

7 Shevat 5779  
Jan. 13, 2019



Chullin Daf 47

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

### ***Tereifah in the Lungs***

Rava said: If two lobes of the lungs adhere to each other, no examination will help to render the animal permitted (because every adhesion is caused by the presence of a perforation beneath it). [Rabbi Yaakov Lach writes in Section three of Chullin Illuminated as follows: The normal healthy lung hangs practically free in the chest cavity, moored in place only by the root of the lung and the pulmonary ligament. This arrangement allows the lung to freely expand and contract as it inhales and exhales air. Nevertheless, when examining the lungs of slaughtered animals, especially older, domesticated animals such as cows and bulls, one often finds strong, fibrous string-like adhesions connecting various sections of the lungs to each other or to the walls of the chest cavity. These adhesions, known as *sirchos*, are indicative of a problem in the lungs. Rashi explains that they result from an existing puncture in the lungs, which they cover and plug. This plug is not a halachically valid seal, because it will eventually fall off.] This is so, however, only if the lobes were not consecutive, but if they were consecutive, it is permitted, for this is their natural form of growth. [Rabbi Yaakov Lach explains in Section three of Chullin Illuminated as follows: The lungs are not one solid piece, but rather consist of seven lobes: two large lobes called *umos*, and five smaller lobes, named *unos*. The *unos* are located closer to the animal's front, and are thus compressed into the top of the chest cavity. The *umos* are positioned further back, where the chest cavity has already enlarged in width, allowing them more room to expand. The *sircha* is only problematic when it connects two lobes that are not naturally proximate to each other. This being the case, we can expect the *sircha* to eventually become distended and detached. If the *sircha*

*connects two surfaces that are naturally adjacent, the animal is kosher, for the *sircha* is positioned in harmony with the natural order of the lung, and will remain attached.]*

Rava also said: If two blisters (on the lung) are close to each other, no examination will help to render the animal permitted (for there is definitely a puncture). If one blister appears like two, we must bring a thorn and burst it (on one of the sides); if the fluid runs from both of them, it is clear that there is here only one blister, and it is permitted, but if not, there are here two distinct blisters, and it is a *tereifah* (for the two blisters are near each other).

And Rava also said: The lungs have five (small, ear-like) lobes. When the ventral side of the (suspended) animal faces the person (so that the right side of the animal is facing the right side of the person), there are three on the right side and two on the left. If there was one lobe missing or one too many, or if the number of lobes on two sides was inverted, the animal is a *tereifah*.

There once was brought before Mereimar an animal whose lung had an additional lobe. Rav Acha, who was sitting at the entrance of Mereimar's house asked the butcher (who asked the question) as he was leaving: What did he say about it? The butcher replied: He declared it to be permitted. Rav Acha (surprised that Mereimar ruled against Rava) told him to take it in to him again. Mereimar said: Go and tell whoever is sitting at the door that the law is not in accordance with Rava in the case of an additional lobe.

The *Gemora* qualifies the ruling: This is the rule, however, only if the additional lobe was in line with the other lobes, but if it was in between the rows of lobes, it is a *tereifah*.

There once was brought before Rav Ashi a pair of lungs that had an extra lobe in between the rows of lobes. He was about to rule it to be a *tereifah* when Rav Huna Mar bar Avya said to him: But all rural beasts have this, and it is called by butchers 'the little rose-like lobe.'

The *Gemora* qualifies the ruling: This is the rule, however, only if it is found from the inside, but if it is found on top of the lungs, even though it is as small as a myrtle leaf, it is a *tereifah*. (46b – 47b)

Rafram said: If the lung was like wood, it is a *tereifah*. Some explain, [like wood] in color; others, [like wood] in touch. The former say: 'in color', meaning thereby that when bloated it is pale [like wood]; but the others say: 'in touch', meaning thereby that it is hard [like wood], or, as some say, that it is quite smooth and it does not have the division of lobes.

