מהדורת משפחת ברייטמן
BRAITMAN FAMILY EDITION

תמצית ערוך השולחן

TAMTZIS ARUCH HASHULCHAN

A Concise Summary of the Dinim of the Aruch HaShulchan

YOREH DEAH · VOLUME I · SIMANIM 1–202

Shechitah • Treifos • Melichah • Basar B'Chalav • Ta'aruvos
Ma'achalei Akum • Niddah • Tevilah • Mikvaos

Concise practical rulings, with source references and explanatory notes from the Chochmas Adam, Pischei Teshuva and later poskim

Kesser Shem Tov
PUBLISHING

Tamtzis Aruch HaShulchan — A Concise Summary of the Dinim of the Aruch HaShulchan
Yoreh De'ah, Volume I — Kashrus, Issur v'Heter & Taharah

Elucidation and digest © 2026 Kesser Shem Tov Publishing
All rights reserved.

The Hebrew text of the *Aruch HaShulchan* was sourced from Sefaria (sefaria.org) and is in the public domain.
The English digest, source notes, and layout are original to this edition.

ISBN: 979-8-1884200-6-2

First edition

Kesser Shem Tov Publishing
For inquiries and permissions: publisher@kessershemtov.org

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER AND NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

The Nature of this Work
This volume presents an English elucidation and commentary generated through the utilization of frontier Artificial Intelligence (AI) models. While the technology employed has been rigorously configured to adhere strictly to Orthodox Jewish *hashkafa* and meticulously prompted to maintain fidelity to the original Hebrew text, this work **does not represent, nor is it comparable to,** the output of a traditional team of rabbinical scholars and professional editors.

Usage and Limitations
This translation is intended solely as a tool to assist advanced learners in accessing the depth of the original work. It is **not** intended as a replacement of the original Hebrew source, nor does it carry the authority of a standard rabbinic translation reviewed by leading Torah authorities.

Despite the safeguards implemented to prevent errors and "hallucinations" common to AI models, the nuance of Torah study often transcends algorithmic interpretation. Therefore:

1. **Verification:** Any novel insight, ruling, or conclusion drawn from this translation should be checked against the original Hebrew.
2. **Consultation:** All practical questions or derived lessons should be discussed with and verified by a qualified rabbinic authority before being relied upon.

The goal of this edition is to make these works accessible to a wider audience, but the responsibility for accurate understanding and practical application remains with the reader.



מוקדש לעילוי נשמת
הורינו היקרים

דבורה בת זוסיע ז״ל
דוב צבי בן יעקב הלוי ז״ל

משה אהרן ורעיתו פייגל ברייטמן

In everlasting memory of our dear parents

Devorah bas Zusya · Dov Tzvi ben Yaakov HaLevi

Dedicated by Moshe Aharon and Faigie Braitman



egory; two of the same name — a blister and a blister, or an adhesion and an adhesion, or the like — is not *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §22)

- A doubtful *tarti l'ri'usa* is *kosher*. (AH §22; Tevuos Shor)
- Where there is a straw's or two hairs' gap between the defects [that removes joining], the membrane between them must be sound and whole; but if it is much spoiled they are as one, and if it is doubtful whether it is sound, it is like a doubtful *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §22; Levushei Serad)

The law of a suspended adhesion emerging from a *tinari* is *kosher*, and all the more so from a *morsa*. (AH §22; Siman 39)

Two Adjacent Blisters

Two blisters adjacent to one another are *tereifah* by Talmudic law, and no examination helps. (AH §23; *Chullin* 47a)

- One reason: their adjacency results from a puncture in the lung that raised these blisters around it; even if we examine and find no puncture, we say a membrane grew and sealed it. (AH §23; Rashi; Ra'ah, Bedek HaBayis)
- Some give the reason: since they are adjacent and each presses upon the other, the skin will ultimately be punctured, and it is as if punctured now. (AH §23; Ran and Rashba)

By the first reason, everything depends on whether they are adjacent **at the root**; if their roots are not adjacent even though they widen and touch at their tops, it is *kosher* — but by the second reason it is *tereifah*, for their tops press one another. (AH §24; Simlah Chadashah)

By the first reason there must be a gap of a thin straw's width, or at least two hairs' width, between them; by the second reason, so long as they do not press one another it is *kosher* even with less; and one should be stringent according to both reasons, this being a *Torah* prohibition. (AH §24)

In the gap between them there must be the appearance of the lung without discharge; if there is discharge in the gap — even though such color is itself among the *kosher* appearances — they are considered adjacent. (AH §24; Shach and Taz §8)[189]

- All the more so if a *tinari* or *morsa* lies in the gap. (AH §24)

A Blister Adjacent to a Growth or Abscess

A blister with a *tinari*, or a blister with a *morsa*, or two growths, or two abscesses, or two blisters full of air, adjacent to one another — by the first reason it is *kosher*, since a puncture raises only two blisters; by the second reason it may be *tereifah* since they press one another. (AH §25; Taz §4; Pri Chadash §9)

- Some hold that even by the second reason only two blisters are *tereifah*, for a *tinari* is hard, stays in place, and does not press the blister; and likewise two growths or two abscesses, and blisters full of air, are *kosher*. (AH §25; Nekudos HaKesef; Bach)

The Rema ruled unqualifiedly that a blister with a *tinari* is *kosher* — implying *kosher* according to all the reasons. (AH §25; Rema; Simlah Chadashah)

- Some require that the *tinari* not have the appearance of discharge, but this is incorrect; even if it has discharge it is *kosher*. (AH §25; Tevuos Shor §15)

Two Adjacent Blisters With Clear Fluid

The Tur holds that two adjacent blisters are *tereifah* even with clear fluid, while some early authorities permit them with clear fluid. (AH §26; Tur; Beis Yosef)

