

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קיי"ג

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 Rava's shitta on salting kosher and non-kosher meat together. The Gemara brings a kasha from a braisa about salting kosher and non-kosher fish, analyzing the different cases of which fish is salted and which is unsalted, and whether we can draw a proof to challenge Rava's ruling.

From there, the Gemara moves into the practical halachos of kashering meat through salting. We learn the yesodos of how to salt meat properly to remove the blood, including the requirement of rinsing the meat before and after salting, using the right kind of salt, and the necessity of using a perforated vessel so the blood can drain out freely.

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

עמוד א' DAF 113A

OBJECTION

וְלִימָא לִיהּ מַדְשָׁמוּאֵל, דְּאָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: מְלִיחַ הָרִי הוּא כְּרוֹתָהּ, וְכַבוּשׁ הָרִי הוּא כְּמַבוּשָׁל!

And let him say to him the same ruling from the statement of Shmuel, as Shmuel said: A salted food is like a boiling food, and a marinated food is like a cooked food! If so, the kosher meat should absorb the taste of the tereifa meat just as if they were cooked together.

ANSWER

אִי מַדְשָׁמוּאֵל, הָיָה אָמִינָא: הֲגִי מִיָּלִי – דָּמֹן, אֲבָל צִירָן וְרוֹטְבָן – לֹא, קַמְשָׁמַע לֵן.

The Gemara answers: If Rava had derived his ruling only from the statement of Shmuel, I would have said: This applies only to **their blood**, which is absorbed, **but their juice and their gravy** are **not** absorbed to prohibit the other piece. Therefore, the derivation from the pasuk **comes to teach us** that even the juices and gravy of a tereifa prohibit.

QUESTION

מִיתִיבִי: דָּג טָהוֹר שֶׁמֶלְחוּ עִם דָּג טָמֵא – מוֹתֵר.

The Gemara **raises an objection** from a braisa: A kosher fish that one salted with a non-kosher fish is permitted.

INFERENCE

מֵאִי לֹא שֶׁהָיָה שְׁנֵיהֶן מְלוּחָיוֹן?

What, is it **not** referring to a case **where both of them were salted**, and they both emit juices? This would prove that the juices of a non-kosher fish do not prohibit the kosher one, which is a kasha on Rava!

ANSWER

לֹא, כְּגוֹן שֶׁהָיָה טָהוֹר מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תָּפֵל.

The Gemara answers: **No**, it is a case **where the kosher fish was salted and the non-kosher fish was unsalted**. Since the non-kosher fish is unsalted, it does not emit juices to prohibit the kosher one.

QUESTION

וְהָא מְדַקְתָּנִי סִיפָא: אֲבָל אִם הָיָה טָהוֹר מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תָּפֵל, מִכָּלֵל דְּרִישָׁא בְּשִׁנְיָהֶם מְלוּחִין
עֲסָקִינוּ!

The Gemara asks: **But from that which the latter clause teaches: But if the kosher fish was salted and the non-kosher fish was unsalted**, it is permitted, **by implication**, the first clause is dealing with a case **where both of them are salted**!

ANSWER

פְּרוּשִׁי קָא מְפָרֵשׁ: טָהוֹר שְׂמֵלְחוּ עִם דָּג טָמֵא – מוֹתֵר, כִּיצַד? שֶׁהָיָה טָהוֹר מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תָּפֵל.

The Gemara answers: The latter clause **is explaining** the first clause, and we read it as follows: **A kosher fish that one salted with a non-kosher fish is permitted**. How so? **Where the kosher fish was salted and the non-kosher fish was unsalted**.

PROOF

הָכִי נָמִי מְסַתְבָּרָא, דְּאִי סְלָקָא דְעֵתָהּ רִישָׁא שְׁנִיָּהֶם מְלוּחִים – הַשְׁתָּא שְׁנִיָּהֶם מְלוּחִים שְׂרִי, טָהוֹר
מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תָּפֵל מִיבְעָיָא?

The Gemara notes: **So too, it is reasonable** to explain it this way, **for if it should enter your mind** that the first clause refers to where **both of them are salted**, now if even when **both of them are salted it is permitted**, is it necessary to state that it is permitted when **the kosher fish is salted and the non-kosher fish is unsalted**? That is obvious!

