



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

### ***Needle in a Liver***

A needle was once found in the great blood vessel of the liver. Huna Mar the son of Rav Idi declared the animal to be a *tereifah*, while Rav Adda bar Manyumi permitted it. The case was presented to Ravina and he said: Take away the cloak of the one who declare it a *tereifah* (and give it to the owner of the animal as compensation, for, in truth, it should be permitted, and the animal, by this time, had been fed to the dogs). (49a)

### ***Date Pit in a Gallbladder***

A date pit was found in the gallbladder. Rav Ashi said: When we were at the school of Rav Kahana he told us that in such a case it is certain that it entered via the vascular route, for although it cannot now exit through that path, it is likely that it was forced through by the movements of the animal. This is so, however, only in the case of a date pit, but an olive pit might very well have pierced its way into the gallbladder (and therefore ruled a *tereifah*). (49a)

### ***Lungs***

Rabbi Yochanan said: Why is the lung called *re’ah*? It is because it makes the eyes bright.

The *Gemora* inquires: Is this so when one eats it as is, or only when one combines it with medicinal herbs?

The *Gemora* resolves this from that which Rav Huna bar Yehudah stated that when the price of a goose was one *zuz*, a goose’s lung was four *zuzim*. Now should you say that when one eats it as is (the health benefit is obtained), he should simply buy the goose for a

*zuz* and then eat the lungs from it? It obviously means that this benefit is obtained when combined with medicinal herbs.

The *Gemora* inquires: If the lung was found punctured in a part which is usually handled by the butcher, do we attribute it to his handling (and therefore it happened after the *shechitah*, and is not a *tereifah*) or not? Rav Acha bar Nassan says we do. Mar Zutra the son of Ra Mari says we do not. The *halachah* is that we do attribute it.

Rav Shmuel the son of Rabbi Avahu said: My father, one of the heads of the *kallah* (public assembly) under Rafram, said that we do attribute it to the handling. This was reported to Mar Zutra the son of Rav Mari, but he would not accept it. Rav Mesharshiya said: It is more reasonable to accept the view of my grandfather, since we also attribute a puncture to a wolf.

If a parasitic worm punctured a lung (but it is not known if it happened before *shechitah* or afterwards), Rav Yosef bar Dosai and the Sages disagree: One says that it is assumed that the worm exited the lung before *shechitah* (thereby puncturing it, and therefore the animal is rendered a *tereifah*); whereas the other one maintains that it is assumed that the worm exited the lung after *shechitah* (thereby puncturing it, and therefore the animal is *kosher*). The *halachah* is in accordance with the latter opinion. (49a)

### ***Punctured Lung***

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Shimon ruled that an animal with a punctured lung is not rendered a *tereifah* until it is punctured up to the bronchi.



Rabbah bar Tachlifa said in the name of Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba that it is not a *tereifah* (according to R' Shimon) until it is punctured up to the primary bronchus.

Rav Acha bar Abba was sitting before Rav Huna and saying: Rabbi Maluch said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: The *halachah* follows Rabbi Shimon. Rav Huna said to him: Are you referring to Maluch from Arabia? As a matter of fact, he says that the *halachah* is not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon.

When Rabbi Zeira went from bavel to *Eretz Yisroel*, he found Rav Bibi who was sitting and saying: Rabbi Maluch said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: The *halachah* follows Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Zeira said to him: I swear by the life of my master that I, Rabbi Chiya bar Abba and Rav Assi once happened by Rabbi Maluch's town, and we enquired of him if he indeed said that the *halachah* follows Rabbi Shimon, and he replied that the *halachah* does not follow him. Rav Bibi asked him: Have you heard anything regarding this? Rabbi Zeira replied: Rabbi Yitzchak bar Ami said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: The *halachah* is in accordance with Rabbi Shimon.

The *Gemora* concludes that the *halachah* does not follow Rabbi Shimon. (49a)

## All about Fats

The *Mishna* had stated that if the abomasums was punctured, the animal is rendered a *tereifah*.

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Nachmeini said in the name of Rabbi Oshaya: The *Kohanim*, who receive the fat of the abomasums as a Kohanic gift, have assumed the custom of permitting it for consumption. They follow Rabbi Yishmael, who said this in the name of his fathers. And, "Yishmael the *Kohen* helps the *Kohanim*" is a mnemonic to remember this.