The Rema: **some permit even two adjacent blisters** if their fluid is clear, limpid, and sweet, and one follows the custom in this, or acts according to the loss and pressing circumstances; blisters at the lower edge of the lung with clear fluid have the same law as adjacent ones. (AH §26; Rema)

- In a case of loss and pressing need one may permit even where there is no established custom. (AH §26)

Since [the Rema] required 'limpid and sweet,' if the fluid is bitter or salty it is *tereifah* even when clear. (AH §27)

The examiners' manuals require that such clear-fluid blisters have their own [separate] sac, peel off the lung, emit no air when punctured, and that the blister's skin be white — including the sac being white on the inside and the blister's skin white on the inside; and additionally one must open the blisters, pour out the fluid, and taste it. If clear, limpid, and sweet, one may permit where there is a custom to permit, or in a case of loss together with pressing need. (AH §27; Shach §15)

- When opening the blisters, one should not use a knife, for iron spoils the fluid making it salty; rather puncture with a wooden thorn. Likewise one should not taste the fluid off his hand, for the hand embitters it; rather put it in a vessel and taste it. (AH §27; Pri Chadash and Simlah Chadashah)
- If he did puncture with a knife and poured it into his hand and it is clear, limpid, and sweet, it is certainly *kosher*. (AH §27)

Lechatchilah one should do all that was described; the tasting is indispensable even *bedieved*, and it is the essential factor. (AH §28)

- If he tested by tasting and found it clear, limpid, and sweet, but forgot to check the sac's signs — some forbid, but some permit, and this appears to be the essential view. (AH §28; Simlah Chadashah; Levushei Serad §29)
- If he checked and there was no separate sac, it is certainly difficult to permit, though the Rema did not mention this at all, and it requires further study. (AH §28; Levushei Serad)

Some hold that even those lenient with clear fluid permit only when both blisters are clear; but if one is full of discharge it is *tereifah*. (AH §29; Simlah Chadashah)

- Some disagree, since when one is clear it is like a blister with a *tinari*; and in a case of great loss and pressing need even the first view concedes to permit. (AH §29; Levushei Serad §30)

If inflation raised the lung's skin over the blisters, it is doubtful whether one may permit two adjacent blisters; regarding an adhesion from a blister one certainly permits, but as to

Notes

189. see *Pischei Teshuva* (citing the *Beis Efraim* §11), that even a sizable gap between blisters does not help if it lacks lung-color — they are still judged as adjacent.

two adjacent blisters — which is Talmudic law — it is doubtful, and great later authorities were in doubt about this. (AH §29; Simlah Chadashah; Levushei Serad §35)

With two adjacent blisters there is no distinction whether they are large or small, or one small and one large. (AH §29)

A Blister on a Groove or Fold; Blisters and Growths Facing Each Other

A blister sitting on a groove or on a fold renders the animal *tereifah*, since it is treated like two adjacent blisters (*trei bu'ei desmichi*). (AH §30; Rema)

- This applies specifically when the blister sits directly on the groove or fold itself; adjacent to them there is no concern. (AH §33)
- With clear fluid, however, it is *kosher* even according to those who forbid two adjacent blisters with clear fluid, and without the conditions required there, since this law is not in the *Gemara*. (AH §31)

Two blisters facing each other between two lobes — the lung is *kosher*; even though the lobes lie against one another they are not judged as adjacent blisters, for they are not on one lobe and will not damage one another. (AH §32)

A blister facing a *tinari* in this manner renders it *tereifah*, since the hard *tinari* knocks against the blister opposite it through the lung's constant motion and is liable to puncture it. (AH §33)

- This is not helped even where the blister is of clear fluid, since the concern is the knocking of the *tinari*. (AH §33)
- If through inflation the color of lung tissue rises over the blister, it is *kosher*, for it is no longer a blister. (AH §33)
- A *tinari* facing a *tinari* in this manner is *kosher*, since both are hard and will not puncture one another. (AH §33)
- A *morsa* (soft swelling level with the lung tissue) facing a blister has no concern, for the *morsa* will not knock the blister. (AH §33)

One Blister That Appears as Two

A single blister that appears to be two — such as when there is a split down its middle — is tested by taking a thorn and piercing it on one side: if the fluid flows from one to the other it is one blister and *kosher*; if not, they are two and it is *tereifah*. (AH §34; *Chullin* 47a)

Some hold that even if the fluid does flow across, one must check whether there are two separate sacs; two sacs is a clear sign of two blisters, and the flow across only means a hole formed between them. (AH §34; Shach)

- Where they do not flow into one another, even in a single sac it is *tereifah*; and with two actual blisters the flow across does not help. (AH §34; Shach)
- One should be stringent like this view, since the *Gemara* mentioned only the test of flowing across, and with two sacs it is *tereifah* in all cases. (AH §34)
- If, however, he did not check for the sacs, this does not invalidate after the fact when the fluid flows across. (AH §34)

If they were pierced and do not flow into one another, yet inflating one caused the second to rise as well, or placing fluid in one filled the other — this is a clear sign that they are one, and it is *kosher*. (AH §34; Be'er Heitev)

- Some hold that when they do not flow into one another it is *tereifah* in all cases, even if one rises through inflating the other or fluid passes across, for we assume a small hole between them. (AH §34)

A Blister at the Lung's Edge (Shipulei)

A blister found at the edge (*shipulei*) of the lung is forbidden if no lung tissue — even as thin as a hair — surrounds it entirely. (AH §35; Halachos Gedolos)

What is called *shipulei*: some say it is only the bottom of the *uma* or lobe, the hanging edge opposite the rooted side; (AH §37) and some say any place with a point (*chidud*) is called *shipulei* — every cut in the lung, whether at the lobes or *umos*, even above where the lung adheres to the spine opposite the cut of the lobes, since the lung is sharp there, but opposite the *umos* where the lung is wide it is not *shipulei*; and one follows local custom in this. (AH §37)

