



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) A flayed animal (cont.)

R' Yochanan concludes the defense of his view that even if an animal has a sela-sized piece of skin on its hoof it is not a tereifah.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates conditions that render a bird a tereifah.

3) A bird bitten by a weasel

Rav, Shmuel and Levi suggest an examination to determine whether a bird bitten by a weasel is a tereifah.

This method of examination is unsuccessfully challenged.

Zeiri states that examining a bird bitten by a weasel is inconclusive.

Zeiri's rationale is challenged and although he initially defends his position, ultimately he retracts.

Zeiri referenced a dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish concerning the correct manner to examine a bird bitten by a weasel and the Gemara relates that the same issue was debated by Tannaim.

The Gemara revises some of its wording.

The Gemara proves that R' Yehudah is the one who taught that the bird should be examined by hand.

A contradiction in the Baraisa just cited is clarified.

A couple of related incidents are recounted.

Additional methods of examining for punctures are presented.

R' Shizbi declares that geese are like marine fowl regarding tereifah matters.

4) Internal organs that are scorched

R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yosi ben Yehoshua rules that if the internal organs of a bird become scorched and turn green the slightest amount, the bird is a tereifah.

R' Yosef the son of R' Yehoshua ben Levi asked his father about the status of a bird whose liver turned green in a spot that is next to the intestines.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi answered that the bird is a tereifah.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

A related incident is presented.

Another incident is related in which R' Avahu ruled that intestines that were green and as a result of scorching turned red render a bird a tereifah.

R' Shmuel bar Chiya in the name of R' Mani rules that if red intestines turned green from scorching and then upon boiling turned red, they are kosher.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok teaches that scorched intestines that did not turn green until they were boiled are tereifah.

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Inspecting a chicken which was bitten by a weasel

כי סליק לנהרדעא שלח להו דברים שאמרתי לפניכם טעות הן בידי

The Mishnah discussed the cases of tereifah for a bird. One of them is if the bird was bitten by a weasel. The Gemara brings various opinions if and how to inspect a chicken which was bitten by a weasel in order to ascertain whether the circumstances warrant a ruling of tereifah.

Rav and Shmuel hold that a chicken bitten by a weasel can be checked. A person inserts his finger into the mouth of the chicken after it is shechted, and he presses his finger upwards on the back of the pallet, toward the brain. If there is any oozing through the bite area through the top of the head, this indicates that the brain membrane was punctured, and it is a tereifah.

Zeiri disagrees, and he says that there is no inspection which is reliable, because the teeth of a weasel are thin and curved. Any hole that was made does not match its entry location with the spot where the teeth might have punctured the brain below. The puncture which is through the upper skin and membrane is not aligned with the puncture into the brain. Therefore, pressing upwards with one's finger would not result in the brain oozing out the top, because the upwards pressure would press against the skull, and the membrane just above it which is not punctured would seal that spot.

Later, when Zeiri went from Bavel to Nahardea (see Rashi), he announced that he was mistaken and that in the name of Reish Lakish he heard that an inspection with one's finger is valid. Nevertheless, Zeiri warned that the inspection should not be done with a nail. This refers to taking a nail and running it along the outer part of the membrane of the skull of the chicken after it is shechted to see if it gets caught along a spot where a hole might have been made by the teeth of a weasel. The reason this is not recommended is that even if there were no hole, the nail itself might puncture the membrane, thus leading to a false positive that the animal is a tereifah, when it is really kosher. R' Yochanan allowed even this type of inspection. The Gemara also tells us that whether an inspection may be done with one's finger is also disputed by R' Yehuda and R' Nechemia.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does one determine whether a bird bitten on the head by a weasel is kosher?

2. What is the difference between land fowl and marine fowl?

3. Under what condition is a bird that fell into a fire a tereifah?

4. What principle is derived from the verse הוא עשך ויכנך

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Ira Arthur Clair and family
In loving memory of their father's 11th Yaharzeit
Mr. Sholem Clair z'l
ר' שלום שכנא בן ר' ברוך ז"ל

HALACHAH Highlight

A bird that fell into a fire

נפלה לאור ונחמרו בני מעיה

If it fell into the fire and its internal organs were scorched

The Mishnah discusses a bird that fell into a fire. In the event that the insides of the bird changed color as a result of the fire the bird is a tereifah. Therefore, if the heart or liver that are red turn green or if the intestines that are green turn red the bird is a tereifah. Even if the discoloration is minute in size the bird is a tereifah. The reason is that had the bird not been slaughtered the spot of the discoloration would continue to deteriorate until eventually there would be a hole in that spot¹.