Rava said: If [the lung was] blue it is permitted, if black like ink it is a *tereifah*; for Rabbi Chanina said: Black [blood] is [in reality] red blood which has turned black by disease. If green it is permitted, in accordance with Rabbi Nassan; if red it is also permitted, in accordance with Rabbi Nassan. For it was taught: Rabbi Nassan said: 'I once came to a coastal town and was approached there by a woman who, having circumcised her first son and he died and her second son and he also died, brought her third son to me. I saw that the child was red so I said to her, "My daughter, wait until the blood will become absorbed in him". She accordingly waited and thereafter circumcised her child and he lived and was named Nassan the Babylonian after me. On another occasion when I went to Cappadocia I was approached by a woman who, having circumcised her first son and he died and her second son and

<sup>1</sup> Either in color or in texture.

he also died, brought her third son to me. I saw that the child had a greenish color; I examined him and found that he was without "blood of the covenant." I said to her, "My daughter, wait until the blood will circulate more freely in the child". She accordingly waited and thereafter circumcised her child and he lived and was named Nassan the Babylonian after me'.

Rav Kahana said: If [the lung] resembles liver<sup>1</sup> it is permitted, if it resembles meat it is a *tereifah*; and in order to remember this, think of the verse: Flesh that is torn of beasts [*tereifah*] in the field.

Rav Samma, son of Rava, said: If the lung resembles hops or saffron or [the yolk of] an egg, it is a *tereifah*. But what is meant by the statement above, 'If green it is permitted'? — That it resembles the leek in color.

Ravina said: If there is an obstruction in the lung, we must fetch a knife and cut open the obstruction. If there is found there an accumulation of pus, then it is clear that the obstruction was caused by the pus, and it is therefore permitted. If there is no pus, we must then place over the obstruction a feather or spittle; if it stirs, it is permitted, otherwise it is a *tereifah*.

Rav Yosef said: A scab which had formed on the lungs in consequence of a wound is not a proper scab.<sup>2</sup>

Rav Yosef further said: If the lung produces a sound [when inflated] and the source of the sound can be located, we must place over that spot a feather or a straw or spittle; if it stirs it is a *tereifah*, otherwise it is permitted. If the source cannot be located, we must then take a basin of luke-warm water and put the lung therein. (The water must not be too hot, for then the lungs would shrivel up, nor too cold, for then they would harden; but it must be luke-warm.) We then

<sup>2</sup> It does not form a strong and effective protection over the wound; it will most certainly break and it is therefore a *tereifah*.

inflate the lung; if it bubbles it is a *tereifah*, otherwise it is permitted, for then it is clear that the inner membrane only has been perforated, but not the outer one, and the sound is caused merely by the air vibrating between the two membranes.

Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: If the substance of the lung [decayed so that it] tosses about as [water] in a jug, it is permitted. Evidently he is of the opinion that a deficiency of substance within an organ is not considered a defect.

Rabbi Abba raised this objection against Ulla. We have learnt: if the lung was pierced or was deficient. Now what does 'deficient' mean? Should you say it means a deficiency from the outside, but that would be identical with 'pierced'. It must mean therefore a deficiency within, thus proving that a deficiency within is considered a defect!

No; it really means a deficiency from the outside and as for your objection that it would then be identical with pierced, [I say that] it is stated in the Mishnah only on account of Rabbi Shimon's view. For he said: provided it was pierced as far as the main bronchi. Now this is his view only where there is a hole without any loss of substance, but where there is a hole with loss of substance even Rabbi Shimon would agree.<sup>3</sup>

Once when Rabbi Chananyah was ill, Rabbi Nassan and all the great men of that age came to visit him. There was then brought in to him [Rabbi Chananyah] a lung whose substance [had decayed and] was tossing about within as [water] in a jug, and he declared it to be permitted.

Rava said: Provided, however, the bronchial tubes within were intact.

Rav Acha, son of Rava, asked Rav Ashi, How would we know it? — He replied: We take a glazed earthen basin, [pierce the

lung] and pour it out into the basin, if there are seen any white streaks it is a *tereifah*, but if not, it is permitted.