- This concern applies specifically to a blister; a *tinari* at the edge is *kosher*. (AH §37)
- One authority holds that a blister smaller than a thumb's breadth is *kosher*, but from all the *poskim* it appears there is no distinction between large and small, and this is the main view. (AH §37)

When lung tissue surrounds it, even a single hair's-breadth of tissue suffices, and it is *kosher*. (AH §38)

- One may perform any stratagem to raise a surrounding thread of tissue — if plain inflation does not raise one, one re-inflates while working the sides of the blister with the hand; if a thread of tissue thereby rises, it is *kosher*. (AH §38)
- This requires that the surrounding ring show the color of lung tissue, though many great authorities permit even without lung color, provided it is not one of the invalidating colors of *Siman 38*. (AH §38)
- If the color cannot be determined because the thread is so fine, it is to be permitted, since these *poskim* treat this as not being a law of the *Gemara*. The *Aruch HaShulchan* himself grounds the edge-blister rule in the *Gemara*'s *trei bu'ei desmichi*, though the leniencies here follow the *poskim* who treat it as extra-Talmudic. (AH §36; §38)
- But with two adjacent blisters one may not be lenient in this, since that is a law of the *Gemara*. (AH §38)

Edge-Blister Cut Before Inspection

If a blister found at the edge was cut off before it could be inflated and checked for a surrounding thread of tissue, so it cannot be examined, it is *tereifah*. (AH §39)

- This is only where it was not seen before inflation whether tissue surrounded it; but if a surrounding thread was seen — even though one should ideally inflate and verify it holds under inflation — after the fact it is *kosher*. (AH §39)
- Some permit even if it was not seen at all before being cut, and one may rely on them in a case of great loss, since this is

not a law of the *Gemara*. (AH §39)

- If, however, the blister was torn intentionally, it is to be forbidden. (AH §39)

If two witnesses say they inflated it and no thread surrounded it, and two others say they inflated it and a thread did surround it, it is to be permitted, for one may say the second pair's breath was stronger and raised a thread; they are not treated as contradicting one another. (AH §40)

- If in a single inflation they contradict — these say there is a surrounding thread and these say there is not — it is a genuine contradiction, though some are lenient even here since this is not a law of the *Gemara*. (AH §40)

An edge-blister of clear fluid — in places where clear-fluid adjacent blisters are permitted — is certainly *kosher*; one full of air is *kosher*. (AH §40)

A Blister Passing From Side to Side

A blister recognizable on the other side of the lung, even where the fluid does not flow across, is *kosher* — provided it is not in the region of the *simponos*. (AH §41)

- This holds because two blisters on opposite sides are not judged as adjacent blisters, and even where they do flow across it is likewise permitted outside the *simpon* region. (AH §43)

If it stands in the *simpon* region — namely, two fingers from the edge in a small animal and four in a large one — the custom is to forbid, and one should not deviate, even with clear fluid, provided the fluid flows across. (AH §41)

- But if the fluid does not flow across it is *kosher* even with turbid or foul fluid, for then they are two separate blisters, each between skin and flesh, not reaching the *simponos*. (AH §41)
- Where the fluid does flow across in the *simpon* region, it is *tereifah* in all cases, even with clear fluid, and even *simpon*-inspection does not help — for a blister is worse than a lung that poured out like a flask. (AH §43)

A blister under the *vered* (accessory lobe) in the thin place, where there is a *simpon* present, is *tereifah* passing from side to side when the fluid flows across, because of the concern of damaging the *simpon*; and all the more so above the edge in the *vered* it is *tereifah* as in all the lobes. (AH §41; §43)

- Accordingly, the leniency of a surrounding thread of tissue for an edge-blister in the rest of the lung does not apply in the *vered*. (AH §43; Taz)

A *tinari* passing from side to side is *tereifah* because of the concern of the *simponos*. (AH §43)[190]

A blister passing from side to side, where on one side it is in the *simpon* region and on the other side it is below the *simponos* — one may be lenient. (AH §45)

If on one side there is a blister and on the other a *tinari* or *morsa*, its law is that of a side-to-side blister; but if, cutting inside, one sees a separation between the blister and the *tinari*, one may be lenient. (AH §45)

- Likewise if inflation raises tissue on one side so that the blister is not discernible there at all, and there is not even the mark of a *morsa*, it is treated as being on one side only, and it is *kosher*. (AH §45; Tevu'os Shor)

Dissenting View on Side-to-Side Blisters

Several of the great later authorities hold there is no comparison to a lung poured out like a flask; there the flesh dissolved and the *simponos* are likely damaged, whereas in a side-to-side blister the flesh is intact and the blister pushes flesh and *simponos* aside, so the *simponos* are not damaged; with clear fluid no inspection is needed. (AH §44; Yam Shel Shlomo §37)

- When the blister is full of pus it is possible the *simponos* were pierced or damaged by the pressure, and inspection is required as with a lung poured out like a flask; with turbid, foul fluid damage is more likely and inspection will not help. (AH §44)
- By these authorities the stringency of the *vered* is unwarranted, since even in the rest of the lung there are some *simponos* near the edge; nor is the stringency of a *tinari* warranted, this law not being in the *Gemara* at all. (AH §44)
- Some agree to forbid in the *vered* like the *Shulchan Aruch*. (AH §44; Simlah Chadashah §28)

Empty Space Within a Blister

A large blister whose fluid does not fill it entirely, the fluid pouring here and there within, is *kosher* even if the empty area within exceeds a *revi'is*. (AH §46; Levushei Serad)

- Likewise a side-to-side or edge-blister that carries no prohibition on account of its position — the empty space within it may exceed a *revi'is* and it is *kosher*. (AH §46)

A Hole Found in a Blister

A blister found with a hole in it, where the slaughterer's hand handles the area — as at the chest wall — or where it was pulled forcefully, one attributes the hole to that, as in *Siman 36*. (AH §47)