Taz² writes that this halacha does not apply if the bird fell in the fire for a short period of time. This ruling applies only when the bird was in the fire long enough for it to become heated up. Rav Shlomo Kluger³ agrees with Taz's position on this matter and contends that it takes a bird ten minutes to become heated up. Darkei Teshuvah⁴ expresses surprise at this contention. A bird that remained in a fire for ten minutes would certainly be roasted and it is difficult to imagine that it would have survived to be able to be slaughtered while yet alive.

Rav Yaakov Emden⁵ asserts that once a bird falls into a fire one must be concerned with the possibility that an internal organ was scorched and the bird is assumed to be a tereifah until proven otherwise. Even if there are no external signs of being scorched, even on its feathers, one must be concerned that internally it was damaged. Darchei Teshuvah⁶ cites the opinion of Mei Da'as who maintains a position between the two extremes of Rav Shlomo Kluger and Rav Yaakov Emden. He maintains that one must be stringent

(Overview...continued from page 1)

R' Ashi comments that these rulings indicate that one should not eat scorched intestines unless they are first boiled but the Gemara rejects this conclusion.

5) Crushed

The Gemara teaches that even if a crushed bird survives for twenty-four hours it must be examined to confirm it is not a tereifah.

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates defects that do not render the bird a tereifah.

7) Uterus

A Baraisa recounts an incident in which Rebbi's ruling regarding the crop was applied to a question involving an animal's uterus.

The Gemara seeks clarification of the Baraisa but the Gemara is unable to clarify the Baraisa's intent.

8) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara clarifies where the esophagus ends and crop begins.

R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchok qualifies the Mishnah's ruling regarding intestines that come out.

A Baraisa is cited that expounds the cited verse differently.

The Gemara begins recounting an incident involving intestines that came out. ■

only if the bird did not come out of the fire immediately and if there are external signs that the bird was singed. ■

1. שריע יו"ד סי' נ"ב סעי' א'.
2. ט"ז שם סי' נ"ז סק"י.
3. שו"ת טוב טעם ודעת תנינא סי' קפ"ה.
4. דרכי תשובה סי' נ"ב סק"א.
5. שו"ת שאילת יעביץ ח"ב סי' ק"ע.
6. דרכי תשובה הני"ל. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Limbs of the Spirit

"אלו כשרות..."

Today's daf continues to discuss the halachos of treifos.

A certain man wondered why the musar works make such a big deal about rectifying one's character traits. "After all, the Torah hardly deals with this area. Doesn't that mean that middos are less important than mitzvos?" he posed.

Rav Chaim Vital, zt"l, rejected such reasoning out of hand, however. "Middos are the most important aspect of a person since without good middos it is impossible to observe the Torah properly. Conversely, if one has good middos he will have an easy time fulfilling the mitzvos, as is fitting."¹

The Alter of Kelm, zt"l, expands on this point. "Just as a person was created with physical abilities that are manifest through the activity of his physical organs, so too does he possess spiritual abilities that are articulated through the middos. His spiritual strengths include the desire for truth and to hate lies; feeling disgusted with injustice; love and humility; a good eye; a modest spirit; love and fear of God and many others. Since we see that people have these middos we understand that these are spiritual attributes that we were created with, just like we were endowed with physical ones. And just like the lack of an essential physical organ renders an animal a treifah, the same is true regarding these character traits. One who lacks one is like a person who has no lungs or kidneys.

"People who lack one of these good traits are like a person who has a piece of one of his inner organs excised. Not only is

the piece missing; the person's entire vitality is lowered. How great is a person who uses his middos single-mindedly to serve God! How much more can he accomplish! And how great is a household that focuses on serving God. The more people who bind together to serve God, focusing on the same goals, the more they can accomplish." ■

1. שערי קדושה, חלק א', השער הב' ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

The Achronim note that Zeiri did not have to say that he was mistaken in disallowing a manual check for a weasel bite on the chicken's head, when this opinion is actually held by R' Yochanan and R' Nechemia. Tiferes Yaakov explains that at one point, Zeiri did not allow for any inspection of a chicken, not by hand and not with a nail. He later retracted this view and proposed that a manual inspection is valid. ■