

דף יומי • חלין • דף ע"ה

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by diving deeper into the status of a ben pekua (a fetus found alive inside a slaughtered animal) and whether a live creature can be considered "food" regarding the laws of tumah (ritual impurity). The Gemara brings down a fascinating machlokes between Beis Shammai, Beis Hillel, and Rabbi Akiva regarding when fish become susceptible to tumah, which leads to a deep discussion about the life force of fish and the halachic status of a tereifah fish.

Next, the shiur moves into a major machlokes between Rabbi Yochanan and Resh Lakish regarding a non-viable newborn animal or a nine-month-old fetus whose fat was torn away while still inside the womb. We explore what makes a fetus an independent animal—is it the completion of its months of gestation, or is it the physical passage through the birth canal? We also learn how this affects the status of its chelev (forbidden fat) and whether such fat is offered on the Mizbe'ach.

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

עמוד א' DAF 75A

RESOLUTION

בשחיטה יבשית, ודלא כרבי שמעון.

The baraita is referring to a **dry slaughter** where no blood was emitted, and this baraita is **not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon**, who holds that the slaughter itself renders the meat susceptible to impurity even without liquid.

QUESTION

מאן תנא עבר בנהר הוכשר, הלה לבית הקברות נטמא?

Who is the tanna of the baraita who taught: If a live ben pekua passed through a river and was wetted, it was thereby rendered susceptible to impurity, and if it then went to a cemetery, it became ritually impure?

ANSWER

אמר רבי יוחנן: רבי יוסי הגלילי היא, דתנא: רבי שמעון בן אلعזר אומר משום רבי יוסי הגלילי: מטמא טומאת אכלים, וצריק הקשר.

Rabbi Yochanan said: It is Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, as it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says in the name of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili: The meat of a ben pekua can become impure with the impurity of foods, but it requires susceptibility through liquid first.

BRAISA

וחכמים אומרים: אינו מטמא טומאת אכלין, מפני שהוא חי, וכל שהוא חי אינו מטמא טומאת אכלין.

But the Sages say: It cannot become impure with the impurity of foods because it is alive, and anything that is alive cannot become impure with the impurity of foods.

STATEMENT

ואַזְדָּא רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְטַעְמִיהּ, דָּאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי וּבֵית שַׁמַּאי אָמְרוּ דְּבַר אֶחָד.

And Rabbi Yochanan follows his standard line of reasoning, as Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and Beis Shammai said the same thing, that a live creature can be considered food.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי – הָא דְאָמַרְנָן.

The opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili is that which we just said in the baraita.

EXPLANATION

בֵּית שַׁמַּאי, דְּתַנּוּ: דָּגִים, מֵאִמְתִּי מְקַבְּלִין טוּמְאָה? בֵּית שַׁמַּאי אוֹמְרִים: מִשְׁיָצוּדוֹ, וּבֵית הֵלֵל אוֹמְרִים: מִשְׁיָמוּתוֹ. רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא אוֹמֵר: מִשְׁעָה שֶׁאֵין יָכוֹלִין לְחַיּוֹת.

The opinion of Beis Shammai is as we learned in a Mishnah: Fish, from when do they become susceptible to impurity as food? Beis Shammai say: From when they are caught, even while alive, and Beis Hillel say: From when they die. Rabbi Akiva says: From the moment they are unable to live.

QUESTION

מַאי בִּינְיָהוּ?

What is the practical difference between them, between Beis Hillel and Rabbi Akiva?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: דָּג מְקַרְטַע אֵיכָא בִּינְיָהוּ.

Rabbi Yochanan said: A convulsing fish is the difference between them; Rabbi Akiva deems it susceptible, while Beis Hillel require actual death.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַב חֲסִידָא: נוֹלְדוּ בְּדָגִים סִימְנֵי טְרֵפָה, מָהוּ?

Rav Chisda raised a dilemma: If symptoms of a tereifah developed in fish, what is the halachah according to Rabbi Akiva? Is it considered dead and susceptible to impurity?

