

דף יומי • פכורות • דף ל"ט

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by wrapping up the shakla v'tarya regarding the exact parameters of the feeding test used to determine if an animal's eye ailment is a permanent blemish. The Gemara raises a series of detailed questions about how the test must be administered—such as whether the animal is fed before or after drinking, whether it must be tied up or loose, and whether it should be fed alone or with other animals. We also learn a major kasha from Pinchas, the brother of Mar Shmuel, regarding whether a blemish that is finally confirmed after three months of testing is considered a blemish retroactively or only from this point forward.

Next, we move into a new Mishnah that lists various blemishes of the head, specifically focusing on the nose, lips, and mouth. The Gemara clarifies which parts of the nostrils and lips must be damaged to count as an open blemish, and we delve into a machlokes Tannaim regarding the teeth and gums. This leads to a fundamental lomdishe inquiry by Rav Achadvoi bar Ami about whether the lack of an internal organ is halachically considered a blemish that disqualifies a korban.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 39A

QUESTION

או דלמא בכל סעודה וסעודה?

Or perhaps does it mean that we feed it this amount at each and every meal?

QUESTION

אם תימצי לומר בסעודה ראשונה — קודם אכילה או לאחר אכילה?

And if you will say that it is only at the first meal of the day, does it mean before eating its regular food, or after eating?

QUESTION

קודם אכילה ודאי מעלי ליה כסמא, לאחר אכילה מאי?

If you feed it before eating, certainly it is effective for it like a medicine, which is taken on an empty stomach. But if you feed it after eating, what is the halacha? Is that a proper test?

QUESTION

קודם שתיה או לאחר שתיה?

Similarly, do we feed it before drinking or after drinking?

QUESTION

וקודם שתיה ודאי מעלי ליה כשערי, לאחר שתיה מאי?

And before drinking, certainly it is effective for it like barley, which is digested well before drinking. But if you feed it **after drinking**, what is the halacha?

QUESTION

קשור או מותר?

Should the animal be **tied or untied** during this test?

QUESTION

מותר — ודאי מעלי ליה, קשור מאי?

When it is **untied**, certainly it is effective for it because it is relaxed. But if it is **tied**, what is the halacha?

QUESTION

לכדו או עם חבירו?

Should it be fed **by itself or with its companion**?

QUESTION

עם חבירו — ודאי מעלי ליה, לכדו מאי?

When it is **with its companion**, certainly it is effective for it because it eats happily. But when it is **by itself**, what is the halacha?

QUESTION

בעיר (ובשדה) [או בשדה]?

Should it be fed **in the city or in the field**?

QUESTION

בשדה — ודאי מעלי ליה, בעיר — מאי?

When it is **in the field**, certainly it is effective for it because it is calm. But when it is **in the city**, what is the halacha?

QUESTION

בעי רב אשי: אם תימצי לומר בשדה — גינה הסמוכה לעיר מאי?

Rav Ashi asks a further kasha: **If you will say** that it is only effective **in the field**, then what about a garden adjacent to the city, **what** is the halacha? Is it considered like the field or like the city?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara concludes: The questions **shall stand** unresolved.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רבי חנניא בן אנטיגנוס אומר.

The Mishnah had stated: **Rabbi Chananya ben Antigonus** says that we examine the animal three times within eighty days.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: ובלבד שיהו משולשים.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: And this is **provided that they are divided into equal thirds**, meaning there must be an equal gap of time between each of the three examinations.

QUESTION

בעי מיניה פנחס, אחיה דמר שמואל, משמואל: אכל ולא איתסי — למפרע הוי מומא, או מיכן ולהבא הוי מומא?

Pinchas, the brother of Mar Shmuel, asked Shmuel: If the animal **ate** the moist and dry fodder for three months **and was not healed**, which proves it is a permanent blemish, **is it a blemish retroactively** from the day it was first seen, **or is it a blemish from this point forward**?

QUESTION

למאי נפקא מינה?

The Gemara asks: **What is the practical difference?**

ANSWER

למימעל בפדיונו.

The Gemara answers: The difference is **regarding whether one has committed me'ilah** (misuse of consecrated property) **with its redemption money**.

QUESTION

אי אפרת למפרע הוי מומא — מעיל, ואי מיכן ולהבא הוי מומא — לא מעיל, מאי?