Rav Nachman said: If the substance of the lung decayed within but the entire external covering was intact, it is permitted. It was taught likewise: If the substance of the lung decayed within but the entire external covering was intact, it is permitted, even though [the cavity within] would hold a quarter log. If the womb of an animal was gone, it is permitted. If the liver of an animal was wormy — this was an actual case about which the people of Asya made enquiry when they came up to Yavneh on three consecutive Festivals. On the third time the Rabbis declared it to be permitted. (47b – 48a)

### INSIGHTS TO THE DAF "Glat" meat and "kosher" meat

Our *sugya* is the source for the halachos regarding the lung. We expanded on the obligation to examine lungs in Vol. 245. This examination includes very many details explained in *Shulchan 'Aruch* (Y.D. 39) and in this and the following article we shall turn the "Meoros" spotlight to *sirchos* on the lung.

Meat shops that want to attract G-d-fearing people emphasize that they sell "glat" meat and not merely "kosher" meat. In this article we shall clarify how a distinction could arise between "glat" meat and "kosher" meat. Reasoning tells us that meat ruled halachically fit to eat may be eaten and meat that is not must not. What, then, is the source of the distinction between "glat" meat and "kosher" meat and, in general, what is the source of the term "glat"?

**Most animals are disqualified because of a *sircha*:** Most animals disqualified by examiners as *treifah* contain a *sircha* — a protuberance of congealed mucus distending from the membrane enveloping the lung. In certain cases well defined

<sup>3</sup> That it is *tereifah* even though the perforation does not extend as far as the main bronchi.

by halachah, a lung with a *sircha* is treifah because it evidences a hole under it or because when it is removed, it forms a hole (Rashi and Tosfos dispute the matter, as will be explained in the next article).

**The disagreement of *Shulchan 'Aruch* and the Remo:** Rabbi Yosef Karo ruled (*Shulchan 'Aruch*, Y.D. 39:10) that any *sircha*, even “as thin as a hair”, causes an animal to be *treifah*. However, the Remo (ibid, *se'if* 13) wrote that some permit to feel the *sirchos* to examine them. In other words, as opposed to *Shulchan 'Aruch*, which disqualifies any *sircha*, they claim that a *sircha* could be examined and classified to determine if it causes the animal to be *treifah*.

This disagreement between *Shulchan 'Aruch* and the Remo is the prominent difference between Sephardic and Ashkenazic *shechitah*. However, the Remo's ruling did not spread among all Ashkenazic communities. Thus we find the Sheloh (*Sha'ar HaOsiyos*, cited in *Baer Heiteiv*, ibid, S.K. 30) declaring sharply: “Not to pay attention to this bad custom... and you, my sons...I command you not to eat meat rendered kosher by rubbing if the *sircha* would strictly be *treifah* and don't buy meat without demanding such, and those living in Eretz Israel and all the Turkish communities declare it *treifah*.”

**The Kaf HaChayim's testimony about the source of the term “glat”:** “Glat” meat is therefore meat with a “smooth” lung – free of *sirchos*. The author of *Kaf HaChayim* testifies as to the distinction between “glat” and “kosher” meat (ibid, *os* 222): “The custom of the Ashkenazim in Yerushalayim is to be lenient but they make two types of meat. That permitted by manipulating and rubbing is stamped “kosher” and if the lung is free of *sirchos*, they stamp it “glat” *chalak* (smooth), without *sirchos*, so that the pious and G-d-fearing, who are strict to behave according to all opinions, will buy it.”

**Examining the lungs in water:** Another method mentioned in the *poskim* is peeling the *sircha* from the lung and putting the lung in water to check if bubbles appear where there was a *sircha*. This type of examination is mentioned in the

Gemara (48a) but not for *sirchos* that cause *treifah* and the author of *Aderes Eliyahu* (ibid, *Yad Eliyahu*, *os* 43) strongly opposes such an examination. He tells of a formidable *shochet* in Prague who introduced examining *sirchos* in this way and “when this bad custom began, there was a great commotion among the *chachamim* of the generation and they agreed to dismiss that *shochet* but the ways of Satan succeeded and they reinstated him.” On the other hand, *Mekor Chayim*, on Yemenite customs (*Hilchos Treifos* 31:96), asserts that thus was the ancient custom in all Yemenite communities based on a tradition from Rambam to be lenient because of the loss (see *Pischei Teshuvah*, S.K. 14, in the name of *Tiferes Tzvi* and the Chasam Sofer).