But not in a place the slaughterer's hand handles, where it is unknown whether it was holed in life or after slaughter, it is *tereifah*; one does not say the animal stood in a presumption of permissibility, nor may one puncture another hole in the blister and compare the holes, since blisters are prone to constant change; nonetheless, this is only a doubtful *tereifah* (*safek tereifah*). (AH §47; Rashi *Chullin* 46b)

Even where the slaughterer's hand handles the area, one must examine the ribs opposite the hole; if a defect is found there, it is *tereifah*. (AH §47)

- If he did not examine the ribs, this does not invalidate after the fact. (AH §47)

Blisters in Organs Other Than the Lung

A blister renders *tereifah* only in the lung, including a bird's lung; in all other organs, even those made *tereifah* by the slight-

Notes

190. see *Chochmas Adam* 11:13, who permits a *tinari* recognizable from side to side in a case of great loss, since a hard growth raises no concern for the *simponos*.

est puncture, a blister does not create *tereifah*, since the blister does not attest to a hole. (AH §48)

- Some hold that in other organs, such as the stomach and intestines, no inspection is even needed; (AH §48) some hold one must open the blister and check whether the flesh beneath is intact — even for a single blister, since here it is out of the ordinary. (AH §48; Tevu'os Shor)
- If he did not check, it does not invalidate after the fact. (AH §48)
- But in the intestines, where there are many blisters, the inspection is certainly essential, there being no greater defect than this; to be explained in *Siman 46*. (AH §48)

Two Defects Together (Tarti L'Ri'usa): Extra Lobes and Growths

A blister upon an extra lobe among the row of lobes (*bidrei d'onei*) constitutes *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §49; Tevu'os Shor)

- Some hold it is not *tarti l'ri'usa*, since an extra lobe in the row is no defect at all; an adhesion, *kosher* color, or other defect upon such an extra lobe depends on this dispute. (AH §49; Levushei Serad, siman 35 §92)
- With an adhesion out of order upon an extra lobe in the row, kneading (*mi'uch*) does not help; (AH §49) and this is only where the two attached lobes not in their order are themselves the extra ones. (AH §49)

An extra lobe at the front (*mikama*), in the places where it is permitted, is a defect, and any defect upon it combines for *tarti l'ri'usa* — except a suspended adhesion or an adhesion running from place to place on the extra lobe that passes upon kneading, which is to be permitted. (AH §49)

A blister standing on a front extra lobe is *tarti l'ri'usa*, but a *tinari* or *morsa* on it is to be permitted. (AH §49)

If part of a lobe shrank on an extra lobe, this is not *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §49)

Bumps, Splits, and the Vered

A bump on the upper surface (*migaba*) the size of a thumbnail is a defect; less than that is no defect; and on the front side (*mikama*) in any case it is no defect. (AH §50)

A split (*pitzul*) on the upper surface is not a defect, even a split shorter than the pit which is permitted in a case of great loss as in *Siman 35*; (AH §50) but a front split of less than a thumbnail, which is permitted in a case of great loss, is a defect. (AH §50)

The various types of *chalif* which some permit as in *Siman 35* are not a defect; but two *vered*-lobes in a place where they are permitted are a defect. (AH §50)

- Two *vered*-lobes on one root — even one of them inverted and *kosher* in the manner explained there — are not a defect, even if the other defect stands on the inverted one; and a defect of the sac of the *vered* does not combine for *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §50)
- Two *vered*-lobes on one root that adhered to one another — some hold kneading helps, some hold it does not. (AH §50; Levushei Serad, siman 35 §132)

If the *vered* is as large as a full lobe (not merely the size permitted in a case of great loss), its law for *tarti l'ri'usa* is that of a front extra lobe; and if part of the *vered* is missing and the missing piece is found on the right or left in the manner permitted there, if it bears any defect its law is that of a front extra lobe. (AH §50)

The Lung's Membranes

The upper membrane of the lung that was holed, or partly, mostly, or wholly peeled is a defect, and with another defect joining it — a blister, adhesion, or the like — it is *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §51)

- An exception: a clear-fluid blister, in a place where clear-fluid adjacent blisters are permitted, is not a defect when it stands on a peeled area, provided the majority was not peeled or the upper membrane holed. (AH §51; Levushei Serad, siman 36 §18)
- A suspended adhesion or one from lobe to lobe below their midpoint, on a slightly peeled area, is to be permitted; but where the majority or all was peeled it is *tereifah*. (AH §51)
- A hole in the sac of the *vered* is not a defect, and an adhesion from the sac of the *vered* to the lung is helped by kneading; (AH §51) all the more so to the *vered* itself kneading helps. (AH §51)

A membrane broken by over-inflation is a defect, and if at or near the break there is some defect it is *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §52)

- This is only where the defect did not pass in that same inflation that broke the membrane; and only where both membranes broke — if only one membrane broke it is not a defect. (AH §52)
- A hole where the slaughterer's hand handles, or where one attributes it to the dog, is not a defect — unless there is some defect there requiring inspection whose inspection is essential, in which case it is *tereifah*, since there is now no inspection possible because of the hole. (AH §52)

Worm-Holes

The holes of the *morna* worm — if there are worms on the lung equal to the number of holes, it is not a defect; if not, it is a defect. (AH §53)

- Some require that each worm be partly in a hole and partly outside, but this is not the main view. (AH §53)

A Lung Poured Out or Partly Emptied

A lung poured out like a flask, and a lung partly emptied, are not a defect. (AH §53)

- When it was emptied by more than a *revi'is*, even according to the view that permits, it is a defect. (AH §53)

Missing Tissue, Pinch, Fold, and Sealed Areas

A lung with a missing portion, a flaw, or a fold — if it is recognizable that it came from illness or injury it is a defect; if recognizable as present from birth it is not a defect and does not combine for *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §54)

- An exception: a blister on a fold is to be forbidden. (AH §54)

