

8 Shevat 5779
Jan. 14, 2019



Chullin Daf 48

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Holes in Lungs

Rav Yosef bar Minyumi quotes Rav Nachman saying that if a lung adhered to the wall (*of the chest cavity*), we are not concerned that it did so due to a hole. However, if the lung sprouted wounds around the site of adhesion, we must assume that it adhered due to a hole, and it is *tereifah*.

Mar Yehudah quotes Avimi saying that in either case, we must assume the lung had a hole, and the animal is a *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* asks how we deal with such a situation, and Rava says that Ravin bar Shaba explained that we separate the lung from the wall with a knife with a thin sharp edge, and then examine the surface of adhesion. If the surface where the lung adhered appears wounded, we can assume it was the cause of the adhesion, but otherwise, we must assume the lung had a hole, which led to the adhesion. Even when the wall exhibited a wound, Rav Nechemiah the son of Rav Yosef would still check the lung by inflating it in warm water, to see if any air would escape through a hole.

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Huna the son of Rav Pappi told Ravina that he learned that Rav Nechemiah performed this check in the case of two adjacent lobes of the lung that are attached by strings.

Rava says that there is no way to check such lungs, and they are definitely *tereifah*, but Rav Nechemiah would check the lungs in warm water.

Rav Ashi challenges this version of Rav Nechemiah. In the case of a lung adhered to the wall, it may be permitted, since the hole

may only be in the wall, but in the case of two attached lobes, a hole in either one makes the animal a *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* asks how Rav Nachman's statement that if the adhesion site is wounded, we must assume it is a *tereifah*, can be consistent with his other statement that if a lung had a hole, but the adjacent wall covers it, it is not a *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* answers that where the lungs and wall are growing close together (*i.e., closer to the head of the animal*), Rav Nachman says that the wall can effectively seal a hole, but where the lungs and wall do not grow together (*i.e., further towards the back*), Rav Nachman says that if the lung had a hole, it is a *tereifah*, even if it adhered to the wall.

The *Gemora* returns to Rav Nachman's statement that the wall can seal a hole in the lung.

Ravina says that it must be sealed by the muscles of the ribcage, and not just the ribs themselves.

Rav Yosef asked Ravina why the muscle can seal a hole, which would otherwise make the animal a *tereifah*.

Rav Yosef cites a *braisa* discussing the category of *kerus shafchah* – a man whose reproductive organ is mutilated, who may not marry. The *braisa* says that if it was pierced, the man may not marry, but if the hole was closed, he may marry. The *braisa* concludes that this is a case of an invalidation which can be undone. Rav Yosef says that the conclusion of the *braisa* implies that in another case, once something is invalid, it remains invalid. He suggests that this implication refers to the case of a lung with a hole that was sealed by the muscles, which should therefore remain a *tereifah*.

Ravina deflects this, saying that it refers to the case a hole in the lung which was sealed by a scab, which is not a valid seal.

Rav Ukva bar Chama challenges Rav Nachman's statement by noting that if the adjacent wall sealing the hole was itself pierced, the animal would become a *tereifah*, as the hole of the lung is not sealed anymore. This should add a new *tereifah* to the list of the *Mishna*, i.e., a hole in the wall sealing a pierced lung.

The *Gemora* rejects this challenge, as the pierced wall per se does not make the animal a *tereifah*, but only enables the pierced lung to make the animal a *tereifah*. (48a)

Wounded Lungs

Rabbah bar bar Chanah asked Shmuel what the status of lungs which display wounds, and Shmuel replied that they are not *tereifah*. Rabbah bar bar Chanah said that he also says so, but the students hesitate to permit it, since Rav Masnah said that wounds are a sign of a *tereifah*. Shmuel explained that Rav Masnah was referring only the kidneys, but not to the lungs.

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Yosef was following Rabbi Yirmiyah in the meat market, and he saw wounded lungs. He asked Rabbi Yirmiyah why he didn't buy the meat of this animal, and Rabbi Yirmiyah answered that he didn't have cash to buy it. Rabbi Yitzchak offered to buy it on credit, so Rabbi Yirmiyah explained that he avoided eating this meat, since there isn't a clear ruling on this case. When they would send such a case to Rabbi Yochanan, he would forward them to Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Shimon, who would permit it, but he himself did not agree that it was permitted.