EXPLANATION

תִּיבְעֵי לְמַאן דָּאָמַר טְרֵפָה חַיָּה, וְתִיבְעֵי לְמַאן דָּאָמַר טְרֵפָה אֵינָה חַיָּה.

You can raise the dilemma according to the one who says a tereifah can live, and you can raise the dilemma according to the one who says a tereifah cannot live.

EXPLANATION

תִּיבְעֵי לְמַאן דָּאָמַר טְרֵפָה חַיָּה, בְּהֶמָּה הוּא דְנִפְיִשָּׁא חַיּוּתָהּ, אַבָּל דָּגִים דְּלֹא נִפְיִשָּׁא חַיּוּתָּיהוּ – לֹא, אוּ דִילְמָא אִפִּילוּ לְמַאן דָּאָמַר טְרֵפָה אֵינָה חַיָּה, הֲנִי מִלְּי בְּהֶמָּה דִּישׁ בְּמִינָה שְׁחִיטָה, אַבָּל דָּגִים

דאין במינן שחיטה – אימא לא.

You can raise the dilemma according to the one who says a tereifah can live: Perhaps only an animal is able to live because its life force is strong, but fish, whose life force is not strong, cannot live, and thus are considered dead. Or perhaps, even according to the one who says a tereifah cannot live, these words apply only to an animal, in whose species slaughter applies, so the Torah treats a tereifah as dead to invalidate its slaughter; but fish, in whose species slaughter does not apply, say that a tereifah is not considered dead.

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

STATEMENT

הטילה נפל, רבי יוחנן אמר: חלבו כחלב בהמה, ורבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר: חלבו כחלב חיה.

If an animal expelled a non-viable newborn, Rabbi Yochanan said: Its fat is like the fat of a domesticated animal and is forbidden under penalty of kares, and Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Its fat is like the fat of a wild animal, which is permitted.

EXPLANATION

רבי יוחנן אמר: חלבו כחלב בהמה – אוירא גרים.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Its fat is like the fat of a domesticated animal, because the air of the womb's opening causes it to be considered born and independent.

EXPLANATION

רבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר: חלבו כחלב חיה – חדשים גרמי.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Its fat is like the fat of a wild animal, because completing the months of gestation causes it to be independent, and this fetus did not complete them.

STATEMENT

איפא דאמרי: כל היכא דלא פלו לו חדשיו – לא פלום הוא.

Some say a different version of the dispute: Anywhere that its months were not completed, it is nothing, and all agree its fat is permitted.

EXPLANATION

כי פליגי – היכא דהושיט ידו למעי בהמה, ותלש חלב של בן תשעה חי ואכל.

Where they disagree is where one inserted his hand into the womb of an animal, and tore away the fat of a live nine-month-old fetus and ate it.

EXPLANATION

רבי יוחנן אמר: חלבו כחלב בהמה, חדשים גרמי.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Its fat is like the fat of a domesticated animal, because the months of gestation alone cause it to be independent.

EXPLANATION

רבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר: חֶלְבוֹ כְּחֶלֶב חַיָּה, חֲדָשִׁים וְאוֹרָא גֵרָמִי.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Its fat is like the fat of a wild animal, because both the months and the air of the birth canal cause it to be independent, and this one was not born.

OBJECTION

אֵיתִיבִיה רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן לְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ: מָה חֶלֶב וְשֵׁתִי כְּלִיּוֹת הָאֲמוּרוֹת בְּאֶשָּׁם – מוֹצֵא מִכָּלֵל שְׁלִיל, אֲףֹ כָּל – מוֹצֵא מִכָּלֵל שְׁלִיל.

Rabbi Yochanan challenged Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish from a baraita: Just as the fat and the two kidneys stated regarding a guilt-offering are excluded from the category of a fetus (since a guilt-offering is only a male), so too all offerings' fats are excluded from the category of a fetus.

EXPLANATION

בְּשִׁלְמָא לְדִידִי, הֵיִינוּ דְּאִיצְטְרִיהּ קְרָא לְמַעוּטִי, אֶלָּא לְדִידְךָ. אַמַּאי אִיצְטְרִיהּ?

