

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Needle found in the liver (cont.)

R' Ashi's assertion that a large needle could not exit the liver head first is unsuccessfully challenged.

Two related incidents are presented.

2) Lungs

R' Yochanan explains the meaning of the term ריאה – lung.

The Gemara inquires and then explains that the health benefit of the lungs is achieved when combined with other medicinal herbs.

The Gemara presents a dispute whether we attribute a puncture to the butcher's hands and the Gemara answers that we do.

Additional related statements are cited.

A related discussion is recorded whether we assume that a worm punctured the lungs before or after slaughter and the Gemara rules that it is assumed that it happened after slaughter.

Rabba bar Tachlifa in the name of R' Yirmiyah bar Abba explains that according to R' Shimon the puncture must reach the primary bronchus.

The Gemara records discussions whether halacha follows R' Shimon and the Gemara's conclusion is that halacha does not follow R' Shimon.

3) Keivah

R' Yitzchok bar Nachmani in the name of R' Oshaya relates that kohanim were lenient regarding the fat surrounding the keivah.

The Gemara inquires about the other context in which R' Yishmael "helped kohanim."

The Baraisa that contains R' Yishmael's opinion regarding the

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the lung called ריאה?

2. How did Yishmael the kohen help kohanim?

3. Does fat effectively seal a puncture?

4. What liquids are prohibited if left exposed?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
The Landsman Family
In loving memory of their father, grandfather, and great grandfather
הרב מנחם מנדל בן הרב פנחס ז"ל

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. David Binter
In loving memory of their mother
מרת חיי' בת ר' ארי' לייב, ע"ה
Mrs. Chaya Futерko o.b.m.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Boruch Weinberg
In loving memory of their father
ר' משה דב בן ר' יעקב יצחק, ז"ל

Distinctive INSIGHT

The placement of the statement of R' Yochanan

אמר רב יוחנן למה נקרא שמה ריאה? שמאירה את העינים

The Gemara presents an extensive discussion regarding irregularities of the lung, and which are defined as tereifos. It then presents illustrations of the halacha when a pin is found in a lung or in any of various other organs. In the middle of this discussion, a statement of R' Yochanan is cited. R' Yochanan notes that a lung is called a ריאה, and this name is meaningful and symbolic, because when someone eats a lung, this contributes to brightening of his vision—מאירה את העינים. The Gemara questions whether the lung causes the improvement of eyesight when eaten by itself, or only if prepared together with certain medicinal additives. The Gemara concludes that it is the medicinal preparation which contributes to this effect, but not the lung by itself.

In any case, Sefer Lev Aryeh points out that the statement of R' Yochanan seems to be out of place among the many illustrations of tereifos. It would have perhaps been more appropriate to introduce the entire section of lungs with this statement, or to present it at the conclusion of the discussion, but citing it precisely in the middle of the halachos of tereifos of the lung seems peculiar. How are we to understand why the Gemara places his statement here?

Lev Aryeh explains that we learned earlier that if a wolf comes and takes the intestines of an animal we have shected, and he later returns those intestines with holes bitten into them, we are allowed to attribute the holes to the teeth of the wolf, and we do not have to be concerned that there were holes in the walls of the intestines before they were taken, which would be a sign of tereifus. Rashba explains in the name of R"l HaZakein, that this is only true regarding intestines, but if a wolf would take the lungs, and return them with teeth marks in them, we would not be allowed to attribute the holes to the wolf alone. In the case of lungs, we would have to assume these holes were there beforehand, and that the lungs are a tereifah. Rashba himself disagrees with R"l HaZakein, and he shows that the "intestines" represent all internal organs, including the lungs. Accordingly, lungs have the same law regarding attributing the holes now found to the wolf, and that the animal is not a tereifah. Yet, this is surprising, because the Gemara in Nedarim (54b) says that intestines and internal organs are not eaten by themselves, while our Gemara suggests that eating lung is proper, and it is even healthy for the eyes. The answer is that the Gemara's conclusion is that lung is healthy by itself only with medicinal additives.

The order of the Gemara is now clear. A lung with a hole can be attributed to its being handled by the butcher, just as we find regarding other internal organs taken and returned by a wolf. To show that a lung is like any internal organ, R' Yochanan's statement is brought to show that a lung is not eaten by itself. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Something muktza during tosefes Shabbos

דאמר ר' נחמן אינהו מיכל אכלי ולדידן מיסתם נמי לא סתים

As R' Nachman said they eat it and for us it would not even seal a puncture

Mishnah Berurah¹ writes that if someone places his Shabbos candles on the table at the outset of Shabbos it is prohibited to move the table for the entire Shabbos. The reason is that the table served as a base for muktza and there is a principle that states that once something is muktza during bein hashemashos it remains muktza for the rest of Shabbos. The way to avoid this issue is to place a non-muktza item on the table as well, e.g. bread that is needed for Shabbos. By doing so the table becomes a base for muktza and non-muktza and as such it may be moved on Shabbos. The implication of the wording of Mishnah Berurah is that once one lights the Shabbos lights it is no longer effective to place bread on the table. Once one has accepted Shabbos the table is muktza and we apply the principle that once the table was muktza during the period of tosefes Shabbos – the time added to Shabbos at its onset or conclusion – it remains prohibited for the entire Shabbos.

