

דף יומי • חלין • דף ק"ט

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf continuing the shakla v'tarya regarding the machlokes between Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis about a pot of meat where milk fell in. The Gemara is medayek the exact parameters of their dispute, looking at whether they are arguing about the concept of "efshar l'sochto"—whether a piece of meat that absorbed a forbidden taste can be squeezed out and made muttar—or if the machlokes is actually about "min b'mino," a mixture of like with like, and whether it can be batel.

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

עמוד א' DAF 109A

OBJECTION

מכלל דרבי יהודה סבר: כי נייער מתחלה ועד סוף וכסה מתחלה ועד סוף – אסור,

The Gemara objects: **From the implication** of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's words, we see **that Rabbi Yehuda holds: even when one stirred the pot from the beginning until the end, and covered it from the beginning until the end**, the contents of the pot are still **forbidden**.

QUESTION

אמאי? הא לא בלע כלל!

But **why** should this be so? **Behold**, the first piece of meat **did not absorb** any concentrated milk **at all**, since the milk was immediately and evenly distributed throughout the entire pot!

ANSWER

אימא: לא נייער יפה יפה, ולא כסה יפה יפה.

The Gemara answers: **Say** that Rabbi Yehuda is stringent because we are concerned that perhaps **he did not stir** it **thoroughly**, and perhaps **he did not cover** it **thoroughly**, and therefore the milk was initially absorbed by only one piece, rendering it forbidden, and that piece then made the rest of the pot forbidden.

STATEMENT

אמר מר, ודברי חכמים כשנייער וכסה.

The Gemara returns to analyze the previous statement: **The Master said** above: **And the words of the Sages** appear correct **when one stirred and covered** the pot.

QUESTION

מאי "נייער" ומאי "כסה"?

The Gemara asks: **What is** the meaning of "**stirred**" and **what is** the meaning of "**covered**" in this context?

OBJECTION

אֵילִימָא נִיעַר בְּסוּף וְלֹא נִיעַר בְּתַחֲלָה, וְכִסָּה בְּסוּף וְלֹא כִסָּה בְּתַחֲלָה – הָאֲמַרְתָּ נִרְאִין דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי
יְהוּדָה בְּהָא!

If we say it means he stirred at the end but did not stir at the beginning, and covered at the end but did not cover at the beginning, but didn't you already say that the words of Rabbi Yehuda appear correct in this case, where the first piece absorbed the milk before it was stirred?

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא נִיעַר מִתַּחֲלָה וְעַד סוּף, וְכִסָּה מִתַּחֲלָה וְעַד סוּף.

Rather, it must mean that he stirred from the beginning until the end, and covered from the beginning until the end.

INFERENCE

מִכָּלֵל דְּרַבְּנָן סָבְרִי: נִיעַר בְּסוּף וְלֹא נִיעַר בְּתַחֲלָה, כִּסָּה בְּסוּף וְלֹא כִסָּה בְּתַחֲלָה – מוּתָר.

But if so, by implication, the Rabbis hold that even if he only stirred at the end and did not stir at the beginning, or covered at the end and did not cover at the beginning, the entire pot is permitted.

INFERENCE

אֵלִימָא קְסָבְרִי אֶפְשָׁר לְסוּחָטוֹ מוּתָר.

Consequently, they hold that in the case of an item that can be wrung out to remove its forbidden taste, it is permitted, because the milk absorbed by the first piece is considered to have been completely extracted and nullified in the rest of the pot.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיהֵא רַב אַחָא מְדִיפְתִּי לְרַבִּינָא: מִמָּאִי דְּבִאֲפָשָׁר לְסוּחָטוֹ פְּלִיגִי?

Rav Acha of Difti said to Ravina: From where do we know that they disagree regarding the principle of an item that can be wrung out?

OBJECTION

דְּלִמָּא אֶפְשָׁר לְסוּחָטוֹ דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל אָסוּר, וְהֵכָא בְּמִין בְּמִינוֹ קָא מִיפְלָגִי, וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה לְטַעְמִיָּה דְּאָמַר:
מִין בְּמִינוֹ לֹא בְּטִיל, וְרַבְּנָן לְטַעְמִיָּהוּ דְּאָמְרִי: מִין בְּמִינוֹ בְּטִיל!