The *Gemora* cites another *braisa* where Rabbi Yishmael helps the *Kohanim*: *Like so you shall bless the Children of Israel*. Rabbi Yishmael says: We have learned from here that Israel is blessed from the mouth of the *Kohanim*. From where is it known that the *Kohanim* are blessed? It is written: *and I will bless them*. This teaches us that when the *Kohanim* bless Israel, the Holy One,

Blessed be He, blesses the *Kohanim*. [*This "helps" the Kohanim.*] Rabbi Akiva says: We have learned from here that Israel is blessed from the mouth of the *Kohanim*. From where is it known that Israel receives a blessing from the Almighty Himself? It is written: *and I will bless them*. This teaches us that when the *Kohanim* bless Israel, the Holy One, Blessed be He, agrees with the *Kohanim*.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that the verse, *And I will bless those who bless you*, teaches us that the *Kohanim* are blessed as well – even according to Rabbi Akiva.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Yishmael, nevertheless, helped the *Kohanim*, for the same verse that teaches us that Israel is blessed from the *Kohanim* teaches us that the *Kohanim* are blessed (*and they are blessed together with Israel*).

The *Gemora* cites the *braisa* where Rabbi Yishmael taught in the name of his ancestors: And all the fat that is on the innards. This (*the extra "vav"*) teaches us that the fat that is on the intestines is placed on the altar (*and therefore, it is fat that is forbidden for consumption*); these are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. [*Since he does not include the fat of the obomasum, we see that it is permitted for consumption.*] Rabbi Akiva says that this verse includes the fat of the obomasum (*and therefore, it is forbidden for consumption*).

The *Gemora* asks a contradiction from a different *braisa*: And all the fat that is on the innards. Rabbi Yishmael says: This (*the extra "vav"*) teaches us that just as the fat which covers the innards is covered by a membrane and can be peeled away, so too any fat that is covered by a membrane and can be peeled away (*which includes the fat that is on the intestines and the fat that is on the abomasums*). Rabbi Akiva says: Just as the fat that covers the innards is a wrap (*it covers it like a garment, but is not attached to it*) and it is covered by a membrane and can be peeled away, so too any fat that is a wrap and it is covered by a membrane and can be peeled away (*which includes the fat that is on the intestines but not the fat that is on the abomasums, which has small pieces that stick to it*). [*It emerges that the Tannaim's opinions are the opposite from that which was taught in the first braisa!?*]

Ravin sent the following message: The second *braisa* is correct, and the opinions in the first *braisa* must be reversed.



The *Gemora* asks: What made him decide to reverse the first one over the second one?

The *Gemora* answers: The words 'just as' in the second *braisa* demonstrate its accuracy (*for a reason for their respective views are mentioned*).

The *Gemora* asks: If so (*that R' Yishmael's opinion has been reversed, and the fat of the abomasum is forbidden*), the *braisa* above (*that permitted the fat for the Kohanim*) is not in accordance with Rabbi Yishmael, but rather Rabbi Akiva!?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answers that Rabbi Yishmael said that it was permitted in the name of his ancestors, but he himself does not hold of it.

Rav said: Fat that is permitted can seal a puncture; fat that is forbidden cannot (*for it is not attached to the organ*). Rav Sheishes said: They both can seal a puncture.

Rabbi Zeira inquired: Does the fat of a nondomesticated animal (*which is permitted*) seal a puncture? Did Rav mean that any permitted fat seals, and this is also permitted, or, did he mean that the permitted fat seals because it sticks to the organ, and this fat does not?

Abaye said: There is no inquiry, for although it is permitted for consumption, it does not stick to the organ (*and therefore it does not seal a puncture*).

The *Gemora* relates an incident where a puncture was sealed by forbidden fat. Rava said: What should we be concerned about? Firstly, Rav Sheishes said that the forbidden fat seals a puncture as well; and secondly (*although Rav argues; in this case we should follow Rav Sheishes*), for the Torah is concerned about the money of Israel (*and therefore, it is reasonable to rule leniently*).

Rav Pappa asked Rava: Rav was ruling regarding a Biblical prohibition, and you say that the Torah is concerned about the money of Israel!?

The *Gemora* relates a similar incident: Manyumin the pottery merchant left uncovered a honey pot. Rava said: What should we be concerned about? Firstly, it was taught in a *Mishna* that three

liquids are prohibited if left uncovered: water, wine and milk, but all other liquids are permitted; and secondly (*although there is a Tanna that argues regarding honey; in this case we should follow the Tanna of the Mishna*), for the Torah is concerned about the money of Israel (*and therefore, it is reasonable to rule leniently*).

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak asked Rava: Rabbi Shimon forbids it on account of a danger to one's life, and you say that the Torah is concerned about the money of Israel!?