- If it is doubtful whether it is congenital or from illness or injury, one is stringent. (AH §54)

A sealed (*atum*) area in the lung is a defect even though the spittle stirs; but if through inflation it becomes sound and rises like the rest of the lung, it is no defect at all, and one attributes it to fluid that sealed it. (AH §54)

Dryness in the lung that has not reached the measure of dryness [that renders *tereifah*] is like shrinkage (*tzimuk*). (AH §54)

Shrinkage (Tzimuk)

Part of the lung that shrank is not a defect, for shrinkage does not lead to a hole. (AH §55; Levushei Serad, siman 35, os 27)

Even if it shrank entirely, or mostly, or a whole lobe — according to the view that renders it *tereifah* — and it returned to its natural form through inspection, it is no defect at all. (AH §55)

Part shrank and there is an adhesion out of order whose kneading is essential — one authority forbids, since with shrinkage there is no [valid] inspection. (AH §55; Levushei Serad, end of siman 36)

- This does not appear correct, since all our inspections are only a stringency; yet, since kneading is itself a great leniency, one should add no further leniencies here. (AH §55)
- Likewise with an adhesion from lobe to lobe below the midpoint with a gap, or above the midpoint without a gap, where kneading is essential, and in shrinkage there is no kneading; and there is no distinction whether both ends of the adhesion emerge from the shrunken part or only one end, though the whole matter requires further study (*tzarich iyun*). (AH §55)
- If the adhesion peeled off easily and the lung is thoroughly sound, one may rely on leniency in a case of great loss. (AH §55)

Blisters as a Defect for Tarti L'Ri'usa

A blister is a defect [for combining as *tarti l'ri'usa*]. (AH §56)

- A clear-fluid blister, in a place where clear-fluid adjacent blisters are permitted, is not a defect; in a place where clear-fluid adjacent blisters are forbidden, it is a defect. (AH §56)
- A blister full of air is no defect at all, and air is never a defect anywhere. (AH §56)

A blister containing a worm — if there is no hole in the blister and the worm is found only upon opening it, it is certainly *kosher*; if there is a hole in the blister and the worm is partly in the hole and partly outside, it is likewise *kosher*; if the worm is not in the hole but on the lung, it is *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §56; Levushei Serad, end of siman 37)

- Per the ruling of *Siman 36* that worms need not be in the hole or near it, when worms are found on the lung it is fully *kosher* — so even when found on the lung this is not *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §56)

Blister With Lung-Color, Two Growths, and Combinations

A blister over which the color of lung tissue rose through inflation is no defect; even if it is still somewhat raised and resembles a bump, it is only like a *morsa*. (AH §57; Simlah Chadashah, siman 37 §4)

Two adjacent blisters count as a defect for combining with a further defect, even with clear fluid and in a place where [they alone] are permitted (they do not combine with one another — see above); but two *tinari*, or two *morsa*, or a *tinari* and a *morsa*, are no defect. (AH §57)

- A blister with a *tinari*, or a blister with a *morsa*, is a defect, since a single blister is itself a defect; even a clear-fluid blister together with a *tinari* or *morsa* may possibly be a defect, and one who is lenient in a case of great loss is not protested. (AH §57; Levushei Serad, end of siman 37)

Edge and Side-to-Side Blisters for Tarti L'Ri'usa

An edge-blister with a surrounding thread of tissue counts only as a single blister for *tarti l'ri'usa*; but with no surrounding thread — even full of air or clear fluid in the places where those are permitted — it is a defect. (AH §58)

When it was cut off and it is doubtful whether a surrounding thread was present, it is a doubtful *tarti l'ri'usa* and it is *kosher*. (AH §58)

- The same applies to a two-against-two contradiction over whether a surrounding thread was present. (AH §58)

A kosher side-to-side blister counts only as a single blister for *tarti l'ri'usa*, its law being that of the edge-blister described. (AH §58)

An edge-blister over which the color of lung tissue rose is no defect; likewise a side-to-side blister when lung color rose on both sides. (AH §58)

38: Discoloration of the Lung

The General Rule of Discoloration

A lung whose color has changed from its normal, permanent color to one of the disqualifying colors is *tereifah*, since such discoloration indicates the membranes have deteriorated and will ultimately be perforated. (AH §1; *Chullin* 47b)

Even a slight change to a disqualifying color renders it *tereifah*, treating it like a minute perforation. (AH §1)

- Some hold the disqualifying colors do not disqualify unless the majority of the lung has that color, but the primary ruling follows the Rif, Rambam, Tur and *Shulchan Aruch* that even a minute area is *tereifah*. (AH §1; *Tosafos Chullin* 46b)

Multiple Permitted Colors on One Lung

There are color changes in the lung that are *kosher*; even if the entire lung, or several places on it, changed to such a color, such a change is neither a deterioration nor an affliction. (AH §2)

Even if it bears several permitted colors that differ from one another — even opposite ones, such as red and grass-green — it remains *kosher*, and even if they are adjacent to one another. (AH §2)

- Some of the great later authorities disqualify such a case, but this is rejected: since *Chazal* declared these *kosher* colors, they cannot be forbidden. (AH §3; Kereisi U'Pleisi)

The Disqualifying Colors — White

A lung the color of a wood chip (*ke'ofta*) — meaning it turned white like a split piece of wood — is *tereifah*, according to Rashi, who explains the disqualification as pertaining to whiteness. (AH §4; *Chullin* 47b, Rashi)

According to Rambam, white is not itself listed as a disqualifying color; rather, a lung the color of a palm frond (*charyus shel dekel*) is forbidden out of doubt, being close to a forbidden color. (AH §4; Rambam, Hilchos Shechitah, ch. 7)

- One of the great early authorities explicitly wrote that whiteness in a lung is not a disqualifying color. (AH §4; Ittur)

The Rema rules that even if it is white like [the white of a cooked] egg it is *tereifah*, and so is the practice. (AH §5; Rema)