Granted according to my view, this is why a verse was needed to exclude it, because the fat is otherwise forbidden. But according to your view that it is permitted, why was a verse needed to exclude it from the altar?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: טַעְמָא דִּידִי נָמִי מִהֲכָא.

Resh Lakish said to him: My reason is also from here; this verse is the source that the fat of a fetus is not forbidden at all.

OBJECTION

וְאִיכָּא דְּאָמְרִי, אֵיתִיבִיה רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מָה חֶלֶב וְשֵׁתִי כְּלִיּוֹת הָאֲמוּרוֹת בְּאֶשָּׁם מוֹצֵא מִכָּלֵל שְׁלִיל, אֲףֹ כָּל – מוֹצֵא מִכָּלֵל שְׁלִיל.

And some say, Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish challenged Rabbi Yochanan from that baraita: Just as the fat and the two kidneys stated regarding a guilt-offering are excluded from the category of a fetus, so too all offerings' fats are excluded from the category of a fetus.

EXPLANATION

בְּשִׁלְמָא לְדִידִי, מְשׁוּם הָכִי מִיעֲטִיה רַחֲמָנָא, אֶלָּא לְדִידְךָ – לִיקְרֹב?

Granted according to my view, because of this the Merciful One excluded it, as it is not considered sacrificial fat. But according to your view that it is forbidden fat, should it not be offered on the altar?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: מִיַּדִּי דְּהִנּוּה אֲמַחוּסְרָ זְמַן.

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: It is just as it is with an animal that lacks the proper time, which is forbidden for the altar but its fat is still forbidden to eat.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי אָמִי: הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַטְּרֵפָה וּמָצָא בָּהּ בֶּן תִּשְׁעָה חֳדָי, לְדִבְרֵי הָאוֹסֵר – מִתִּיר, לְדִבְרֵי הַמֵּתִיר – אוֹסֵר.

Rabbi Ami said: One who slaughters a tereifah animal and finds in it a live nine-month-old fetus, according to the words of the one who forbids a ben pekua without its own slaughter, the mother's slaughter permits it; according to the words of the one who permits a ben pekua without slaughter, the mother's slaughter forbids it.

STATEMENT

רַבָּא אָמַר: לְדִבְרֵי הַמֵּתִיר נִמְי מוֹתֵר, אֲרַבְעָה סִמְנִין אֲכֻשָׁר בִּיה רַחֲמָנָא.

Rava said: According to the words of the one who permits, it is also permitted, because the Merciful One declared fit four signs in it—either the mother's two signs or its own two signs.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַטְּרֵפָה, וּמָצָא בָּהּ בֶּן תִּשְׁעָה חֳדָי –

Rav Chisda said: One who slaughters a tereifah animal and finds in it a live nine-month-old fetus —

עמוד ב' DAF 75B

STATEMENT

טָעוֹן שְׁחִיטָה, וְחַיִּיב בְּזִרְוֹעַ וְהַלְחִיִּים וְהַקֶּבֶה, וְאִם מֵת – טָהוֹר מִלְּטֵמָא בְּמַשָּׂא.

The live nine-month-old fetus requires slaughter to permit it for eating, and it is obligated in the priestly gifts of the foreleg, and the jaws, and the maw, and if it dies without slaughter, it is pure from imparting impurity through carrying, as it does not have the status of a carcass.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה רַבָּא: טָעוֹן שְׁחִיטָה – כְּמָאן? כְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר, וְאִם מֵת טָהוֹר מִלְּטֵמָא בְּמַשָּׂא – כְּמָאן? כְּרַבְנִן.

Rava said to him, to Rav Chisda: Your ruling is contradictory! When you say it requires slaughter, according to whom is this? It is according to Rabbi Meir, who holds that the mother's slaughter does not permit a live nine-month fetus. And when you say if it dies it is pure from imparting impurity through carrying, according to whom is this? It is according to the Rabbis, who hold that the mother's slaughter does affect it. Can you rule in accordance with two opposing views?