REFUTATION

אִי מְשׁוּם הָא לָא אִירִיא, תְּנָא סִיפָא לְגַלּוּיֵי רִישָׁא, דְּלֹא תִימָא רִישָׁא טָהוֹר מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תָּפֵל, אֲבָל
שְׁנִיָּהֶם מְלוּחִין אָסוּר, תְּנָא סִיפָא טָהוֹר מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תָּפֵל, מִכָּלֵל דְּרִישָׁא שְׁנִיָּהֶם מְלוּחִין, וְאִפִּילוּ
הָכִי שְׂרִי.

The Gemara rejects this: **If it is because of that, there is no proof**, for the Tanna taught the latter clause to clarify the first clause, so that you should not say that the first clause is only where **the kosher fish is salted and the non-kosher fish is unsalted**, but if **both of them are salted it is forbidden**. Therefore, he taught the latter clause explicitly referring to where **the kosher fish is salted and the non-kosher fish is unsalted**, so that **by implication**, the first clause must refer to where **both of them are salted**, and even so it is permitted.

QUESTION

תָּא שְׁמַע מִסִּיפָא דְּסִיפָא: אֲבָל אִם הָיָה טָמֵא מְלִיחַ וְטָהוֹר תָּפֵל – אָסוּר.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear a proof from the end of the latter clause: But if the non-kosher fish was salted and the kosher fish was unsalted, it is forbidden**.

INFERENCE

טָמֵא מְלִיחַ וְטָהוֹר תָּפֵל הוּא דְאָסוּר, הָא שְׁנִיָּהֶם מְלוּחִין – שְׂרִי.

We can infer: It is specifically when **the non-kosher fish is salted and the kosher fish is unsalted** that it is forbidden, but if **both of them are salted, it is permitted**! This contradicts Rava's ruling.

ANSWER

אִיִּדִי דְתֵנָא רִישָׁא: טְהוֹר מְלִיחַ וְטָמֵא תַּפְּל, תֵּנָא נְמִי סִיפָא: טָמֵא מְלִיחַ וְטְהוֹר תַּפְּל.

The Gemara answers: No, since he taught the first clause: The kosher fish is salted and the non-kosher fish is unsalted, he also taught the latter clause using parallel language: The non-kosher fish is salted and the kosher fish is unsalted, but no inference can be drawn regarding when both are salted.

STATEMENT

(סִימָן: בִּישְׁרָא דְמִנַּח נִפְקוּתָא).

The Gemara provides a mnemonic: Meat that is placed, the departure.

STATEMENT

אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: אֵין הַבֶּשֶׂר יוֹצֵא מִיָּדֵי דָמוֹ, אֶלָּא אִם כ�ּן מוֹלְחוֹ יִפֶּה יִפֶּה, וּמְדִיחוֹ יִפֶּה יִפֶּה.

Shmuel said: Meat does not leave its blood to become permitted unless one salts it very well, and rinses it very well.

STATEMENT

אָתְמַר: רַב הוּנָא אָמַר: מוֹלֵחַ וּמְדִיחַ.

It was stated: Rav Huna said: One salts and then rinses.

BRAISA

בְּמִתְנִיתָא תֵּנָא: מְדִיחַ וּמוֹלֵחַ וּמְדִיחַ.

In a braisa it was taught: One rinses first, and then salts, and then rinses again.

RESOLUTION

וְלֹא פְּלִיגִי, הָא דְחִלְלִיָּה בִּי טַבְּחָא, הָא דְלֹא חִלְלִיָּה בִּי טַבְּחָא.

And they do not disagree: This ruling of Rav Huna, who did not require a first rinsing, is where they rinsed it in the butcher shop; whereas that braisa, which requires a first rinsing, is where they did not rinse it in the butcher shop.

STATEMENT

רַב דִּימִי מִנְהַרְדֵּעָא מָלַח לֵיהּ בְּמִילְחָא גָּלְלִיתָא, וּמִנְפִּיץ לֵיהּ.

Rav Dimi of Neharde'a would salt meat with coarse salt, and then shake it off before rinsing.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב מֶשֶׁרְשִׁיָּא: אֵין מַחֲזִיקִין דָּם בְּבִנְיָ מַעֲיִים.