According to Rambam and the *Ittur*, white is the lung's usual color when inflated, which is why the *Gemara* did not list it among either the disqualifying or the permitted colors. (AH §6)

In practice, we rule stringently according to all opinions, since it is a doubt of a *Torah* prohibition: whether it is white like egg-white, and all the more so like a wood chip or whiter, or the color of a palm frond, it is *tereifah* out of doubt. (AH §7)[191]

- One must be very careful when inflating the lung that its white does not become excessively white, resembling egg-white or a wood chip or more. (AH §7)

The Disqualifying Colors — Black

A lung black like a dried speck of ink (*kediyusa*) — an intense black — is *tereifah*, this being a defect that will ultimately rot and perforate. (AH §8; Rashi)

If it is not that black — such as black like pitch, a raven, or an olive — it is *kosher*, since their blackness does not reach the blackness of ink; and all the more so if it is less black than these. (AH §8; *Niddah* 20a)

- Some hold that only a black reaching the blackness of pitch is *kosher*, treating anything blacker than pitch as ink-black — but the primary ruling is that anything not like ink is *kosher*. Nowadays we may not be expert enough to tell pitch-black from dried-ink black; one who is expert may rely on the distinction. (AH §8; Simlah Chadashah §5)

The Disqualifying Colors — Green (Yellow-Green)

A lung the color of hops (*kishusa*), or saffron/crocus (*morika*), or the yolk of an egg is *tereifah*; all these are shades of *gel* (yellow-green). (AH §9; *Chullin* 47b)

The color *gel* is disqualifying, whereas the shades called *grin* and *bloi* are permitted colors. (AH §9)

The three shades listed correspond to a very faint shade (hops), a very strong shade (egg-yolk), and one inclining toward red like gold; anything inclining toward *gel* is *tereifah*, and likewise gold-colored, wax-colored, or peacock-feather colored. (AH §9; Taz)

The Disqualifying Color — Flesh-Colored

A lung the color of liver (*kevida*) is *kosher*, but one like flesh (*bisra*) is *tereifah*. (AH §12; *Chullin* 47b)

- Some explain this refers not to color but to feel: if on palpation it feels like flesh it is *tereifah*, and like liver it is *kosher*. (AH §12; HaMaor and Rashba)
- The Rashba writes that since it is doubtful whether the criterion is appearance or feel, it is *tereifah* either way. (AH §12; Rashba, Toras HaBayis)

One authority requires verifying that an intense red does not incline toward flesh-color, but the *Aruch HaShulchan* holds that no one can discern this. He therefore reads the phrase 'like flesh' as referring to the lung's essential texture, not merely redness: if a viewer would say it looks like flesh rather than a lung it is *tereifah*, and if he would say it looks like liver or spleen it is *kosher*. (AH §13)

Summary of the Colors

There are four disqualifying colors and four permitted colors in the lung. (AH §14)

The disqualifying colors: ink-black; white (per Rashi) or palm-frond (per Rambam); egg-yolk (*gel*); and flesh-colored — listed in detail as six, since the *gel* shade is counted as three (hops, saffron, egg-yolk). (AH §14)

The permitted colors: *kochla* (a black that is not ink-black); liver-colored; red; and green like leeks — i.e. *grin* and *bloi* (grass-green and sky-blue). (AH §14; §§10-12)

Rambam lists five forbidden colors — ink-black, hops-green, egg-yolk, saffron, and flesh-colored, with palm-frond being *tereifah* out of doubt — and four permitted: *kochol*-black, leek-green, red, and liver-colored; he does not count white. (AH §14; Rambam, Hilchos Shechitah, ch. 7)

Colors Not Listed in the *Gemara*

Any color that is not one of the disqualifying colors listed in the *Gemara* is *kosher*, even if it is not among the listed permitted colors either. (AH §15)

- Some wished to forbid other unlisted colors, but this is rejected; spleen-color, and certain other colors, are permitted even though not in the *Gemara*. (AH §15; Noda BiYehudah, siman 10; Yam Shel Shlomo, siman 39)

Red — Kosher Even at Its Most Intense

Red is *kosher*, even at its most intense, and even if the whole lung is that color. (AH §16; Tur)[192]

If the redness came from a blow (*makkah*) and there is a corresponding wound on the body wall opposite it, it is *tereifah*, and one must inspect for this; so is the practice. (AH §16; Rema)

Notes

191. see *Pischei Teshuva* (on '*levanah ke'bik'as*'), citing the *Chasam Sofer* (34), who forbids any unexplained whitening out of concern for *nismasmes* since we are not expert, but permits peeling the membrane to check whether a surface white sheen stems from a *makkah* in the flesh beneath.

192. see *Chochmas Adam* 12:1, citing the *Tevuos Shor*, who cautions that since flesh-color is itself a red one must verify an intense red does not resemble flesh, questioning the widespread practice of permitting every red.

- *Bedieved*, if one did not inspect the body wall, it appears this does not invalidate. (AH §16; Tevuos Shor)

Inflating and Kneading the Lung

None of these colors disqualify until one inflates the lung and kneads it by hand: if it changes to a permitted color it is permitted, and if it remains as it was it is forbidden. (AH §17; Rambam, Hilchos Shechitah 7:17)

It suffices that it reverts to any permitted color; it need not revert specifically to the lung's normal color. (AH §17; Shach, Pri Chadash)

Even if it reddened from a blow with a corresponding wound on the wall, if after inflating and kneading it reverted to the lung's color or to a permitted color, it is *kosher*. (AH §17; Shach, Taz)

Even a lung with a crease, deficiency, and a wound on the wall opposite it that filled out upon inflation is *kosher*. (AH §17)[193]

- But where there is redness together with a crease, deficiency, and an opposing wound, it may be a case of *tarti l'ri'usa* [two defects together] where inflation does not help; the matter requires deliberation. (AH §17)