OBJECTION

וְלִיטְעָמִיהּ, הָא דְתַנִּי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַטְּרֵפָה וּמָצָא בָּהּ בֶּן תִּשְׁעָה חֳדָי – טָעוֹן שְׁחִיטָה, וְחַיִּיב בְּזִרְוֹעַ וְהַלְחִיִּים וְהַקֶּבֶה, וְאִם מֵת – טָהוֹר מִלְּטֵמָא בְּמַשָּׂא.

Rav Chisda replied: And according to your reasoning, how will you explain that which Rabbi Chiyya taught in a braisa: One who slaughters a tereifah animal and found in it a live nine-month-old fetus, the fetus requires slaughter, and is obligated in the gifts of the foreleg, and the jaws, and the maw, and if it dies without slaughter, it is pure from imparting impurity through carrying.

EXPLANATION

טָעוֹן שְׁחִיטָה כְּמָאן? כְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר, וְאִם מֵת – טָהוֹר מִלְּטֵמָא בְּמַשָּׂא, כְּרַבְנִן.

Here too, we must ask: When it says it **requires slaughter, according to whom** is this? It is **according to Rabbi Meir**. And when it says **if it dies**, it is **pure from imparting impurity through carrying**, according to whom is this? It is **according to the Rabbis!** Thus, the same difficulty applies to Rabbi Chiyya's braisa.

ANSWER

הָא לָא קִשְׁיָא, רַבִּי חִיְיָא אִם פְּכָר מְצָאוּ מֵת קֹאמֵר, אֲלָא לְדִידָהּ קִשְׁיָא!

Rava answered: **That is not difficult**, because **Rabbi Chiyya is speaking** of a case **where he already found it dead** inside the mother. In that case, even Rabbi Meir agrees that the mother's slaughter purifies it from nevelah impurity. **But according to you**, who hold that even if it was found alive and died later it is pure, the contradiction **is difficult!**

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: לְדִידֵי נָמִי לָא קִשְׁיָא, אֲרַבְעָה סִימָנִים אֲכִשֵּׁר בֵּיהּ רַחֲמָנָא.

Rav Chisda **said to him: According to my view also, it is not difficult**, because the entire ruling is in accordance with the Rabbis, and the reason it requires slaughter is that **the Merciful One made four simanim fit for it**. That is, the Torah allows a fetus to be permitted either by the two simanim of its mother's slaughter or by the two simanim of its own slaughter.

STATEMENT

כִּי סָלִיק רַבִּי זֵירָא, אֲשַׁכְּחִיהּ לְרַב אָסִי דִּיתֵיב וְקֹאמֵר לֵיהּ לְהָא שְׁמַעְתָּא.

The Gemara relates: **When Rabbi Zeira went up** to Eretz Yisrael, **he found Rav Assi sitting and stating this halachah** of Rav Chisda, that the Torah fit four simanim for a fetus.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לֵיהּ: יֵישֵׁר, וְכֵן אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן.

Rav Assi **said to him: It is correct**, and so said Rabbi Yochanan.

QUESTION

מִכָּלֵל דְּפִלִּיג עָלֵיהּ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ?

Rabbi Zeira asked: Is it **by implication** from your specifying Rabbi Yochanan's name **that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish disagrees with him?**

ANSWER

מִשְׁחָא הָוָה שְׁהִי לֵיהּ וְשִׁתִּיק לֵיהּ, וְאִיפָא דְאָמְרִי: מִשְׁתָּא הָוָה שְׁתִּי וְשִׁתִּיק לֵיהּ.

Rav Assi replied: When Rabbi Yochanan said this, Reish Lakish **was waiting for him** to see if he would retract, **and** so he **remained silent to him**, and I do not know if he ultimately agreed. **And some say** that Rav Assi said: Reish Lakish **was drinking** wine at the time, **and** therefore **he remained silent to him**, so we cannot infer his opinion.

QUESTION

רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן שְׁזוּרִי אוֹמֵר: אֶפִּילוּ וְכוּ'. הֵינֵנו תַּנָּא קַמָּא!

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: Even** if a nine-month fetus emerged alive and is now five years old and plowing, it does not require slaughter. The Gemara asks: This **is identical to** the view of **the first tanna**, the Rabbis! What is the difference between them?