For **if you say it is a blemish retroactively**, then the redemption performed during the three months was valid, so the money became holy and anyone who benefits from it **has committed me'ilah**. But **if you say it is a blemish from this point forward**, then the redemption was invalid because it was still unblemished, so the money remains chullin and he **has not committed me'ilah**. What is the halacha?

STATEMENT

קרי שמואל עליה: "פסחים בזו בז".

Shmuel read about him, applying the pasuk: "**The lame take the prey**", meaning that even someone who is not a regular bais medrash scholar has asked a powerful kasha that I cannot answer.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' חוטמו שניקב, ושנפגם, ושנסדק. שפמו שניקב, שנפגם, שנסדק.

MISHNAH: The following are blemishes for which we may slaughter a firstborn animal: Its nose that was pierced, or that was damaged, or that was split. Its lip that was pierced, or that was damaged, or that was split.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

גמ' תנו רבנן: ניקבו חוטמין זה לתוך זה — מבחוץ הרי זה מום, מבפנים אינו מום.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a braisa: If its nostrils were pierced one into the other, if the hole is visible from the outside, this is a blemish; if it is only visible from the inside, it is not a blemish.

EXPLANATION

שפתו שניקב ושנפגם ושנסדק, אמר רב פפא: תורא ברא דשיפתייה.

Regarding the Mishnah's case of its lip that was pierced, or that was damaged, or that was split, Rav Pappa said: This refers to the outer row of its lip, which is visible.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' חוטין החיצונות שנפגמו, ושנגממו, הפנימים שנעקרו.

MISHNAH: The outer gums that were damaged, or that were worn down, and the inner teeth that were uprooted are blemishes.

MISHNAH

רבי חנינא בן אנטיגנוס אומר: אין בודקין מן התיומת ולפנים, ואף לא את התיומת.

Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus says: We do not examine from the double teeth and inward, and we do not even examine the double teeth themselves, because a blemish there is considered a hidden blemish.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

גמ' תנו רבנן: התיומת, איזהו תיומת? מן התיומת ולפנים, ותיומת עצמה כלפנים.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a braisa: Regarding the double teeth, what are the double teeth? The area from the double teeth and inward, and the double teeth themselves are considered like the inward part.

BRAISA

רבי יהושע בן קפוצאי אומר: אין שוחטין אלא על החיצונות בלבד.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Kefutzai says: We only slaughter a firstborn for a blemish on the outer teeth alone.

BRAISA

רבי חנינא בן אנטיגנוס אומר: אין משגיחין על התיומת כל עיקר.

Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus says: We do not pay attention to the double teeth at all.

QUESTION

מאי קאמר? ותו, רבי יהושע בן קפוצאי היינו תנא קמא!

The Gemara asks: What is the Tanna saying in the first part of the braisa? And furthermore, the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Kefutzai is the same as the First Tanna!

ANSWER

חסורי מיחסרה והכי קתני: איזהו הפנימית? מן התיומת ולפנים, ותיומת עצמה כלפנים.

The Gemara answers: The braisa is missing words, and this is what it is teaching: What is the inner gums? The area from the double teeth and inward, and the double teeth themselves are considered like the inward part.

EXPLANATION

במה דברים אמורים? שנפגמו וּשְׁנֵגְמוּ, אֲבָל נֶעְקְרוּ — שוחטין.

In what case are these words said, that it is not a blemish? When they were damaged or worn down; but if they were uprooted, we do slaughter the firstborn.

EXPLANATION

רבי יהושע בן קפוצאי אומר: אין שוחטין אלא על החיצונות, אֲבָל פְּנִימִיּוֹת שֶׁנֶּעְקְרוּ — מִישָׁחַט עֲלֵיהֶן לֹא שֹׁחֲטִינָה, אֲבָל אִפְסוּלֵי מִיפְסָל.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Kefutzai says: We only slaughter for the outer teeth; but as for the inner teeth that were uprooted, we do not slaughter for them, but they do disqualify the animal from being brought as a korban.

EXPLANATION

רבי חנינא בן אנטיגנוס אומר: אין משגיחין על התיומת כל עיקר, וְאִפִּילוּ אִפְסוּלֵי לֹא אִיפְסִיל.

Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus says: We do not pay attention to the double teeth at all, and even to disqualify the animal, it does not disqualify.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַב אַחַדְבּוּי בַּר אַמִּי: יֵשׁ מְחוּסֵר אַבְרָ מִבְּפָנִים, אוֹ אֵין מְחוּסֵר אַבְרָ מִבְּפָנִים?

Rav Achadvoi bar Ami asked: Is there a halachic status of lacking an internal limb, or is there no halachic status of lacking an internal limb?