In this article we have become generally familiar with *sirchos*, the halachah of which originates in our *sugya*, which extensively discusses them, and the sharp disagreement between *Shulchan 'Aruch* and the Remo. In the next article we shall focus on the question as to if every *sircha* is indeed *treifah*.

***Most sirchos are not treifah, we are strict out of doubt!***

The lung is divided into five lobes, as Rambam explains (*Hilchos Shechitah* 8:1): “The lung has five lobes. If a person hangs it and the front of the lung faces him, three are on the right and two on the left.” Our Gemara explains that a *sircha* extending from a lobe to a neighboring lobe is not *treifah*. The *sircha* that causes an animal to be *treifah* is one that extends from one lobe and sticks to another lobe that is not adjacent to it.

**Rashi: A *sircha* results from a hole:** According to Rashi (s.v. *Haynu*), a *sircha* results from a hole in the lung, through which liquids came out and solidified to become mucus. Though the *sircha* now seals the hole, it can get tangled with other lobes or with other *sirchos* and be detached from the lung and then the hole will open again. He apparently indicates that every *sircha* seals a hole. We can rely on

permanent *sirchos* that will never fall off but we cannot rely on temporary *sirchos*.

**Why are the lungs not perforated like a sieve?** The obvious question is if every *sircha* is the result of a hole, we must say that the lung has many holes as most animals have many *sirchos*. The trouble is when one examines the lung itself, one generally doesn't find holes. Why? How could it be that we don't find holes as they develop – i.e., a hole that has formed but has not yet been sealed by a *sircha*? Could it be that as soon as a hole forms, it is sealed by a *sircha*?

**Stringency out of doubt:** 'Aroch HaShulchan (Y.D. 39:22-23) addresses this question and explains that, in truth, most *sirchos* do not result from holes but are "merely mucus" exuded by the lung. "Whatever we see, we do not have the expertise to distinguish between a definite *sircha* and a doubtful one, or one that is not a *sircha* at all but, at any rate, true *sirchos* resulting from a hole are few." It emerges that the *sirchos* we so worry about are indeed uncommon but, out of doubt we must declare an animal with a *sircha* as *treifah* if we don't succeed in verifying whether the *sircha* is merely mucus exuded from the lung, or if it is a true one, resulting from a hole.

**Tosfos: The *sircha* will cause a hole when it detaches:** According to Tosfos (s.v. *Haynu*), a *sircha* does not evidence a hole in the lung but when a *sircha* becomes detached from the lung, a hole could form. Thus we have an animal, which now is not *treifah*, but the cause of its becoming *treifah* is already present and, as such, it is *treifah*.

Tosfos' opinion also needs the excellent explanation of the author of 'Aroch HaShulchan. After all, is an animal with a time bomb attached to it that will explode in an hour *treifah*? It's healthy and kosher but we can foresee the future, that it will die. In the same way, this *sircha* attached to its lung and threatening its life hasn't performed its action. The lung is still whole. Why, then, should we consider this animal *treifah* now?

'Aroch HaShulchan explains that we suspect the *sircha* already began separating from the lung and the hole has already formed but that it is now sealed by mucus or a *sircha*. But the hole already exists and the animal is *treifah* right now (see *ibid*, that some Rishonim wrote explicitly that though the *sircha* has not become detached from the lung, it is *treifah* because the *sircha* itself is like a disease in its body and *sofo lamus* – it will finally die). The author of *Aroch HaShulchan* sums up (according to the Rishonim) that both according to Rashi and Tosfos, most *sirchos* don't cause *treifah* and we are strict only out of doubt: according to Rashi, because most *sirchos* are mucus not resulting from a hole and according to Tosfos, because mucus will not cause a hole in the lung when detached and only true *sirchos*, fastly attached to the lung, will cause a hole when detaching. Therefore, we can well understand the Remo's opinion, cited in the previous article, that one may be lenient with a *sircha* by feeling and manipulating it, and if it is soft and dissolves, it's not a *sircha*. We only wanted to forbid this *sircha* out of doubt and therefore the Remo was lenient.

