

30.3.6

49a → (ואין הלכה כר"ש) (אמר רב יוסף בר מניומי אמר רב נחמן ריאה הסמוכה לדופן)

I Conclusion of discussion re: ריאה (lungs)

- a **דב נחמן**: if the lung is attached to the wall (ribs) – no reason to suspect that there is a נקב there
 - i **טריפה** → But: if it raises pus-filled blebs – must be concerned
- b **אבימי**: in either case, must be concerned (→ **טריפה**)
- c **דבא**: solution is to take knife with narrow tip and lift lung off of wall – if wound is on wall – כשרה; if on lung – טריפה
 - i **Even if**: there is no air coming out of it
- d **דב נחמיה**: would check it out using luke-warm water
 - i **מר זוטרא**: we heard that that solution (of the luke-warm water) was used for רבא's case of the adhered lobes
 - ii **דבאשי**: only reasonable to apply to ר"נ's "lung-wall" adherence; if wound is from wall – כשרה
 - 1 But: in רבא's "adhered lobes" case (סירכא), either side is a problem and test proves nothing
- e **Challenge**: ר"נ ruled that if a lung is punctured and the wall seals it – טריפה
 - i **Resolution**: if joined at place where it grows (i.e. inside, where lobes meet) – כשרה; if not – טריפה
 - ii **Reassessing ר"נ's rule**: רבינא – only if there is a lot of meat around it
 - 1 **Challenge (רב יוסף)**: meat shouldn't matter; if we are concerned that it is punctured, should be even if meaty
 - (a) **Per**: ruling re: כרות שפכה; if it is opened, פסול (can never again give birth) but if sealed, כשר – could open
 - (b) **and**: **this** is the kind of wound that heals
 - (i) **implication**: "this" excludes our case
 - (ii) **rejection**: "this" excludes a membrane that grew over a wound in the lung – still טריפה
 - 2 **challenge (רב עוקבא בר חמא)**: if the wall were pierced, the lung would be טריפה – should list in נקובת הדופן
 - (a) **block**: since the ruptured gall-bladder is כשר if sealed by liver, but if liver were pierced would be טריפה, should also state נקובת הכבד – but it only lists inherent ruptural problems, not secondary ruptures
- f **question asked of שמואל**: if the lung developed pus-filled blebs, is it כשרה
 - i **answer**: it is valid, but the students aren't pleased with this ruling, per ר' מתנא – if pus-filled, טריפה; if water – כשרה
 - 1 **defense**: that statement was made about the kidneys, not the lung
 - ii **story**: ר' יוחנן "pushed" ר' ירמיה to buy such lungs, he refused, as ר' יוחנן wouldn't permit
 - 1 **Note**: ר' יוחנן wouldn't forbid; directed to יהודה בר שמעון who had tradition from ר' יוחנן to permit
 - 2 **Related story**: רבא followed ר"נ in שוק of tanners (or חכמים), saw animals with large pus-filled blebs being sold and kept silent; ר' אסי and ר' אמי saw them selling animals with (larger) blebs hard as boulders and were silent

II The needle found in the lung:

- a **Permitting**: ר' יוחנן, ר' אלעזר, ר' חנינא
- b **Prohibiting**: רשב"ל, ר' מני בר פטיש, ר' שמעון בן אליקים
 - i **Suggestion**: they disagree if an internal חסרון is reckoned
 - 1 **Correction**: all agree that an internal חסרון is *not* reckoned
 - ii **Dispute**: whether we assume the needle came through bronchii (מתירין) or through esophagus (מטריפין)
- c **Case**: animal brought to ר' אמי with needle found in lung, he considered permitting it
 - i **However**: ר' ירמיה challenged him from our משנה – a lung that is punctured or חסרה
 - 1 **Argument**: חסרה must be inside, else it is the same as punctured → חסרון בפנים הוא חסרון
 - 2 **Then**: ר' ירמיה raising same challenge, ר' יוחנן was asked and considered permitting, ר' יוחנן was asked and considered permitting
 - 3 **Then**: question returned to ר' אמי, but he didn't have lung in front of him; forbade in spite of ר' יוחנן et al
 - (a) **Reasoning**: they could determine cause; without lung before him, perhaps it had a puncture
 - (b) **Inference**: if it were present and saw no puncture, he would declare כשר
 - (i) **Challenge**: ר"נ ruled that a punctured bronchus renders a טריפה
 - (ii) **Defense**: that is if it punctures from one bronchus to the other
 - 1. **Challenge**: ר"נ ruled that if there is a puncture between neighboring parts of intestine – כשרה
 - 2. **Block**: can't compare טריפות to each other; cut from one side and the animal dies; the other – it lives
- d **Case**: a needle was found in large bronchus; brought to ר' ל et al (who ruled טריפה above) – didn't rule either way
 - i **Didn't permit**: per their own ruling
 - ii **Didn't prohibit**: maintained that in this case, it certainly came through trachea