The *Gemora* cites the *braisa* where Rabbi Shimon forbids it: There are five liquids that we are not concerned about exposure: fish brine, vinegar, oil, honey and fatty fish innards (*because snakes do not drink from them*). Rabbi Shimon disagrees. He said that he even saw a snake drink from brine in Sidon! They told him that the snake must have been deranged, and no proof can be brought from it.

Rava said: At least admit to me regarding brine that we do not rule according to Rabbi Shimon, for Rav Pappa, Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua and the Rabbis would use brine to defuse (*the venom of a snake when they had an*) uncovered liquid (*and therefore, we are obviously not concerned for uncovered brine; accordingly, we should not follow his opinion by honey either*). Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak replied: At least admit to me regarding honey that we do rule according to Rabbi Shimon, for Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar holds like him as well, for it was taught in a *braisa*: and Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar forbid the uncovered honey as well. (49a – 49b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***"They eat it...": the repeated statement in hundreds of halachic responsa***

HaGaon Rabbi Yitzchak Zilberstein drew our attention to Rav Nachman's statement in our *sugya*: "They eat it, and for us it doesn't even seal?"

Our *Gemora* explains that though an animal with a hole in certain places is considered *tereifah*, if fat that is *tahor* – permitted to eat – seals the hole, it isn't *tereifah* and the animal may be eaten because pure fat becomes firmly attached to the meat and seals

the hole entirely. In Eretz Israel they used to eat a certain part of the fat that the Babylonian Jews maintained was of the forbidden fat parts. Rav Nachman says that though we, the Babylonians, do not eat that part of the fat, if it sealed a hole in the stomach we may eat the animal and not declare it *tereifah*. Although only pure fat can seal the hole and we don't eat that part of the fat, "they eat it, and for us it doesn't even seal?" In other words, since those in Eretz Israel eat that part of the fat, it can't be that for us, the Babylonians, it isn't even fit to seal a hole in the stomach.

Rav Nachman's ruling is repeated in hundreds of halachic responsa throughout the generations when the *poskim* wanted to say that concerning a disputed matter, those who forbid also don't regard it as strictly as something agreed by all to be forbidden.

**The bride's side wanted to cancel the *shiduch*: "The *chasan* lacks *yichus*":** Thus we find the Chasam Sofer's pupil, HaGaon Rabbi Chayim Sofer zt"l, author of *Machaneh Chayim* (II, E.H. 1), using this expression in a complicated case brought for his decision. This concerned a finalized *shiduch* that was faltering due to a shocking revelation that came to light. Two families with *yichus* agreed to a *shiduch* but after a while it was revealed that the *chasan's* father abandoned his first wife in a faraway land and wed his second wife, the *chasan's* mother, while still being married. The bride's family claimed that the father thus transgressed the decree of Rabeinu Gershom, who forbade marrying two wives, and that such behavior taints the *chasan's* *yichus* and therefore they could cancel the *shiduch* as a "mistaken purchase".

The author of *Machaneh Chayim* discusses the case at length. After emphasizing that they should verify the facts well, he added: "concerning a decree that was not accepted by all Jews, such as Rabeinu Gershom's decree, which was not accepted all over and some also say that he decreed so only till the end of the fifth millenium, this is not considered a defect...as *Chazal* say: They eat it, and for us it doesn't even seal? He means that though, in certain instances, we can justify cancelling a *shiduch* when it turns out that prohibitions of the Torah have been transgressed, this is not so in our case. Since this decree does not apply to all communities (see *Shulchan 'Aruch*, E.H. 1:9) we shouldn't consider someone who transgressed it as having a defect affecting his family. It is impossible that the same act, permitted in certain communities, could taint the *yichus* of a family in other communities.

## DAILY MASHAL

### *A Herring's Tail*

Our *Gemora* says that a goose costs a zuz but its lung costs four zuzim because it is sold with spices and he who eats it improves his eyesight.

Once a person was travelling on a train with herring wrapped in newspaper. Suddenly the train stopped due to a fault. All the passengers slowly began to search their belongings to find something to occupy themselves and the person with the herring spread out the fish and began to cut off their tails. Opposite him sat an ignorant anti-Semitic peasant who constantly bothered him during the whole trip.

"What are you doing?" asked the peasant.

"I'm cutting off the tails."

"Why?"

The Jew realized whom he was dealing with and replied, "The tail of a herring is the most important part."

"Really?"

"Yes. Anyone who eats it gets smart."

"Please give me two tails."

"Give me four ruble and I'll give you what you want."

The peasant swallowed one tail and as he was getting ready to eat the second, he complained to the Jew: "Could it be? A whole fish costs only a ruble and you sold me a tail for two ruble?!"

"Very good. See, you ate just one tail and got smart..."