Rav Mesharshiyya said: We do not presume there is blood in the intestines, and therefore they do not require salting.

EXPLANATION

תַּרְגָּמָא אַפְרַכְשָׁא וּמַעֲזִיא וְהִדְרָא דְכִנְתָּא.

The Sages interpreted this statement as referring specifically to the rectum, the intestines, and the spiral colon.

STATEMENT

אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: אֵין מְנִיחִין בֶּשֶׂר מְלִיחַ אֶלָּא עַל גְּבִי כְּלִי מְנוּקָב.

Shmuel said: One may place salted meat only on a perforated vessel, so that the blood can drain out.

STATEMENT

רב ששית מלח ליה גרמא גרמא.

Rav Sheshet would salt meat one piece at a time.

QUESTION

תרי מאי טעמא לא? משום דפריש מהאי ובלע האי?

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** he would **not** salt **two** pieces together? Is it **because** blood **discharges from this** piece **and is absorbed by that** piece?

OBJECTION

חד נמי פריש מהאי גיסא ובלע האי גיסא!

But even with **one** piece, blood **discharges from this side** and is absorbed by that side!

RESOLUTION

אלא לא שנא.

Rather, there is **no difference**, and one may salt many pieces together.

STATEMENT

אמר שמואל, משום רבי חייא: השובר מפרקתה של בהמה קודם שתצא נפשה – הרי זה מכביד את הבשר, וגוזל את הבריות, ומבליע דם באברים.

Shmuel said in the name of Rabbi Chiyya: One who breaks the neck of an animal before its soul departs, behold, this makes the meat heavy, and thereby robs people, and causes blood to be absorbed in the limbs.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: היכי קאמר? מכביד את הבשר, וגוזל את הבריות משום דמבליע דם באברים – הא לדידיה שפיר דמי, או דלמא לדידיה נמי אסיר?

A dilemma was raised before them: How is he saying? Does he mean that it makes the meat heavy and robs people because it causes blood to be absorbed in the limbs, but for himself to eat, it is fine? Or perhaps for himself to eat, it is also forbidden because of the blood?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

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

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' המעלה את העוף עם הגבינה על השלחן – אינו עובר בלא תעשה.

MISHNAH: One who brings up poultry with cheese onto the table does not transgress a negative commandment.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' הא אוכלו – עובר בלא תעשה, שמע מינה: בשר עוף בחלב דאורייתא!

GEMARA: The Gemara infers: But if he eats it, he transgresses a negative commandment! Shall we conclude from this that poultry in milk is forbidden Torah-law?

ANSWER

אימא: המעלה את העוף עם הגבינה על השלחן – אינו בא לידי לא תעשה.

The Gemara answers: No, say instead: One who brings up poultry with cheese onto the table does not come to the possibility of transgressing a negative commandment, because even if he eats them together, it is only a Rabbinic prohibition.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' בשר בהמה טהורה בחלב בהמה טהורה – אסור לבשל ואסור בהנאה.

MISHNAH: The meat of a kosher animal in the milk of a kosher animal is forbidden to cook and forbidden in benefit.

MISHNAH

בשר בהמה טהורה בחלב בהמה טמאה, בשר בהמה טמאה בחלב בהמה טהורה – מותר לבשל ומותר בהנאה.

But the meat of a kosher animal in the milk of a non-kosher animal, or the meat of a non-kosher animal in the milk of a kosher animal, is permitted to cook and permitted in benefit.

MISHNAH

רבי עקיבא אומר: חיה ועוף אינם מן התורה, שנאמר "לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו" שלש פעמים – פרט לחיה, ולעוף, ובהמה טמאה.

Rabbi Akiva says: A wild beast and poultry are not forbidden from the Torah, as it is said: "You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk" three times in the Torah — excluding a wild beast, and poultry, and a non-kosher animal.

MISHNAH

רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: נאמר "לא תאכלו כל נבלה", ונאמר "לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו", את שאסור משום נבלה אסור לבשל בחלב.

Rabbi Yose HaGelili says: It is said: "You shall not eat any carcass (neveilah)," and in the same pasuk it is said: "You shall not cook a kid in its mother's milk"; this teaches that that which is forbidden under the law of neveilah is forbidden to

cook in milk.