ANSWER

אמר רב כהנא: הפרים על גבי קרקע איכא בינייהו.

Rav Kahana said: The case where the fetus stood upon the ground with its hooves is the difference between them. The Rabbis rabbinically require slaughter once it walks on the ground, whereas Rabbi Shimon Shezuri permits it without slaughter even then.

STATEMENT

אמר רב משרשיא: לדברי האומר חוששין לזרע האב, בן פקועה הפא על בהמה מעלייתה – הולד אין לו תקנה.

Rav Mesharshiyya said: According to the words of the one who says we are concerned for the seed of the father in determining the status of the offspring, if a ben pekua, which does not require slaughter, mated with a normal animal that requires slaughter, the offspring has no rectification. It cannot be permitted by slaughter because of its father's side, and it cannot be permitted without slaughter because of its mother's side.

STATEMENT

אמר אביי: הכל מודים בקלוט בן פקועה שמוותר, מאי טעמא? כל מלתא דתמיהא מידכר דכירי לה אינשי.

Abaye said: Everyone agrees regarding a single-hoofed animal born of a ben pekua mother that it is permitted without slaughter even if it walked on the ground. What is the reason? Any matter that is wondrous, people remember it, and they will not mistakenly permit normal animals.

STATEMENT

איכא דאמרי: אמר אביי: הכל מודים בקלוט בן קלוטה בן פקועה שמוותר, מאי טעמא? תרי תמיהי מידכר דכירי אינשי.

Some say that Abaye said: Everyone agrees regarding a single-hoofed animal born of a single-hoofed ben pekua mother that it is permitted without slaughter. What is the reason? Two wondrous things, people surely remember.

STATEMENT

אמר זעירי אמר רבי חנינא: הלכה כרבי שמעון שזורי, וכן היה רבי שמעון שזורי מתיר בבנו ובן בנו עד סוף כל הדורות.

Ze'eiri said that Rabbi Chanina said: The halachah is like Rabbi Shimon Shezuri that a ben pekua requires no slaughter even if it walked on the ground, and so did Rabbi Shimon Shezuri permit its offspring, and the offspring of its offspring, until the end of all generations without slaughter.

STATEMENT

רבי יוחנן אמר: הוא מותר, ובנו אסור.

Rabbi Yochanan said: It, the ben pekua itself, is permitted without slaughter, but its offspring is forbidden unless it undergoes ritual slaughter.

STATEMENT

אדא בר חבו הוה ליה בן פקועה דנפל דיבא עליה, אתא לקמיה דרב אשי.

The Gemara relates: **Adda bar Chavu had a ben pekua upon which a wolf fell** and mauled it, and it was about to die. **He came before Rav Ashi** to ask how to render it permitted.

RULING

אמר ליה: זיל שחטיה.

Rav Ashi said to him: **Go and slaughter it** so that you may eat it, in accordance with the Rabbis who require slaughter once it walks on the ground.

QUESTION

אמר ליה: האמר זעירי אמר רבי חנינא: הלכה כרבי שמעון שזורי, וכן היה רבי שמעון שזורי מתיר בבנו ובן בנו עד סוף כל הדורות, ואפילו רבי יוחנן לא קאמר אלא בנו, אבל איהו לא!

Adda bar Chavu said to him: **But did not Ze'eiri say in the name of Rabbi Chanina that the halachah is like Rabbi Shimon Shezuri, and so did Rabbi Shimon Shezuri permit its offspring and the offspring of its offspring until the end of all generations? And even Rabbi Yochanan only said his prohibition regarding its offspring, but regarding the ben pekua itself, he did not forbid it! Why then do I need to slaughter it?**

ANSWER

אמר ליה: רבי יוחנן לדברי רבי שמעון שזורי קאמר.

Rav Ashi said to him: **Rabbi Yochanan did not actually agree with Rabbi Shimon Shezuri; he only stated his ruling according to the words of Rabbi Shimon Shezuri**, to explain his view, but Rabbi Yochanan himself rules like the Rabbis.