QUESTION

למאי? אי לבכור — "פסח או עור" כתיב, אי לקדשים, "עורת או שבור" כתיב!

The Gemara asks: **For what** halacha is this asked? If it is to permit a **firstborn** to be slaughtered, "**lame or blind**" is written, which are external blemishes! If it is to disqualify **kodashim**, "**blind or broken**" is written, which are also external!

EXPLANATION

לאישחטי ולאפרוקי לא איבעיא לן, כי מיבעיא לן לאיפסולי — מאי?

The Gemara clarifies: **To slaughter** a firstborn **or to redeem** kodashim, **we do not ask**, because that certainly requires an external blemish. **When we ask**, it is to **disqualify** the animal from being offered on the mizbeach: **What** is the halacha?

QUESTION

"תמים יהיה לרצון" אמר רחמנא, תמים — אין, חסרון — לא.

Do we say **the Torah said**, "**It shall be unblemished (tamim) to be accepted**", which implies **unblemished** — yes, it is accepted, but if there is a **lack** of an internal organ, **no**, it is not accepted?

QUESTION

או דלמא "תמים יהיה לרצון", "כל מום לא יהיה בו" — מה מום מאפראי, אף חסרון מאפראי.

Or perhaps we learn from the juxtaposition of "**It shall be unblemished to be accepted**" and "**no blemish shall be in it**" — just as a blemish must be **external**, so too a lack of an organ must be **external** to disqualify?

PROOF

תא שמע: "וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלִיֹּת" — וְלֹא פָעַל כּוֹלֵיאָ אַחַת, וְלֹא פָעַל שְׁלֹשׁ כּוֹלִיֹּת.

Come and hear a proof from a braisa: The Torah says regarding a shelamim, "**And the two kidneys**", which teaches: **but not** an animal **with only one kidney**, and **not** an animal **with three kidneys**.

PROOF

ותנאי אידיה: "יְסִירָנָה" — לרבות פֿעַל כּוֹלֵיאָ אַחַת.

And another braisa taught: The word "**he shall remove it**" comes to include as kosher an animal **with only one kidney**.

STATEMENT

סברוה, דכולי עלמא אין בריה באחת, דהא מיחסר חסר.

The Gemara's scholars **assumed** that **everyone** agrees there is **no natural creation** of an animal **with only one kidney**, so it **must be** that it is **lacking** a kidney that was lost.

QUESTION

לימא בהא קמיפלגי: דמר סבר, חסרון מבפנים שמייה חסרון, ומר סבר, חסרון מבפנים לא שמייה חסרון.

Shall we say that they argue about this: that one Master holds that an internal lack is called a lack and disqualifies the animal, and one Master holds that an internal lack is not called a lack?

ANSWER

אמר רב חייא בר יוסף: דכולי עלמא יוש בריה באחת, וחסרון מבפנים שמיא חסרון,

Rav Chiyya bar Yosef said: Actually, everyone agrees that there is a natural creation with one kidney, and everyone agrees that an internal lack is called a lack.

EXPLANATION

ולא קשיא: כאן — כשנבראה בשתיים וחסרו, כאן — כשנבראה באחת מעיקרא.

And it is not difficult: Here, where it is disqualified, is where it was created with two and one was lost; there, where it is kosher, is where it was created with only one from the beginning.

OBJECTION

והא דומיא דשלש קתני, מה שלש מעיקרא, אף אחת מעיקרא!

The Gemara objects: But it teaches the case of one kidney similar to the case of three kidneys; just as three kidneys must be from the beginning, so too the case of one kidney must refer to where it had one from the beginning, and yet the first braisa disqualifies it!

RESOLUTION

אלא, הכא ביש בריה מעיקרא קמיפלגי, מר סבר: יש בריה באחת, ומר סבר: אין בריה באחת.

Rather, here they argue about whether there is a natural creation from the beginning: one Master holds there is a natural creation with one kidney, and one Master holds there is no natural creation with one kidney.

STATEMENT

רבי יוחנן אמר: דכולי עלמא אין בריה באחת, וחסרון מבפנים שמיא חסרון.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Actually, everyone agrees there is no natural creation with one kidney, and an internal lack is called a lack.

EXPLANATION

ולא קשיא: כאן שחסרה קודם שחיטה, כאן שחסרה לאחר שחיטה.

And it is not difficult: Here, where it is disqualified, is where it was lost before shechitah; there, where it is kosher, is where it was lost after shechitah.