**Pneumonia in livestock:** We conclude with a brief visit to the cowsheds. The most common *sirchos* generally form because of pneumonia. During the illness the membrane of the lung becomes penetrable and exudes substances to form a stronger membrane for recuperation. These *sirchos* are so common that if there are no *sirchos* in a human lung, there is a suspicion that their absence stems from a growth on the kidney-lobe gland responsible for recuperation of infected areas. To prevent *sirchos* as much as possible, farmers try to treat any event of their animals' catching cold (*Mazon Kasher min HaChai*, III Ch. 8).

#### 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.

### ***Naming Children after Torah Leaders***

In our sugya, we find that R' Nosson offered advice to two families who had lost children as a result of performing the bris milah before the child was healthy enough to endure it. He instructed them to postpone the bris until the children were ready. They followed his advice, and in both cases the children lived, and the parents named them both Nosson HaBavli, after R' Nosson.

We find many instances in the Torah in which children are named after events in the lives of their parents. For example, Moshe Rabbeinu named his son Gershom, explaining, "For I have been a sojourner (*ger*) in a foreign land," (Shemos 2:22). Later generations began to name their children after their forefathers instead. The Midrash explains, "R' Shimon ben Gamliel said: the earlier generations made use of Ru'ach HaKodesh. Therefore they chose [original] names based on the events that occurred to them. We do not have use of Ru'ach HaKodesh, therefore we name our children after our fathers," (Bereishis Rabbah, 37:7; See also Meoros HaDaf HaYomi, Kesubos 100a).

Nosson HaBavli was just one example of a Torah leader after whom parents named their children. However, he was not the first. Our Sages tell us that a convert who was drawn to Torah observance by Hillel, named his son Hillel (Avos D'Rebbe Nosson, ch. 15). Thousands of families whose domestic strife was resolved through Aharon's HaKohen's intervention, named their sons after him (ibid, ch. 12).

**An auspicious name brings success to its bearer:** In Zecher David (cited in Otzer HaBris I, 341) the author writes that an auspicious name brings success to its bearer. For this reason,

many have the custom to name their children after their rabbis. R' Elimelech of Lizensk zt"l said that when a tzaddik's name is given to a child, his light is awakened in the higher worlds, creating an influence to help the child resemble him.

Some authorities hold that it is preferable to name one's child after his rabbi, than after his father (Zecher David, ibid). Others hold that a child should only be named after the previous generations of his own family (Mishneh Halachos VI, 256). Sometimes parents are forced to name their child after someone in their family, whose lifestyle was such that the parents can only hope that their child will excel his namesake. In such a case, it is best that the parents intend that the name refer to a tzaddik who carried the same name (ibid, 253).

**Naming a child after a tzaddik who endured misfortune:** The Poskim debate whether it is proper to name a child after a tzaddik who endured uncommon misfortune (see Teshuvos Afarkasta D'Aniya, 101; Otzer HaBris, ibid). For this reason, many refrain from naming their children after such tzaddikim as Yishayahu HaNavi, Yirmiyahu HaNavi, and Gedalyahu ben Achikam, who all suffered untimely deaths at the hands of their enemies. Those who do name their children after them, change the name slightly, removing the final *vav*. Thus, the names Yishaya, Yirmiya, and Gedalya are more common (see Beis Shmuel, hilchos gittin, Shemos Anashim:10; Teshuvos Chasam Sofer, E.H. II, 25; Otzer HaBris p. 263, 347).

**Segulah for having children:** Some hold that if a person davens to have a child, and resolves to name him after a tzaddik, this merit will assist his prayers (Birkas HaBanim, p. 533).