Perhaps regarding an item that can be wrung out, everyone agrees that it is forbidden, and here they disagree regarding a mixture of like with like? And Rabbi Yehuda is consistent with his reasoning, as he said: like with like is not nullified, and the Rabbis are consistent with their reasoning, as they say: like with like is nullified! Since the milk-flavored meat is mixed with other meat, the Rabbis permit it because it is nullified.

ANSWER

הָאִי מָאִי? אִי אָמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא דְּרַבְּנָן בְּמִין בְּמִינוֹ הֵכָא פְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה סָבִירָא לָהּ, וּבִאֲפָשָׁר לְסוּחָטוֹ
פְּלִיגִי – הֵיִינוּ דְּקָאֻמַר רַבִּי: נִרְאִין דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בְּהָא, וְדְבָרֵי חֲכָמִים בְּהָא.

Ravina responded: What is this reasoning? Granted, if you say that the Rabbis here hold like Rabbi Yehuda regarding like with like, and they only disagree regarding an item that can be wrung out, that is why Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says:

The words of Rabbi Yehuda appear correct in this case, and the words of the Sages appear correct in that case, since the issue of whether one stirred or covered is directly relevant to the dispute.

REFUTATION

אָלֵא אִי אָמַרְתָּ: אַפְשָׁר לְסוּחָטוֹ דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל אָסוּר, וְהָכָא בְּמִין בְּמִינוֹ קָמִיפְלָגִי – הָאִי נִרְאִין דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי
הַחוּדָה וְאִין נִרְאִין מִבְּעֵי לֵיהּ, וְתוּ לֹא מִיָּדִי.

But if you say that regarding an item that can be wrung out, everyone agrees it is forbidden, and here they disagree regarding like with like, then Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi should have said: "The words of Rabbi Yehuda appear correct, and they do not appear correct" in the other case, and nothing more. He would not have split his ruling based on whether the pot was stirred or covered.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' הִפְחֵל – קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת הַלֵּב.

MISHNAH: One who wants to cook the udder of a slaughtered animal must tear it and remove its milk before cooking.

MISHNAH

לֹא קָרְעוֹ – אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו.

If he did not tear it before cooking, he does not transgress a Torah prohibition for it, and is not liable to lashes, because the milk inside the udder is not considered halachically active milk.

MISHNAH

הֵלֵב – קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת דָּמוֹ, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו.

One who wants to eat the heart of a slaughtered animal must tear it and remove its blood before cooking. If he did not tear it, he does not transgress a Torah prohibition for it that would make him liable to kares.

עֲמוּד ב' DAF 109B

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

GEMARA

גְּמ'.

GEMARA:

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא אָמַר רַב:

Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said: If one cooked an udder without tearing it first, he does not violate the Torah prohibition of cooking meat and milk, and the cooked udder is completely permitted to be eaten even ab initio.

QUESTION

וְהָא אֲנִי תָנִי אֵינּוּ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו –

The Gemara asks: **But didn't we learn** in our Mishnah: **He does not violate** the prohibition? This implies:

INFERENCE

מֵעֵבֶר הוּא דִּלָּא עֹבֵר, הָא אִיסוּרָא אֵיכָא!

It is only **violating** a Torah prohibition **that he does not** do, **but there is** still a Rabbinic **prohibition** to eat it ab initio!

ANSWER

בְּדִין הוּא דְאִיסוּרָא נָמִי לֵיכָא,

The Gemara answers: **By right**, the Mishnah should have taught that **there is also no** Rabbinic **prohibition** at all,

EXPLANATION

וְאֵיִדִּי דְבָעָא לְמִיתְנָא סִיפָא:

but since the Tanna **wanted to teach** in the **latter clause** of the Mishnah:

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הֶלֶב קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת דָּמּוֹ, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – אֵינּוּ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו.

As for **the heart**, one must tear it and remove its blood; if he **did not** tear it before cooking, he **does not violate** the Torah **prohibition** by eating it.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

EXPLANATION

הֵתָם מֵעֵבֶר הוּא דִּלָּא עֹבֵר, הָא אִיסוּרָא אֵיכָא,

And **there**, regarding the heart, **it is** indeed only **violating** a Torah prohibition **that he does not** do, **but there is** still a Rabbinic **prohibition** to eat it without tearing,

EXPLANATION

תָּנָא נָמִי רִישָׁא אֵינּוּ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו.

therefore, the Tanna **also taught** in the **first clause** regarding the udder using the same phrasing: **He does not violate** the prohibition.