QUESTION

ולאחר שחיטה קודם קבלה מי שרי?

The Gemara asks: But if it was lost after shechitah, before the receiving of the blood, is it permitted? Is it not disqualified as a lacking animal?

עמוד ב' DAF 39B

OBJECTION

והאמר רבי זירא אמר רב: הצורם און הפר ואחר כך קיבל דמו — פסול, שנאמר "ולקח מדם הפר" — הפר שהיה כבר!

But doesn't Rabbi Zeira say that Rav says: One who slits the ear of the bull after slaughter, making it blemished, and afterward collects its blood, the offering is disqualified, as it is stated: "And he shall take from the blood of the bull"—implying that it must be the bull that was already unblemished at the time of slaughter, and it must remain so during the collection of the blood!

RESOLUTION

אָלֵא: כָּאן שְׁחִטָּה קוֹדֵם מְבֻלָּה, כָּאן שְׁחִטָּה לְאַחֵר מְבֻלָּה.

Rather, we must distinguish: **here**, in the first braisa where it is disqualified, it is a case **where it lacked** the kidney **before the collection** of the blood; whereas **there**, in the second braisa where it is kosher, it is a case **where it lacked** the kidney only **after the collection** of the blood.

QUESTION

וְלֵאחֵר מְבֻלָּה קוֹדֵם זְרִיקָה, מִי שְׂרִי?

The Gemara asks: **And after the collection** of the blood but **before the sprinkling** of the blood, **is it permitted** to have a blemish or be lacking? Is the offering really kosher then?

OBJECTION

וְהִתְנַיָא: "שֶׁה תָּמִים זָכָר בֶּן שָׁנָה יִהְיֶה לָכֶם", שֶׁיְהִי תָּמִים בֶּן שָׁנָה בְּשַׁעַת שְׁחִיטָה.

But isn't it taught in a braisa: "Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male in its year"—this teaches that it must be unblemished and in its first year at the time of slaughter.

OBJECTION

וּמִנֵּין בְּמֻבָּלָה וְהוּלָכָה וְהוֹיָיָה? תִּלְמוּד לומר: "יִהְיֶה", שֶׁיְהִי כָּל הַיּוֹתָיו תָּם וּבֶן שָׁנָה.

And from where do we know that this is also required at the collection, and the conveying, and the sprinkling of the blood? The verse states: "Shall be"—implying that all of its states and procedures **must be** when it is unblemished and in its first year. This proves that a blemish before sprinkling disqualifies!

RESOLUTION

תַּרְגּוּמָה אַפֵּן שָׁנָה,

The Gemara answers: **Interpret this** braisa as referring only to the requirement of being **in its first year**, meaning that only the age requirement continues until the sprinkling, but the requirement to be unblemished does not apply after collection.

PROOF

הָכִי נָמִי מְסַתְבָּרָא, דִּתְנַיָא: רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אומר: כָּל הַזִּבְחִים שֶׁבִּתְּוָרָה שֶׁנִּשְׁתַּיֵּיר מֵהֶן כּוֹזֵית בָּשָׂר אוֹ כּוֹזֵית חֵלֶב — זוֹרֵק אֶת הַדָּם, שְׁמַע מִינָהּ.

The Gemara adds: **So too** it is reasonable, as it is taught in a braisa that Rabbi Yehoshua says: Regarding all offerings in the Torah, if there remained of them even only an olive-sized piece of meat or an olive-sized piece of fat, the kohen **sprinkles the blood**. **Hear from this** that once the blood is collected, even if the animal's body is almost entirely missing, it does not disqualify.

QUESTION

וּמִי אֵיכָא מִיָּדִי, דְּבִשְׁעַת שְׁחִיטָה הָיָה בֶּן שָׁנָה, וּבְשַׁעַת מְבֻלָּה וְהוּלָכָה הָיָה בֶּן שְׁתֵּי שָׁנִים?

The Gemara asks: **But is there anything where at the time of slaughter it is in its first year, and at the time of collection and conveying it is in its second year?** How can the animal age out in the middle of the service?

ANSWER

אמר רבא: זאת אומרת שעות פוסלות בקדשים.

Rava said: This is to say that hours disqualify in consecrated animals. We calculate the animal's age down to the exact hour of its birth, so it can literally become a year old in the minutes between slaughter and sprinkling.

STATEMENT

לימא כתנאי: "ומעוה וכתות ונתוק וכרות" — כולן בפיצים, דברי רבי יהודה.