MISHNAH

עוף שאסור משום נבלה, יכול יהא אסור לבשל בקלב? תלמוד לומר "בחלב אמו" – נצא עוף שאין לו חלב אם.

If so, poultry, which is forbidden under the law of neveilah, I might think it should be forbidden to cook in milk. Therefore the Torah says: "in its mother's milk" — excluding poultry, which has no mother's milk.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' מנא הני מילי? אמר רבי אלעזר: אמר קרא "וישלח יהודה את גדי העזים",

GEMARA: From where do we know these words that the word "kid" (gedi) on its own refers to a young goat? Rabbi Elazar said: The pasuk says: "And Yehudah sent the kid of the goats,"

עמוד ב' DAF 113B

INFERENCE

כאן גדי עזים, הא כל מקום שנאמר גדי סתם – אפילו פרה ורחל במשמע.

We can infer that only **here**, where the Torah specifies, does it mean a **kid of the goats**; consequently, anywhere that it is stated simply "kid" without specification, even a cow or a ewe is included in the meaning.

QUESTION

ולילף מיניה?

The Gemara asks: **But why not derive from it**, from this verse, that every unspecified "kid" in the Torah is indeed a goat?

ANSWER

כתיב קרא אחרינא: "ואת ערת גדיי העזים" – כאן "גדיי העזים", הא כל מקום שנאמר "גדי" סתם – אפילו פרה ורחל במשמע.

The Gemara answers: **Another verse is written** regarding Yaakov Avinu: "And the skins of the kids of the goats". This indicates that only **here** they are specifically "kids of the goats", consequently, anywhere that it is stated "kid" without specification, even a cow or a ewe is included in the meaning.

OBJECTION

ולילף מיניה?

The Gemara objects: **But let us derive from it**, from this second verse as well, that a "kid" is always a goat!

EXPLANATION

הווי להו שני כתובין הבאין כאחד, וכל שני כתובים הבאים כאחד – אין מלמדיו.

The Gemara explains: **They are two verses that come as one** to teach the same thing, **and** we have a rule that **any two verses that come as one do not teach** their common rule to other cases.

QUESTION

הַנִּיחָא לְמַאן דְּאָמַר אִין מְלַמְדִּין, אֶלָּא לְמַאן דְּאָמַר מְלַמְדִּין, מַאי אִיכָּא לְמִימַר?

The Gemara asks: **This works out well according to the one who says** that two verses that come as one **do not teach**, **but according to the one who says they do teach**, what is there to say? How does he know that an unspecified "kid" includes other animals?

ANSWER

תָּרִי מִיעוּטֵי כְּתִיבִי: "עֲזִים", "הָעֲזִים".

The Gemara answers: **Two exclusions are written** in these verses, as they use the words "goats" and "the goats" with the definite article, which limits the specific definition of a goat to those cases alone.

STATEMENT

אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: "גְּדִי" – לְרִבּוֹת אֶת הַחֵלֶב, "גְּדִי" – לְרִבּוֹת אֶת הַמֶּתָה, "גְּדִי" – לְרִבּוֹת אֶת הַשֶּׁלִּיל.

Shmuel says: The three mentions of the word "kid" in the context of meat and milk serve to include other cases: the first "kid" is **to include forbidden fat** in the prohibition; the second "kid" is **to include a dead carcass**; and the third "kid" is **to include a fetus**.

STATEMENT

"גְּדִי" – לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַדָּם, "גְּדִי" – לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַשְּׁלֵיָא, "גְּדִי" – לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַטְּמֵאָה.

And each mention also excludes a case: the first "kid" is **to exclude blood**; the second "kid" is **to exclude the placenta**; and the third "kid" is **to exclude a non-kosher animal**.

STATEMENT

"בֶּחֱלֵב אִמּוֹ" – וְלֹא בֶּחֱלֵב זָכָר, "בֶּחֱלֵב אִמּוֹ" – וְלֹא בֶּחֱלֵב שְׁחוּטָה, "בֶּחֱלֵב אִמּוֹ" – וְלֹא בֶּחֱלֵב טְמֵאָה.

