



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Fish (cont.)

Ravina finishes his exposition that teaches that the Torah permits water sheratzim that develop in utensils.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another Baraisa is cited that expounds these verses differently.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara relates that R' Acha and Ravina disagree about the meaning of the earlier Baraisa (66b) that discussed water sheratzim.

The rationale behind each opinion is explained.

2) Beer worms

R' Huna warns against sifting beer through wood chips out of concern that a worm will crawl on a wood chip and then return to the beer rendering it prohibited.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Huna's ruling.

3) Sheratzim

Shmuel rules that a cucumber that becomes wormy while attached to the ground is prohibited due to the prohibition of consuming a creeping sherez.

A support for this ruling is suggested but rejected.

A couple of questions related to the permissibility of insects and worms that emerge on fruit or vegetables are presented and left unresolved.

R' Sheishes the son of R' Idi rules that worms that are found in animal livers and lungs are prohibited.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

A second version of this discussion is recorded.

The Gemara rules that these worms are prohibited.

The Gemara states that larvae found in meat are prohibited but those found in fish are permitted.

An example of this permissibility is presented.

Ravina explains the difference in halacha between worms in meat and worms found in fish.

Another Baraisa related to sheratzim is cited.

The Gemara concludes with a Baraisa that proves that the leviathan is a kosher fish. ■

הדרן עלך אלו טריפות

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Starr Family
לע"נ הרב דוד בן הרב בנימין ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Langsner family
in loving memory of their grandmother
Mrs. Chana Robinson o'h
מרת חנה בת ר' שלום, ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Swarming water creatures found in ponds and canals

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

A Baraisa in Toras Kohanim (66b) analyzes the verses in Vayikra (11:9-11) which discuss creatures from the water that are permitted or prohibited to be eaten. There are three categories of collections of water wherein creatures of the water germinate. The verse speaks explicitly about seas and streams. These emanate from wellsprings below the ground. The opposite extreme of seas and streams is water found in vessels and cisterns, which are containers where water is placed and stored. The third category includes canals and ponds, which are similar to seas and streams in that the water found in them comes from wellsprings.

The Baraisa concluded that in order to eat a water creature from the seas or streams, the creature must have fins and scales. From this we learn that if a creature germinates in water in a vessel, it is permitted even if it does not have fins and scales. This dispensation applies only to swarming creatures (sheratzim), which are possible to be consumed while one drinks the water, and it does not apply to fish which are lacking fins and scales which might be found in a pit or ditch. The verses are understood to teach that the prohibition against these prohibited creatures applies to canals and ponds.

On our daf, a second Baraisa is presented, this one taught in the yeshiva of R' Yishmael, which analyzes the verses of water creatures. Here, the word "מים" which is repeated in Vayikra 11:9 teaches that we extend the prohibition of consuming creatures in seas and streams that do not have fins and scales to also include creatures found in canals and ponds, but this limitation does not apply to such creatures found in vessels and ditches.

Rashi learns that these two Baraisos, the one from Toras Kohanim and the one learned in the yeshiva of R' Yishmael, agree. They only differ in the method of analysis to arrive at their conclusion.

Tosafos disagrees with Rashi, and he says that there is a practical difference which emerges based upon the approach used in each Baraisa. According to R' Yishmael, the verse expands the prohibition to all cases except one, which is excluded from the word "תאכלו." This therefore permits only creatures in pits and cisterns, but not canals and ponds, even if they do not emanate from wellsprings. Toras Kohanim, however, used a klal u'prat to include all bodies of water which are similar to seas and streams in even one manner, so such creatures in canals and ponds are permitted, even if the ponds do not emanate from wellsprings. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

*Does one violate **בל תשקצו** if one does not know the disgusting item is present?*

אבלע לי ואנא איכור

Mix it for me and I will eat it.

The Gemara relates that Ravina told his mother that when she finds worms in the fish that she prepares for him she should mix them into the fish so that they are no longer recognizable and he will not be disgusted by their sight. Pri Chadash¹ proves from this that the prohibition of **בל תשקצו** applies when one sees the disgusting thing and eats it anyways. If, however, there is something that is disgusting but one does not see that it is there he does not violate the prohibition. This is clear from Ravina's statement that he did not want to see the worms since it would disgust him, but he had no issue eating fish mixed with worms as long as he could not see them.

There used to be a practice amongst butchers to soak liver in blood for a few hours so that it should appear more attractive to the customers. Some Rabbanim opposed the practice since it causes the customer to violate **בל תשקצו** since most people would not eat this liver if they knew that it was soaked in blood even though all the blood was later rinsed off. Rav Moshe Feinstein² disagreed because the prohibition of **בל תשקצו** is violated only if one is aware that the disgusting thing is present and eats it anyways. If, however, one is completely ignorant of the presence of the disgusting thing the prohibition is not violated.

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Acha and Ravina?
2. Why are beer worms permitted for consumption?
3. Why are worms found in an animal's lungs prohibited?
4. How do we know that the **לויתן** is a kosher fish?

Teshuvos Mishnah Halachos³ addressed a similar issue. It happened once that some dirty sewer water dripped from an upstairs apartment into a pot of food cooking in the downstairs apartment. The question was whether the pot needed kashering in accordance with an opinion cited in Beis Yosef⁴ that one must kasher a utensil if it absorbed something disgusting like urine. Although Beis Yosef writes that this practice has no source, perhaps one should be stringent. Mishnah Halachos ruled that in this case since the owner was unaware of what fell into his pot it is certainly sufficient to simply wash out the pot and kashering is unnecessary. **בל תשקצו** is a prohibition that addresses the person and is not something that is inherently prohibited that triggers an automatic obligation to kasher. ■

1. פרי חדש יו"ד סי' פ"ד סק"ב.
2. שו"ת אגנימ יו"ד ח"א סי' ל"א.
3. שו"ת משנה הלכות ח"ט סי' קס"ז.
4. שו"ע יו"ד סי' קכ"א סעי' ז. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

An Important Distinction

פריש לעיל מצביייתא

Rabbi Yonasan Eibeschutz, zt"l, was one of the Torah's staunchest defenders. Even as a child he always had the right answer to explain the Torah path.

When he was a child the local nobleman's daughter was so impressed that she took him into a special room dedicated to a very precious statue. It was a work of fine art, encrusted with gems and aesthetically pleasing. Of course, it was also an idol. When the princess asked the child what he had to say about

this wonder he gave a sharp reply. "I never talk in front of my elders. Let the statue speak and I will answer..."

The young aristocrat never forgave him for this remark.

Even when officers tried deriding various mitzvos, Rav Yonasan had the knack of knowing exactly what to say and do to explain. A certain nobleman once asked him about a halachah brought on today's daf.

"I heard a contradiction which I cannot comprehend. Your law states that it is forbidden to eat a worm. That I understand. But a worm which never left the place it was born is permitted. How can this be reconciled? If a worm is loathsome—and it surely is!—it should always

be prohibited. And if there is ample reason to permit something, it should always be permitted!"

Without hesitating Rav Yonasan took a largish spoon and asked the officer to spit in it. After he did so Rav Yonasan made a strange request. "Now please take this back. Swallow it up, if you please."

The officer refused. "I will not. That's disgusting!"

That explains the law of worms. When they are absorbed, they are permitted. But once they are detached they are forbidden, since they are disgusting."¹ ■

1. גדולת יהונתן, ע' 103 ■