PROOF

לֵימָא מְסִיעָה לֵיהּ:

The Gemara suggests: **Let us say** that the following Braisa **supports him**, Rav's ruling that the cooked udder is permitted ab initio:

BRAISA

הֶכְחָל – קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת הַלֵּב, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו.

For it was taught in a Braisa: As for the **udder**, one must tear it and remove its milk; if he did not tear it before cooking, he **does not violate** the Torah prohibition.

BRAISA

הֵלֵב – קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת דָּמוֹ, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – קוֹרְעוֹ לְאַחַר בִּשְׁוִלּוֹ וּמוּתָר.

As for the **heart**, one must tear it and remove its blood; if he did not tear it before cooking, he may tear it after its cooking and it is permitted.

INFERENCE

לֵב הוּא דְּבָעֵי קְרִיעָה, אֲבָל כְּחָל לֹא בָּעֵי קְרִיעָה.

We can infer: It is only the cooked **heart that requires tearing** after cooking to make it permitted, **but** the cooked **udder does not require tearing** at all after cooking, and is permitted as is. This supports Rav's view.

REFUTATION

דְּלִמָּא לֵב הוּא דְּסָגִי לִיהּ בְּקְרִיעָה, אֲבָל כְּחָל – לֹא סָגִי לִיהּ בְּקְרִיעָה.

The Gemara rejects this: **Perhaps** we should infer the opposite: It is only the cooked **heart for which it is sufficient to tear it** after cooking to make it permitted, because the heart does not absorb its own blood; **but** as for the cooked **udder, it is not sufficient to tear it** after cooking, because the meat of the udder has already absorbed the milk, and tearing it now will not help to permit it.

STATEMENT

וְאִיכָא דְּאָמְרִי, אָמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא אָמַר רַב:

And some say a different version of this discussion: Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said:

STATEMENT

אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו, וְאָסוּר.

If one cooked an udder without tearing it, **he does not violate** the Torah prohibition, **but it is** nevertheless **prohibited** to eat it by Rabbinic law.

PROOF

לִימָא מְסִיעָה לִיהּ: "אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו" –

The Gemara suggests: **Let us say** that our Mishnah **supports him**, since it states: "**He does not violate** the prohibition." This implies:

INFERENCE

מִיעֲבָר הוּא דְּלֹא עָבַר, הָא אִיסוּרָא אִיכָא.

It is only **violating** a Torah prohibition **that he does not do**, **but there is** still a Rabbinic prohibition to eat it.

ANSWER

בְּדִין הוּא דְאִסּוּרָא נְמִי לִיכָא,

The Gemara answers: No, **by right, there is also no** Rabbinic **prohibition** here,

EXPLANATION

וְאִיִּדִּי דְבִעָא לְמִיתְנָא סִיפָא:

but since the Tanna **wanted to teach** in the latter clause:

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הֶלֶב קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת דָּמּוֹ, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו,

As for **the heart**, **one must tear it and remove its blood**; if he **did not tear it** before cooking, **he does not violate** the Torah **prohibition** by eating it,

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

EXPLANATION

דְּהֵתָם מֵיעֶבֶר הוּא דְלֹא עֵבֶר, הָא אִסּוּרָא אִיכָא,

where there, regarding the heart, **it is** indeed only **violating** a Torah prohibition **that he does not do**, **but there is** still a Rabbinic **prohibition** to eat it,

EXPLANATION

תָּנָא נְמִי רִישָׁא "אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו".

therefore, the Tanna **also taught** in the **first clause**: "**He does not violate** the prohibition."

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע:

The Gemara says: **Come and hear** a proof from the Braisa:

BRAISA

הֶבֶל – קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת הַלֵּב, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – אֵינוֹ עוֹבֵר עָלָיו.

As for **the udder**, **one must tear it and remove its milk**; if he **did not tear it** before cooking, **he does not violate** the Torah **prohibition**.

BRAISA

הֶלֶב – קוֹרְעוֹ וּמוֹצִיא אֶת דָּמּוֹ, לֹא קָרְעוֹ – קוֹרְעוֹ לְאַחַר בְּשׂוּלוֹ, וּמוֹתֵר.