Furthermore, the first instance of "in its mother's milk" teaches: **and not in the milk of a male**; the second "in its mother's milk" teaches: **and not in the milk of a slaughtered animal**; and the third "in its mother's milk" teaches: **and not in the milk of a non-kosher animal**.

QUESTION

הָא תְּלָתָא "גְּדִי" כְּתִיבִי, וְאַנּוּן שִׁיתָא דְּרִשְׁיִנּוּ!

The Gemara challenges: **But only three** times is the word "kid" written, and yet we **expound six** different halachot from them!

ANSWER

קָסְבַּר שְׁמוּאֵל אִיסוּר חָל עַל אִיסוּר, וְאִיסוּר חֵלֶב וּמִתָּה מִחֵד קָרָא נִפְקִי.

The Gemara responds: Shmuel holds that a **prohibition can take effect upon an existing prohibition**, and therefore the added prohibition of cooking **forbidden fat and a dead carcass** in milk **are derived from one verse**, as they are both applications of a prohibition to an already prohibited item.

EXPLANATION

דם נמי לאו "גדי" הוא, ושלֵיֵא נמי פירשׁא בעלמא הוא.

Furthermore, **blood is also not** considered a "kid" at all, so it does not need a verse to exclude it, and a **placenta is also merely waste matter** and not meat, so it also does not need a verse.

EXPLANATION

פשו להו תרי: חד לרבות את השליל, וחד למעוטי בהמה טמאה.

Therefore, **two** mentions of "kid" **remain for us**: one to include a fetus, and one to exclude a non-kosher animal.

QUESTION

וסבר שמואל איסור חל על איסור?

The Gemara asks: **And does Shmuel really hold** that a prohibition can take effect upon an existing prohibition?

OBJECTION

והאמר שמואל משום רבי אלעזר: מנין לכהן טמא שאכל תרומה טמאה שאינו במיתה?

But didn't Shmuel say in the name of Rabbi Elazar: From where is it derived that an impure Kohen who ate impure terumah is **not** punished with death at the hand of Heaven?

PROOF

שנאמר "ומתו בו כי יחללהו" – פרט לזו שמחוללת ועומדת.

As it is stated: "**And they shall die therein if they desecrate it**", which serves to **exclude this** impure terumah, which is **already desecrated**. This implies that since it was already prohibited, the second prohibition of the impure Kohen does not take effect!

RESOLUTION

איבעית אימא: בעלמא איסור חל על איסור, ושאיני התם דמייעט רחמנא "ומתו בו".

The Gemara answers: **If you wish**, say that **in general**, a prohibition **does** take effect upon an existing prohibition, and it is **different there** regarding terumah, as the Merciful One excluded it by writing "and they shall die therein".

RESOLUTION

איבעית אימא: בעלמא קסבר שמואל אין איסור חל על איסור, ושאיני הקא דרבי רחמנא "גדי".

And if you wish, say instead that **in general**, Shmuel holds that a prohibition **does not** take effect upon an existing prohibition, and it is **different here** regarding meat and milk, as the Merciful One **explicitly included** them by repeating the word "kid".

RESOLUTION

ואיבעית אימא: הא דידיה, הא דרביה.

And if you wish, say that **this** statement regarding meat and milk is **his own** opinion, while **that** statement regarding terumah is **his teacher's**, Rabbi Elazar's, opinion.

QUESTION

בָּעָא מִיִּנְיָה רַב אַחַדְוֵי בַר אַמִּי מַרְב: הַמְכַשֵּׁל בְּחֶלֶב גְּדִי שֶׁלֹא הִנִּיקָהּ, מַהוּ?

Rav Achadvoi bar Ami asked of Rav: One who cooks meat in the milk of a young goat that has not yet nursed offspring, but has produced milk, what is the halacha?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: מִדְּאִיצְטְרִיקָא לְשִׁמוּאֵל לְמִימַר "בְּחֶלֶב אִמּוֹ" – וְלֹא בְּחֶלֶב זָכָר,

Rav said to him: From the fact that it was necessary for Shmuel to say that the phrase "in its mother's milk" teaches: and not in the milk of a male,

EXPLANATION

זָכָר הוּא דְלֹא אִתִּי לְכָלֵל אִם, אֲבָל הָאִי, כִּיּוֹן דְּבָא לְכָלֵל אִם – אָסוּר.

we infer that it is a male that is excluded, because it can never come to the category of a mother, but this young goat, since it will eventually come to the category of a mother, is prohibited.