QUESTION

והאמר רבין בר חנינא אמר עולא אמר רבי חנינא: הלכה כרבי שמעון שזורי, ולא עוד, אלא כל מקום ששנה רבי שמעון שזורי במשנתנו – הלכה כמותו!

Adda bar Chavu asked: **But did not Ravin bar Chanina say that Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Chanina: The halachah is like Rabbi Shimon Shezuri, and not only that, but anywhere that Rabbi Shimon Shezuri taught in our Mishnah, the halachah is like him!**

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אנא כי הא סבירא לי, דאמר רבי יונתן: הלכה כרבי שמעון שזורי במסוכן, ובתרומת מעשר של דמאי.

Rav Ashi said to him: **I hold like this other opinion, as Rabbi Yonatan said: The halachah is like Rabbi Shimon Shezuri only in the case of one in danger of death who orders a get, and in the case of the tithe-of-the-tithe of demai-produce.**

EXPLANATION

מסוכן, דתנן: בראשונה היו אומרים, היוצא בקולר ואמר: "כתבו גט לאשתי", הרי אלו יכתבו ויתנו. חזרו לומר: אף המפרש והיוצא בשירא. רבי שמעון בן שזורי אומר: אף המסוכן.

The Gemara explains: The case of **one in danger of death** is as we learned in a Mishnah: At first they would say, one who is **led out in chains** to be executed and said, "Write a get for my wife," they should write and give it. They retraced their steps to say: Even one who sets sail on a ship, and one who goes out in a caravan. Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: Even one who is dangerously ill.

EXPLANATION

תְּרוּמַת מַעֲשֵׂר שֶׁל דִּמְאִי, דִּתְנִן: תְּרוּמַת מַעֲשֵׂר שֶׁל דִּמְאִי שֶׁחֲזָרָה לְמִקְוָמָהּ, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן שְׁזוּרִי
אוֹמֵר: אִם בָּחֹל שׁוֹאֵל וְאוֹכֵל עַל פִּיו.

And the case of **the tithe-of-the-tithe of demai** is as we learned in a Mishnah: **The tithe-of-the-tithe of demai that fell back into its place** and became mixed with chullin, **Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: Even on a weekday, one may ask** the am ha'aretz seller if he tithed it, **and eat it based on his word.**

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara clarifies that according to Rabbi Yosei HaGelili and Beis Shammai, a live creature can indeed be considered food and become tamei once wetted by liquid. We then analyze a dispute between Rabbi Yochanan and Resh Lakish regarding the chelev of a fetus, debating whether gestation or birth determines its status as an independent animal. Finally, the Gemara discusses the halachah of a live, nine-month-old fetus found inside a slaughtered tereifah animal, examining whether the mother's shechitah permits it, and Rav Chisda's ruling that such a fetus requires its own shechitah to be eaten, is obligated in the priestly gifts, but does not convey the tumah of a carcass if it dies without shechitah.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In today's sugya, we find a fascinating dispute between Rabbi Yochanan and Resh Lakish about what defines a newborn animal's status. Rabbi Yochanan holds that "the air of the womb's opening causes it" (avira garem), the moment the fetus emerges and meets the outside air, it is transformed into an independent entity. Resh Lakish, on the other hand, holds that "the months of gestation cause it" (chodashim garmi), it is the slow, hidden, internal process of time and development that truly defines its status.

This machlokes contains a profound lesson for our own avodah. In life, we often look for the "avira garem" moments, the sudden, dramatic breakthroughs, the public milestones, or the external shifts that we hope will instantly change who we are. But the Torah is teaching us the deep truth of "chodashim garmi." Real, lasting spiritual growth is an internal process that requires time, patience, and quiet consistency. You cannot rush the months of gestation in your own neshama.

When you are working on a middah, learning a difficult piece of Gemara, or trying to improve your tefillah, do not get discouraged if you do not see an immediate, dramatic transformation. The Aibershter designs growth to happen quietly, beneath the surface, day by day, through the steady accumulation of small efforts.

Today, choose one small spiritual goal, like learning for ten minutes without looking at your phone, or pausing before a brachah, and focus on doing it consistently, trusting that the quiet, hidden process is building something real inside of you.