a netz.

Rav's statement is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Amram in the name of R' Chisda provides further guidelines regarding the relative size of the predator and its victim.

These guidelines are unsuccessfully challenged.

Beribi's position in a Baraisa attributed to him is unsuccessfully challenged.

A second version of the answer to the challenge against R' Chisda is presented with a followup analysis of Beribi's position. ■

have ribs that contain marrow and ribs that do not contain marrow and their life depends upon those ribs that have marrow. Therefore, when determining whether an animal is a tereifah due to broken ribs we only take into account the ribs with marrow. The life of birds are much more tenuous and were created with ribs that do not have marrow, thus the majority of all of its ribs are taken into account to determine whether it is kosher. ■

1. פמ"ג יו"ד סי' מ"ז סי' נ"ד סק"א.
2. פמ"ג אר"ח סי' תצ"ח מ"ז סק"ז.
3. רש"י ביצה ל"ד. ד"ה הי"ג.
4. כתב סופר ד"ה נשתברו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Chad Gadya

דרוסת חתול ונמיה בגדיים

Today's daf discusses a cat that attacks a kid goat.

In Slonim there lived an influential man who had an abundance of chutzpah and who loved to fan local controversies. Unfortunately for him, the famous Rav Aizel Charif, zt"l, was just the right person to deal with him. For all of his public chutzpah, Rav Aizel soundly rebuked the man and put him in his place.

But this man was not only brazen, he was also clever. He calmly answered that

the many fights that he had stoked with dedication and care had not been intentional. He had merely meant that the party who was in the right receives his due. After defending himself, the man concluded, "Everything I have done, I did for the sake of heaven."

Rav Aizel gave one of his typically acerbic replies. "You are surely familiar with the famous song Chad Gadya. A cat attacked a kid. Obviously he acted incorrectly. Then the dog attacked the cat. This appeared proper since he was merely avenging the kid. A stick hit the dog for no apparent reason, since the dog was merely avenging the kid. The stick is punished by a fire, which is right. This pattern of right and wrong continues. The water which

extinguished the fire acted improperly while the ox which drank the water avenged the fire. In the end, the man who killed the ox acted incorrectly and was rightfully killed by the angel of death. So why did God kill the angel of death?"

Rav Aizel answered his own question. "Obviously God acted correctly. We see that the dog who got involved in a fight between the cat and the kid had no business doing so. And the same is true for all the rest of those who got involved in a dispute between others..."

The rav concluded with a pointed rebuke, "Next time you see two parties fighting, stay out of it!"¹ ■

1. מגנתנו העתיק, פסח. ■