As for **the heart**, one must tear it and remove its blood; if he did not tear it before cooking, he may tear it after its cooking and it is permitted.

INFERENCE

לב הוא דבְּעֵי קְרִיעָה, אֲבָל כָּחֵל – לֹא בְּעֵי קְרִיעָה!

We can infer: It is only the cooked **heart that requires tearing** after cooking, **but** the cooked **udder does not require tearing** at all after cooking, and is permitted as is! This contradicts Rav's second version that the udder is Rabbinically prohibited.

REFUTATION

דְּלִמָּא לֵב הוּא דְּסִגִּי לִיָּה בְּקְרִיעָה, אֲבָל כָּחֵל לֹא סִגִּי לִיָּה בְּקְרִיעָה.

The Gemara rejects this: **Perhaps** we should infer the opposite: It is only the cooked **heart for which it is sufficient to tear it** after cooking to make it permitted; **but** as for the cooked **udder, it is not sufficient to tear it** after cooking, and it remains prohibited. Thus, the Braisa can support Rav's second version.

STATEMENT

תְּנִינָא כְּלִישְׁנָא קִמָּא דְּרַב:

The Gemara comments: **It is taught** in a Braisa **in accordance with the first version of Rav's** statement, that the cooked udder is permitted:

BRAISA

כָּחֵל שֶׁבִּשְׂלוּ בַּחֲלָבוֹ – מוּתָר,

An udder that one cooked, meaning roasted, with its milk is permitted;

BRAISA

קִבָּה שֶׁבִּשְׂלָהּ בַּחֲלָבָה – אָסוּר.

but a **stomach** of a suckling calf **that one cooked with its milk** is prohibited.

BRAISA

וּמָה הַפֶּרֶשׁ בֵּין זֶה לָזֶה?

And what is the difference between this stomach and that udder?

BRAISA

זֶה כָּנוּס בְּמַעֲיוֹ, וְזֶה אֵין כָּנוּס בְּמַעֲיוֹ.

The milk in **this** stomach is **collected in its innards** from the outside, so it is considered actual milk; **but** the milk in **that** udder is **not collected in its innards**, but is rather absorbed in the flesh, so it is not considered actual milk.

QUESTION

כִּיצַד קוֹרְעוֹ?

The Gemara asks: **How must one tear** the udder before cooking it?

ANSWER

אמר רב יהודה: קורעו שתי וערב, וטחו בכותל.

Rav Yehuda said: One must tear it lengthwise and widthwise, and smear it against a wall to squeeze out all the milk.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה רבי אֶלְעָזָר לְשִׁמְעִיה: קרע לי, ואֲנִי אֵכֹל.

The Gemara relates: Rabbi Elazar said to his attendant: Tear the udder for me, and I will eat it.

QUESTION

מאי קא משמע לן? מתניתין היא!

The Gemara asks: What is this coming to teach us? It is already taught in our Mishnah that one must tear it!

ANSWER

הא קא משמע לן: דלא בעינן שתי וערב וטחו בכותל.

The Gemara answers: This is what it comes to teach us: That we do not require tearing it lengthwise and widthwise and smearing it against a wall; rather, a simple tear is enough.

STATEMENT

אמרה ליה ילתא לרב נחמן: מכדי, כל דאסר לן רחמנא שרא לן כוותיה,

Yalta said to Rav Nachman: Now, for everything that the Merciful One prohibited to us, He permitted to us something similar to it:

STATEMENT

אסר לן דמא – שרא לן כבדא,

He prohibited to us blood, but He permitted to us liver, which is full of blood;

STATEMENT

נדח – דם טוהר.

He prohibited to us a niddah, but He permitted to us a woman during her days of pure blood;

STATEMENT

חלב בהמה – חלב חיה,

He prohibited to us the forbidden fat of a domesticated animal, but He permitted to us the fat of a wild beast;

STATEMENT

חזיר – מוחא דשיבּוּטא,

He prohibited to us pig, but He permitted to us the brain of the shibuta fish, which has the taste of pork;

STATEMENT

גירותא – לישנא דכוּרָא.