The Gemara suggests: **Let us say** that this dispute regarding whether an internal lack is considered a blemish is **like a dispute between Tannaim. As it is taught in a braisa** regarding the verse: "**And that which is bruised, or crushed, or torn, or cut you shall not offer to Hashem**" —**all of these blemishes apply to the testicles; these are the words of Rabbi Yehuda.**

QUESTION

בפיצים ולא בגיד?

The Gemara asks: Do they apply only **to the testicles and not to the penis**? Surely if they are blemishes on the testicles, they are blemishes on the penis!

ANSWER

אימא: אף בפיצים — דברי רבי יהודה.

Rather, **say: Even in the testicles; these are the words of Rabbi Yehuda.**

STATEMENT

רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אומר: כולן בגיד.

Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov says: All of them are blemishes only when they are **on the penis**, but not on the testicles.

STATEMENT

רבי יוסי אומר: "מעוה וכתות" — אף בפיצים, "נתוק וכרות" — בגיד אין, בפיצים לא.

Rabbi Yose says: "Bruised and crushed" are blemishes **even in the testicles**; but "**torn and cut**" **on the penis**, yes, they are blemishes, but **on the testicles, no**, they are not blemishes.

EXPLANATION

מאי לאו בהא קמיפלגי, דמר סבר: חסרון מבפנים שמיא חסרון, ומר סבר: לא שמיא חסרון?

What, is it not that they argue about this: That one Master, Rabbi Yehuda, holds that an internal lack is called a lack, and therefore the testicles, which are internal, are disqualified when lacking; and one Master, Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, holds that an internal lack is not called a lack?

OBJECTION

ותסבא? רבי יוסי מאי קסבר?

The Gemara rejects this: **And can you understand it this way? What does Rabbi Yose hold?**

OBJECTION

אי קסבר חסרון מבפנים שמייה חסרון — אפילו "נתוק ופרות" נמי!

If he holds that an internal lack is called a lack, then even "torn and cut" should also be blemishes on the testicles!

OBJECTION

ואי קסבר לא שמייה חסרון — אפילו "מעוה וכתות" נמי לא!

And if he holds that an internal lack is not called a lack, then even "bruised and crushed" should also not be blemishes on the testicles!

RESOLUTION

אלא, הקא במומים שפגלוי קמיפלגי.

Rather, here they argue about visible blemishes, meaning whether these conditions on the testicles are considered visible blemishes.

EXPLANATION

רבי יהושע סבר: "מעוה וכתות" הוי מומא, דמיפּוּצָן, "נתוק ופרות" הוי מומא, דהא תליין.

Rabbi Yehuda holds: "Bruised and crushed" is a blemish because they shrink and look visibly different; "torn and cut" is a blemish because they hang down loosely in a visible way.

EXPLANATION

רבי אליעזר בן יעקב סבר: "מעוה וכתות" לא הוי מומא, דמעיקרא נמי זמנין דמיפּוּצָן, "נתוק ופרות" לא הוי מומא, דמעיקרא נמי זמנין דתליין.

Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov holds: "Bruised and crushed" is not a blemish because originally, too, there are times when they shrink naturally; "torn and cut" is not a blemish because originally, too, there are times when they hang down naturally, so it is not a distinct visible blemish.

EXPLANATION

ורבי יוסי סבר: "מעוה וכתות" הוי מומא — דהא ליתנהו, "נתוק ופרות" לא הוי מומא — דהא איתנהו.

And Rabbi Yose holds: "Bruised and crushed" is a blemish because they are no longer there in their normal form, as they are completely crushed; but "torn and cut" is not a blemish because they are still there inside the pouch, even if they are detached.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' נפגם הזכר, העריה של נקבה במוקדשיו, נפגם הזכר מן העצם, אכל לא מן הפרק, או שראש זנב מפצל, נקלפה העור והבשר והעצם נשאר, או שיש בשר מחוליא לחוליא מלא אצבע.

MISHNAH: If the pouch of the male genitalia was damaged; or the female genitalia of a consecrated animal was damaged and lacking; or if the tail was damaged from the bone, but not from the joint because that heals; or if the tip of the tail is split; or if the skin and flesh were peeled off and the bone remained exposed; or if there is a gap of flesh between one vertebra and another vertebra of a full fingerbreadth—all of these are blemishes.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גְּמ' אָמַר רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר: נִפְגָּם וְלֹא נִיטַל, כִּיס וְלֹא זָכְרוֹת.