Scab-Like Peelings

Multiple black scabby patches of differing appearance on the lung are *kosher* where the blacks do not reach ink-black and all the shades are among the permitted colors — the *Gemara*'s *gildei gildei, ukmei ukmei, chazusa chazusa*. (AH §18; *Chullin* 46b)

A lung with peelings like scabs (*nesek*) that is otherwise whole is *kosher*, this being like leprosy [*tzara'as*]. (AH §18; Tur and SA)

- Some say it is *kosher* without inspection, but it is proper to inspect *lechatchilah*. (AH §18; Pri Chadash in the name of Rashdam)[194]
- Some hold that peeling the scab off the membrane is essential even *bedieved*, since the lung beneath may not be sound; failure to inflate, however, does not invalidate *bedieved*. (AH §18; Levushei Serad)

If there is a *sircha* between one peeling and another it is of no consequence, since these peelings are not part of the lung's substance. (AH §18)

Discoloration Caused by Pus, Hair, or Congealed Blood

The disqualifying colors invalidate only when the discoloration of the membranes is intrinsic; if it came from pus (*mugla*) beneath them — so that upon removing the pus the membranes are the lung's color or a permitted color — it is *kosher*. (AH §19; Shach)

Likewise if the change came from a black hair lying on the lung or from congealed blood, and upon removing them the membranes reverted to a permitted color, it is *kosher*. (AH §19)

If one did not extract the pus to see whether the membranes reverted to a permitted color, it is forbidden, even *bedieved*. (AH §19; Simlah Chadashah §15)

- Some are lenient, attributing the change to the pus beneath; one who is lenient in a case of great loss has not lost. The essential ruling follows the first (stringent) view: only where it is plainly visible that the change is not in the membranes themselves may one be lenient; if it appears to be in the membranes, one may not be lenient without inspection — and the matter requires further study. (AH §19; Pri Megadim, Levushei Serad)

Discoloration in Only One Membrane

If the color change is only in one membrane and not the other, some forbid it, treating it like spreading venom even if only on the surface. (AH §20; Taz)

- Many great authorities permit it, since it is no worse than a perforation, which is *kosher* in one membrane; the color need not penetrate the flesh, but it must be in both membranes to disqualify, and otherwise it is *kosher*. (AH §20; Pri Chadash, Kereisi U'Pleisi)[195]
- Some permit for a great need; and this only where the second membrane is the lung's color, but if it too bears an altered color — even a permitted one — it is *tereifah*, since it will turn to a forbidden color. (AH §20; Simlah Chadashah §14)

A Black Cord on the Lung; Fowl

Where a black cord lay on the lung with a small pus-filled blister at its head, it was cut open to release the blood to see if it would turn white; the color on the lung remained black as before, and the animal was ruled *tereifah*. (AH §21; Taz)

The lung's colors disqualify in fowl just as in an animal. (AH §21; Taz)

Color as an Additional Defect (Tarti L'Ri'usa)

A disqualifying color that reverts through inflation to a permitted color — but not to the lung's normal color — combines toward *tarti l'ri'usa*. (AH §22)

- Whether a *kosher* color itself counts as a defect to combine with a blister or adhesion is in doubt; in a case of great loss or pressing circumstance, one who is lenient has not lost. (AH §22)[196]

If a disqualifying color rests upon a blister, one must open the blister and extract the pus; if the membranes reverted to the lung's color it is *kosher*, and if one did not do so it is forbidden — unless it is plainly evident from outside that the color is from the pus and not the membranes. (AH §22; Simlah Chadashah §15)

If, after inflation, the color reverted to a permitted color, it is *kosher* even if it reverts to the forbidden color once the inflation

Notes

193. see *Pischei Teshuva* (on '*v'hachi nahug*'), citing the *Givas Shaul* (86), who permits even without great loss a lung with a crease, deficiency, and a corresponding wall-wound that filled out on inflation — distinguishing it from reddening, which is worse — against the *Bach* (130) who forbade.

194. see *Tzemach Tzedek YD* 36, who holds that scab-like peelings — and indeed any color the *Gemara* declares *kosher* — require no inspection or inflation at all.

195. see *Chochmas Adam* 12:5, who leaves the case of a disqualifying color in the upper membrane alone unresolved (*tzarich iyun*), noting the Taz and *Kereisi U'Pleisi* forbid while the *Pri Chadash* permits.

196. see *Chochmas Adam* 12:7, citing the *Noda BiYehuda*, that a *kosher* color is not deemed a defect at all to combine toward multiple *rieusos* — except for red (and, he adds, green).

subsides, since all lung matters are assessed while inflated. (AH §22; Simlah Chadashah §12)

Red Color Over a Blister or Wound; Shifting Color

Where a red color rests on a blister, *tinari*, *morsa*, or pus, with a wound on the wall opposite it, one opens them and empties the pus; if it reverted to the lung's color it is *kosher*, and if one did not open and inspect, it is *tereifah*. (AH §23; Levushei Serad §66)

If, upon inflation, the disqualifying color does not stay in one place but shifts from spot to spot, it is *kosher*, since this shows the defect is not in the membranes but in pus beneath them that moves about. (AH §23; Simlah Chadashah §17)

- *Lechatchilah* it is proper to open the membranes and inspect, but *bedieved* this does not invalidate. (AH §23; Pri Megadim)

Color Coming From the Lung's Flesh

Some say that if a disqualifying color is on the membranes not at a blister or pus but at a place of flesh, and one peeled the membranes and the color went away, it is still forbidden. (AH §24; Simlah Chadashah §67)

- This is rejected as an astonishing view with no basis in any authority: once the color has been removed from the membranes, why should it be *tereifah*. (AH §24; Levushei Serad §67)

Red Dots

If there are red dots on the lung, one must inspect for perforations at the reddened spots; if one did not inspect, it is forbidden. (AH §25; Simlah Chadashah §13)