- e Case: needle found in liver; מר בריה דרבינא considered declaring it to be טריפה
 - i Challenge (ר' אשי): if such a needle were found in the flesh, we wouldn't declare it טריפה (כבוד::בשר)
 - ii Rather (רב אשי): we see if broad end is facing out – it punctured and is a טריפה
 - 1 But: if facing in, it came via the system and is כשרה
 - 2 Note: this distinction only applies to a thick needle; a small one is adjudged a טריפה in either direction
 - iii Question: why is this any different than a needle found in the reticulum; only טריפה if seen from both sides?
 - 1 Answer: in that case, there is food and liquid pushing it; therefore, even if the head of the needle is stuck into the walls of the stomach, it may have been pushed there from the inside; this is not a relevant consideration for the liver
- f Case: needle found in large tube of liver;
 - i מר בריה דר' אידי declared it to be a טריפה
 - ii דב אידי בר מניומי declared it to be כשרה
 - 1 דבניא suggested that מר בריה דר"א should pay for lost animal (i.e. he erred in judgement)
- g Case: a date-seed was found in gall-bladder
 - i דב אשי recalled ruling from כהנא בי ר' – in such a case, it certainly came via “tubes”
 - 1 And even if: it can't be taken out, it wedged its way in
 - 2 Caveat: this only applies to a date-seed; but an olive-seed certainly tore its way in (→ טריפה)
- h Tangent: ר' יוחנן's homiletic explanation for word ריאה – eating lungs helps vision
 - i Question: eating “as is” or with spices
 - ii Answer: since an entire goose costs 1 זוז and its lungs cost 4 זוזים, must mean lungs cooked in spices
- i Ruling: if the lung shows a puncture at the spot where the שוחט handles it, we assume it to be from his hands
 - i Contra: מרי דר' מר who said that we cannot assume that to have been the case (לא תלינן)
 - 1 Support: מר זוטרא was a loyal attendee at רפרם's lectures, ruled תלינן and explicitly rejected מר זוטרא's ruling
 - (a) Support (רב משרשיא): above (פ"א), if innards are taken away by wolf and returned with puncture marks, we ascribe them (תלינן) to the wolf and declare it to be כשרה
- j Tangential ruling: dispute if we ascribe worms that entered lung to be before or after שחיטה
 - i Ruling: we ascribe it to be after שחיטה and permit
- III Analysis of ר"ש's opinion in משנה – puncture of lungs is only a טריפה if it goes into the main bronchii
 - a דבה בר תחליפא it must be punctured to the large bronchus
 - b Confusion about ר' מלך's quote from ריב"ל as to the הלכה here:
 - i Version1 (ר' אחא בריה דר' אבא): he ruled that כר"ש
 - 1 Challenge (רב הונא): ר' מלך said the opposite – אין הלכה כר"ש
 - ii Story: when ר"ז made עלייה, he found ר' ביבי quoting ר' מלך to wit – הלכה כר"ש
 - 1 ר"ש brought testimony of his own visit – with colleagues – to ר' מלך, who denied having ruled כר"ש
 - 2 ר"ש had his own tradition that ריב"ל ruled like ר"ש
 - 3 Conclusion: אין הלכה כר"ש