GEMARA: Rabbi Eleazar said: The Mishnah means damaged, but not removed entirely; and it means the pouch, but not the male organ itself.

PROOF

תִּנָּיָא נָמִי הָכִי: נִפְגָּם וְלֹא נִיטַל, כִּיס וְלֹא זָכְרוֹת.

It is also taught in a braisa likewise: Damaged, but not removed; the pouch, but not the male organ.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסִי בֶן הַמְּשׁוּלָּם: מַעֲשֶׂה בְּעֵינָבֵל אֶחָד שֶׁנִּטְלוּ זָאֵב וְחִזְרָה לְאַיְתָנוּ.

Rabbi Yose ben Hamshulam said: There was an incident with a certain uvula-like organ that a wolf took, and it returned to its strength and healed.

STATEMENT

נִפְגָּמָה הַזֶּנֶב מִן הָעֶצֶם וְכוּ'.

We learned in the Mishnah: If the tail was damaged from the bone, etc.

STATEMENT

תָּנָא: אֶצְבַּע שְׁאֲמָרוּ — אֶחָד מֵאַרְבָּעָה בְּטַפַּח שֶׁל כָּל הָאָדָם.

A Tanna taught: The fingerbreadth that they spoke of is one-fourth of a handbreadth of an average man.

QUESTION

לְמַאי הִלְכְתָּא?

The Gemara asks: For what halachic purpose is this definition of a fingerbreadth given?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבָּה: לְעֻנִין תִּכְלֶת, דִּתְנִינָא: כַּמָּה חוּטִין הוּא נוֹתֵן? בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: אַרְבָּעָה, וּבֵית הִלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: שְׁלֹשָׁה.

Rabbah said: Regarding the matter of techeiles. As it is taught in a braisa: How many threads does one place? Beis Shammai say: Four, and Beis Hillel say: Three.

STATEMENT

וכמה תהא משולשת? בית שמאי אומרים: ארבעה, ובית הלל אומרים: שלשה.

And how much must be hanging down? Beis Shammai say: Four fingerbreadths, and Beis Hillel say: Three fingerbreadths.

STATEMENT

ושליש שבית הלל אומרים — אחד מארבע בטפח של כל אדם.

And the third fingerbreadth that Beis Hillel speak of is one-fourth of a handbreadth of an average man.

ANSWER

רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע אמר: לשתי אמות, דתנן: שתי אמות היו

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said: It is for the two cubit-measures kept in the Beis HaMikdash, as we learned in a Mishnah: There were two cubit-measures in Shushan the Palace.

SUMMARY

The daf concludes that the various practical questions regarding the feeding test for eye ailments remain unresolved. Shmuel highly praises a kasha from his brother Pinchas regarding the retroactive status of a blemish confirmed after three months, which has practical ramifications for me'ilah. The Gemara then transitions to the next Mishnah, clarifying that blemishes on the nose and lips must be visible on the outside to permit slaughtering a firstborn. Finally, the Gemara analyzes a braisa regarding the inner and outer teeth, and begins a deep halachic discussion on whether the lack of an internal organ disqualifies an animal from being offered on the mizbeach.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is deeply bothered by the exact conditions needed for a sick animal to heal. We ask: does it need to eat before drinking or after? Does it need to be untied so it is relaxed, or with a companion so it eats happily? Does it need the calm of the open field, or is a garden near the city good enough? The Tanna is teaching us a profound yesod about how Hashem created the world: healing and growth do not happen in a vacuum. For a refuah or any real change to take hold, the environment and the emotional state of the creature must be just right.

We often wonder why our own avodas Hashem feels stuck, or why we struggle to heal from old habits and bad middos. We try to force a change, but we forget to look at our surroundings. Just like the animal in the field, a Yid needs the right conditions to thrive. If you are constantly tied down by stress, or if you are trying to grow entirely on your own without a warm chavrusa or a supportive friend, you are making the avodah much harder than it needs to be.

To make a real change in your life, you must create the environment that allows it to happen. You cannot expect to find yiras Shamayim or peace of mind in the middle of a noisy, chaotic rush. You need to set up your day with the spiritual "medicine" of Torah before the distractions of the world crowd in, and surround yourself with people who make you happy to do the ratzon of Hashem.

Today, choose one small way to improve your environment for growth: set a fixed time for learning or davening when you are completely free from the distraction of your phone, or reach out to a friend who inspires you so you can learn together.