Pri Megadim² disagrees and writes that one who accepted Shabbos from plag hamincha and kindled Shabbos candles at that time may move the table if the candles become extinguished. The reason is that the principle “once something is muktza...” is limited to the time of bein hashemashos and does not apply to the time before that if a person were to accept Shabbos early. Teshuvos Divrei Yoel³ cites our Gemara as proof to this assertion. The Gemara discusses a certain fat called bar-chimtza and declares that since in Eretz Yisroel they consider it to be edible it must be that even in Bavel where it is not eaten it is considered a kosher fat that is effective at sealing a puncture. The rationale, explains Divrei Yoel, is that there cannot be an item that is completely permitted for one person and completely prohibited for a second. Accordingly, during the period of tosefes Shabbos it cannot be that for some people it is completely

(Overview...continued from page 1)

permissibility of the fat on the keivah is cited.

A contradictory Baraisa is cited and Ravin asserted that the names in the first Baraisa should be reversed.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged and the exact meaning of R' Ashaya's statement is explained.

4) Sealing a hole in the keivah

Rav and R' Sheishes disagree whether only permitted fat can seal a puncture or whether forbidden fat can also seal a puncture.

R' Zeira inquires whether fat of an undomesticated animal can seal a puncture and Abaye answers that it cannot.

A related incident is presented.

Another incident related to the Torah's concern for the money of the Jewish People is recorded.

5) Sealing a puncture with fat

R' Nachman asserts that helmet-shaped fat does not seal a puncture.

Two opinions are recorded regarding the area to which R' Nachman referred.

Rava reports that he heard from R' Nachman that there are two fats, one seals the keivah and the other does not, and he could not recall which was which.

Two Amoraim asserts that it is the bar-chimtza that seals a puncture.

A statement of R' Nachman is cited to identify which fat is the chimtza and which is the bar-chimtza. ■

prohibited whereas for others it is completely permitted. Similarly, it is not possible for an item to be muktza for the duration of Shabbos for some people whereas for others it would not be muktza. The same rationale explains why it is permitted for one who accepted Shabbos early to ask someone who has not accepted Shabbos to do melacha on his behalf⁴. ■

1. מייב סי רעיז סייק י"ח.
2. פרי מגדים סי רעיז אי"א סייק י"ד.
3. דברי יואל השמטות או"ח סי קנ"ט.
4. שו"ע או"ח סי רס"ג סעי' י"ז. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

“And I Will Bless Them”

”ואני אברכם...”

The Haskalah brought in its wake many unanticipated halachic questions with which poskim had to grapple. A certain city had droves of young people falling off the derech. Although they had abandoned Shabbos—publicly transgressing its halachos—they still went to shul on Yomim Tovim. This gave rise to a pressing question regarding the kohanim among them: could they pronounce bircas kohanim or not? Although ordinarily only certain sins bar a kohein from this merit, perhaps profaning Shabbos

was different. After all, isn't violating Shabbos compared to transgressing the entire Torah?

Many of the community claimed that such kohanim could not give bircas kohanim. Others protested that such discrimination would accomplish nothing.

When this question was brought before the author of the Zkan Aharon, zt"l, he ruled that these kohanim were indeed permitted to give the priestly blessing. “The halachah follows Rabbi Akiva in Chullin 49 regarding bircas kohanim. He explains there that the words ‘ואני אברכם’ — And I will bless them’ — means that the priests intone the words of the blessing but God confers the actual berachah. The Rambam explicitly rules that we do not prevent a kohein who

has sinned from giving bircas kohanim. He explains this quite clearly. ‘Do not be surprised and wonder: How will the blessing help if it is conferred by such a mediocre person?’ The answer is that the blessing's fulfillment does not depend on the kohanim. It depends on God. As the verse states, ‘ושמו את שמי וכו' ואני אברכם.’ The kohanim are commanded to bless the Jewish people and God in His mercy blesses the Jewish people as He desires.”

The Zakein Aharon concluded, “We find even more than this in the Yerushalmi in Gittin, chapter 5, Mishnah 9. It is clear from there that even a mechalel Shabbos may give bircas kohanim.”¹ ■

1. שו"ת זקן אהרן, ח"א, או"ח, סי י"ב ■