STATEMENT

אֲתַמַּר: הַמְכַשֵּׁל חֶלֶב בְּחֶלֶב, רַבִּי אַמִּי וְרַבִּי אָסִי – חֵד אָמַר: לֹקָהּ, וְחֵד אָמַר: אֵינוֹ לֹקָהּ.

It was stated: One who cooks forbidden fat in milk, Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Assi argue about this; one says he is flogged, and one says he is not flogged.

INFERENCE

לִימָא בְּהָא קָמִיפְלָגִי, דִּמָּאן דְּאָמַר לֹקָה קְסָבַר: אִיסוּר חָל עַל אִיסוּר, וּמָאן דְּאָמַר אֵינוֹ לֹקָה קְסָבַר: אֵין אִיסוּר חָל עַל אִיסוּר.

The Gemara suggests: Shall we say that they argue about this: that the one who says he is flogged holds that a prohibition can take effect upon an existing prohibition, and the one who says he is not flogged holds that a prohibition cannot take effect upon an existing prohibition?

REFUTATION

לָא, דְּכוּלִּי עֲלָמָא אֵין אִיסוּר חָל עַל אִיסוּר, אֲאָכִילָה דְּכוּלִּי עֲלָמָא לָא פְּלִיגִי דְלָא לָקִי, כִּי פְּלִיגִי אֲבָשׁוּל.

The Gemara rejects this: No, everyone agrees that a prohibition does not take effect upon an existing prohibition, and regarding eating, everyone agrees that he is not flogged; they only argue regarding cooking.

EXPLANATION

מָאן דְּאָמַר לֹקָה – חֵד אִיסוּרָא הוּא, וּמָאן דְּאָמַר אֵינוֹ לֹקָה – לְהַכִּי אֲפָקָה רַחֲמֵנָא לְאֲכִילָה בְּלִשׁוֹן בִּישׁוּל,

The one who says he is flogged holds that cooking is a single prohibition that was never prohibited beforehand, and the one who says he is not flogged holds that the Merciful One expressed the prohibition of eating in the terms of cooking to show they are linked.

SUMMARY

The Gemara resolves the kasha on Rava by clarifying the exact cases of salted and unsalted fish in the braisa. It then discusses the halachos of salting meat, establishing that meat must be rinsed before salting to soften it and after salting to wash away the blood, and that it must be placed on a perforated vessel. After discussing whether intestines require salting and the prohibition of breaking an animal's neck before it dies, the Gemara transitions to a new Mishnah. This Mishnah teaches that putting poultry and cheese on the same table does not violate a Torah prohibition, leading into a discussion on the Rabbinic nature of the prohibition of poultry in milk, and the Torah-level parameters of basar b'chalav which only apply to kosher meat cooked in kosher milk.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, Shmuel teaches a powerful halachah in the name of Rabbi Chiyya: one who breaks the neck of an animal before its soul departs causes the blood to be absorbed in the limbs, which makes the meat heavier. The Gemara calls this 'gozel es habriyos', robbing the creations, because the butcher is selling blood under the guise of meat, charging people for weight that isn't actually food.

Look at the depth of this chiddush. The animal is already shechted, the meat is kosher, and the butcher is just trying to speed up the process. Yet, by rushing the natural process and forcing the blood back into the limbs, he is creating an illusion of substance. He is selling something that looks heavy and valuable on the scale, but is actually hollow and forbidden.

In our own avodas Hashem, we often face the temptation to 'make our meat heavy', to present ourselves to the world as spiritually weighty, full of substance, and deeply pious, when inside we might be rushing through our davening or neglecting our inner middos. We want the credit and the respect of being a 'heavyweight' without putting in the quiet, honest work of refining our neshama. This is a subtle form of 'gozel es habriyos', deceiving those around us and, ultimately, fooling ourselves.

Today, focus on absolute authenticity in one small area of your life. When you daven or learn, do it purely for Hashem, without looking around to see who is watching or trying to project an image of being more than you currently are. Let your weight be real.