He prohibited to us the fat-tailed giruta bird, but He permitted to us the tongue of a certain fish;

STATEMENT

אִשָּׁת אִישׁ – גְּרוּשָׁה בְּחַיֵּי בַעְלָהּ,

He prohibited to us a **married woman**, but He permitted to us a **divorced woman** during the lifetime of her husband;

STATEMENT

אִשָּׁת אָח – יְבָמָה,

He prohibited to us a **brother's wife**, but He permitted to us a **yevamah** in a levirate marriage;

STATEMENT

גּוֹיָה – יְפֶת תַּאֲר,

He prohibited to us a **non-Jewish woman**, but He permitted to us a **beautiful captive woman** in war.

QUESTION

בָּעֵינֵינוּ לְמִיכַל בְּשָׂרָא בִּחְלָא.

Now, **I want to eat meat cooked in milk**; what is the permitted equivalent?

STATEMENT

אָמַר לְהוּ רַב נַחֲמָן לְטַבְּחִי: זְוִיקוּ לָהּ כַּחֲלִי.

Rav Nachman said to the butchers: **Roast udders for her**, which taste like meat cooked in milk.

QUESTION

וְהָאֵינָן תַּנּוּ: קוֹרְעוּ!

The Gemara asks: **But didn't we learn** in our Mishnah: **One must tear it** before cooking?

ANSWER

הָהוּא לְקַדְרָה.

The Gemara answers: **That** requirement to tear it is specifically for cooking it in a **pot**, but for roasting it on coals, tearing is not required.

QUESTION

וְהָא קְתַנִּי: שְׂבֻשְׁלוֹ – דִּיעֲבַד אִין, לְכַתְּחָלָה לָא?

The Gemara asks: **But doesn't** the Braisa **teach**: "**That one cooked it**"—implying that **after the fact**, yes, it is permitted, but **ab initio**, no, one may not cook it?

ANSWER

הוּא הִדִּין דְּאֶפִּילוּ לְכַתְּחָלָה, וְאִיִּדִּי דְקָא בְּעִי לְמִיתְנָא סִיפָא קָבָה

The Gemara answers: **The same law applies that even ab initio** it is permitted to roast it, **but since** the Tanna wanted to **teach** in the **latter clause** regarding a **stomach**, which is prohibited even after the fact, he used the same phrasing in the first clause.

SUMMARY

After resolving the details of the machlokes regarding the pot of meat, we learn a new Mishnah that introduces the halachos of cooking an udder (kachal) and a heart. The Mishnah teaches that one must tear the udder to remove its milk, and the heart to remove its blood, before cooking. In the Gemara, Rabbi Zeira quotes Rav who brings down a major chiddush: if one cooked an udder without tearing it first, it is completely muttar to eat even l'chatchilah. The Gemara challenges this from the wording of our Mishnah and analyzes a Braisa to see if it supports Rav's shita or if we must say the udder is actually forbidden because it absorbed its own milk during the cooking process.

למעשה

WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara brings down the famous words of Yalta, the wife of Rav Nachman, who pointed out a beautiful, deep truth about how Hashem created the world: for almost every forbidden thing, Hashem created a permitted equivalent. If blood is forbidden, we have liver; if non-kosher fat is forbidden, we have the fat of a wild animal; if pig is forbidden, we have the shibuta fish which tastes just like it; and if meat cooked in milk is forbidden, we have the udder of a cow, which gives us that very same taste in a permitted way.

This is not just a list of culinary substitutes; it is a fundamental approach to our entire avodas Hashem. The Torah does not want to starve us or make us miserable. Hashem did not create the physical world to torture us with desires we can never satisfy. Rather, the purpose of the prohibitions is to refine us, to teach us kedushah and self-discipline. When we hold back from the forbidden, it is not because the pleasure itself is evil, but because Hashem commanded us to channel our desires in a holy way.

This teaches us a massive lesson for our daily lives. When you feel a strong desire for something that is not aligned with Torah or yiras Shamayim, do not despair and think that you are being forced into a life of total deprivation. Instead, look for the kosher, holy outlet for that same energy. If you have a drive for honor, channel it into honoring the Torah; if you have a desire for excitement, find it in the sweetness of a good kasha in the bais medrash. Hashem always provides a holy path to satisfy the natural desires of our neshama.

Today, when you feel a pull toward something questionable or forbidden, stop and ask yourself: "How can I find the kosher version of this desire?" Channel that energy into a permitted, holy action instead of trying to fight it with raw force.