Rava says that when he was following Rav Nachman in the tanner's (or *Torah scholar's*) marketplace, he observed lungs with big wounds on them, but Rav Nachman did not say tell the sellers to remove the meat.

Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Assi passed through the marketplace of Tiberias, and observed larger wounds on lungs, but they did not tell the sellers to remove the meat. (48a – 48b)

A Needle in the Lung

The *Gemora* cites a dispute about a lung in which one found a needle, but no hole. Rabbi Yochanan, Rabbi Elozar, and Rabbi Chanina say the animal is permitted, while Rish Lakish, Rabbi Mani bar Patish, and Rabbi Shimon ben Elyakim say it is a *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* suggests that their dispute depends on how they classify a lung with part of the inner matter missing, as a needle hollows out part of the lung.

The *Gemora* rejects this, saying that all agree that such a lung is not a *tereifah*. Rather, their dispute is whether we assume the needle entered the lung through the trachea, not making any hole, or whether it was swallowed and entered the lung from outside, piercing it.

A needle was found in a piece of a lung, and it was brought to Rav Ami. He thought it was permitted, but Rabbi Yirmiyah (or *Rabbi Zerika*) challenged him, since the *Mishna* lists one of the *tereifah* signs, "a lung that was pierced or has some missing." The second case must be when some of the inside is missing, since anything missing outside would be included in the case of a pierced lung. He then sent it to Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha, who also thought it should be permitted. Once again, Rabbi Yirmiyah (or *Rabbi Zerika*) challenged him from the same case in the *Mishna*, and he sent it back to Rabbi Ami. Rabbi Ami then ruled that it was a *tereifah*. When they asked him why he changed his mind and ruled against the Rabbis who said that this is not a *tereifah*, he clarified that they only said so when the lung was found intact. In this case, since it was cut, we assume that the needle already pierced the lung from the outside, since it is more likely for an animal to swallow a needle rather than have the needle enter the trachea.



The *Gemora* asks why a needle that didn't pierce the outside of the lung would be permitted, as Rav Nachman says that if one of the bronchi inside the lung was pierced, the animal is a *tereifah*.

The *Gemora* answers that Rav Nachman is referring to the section of the lung where the bronchi split, as nothing there seals the hole. However, if the needle pierced a bronchus further inside the lung, it would be permitted, as the membrane of the lung itself seals the hole.

The *Gemora* challenges this answer from another statement of Rav Nachman. Rav Nachman says that if there is a hole in the winding part of the colon adjacent to another section of the colon, the animal is permitted, as the other section will seal the hole. This statement indicates that two sections of the animal can seal a hole in each other.

Rav Ashi deflects this, as we cannot make analogies from one type of *tereifah* problem to another, just as a cut at one point in the leg makes the animal a *tereifah*, even as a cut higher up does not.

A needle was found in the large bronchus of a lung, and was brought to the Rabbis who said that a needle in the lung is *tereifah*, and they did not rule either way.

The *Gemora* explains that they did not permit it, since they say that a needle in a lung is a *tereifah*. They also did not rule that it was a *tereifah*, since it was found in the large bronchus. It is very unlikely that it went through the esophagus, and then found its way that far up, but it is far more likely that it entered via the trachea.

A needle was found in a piece of liver, and Mar the son of Rav Yosef thought to rule it a *tereifah*. Rav Ashi asked him why the liver should be different than any other part of the flesh which has a needle, which would not make the animal a *tereifah*. Rather, Rav Ashi says that we look at the orientation of the needle. If the head of the needle is facing out of the liver, we see that it went through the digestive tract to reach the liver,

and it must have pierced the small intestines in its path, making the animal a *tereifah*. If the head is facing inwards, we see that it went through the trachea, and entered the liver via the bronchi. Since a hole in the bronchi is not a *tereifah*, the animal is permitted. This is true only when the needle is a large one with a blunt head. However, if the needle is a small one with a small head, the head can pierce just like the tip, and we assume it passed through the digestive tract, independent of its orientation.

