

30.3.13

56a → 57a (משנה ג) → (מדבריו של בריבי ניכר שאינו בקי בתרגומיו)

1. ה' לה' תגמלו זאת עם נבל ולא חכם הלוא הוא אביד קנה הוא עשך וְלִנְנָה: דברים לב,
2. מִמֶּנּוּ פָּנָה מִמֶּנּוּ יִתֵּד מִמֶּנּוּ קִשְׁת מִלְחָמָה מִמֶּנּוּ יֵצֵא כָּל נוֹגֵשׁ יִחְדָּר: זכריה י"ד,

I טריפות: list of משנה ג'

- a *List*: punctured esophagus, gizzard or intestines or detached trachea
- i *If*: a rat hit it on its head where it makes it a טריפה (concern that it may have punctured the skull's membrane)
- 1 טריפה – טריפה we check it by putting a hand in the bird's mouth and pushing up – if the brain comes out – טריפה
 - (a) *Challenge*: what if only outer lining was punctured – and we have an opinion that that's also a טריפה
 - (b) *Answer*: if the outer lining were punctured, inner wouldn't hold pressure, brains would still come out
 - 2 *Extending this test to a rat bite*: זעירי – cannot, as teeth are narrow and crooked (may be that nothing exudes)
 - (a) זעירי: recanted, per ר"ל (may check with hand, not with nail) and ר"י (even with nail)
 - (b) *Per*: dispute נחמיה ר' יהודה ר' (one only checked with hand; other, also with nail)
 - (i) *One who checks with hand (lenient)*: other position is neglectful of Jewish property
 - (ii) *One who checks with nail (stringent)*: other position permitting טריפות – perhaps brain cover punctured
 1. *Note*: ר' יהודה ר' is recorded as checking by hand (must be ר"נ – with nail)
 - a. *Then*: he ruled that if the skull bone was broken, טריפה, even if membrane not punctured
 - b. *Contradiction*: 1st ruling – there is בדיקה; 2nd – no בדיקה will help
 - c. *Resolution*: last ruling, re water fowl (e.g. geese) – membrane is soft (שמואל – similar ruling)
 - (c) *note*: different חכמים used various methods to check for punctured membrane (sunlight, water, straw)
- ii *If*: it fell in the fire and its bowels were burned; if green – טריפה; if red – כשרה
- 1 משהו = ג' יוחנן just like puncture, amount of "greenness"
 - 2 *Question posted to דיב"ל*: if the liver went green in section facing bowel – status?
 - (a) *Answer*: טריפה
 - (b) *Challenge*: why is it worse than if the liver were gone (כשרה, per ב משנה)?
 - (i) *Answer (רנא)*: if green, must have fallen in the fire and bowels were burned out
 - 3 *Story*: ר' אבהו ר' אהבהו's chicken had green innards, ר"א הקפר pronounced כשר
 - (a) *Reason*: "green" is only an automatic מטריף if in gizzard, heart or liver
 - 4 *Story*: chicken with red innards was sent to ר' אבהו – declared it טריפה
 - (a) *Reason*: red is only מכשיר if in gizzard, heart of liver – and if was always red (not green → red)
 - 5 כשר ג' מני red innards that went green and then were boiled and returned to red – כשר
 - (a) *Reason*: the green was smoke
 - (b) *Similarly*: if red innards didn't go green, then when boiled went green – טריפה
 - (c) *Reason*: now we see that they were originally burned out (their "shame" was uncovered)
 - (i) דב אשי therefore, meat should only be eaten boiled
 1. *Rejection*: we don't assume a ריעותא
- iii *If*: it was smashed against a wall or torn by an animal but spasms for 24 hours and then he slaughtered it – כשרה
- 1 ג' אלעזר ב"ר ינאי in both cases, בדיקה is needed (perhaps the spinal cord was broken)

II טריפה: deficiencies which do not render a bird as a טריפה

- a *Trachea*: punctured or sliced
- b *Skull*: if a rat hit it in a place that *doesn't* make it a טריפה (see discussion above)
- c *Crop*: punctured
- i דב even if completely gone
 - ii *Story (ברייתא)*: in לוד, 2 חכמים ruled re a missing uterus per רבי
 - 1 *Question*: did they invalidate the uterus case, but agree with רבי re זפק
 - (a) *Or*: did they validate the טרפחה - as did רבי in case of זפק – but disagreed with רבי? תיקו
 - 2 דיב"ל top of the crop - which is pulled along with the וושט - is judged like an esophagus
- d *Bowels*: even if completely gone (and he replaced them), as long as they weren't punctured
- i *Caveat*: as long as he didn't turn them upside-down before restoring them, per v. 1 (tangent – vv1-2)
 - ii *Story*: Roman saw Jew fall from roof and his bowels fell out; he feigned killing his son to scare him up
 - 1 *Then*: the bowels came back in and the Roman sewed up his stomach and he lived
- e *Wings*: broken

- f *Legs: broken*
- i *Story: basket of birds with broken legs brought before רבא;*
 1 *He checked: that the sinew under the calf was intact – and rendered them כשרים*
- g *Feathers: pulled out from wings*
- i *טריפה – ג' יהודה: if the feather which covers her back is gone – טריפה*
- ii *טריפה – ג' דב: a dislocated foreleg in a mammal – כשר; but in a bird – טריפה;*
 1 *And: a dislocated wing in a bird – טריפה*
 (a) *Reason: perhaps the lung was punctured*
 (b) *Dissent (שמואל ור' יוחנן): it should be checked*
 (c) *Related: חזקיה – birds have no lungs (?) – ר' יוחנן – they do have lungs, like a rose petal between the wings*
 (i) *Clarification: of חזקיה's statement*
 1. *Cannot mean: that they have no lungs whatsoever (we see that they do)*
 2. *Cannot mean: that there is no טריפה there*
 a. *Per: לוי who stated that all טריפות of a mammal apply to birds, along with the skull (above)*
 3. *Rather: that we aren't concerned about the lungs in case the bird fell on the ground (puncture)*
 a. *Or: fell into a fire (burned out)*
 b. *Reason: most of the ribs protect it*
 4. *Challenge: from ר' יוחנן's rejoinder (it has lungs, like a rose petal...), we see that חזקיה thinks that it really doesn't have lungs*
 a. *Rather: he thought it doesn't – and he was wrong (wasn't considered an avian expert)*