

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Squeezing out prohibited taste (cont.)

Further clarification of Rebbi's understanding of R' Yehudah is presented.

The Gemara analyzes Chachamim's position regarding the matter of stirring and covering the pot after a drop of milk spilled on a slice of meat and the conclusion that is reached is that they maintain that it is possible to squeeze out the prohibited taste.

R' Acha from Difti rejects the assertion that the point of dispute relates to whether it is possible to squeeze out prohibited taste.

This assertion is dismissed.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the correct procedure for making udder and heart fit for consumption and whether there is liability for one who did not follow these procedures.

3) Udder

R' Zeira in the name of Rav asserts that one who does not cut open the udder does not violate a Biblical command and it is even permitted for consumption.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

Support for Rav's ruling is suggested but rejected.

According to a second version R' Zeira in the name of Rav ruled that the udder is rabbinically prohibited for consumption.

An attempt to support and then an attempt to refute this ruling prove unsuccessful.

A Beraisa is cited that supports the first version of Rav's ruling.

R' Yehudah describes the correct procedure for tearing an udder to make it permitted for consumption.

R' Elazar's instructions to his attendant regarding udder are recorded and explained.

An incident involving udder is recorded.

R' Nachman's ruling in this incident is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Tasting the milky taste of the udder

אמר להו ר' נחמן לטבחו זויקי לה כחלי

The Mishnah ruled that the udder of an animal must be torn and its milk removed. If, however, it was not torn, one is not in violation of the halacha.

The Gemara presents two approaches in the name of Rav regarding the halacha where one did not tear the udder. The first is that not only is one not in violation of a Torah law for consuming an udder which was not torn, but it is also permitted, without any rabbinic restrictions. A second version of Rav's statement is then presented that although one is not in violation of a Torah law for consuming milk and meat for eating an udder with its milk, one would be in violation of a rabbinic transgression. The Gemara presents the wording of the Mishnah in reference to each version of Rav's words to prove the intent of the Mishnah, with inconclusive results.

A Beraisa is cited as a support for the first version of Rav's view. The Beraisa rules that if a קבה (abomasum) of a cow is roasted with the animal's milk in it, it is prohibited. An udder, however, which is roasted with its milk in it is permitted. The reason is that while the animal is alive, the milk absorbed into the walls of the udder is not considered to be milk. The udder should be torn due to rabbinic law, and in the case where it is roasted, even that is not required. This supports the first version of Rav's understanding.

The Gemara tells the story of Yalta, the wife of R' Nachman, who notes that for every food which the Torah prohibits, there is a corresponding item which is permitted which has the same physical taste. She listed the items which mimic the taste of blood and pork, and she even illustrated permitted cases of marital relations which correspond to the forbidden cases of niddah and a married woman. She asked her husband what would be a permitted case of milk and meat, and R' Nachman instructed the butchers to prepare a roasted udder for her to taste. The specific instructions of R' Nachman was for the butcher to "pierce the udder" (זויקו לה). Rashi explains that R' Nachman instructed that the udder be put onto a spit, to be prepared for roasting. Tosafos cites Aruch who translates the word "זויקי" from the Aramaic word for pouch or leather flask (זיקים). Accordingly, R' Nachman's instructions were to roast the udder intact, as a pouch filled with milk.

Toras Chaim raises the question that according to Rashi, since the udder was pierced, why did R' Nachman require that the udder be roasted, when it could have been cooked after the milk was removed? Rather, Toras Chaim explains that the udder was pierced, but R' Nachman instructed that the udder not be completely drained in order that his wife be able to taste the milky substance which remained. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת הרב פינחס בן זלמן
by the Singer family*

HALACHA Highlight

Kashering the heart

הלב קורעו ומוציא את דמו

Regarding the heart one should tear it open and extract the blood

The Mishnah teaches that if one is interested in eating the heart of an animal it is necessary to first tear it open in order to extract its blood. In the event that one did not open the heart first and prepared it for consumption as is, he does not violate a prohibition. When Shulchan Aruch¹ cites this halacha he adds that blood gathers in the heart following its slaughter and the purpose of tearing open the heart is to allow that blood to drain. Tearing the heart only drains the blood that collects in the heart but the blood that is absorbed in the meat of the heart does not come out by tearing open the heart and it is still necessary to salt the heart before consumption. Shulchan Aruch adds that once the heart was torn open and salted it is permitted to even cook the heart in a pot with water. Rema² notes that there are Poskim who are stringent and maintain that even after tearing open and salting the heart one may only roast the heart but not cook it. Taz³ takes note of the fact that in Darchei Moshe Rema writes that he heard that many opinions are lenient and maintain that it is permitted to cook the heart after it was torn open and salted.

There is a disagreement amongst the Poskim why one who eats the heart without tearing it open does not violate a Biblical prohibition against consuming blood. Rashi⁴ explains

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does R' Acha of Difti understand the dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan ?

2. How does one prepare udder for consumption ?

3. Is it permitted to eat udder that one does not tear open ?

4. What is the appropriate manner of tearing open an udder ?

that the inside of the heart is smooth and as a result the blood that collects in the heart does not become absorbed. Tosafos⁵ disagrees and asserts that it is only if one roasts the heart without cooking it that one does not violate the Biblical prohibition against consuming blood. If one cooked the heart without first tearing it open the blood would be absorbed by the flesh of the heart and the prohibition would be violated. Shulchan Aruch⁶ cites Tosafos's stringent opinion about this matter. ■

¹ שו"ע יו"ד סי' ע"ב סעי' א'.
² רמ"א שם.
³ ט"ז שם סק"א.
⁴ רש"י ד"ה הלב.
⁵ תוס' ד"ה הלב.
⁶ שו"ע שם סעי' ב'.

STORIES off the Daf

Forbidden Flavor

"מכדי כל דאסר לן רחמנא שרא לן כוותיה..."

The many baalei teshuvah from Russia brought up all sorts of interesting halachic questions. One couple did teshuvah but missed the flavor of bacon, which had been a staple of their former diet. They were fairly wealthy and were willing to invest to find a way to manufacture the taste of their favorite food in a kosher substitute. When someone heard about this he objected. "How can this be permitted? Isn't it detestable for someone to seek the taste of a forbidden food?"

The couple decided to ask Rav Yizchak Silberstein, shlit"a, to rule regarding their question. "The Chida writes explicitly that this is permitted. He learns this from Yalta's statement to Rav Nachman—found on Chullin 109—that everything God forbade us, he permitted in another form. The Gemara explicitly notes a permitted counterpart which has the taste of swine. The Chida adds an interesting note: 'From here I responded to a nephew who wondered about thinking about pig while eating the manna. Was this forbidden or permitted? I answered him from this gemara it is clearly permitted. Nevertheless, it would not have worked. Manna could only become food that had a permitted flavor.'¹

"We see from this Chida that it is

permitted. Rav Eliyashiv, shlit"a, added, however, that if it hadn't been for these words of the Chida, we would have thought otherwise..."²

Rav Shmuel Auerbach, shlit"a, spent a lot of time speaking in learning with the Tchebiner Rav, zt"l, who clearly took vast pleasure in his Torah study. The Tchebiner Rav once said to Rav Shmuel, "We find in Chullin 109 that everything forbidden has a permitted counterpart. We are forbidden to speak devarim be-tailim...but we are permitted to speak in learning as much as we like!"³ ■

¹ פתח עינים, חולין ק"ט
² חשוקי חמד, פסחים ע"ד
³ שר התורה, ע" 188