The *Gemora* asks why this is different than the case of needle found in the thick edge of the reticulum, which is *tereifah* only if it pierced both membranes, independent of its orientation.

The *Gemora* answers that since there is food and drink in the reticulum, these can move the needle around, so that even if it was inside, it may have shifted to point the head toward the outside. (48b – 49a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Pierced Lungs

The *Gemora* discusses the rules for a lung which adhered to the adjacent wall of the chest cavity. The *Gemora* cites Rav Nachman, who says that we are lenient, unless wounds sprouted on the lung, while Avimi says that we consider it a *tereifah* in all cases. Rava then explains how to check the adhesion site, and the *Gemora* cites Rabbi Nechemiah, who would check for holes by inflating the lungs.

The Rishonim debate the parameters of these statements. The Ramban and Ran say that Rav Nachman allows an adhered lung, whether the adhesion is full or only by means of *sirchas* – strings.

The Rosh disagrees, and says that it is only in the case of a full adhesion, but a *sircha* clearly indicates a wound in the lung.

The Rosh, Ran, and Ramban all say that Rav Nachman permits the adhered lung, without any need for checking for holes, as it is more common for the wall to adhere to the moist lung, rather than the lung adhering to the hard wall.

The Ramban and Ran explain that Rav Nachman says that a *sircha* is not a clear indication of a hole, but may indicate a hole, so the adhered lung has two possible ways to be permitted – perhaps the wall was the source of adhesion, and even if it was the lung, it may not have had a hole, but just a *sircha*.

Tosfos says that Rava's method of checking the adhesion site is only in a case where no wounds are visible, but if wounds are visible, no checking can permit the animal.

The Maharsha explains that Tosfos hold that Rava is following Avimi's ruling, that we must consider an adhered lung a *tereifah*, even without a wound. Just as an adhesion without a wound, which can just as easily be a hole in the lung or in the wall, is considered a *tereifah*, so would an adhesion with a wounded lung, even if a wound is found in the wall, be a *tereifah*, as there are valid reasons to argue that the lung did or didn't have a hole.

The Ba'al haMaor, Rashba, Ran and Rambam (Shechita 7:5) say that Rava is referring to all cases where the *Gemora* said that we must be concerned the animal is *tereifah*.

Rashi says that Rabbi Nechemiah's method of inflating the lungs is to be strict, in the case where a wound was found on the wall, and is not effective if no wound was found on the wall.

The Ran, Ramban, and Rabbeinu Tam say that Rabbi Nechemiah would inflate the lungs in the case where no wound was found on the wall, and would permit the animal with no further checking once a wound was found on the wall.

The Ba'al Hamaor says that there is no dispute between Rabbi Nechemiah and Rava, and each was just teaching a distinct way to check. Rava explained how one may check for a wound in the wall, and Rabbi Nechemiah explained how to check the lung if there was no wound in the wall.

The *Gemora* cites Rav Nachman, who says that if the lung was pierced, but the wall of the ribcage seals the hole, it is permitted. Ravina adds that it must be adhered to the muscle.

Rashi explains that Ravina is adding that it must adhere to the flesh between the ribs, and not just the rib bones themselves.

Tosfos (48a Amar Ravina) says that Ravina is adding that just being adjacent to the ribcage is not enough, but it must adhere to it.

Tosfos cites Sar Shalom Ga'on, who says that Ravina is arguing with Rav Nachman, who only requires that the wall be adjacent to the hole.

DAILY MASHAL

One time a sick person came before the Sar Shalom from Belz. He had a diseased lung, and all the doctors said that there is no cure. When the Rebbe read the kvitel he saw that his name was Shimon; he told him: Behold your name is Shimon, and Rabbi Shimon maintains that a pierced lung is only regarded a *tereifah* if it was pierced as far as the main bronchi, and since your lung is not pierced to that extent, you are not a *tereifah* and you are indeed healthy! And so it was; the man returned to live a healthy life.