- In places where red dots are common and one has inspected many times without finding perforations, then although one should always inspect, if by accident and inadvertence one did not inspect, it may be ruled *kosher*. (AH §25; Levushei Serad)

Application to Wild Animals and Fowl; Detection

All these color laws apply to wild animals and fowl as well. (AH §26)

In fowl there is no need to inspect for these colors specifically; in an animal, when an expert performs the internal inspection, he detects a color by feel — since the spot of the color differs from the rest of the lung in warmth, coldness, smoothness like mucus, or dryness — and then removes the lung and looks. (AH §26; Simlah Chadashah §19)

In fowl, congealed blood is common and appears red or black, coming from the place of slaughter; it needs no inspection, is recognizable to one expert in chickens, and is *kosher*, being only from congealed blood at the slaughter site. (AH §26; Levushei Serad)

39: Examining the Lung and Adhesions

The General Rule: No Routine Examination for Most Defects

As a rule, the defects (*tereifos*) enumerated by the Sages need not be examined for, since an animal, beast, or bird stands in a presumption of being healthy and kosher, most living creatures being sound. (AH §1; Tur)

Once slaughtered by a valid *shechitah*, the animal stands in its presumption of permissibility until something arises that warrants concern, and only that particular matter is then examined. (AH §1; Rambam, Hilchos Shechitah, ch. 11)

Even though every defect could in principle be examined for, the *halachah leMoshe miSinai* is to rely on the majority even where examination is possible. (AH §1; Rashi, *Chullin* 12a)

Where clarification would entail great toil — as it would if every defect had to be checked — we do not require it; the rule of clarifying wherever possible applies only where it is done easily. (AH §1; Pri Megadim)

Why the Lung Is Different and Must Be Examined

By contrast, the lung must be examined, and it is forbidden to eat without examining it; one who breaches this fence to eat without examination will be bitten by a snake. (AH §2–3; *Beitzah* 25b; the closing phrase is the SA's (§1))

Even in the Temple, the lung of sacrifices was examined. (AH §2; Rivash §163)

The reason the lung was singled out for stringency is that its adhesions (*serachos*) are common, and the Sages were concerned for the common minority. (AH §3)

The required examination is only for adhesions; for other lung matters — colors, missing lobes, blockage (*otem*), and blisters (*bu'os*) — no examination is required even *lechatchilah*, since these are not common. They are noticed only incidentally in the course of checking for adhesions. (AH §3)

- Some hold the Sages' decree was to examine for all types of lung *tereifos*, but this is not the view of the *Rishonim*, nor of the Tur and *Shulchan Aruch*, who state the examination was instituted only because of adhesions. (AH §3; Tur and SA §1)

A further reason the lung alone is examined: since adhesions are common, unchecked meat could lead to loss and to stumbling — meat already sold or eaten found later to be forbidden; whereas uncommon defects were not decreed upon. Moreover the lung examination involves no toil, for it is seen as soon as the chest is opened. (AH §4; Rashba, *Chullin* 9a, citing Ramban)

The Manner of Examination: Internal Feel Versus Inflation

The Sages' enactment required only an internal examination (*bedikas panim*): after slaughter, one opens the diaphragm, inserts his hand, and gently and thoroughly checks the entire lung; if there is no adhesion and no change is felt, nothing more is needed. (AH §5; Rambam, Hilchos Shechitah 11:11)

- In some places they were stringent to remove and inflate the lung, and the custom of each place stands. (AH §5)

Rema's ruling: the custom is to inflate every lung even when it has no defect; in some places they are lenient not to inflate unless there was an adhesion removed by rubbing, and this is the essential view. (AH §5; Rema)

Where any defect at all is present, inflation is required and is indispensable even *bedieved*. (AH §5)

Some say that even where inflation is not the custom, one should remove the lung after the internal examination to inspect it visually; and some placed a severe prohibition on examiners not to rely on the internal feel alone, unless the examiner is well-practiced for years in a city where examination occurs daily. This is proper, since it entails little toil. (AH §6)

When a Defect Is Felt During Examination

If some slight defect is felt within, one is obligated to remove the lung and inspect it, and this is indispensable even *bedieved*; if upon removal the defect is still in place, he must inflate and examine it. (AH §7)

When inserting the hand, one cuts gently to open the diaphragm, inclining toward the ribs, no wider than needed for the hand, so as not to sever an adhesion. (AH §7)

- Some do not cut the diaphragm with a knife but with a fingernail, out of this concern. (AH §7)

A Lung Lost Before Examination

If the lung was lost before examination through accident or inadvertence — a dog or non-Jew took it, or it was otherwise lost — the *Rishonim* are divided; Rashi, Rambam, Rosh, and Rashba permit, while the Tur inclines to forbid. (AH §8; Rashi, *Chullin* 12a)

Rema's decision: where there is a great loss (*hefsed merubah*), one may rely on those who permit; and in kids, lambs, and wild beasts, in which adhesions are not common, it may be permitted even without a loss. (AH §9; Rema)

"Kids and lambs" applies so long as people still call them such; some say only while they still nurse, but once they begin to eat their law is like adult animals, since most adhesions come from unsuitable food — and lambs raised in houses commonly do have the lung adhered to the chest-wall. (AH §9)

Young calves have the law of kids and lambs, likewise while they nurse; it depends on the butchers' knowledge whether adhesions are found in such animals. (AH §9)

If an internal examination for adhesions was done — even without checking for other defects — one need not be stringent even where the custom is to remove and inflate the lung. (AH §9)

If the lung was lost deliberately, it has the law of one who nullifies a forbidden substance intentionally: it is forbidden to the one who lost it and to whomever it was lost on his behalf, and he may not profit thereby; and this applies even to a Rabbinic prohibition, all the more so here where he uproots a Rabbinic enactment, and he is to be penalized for it. (AH §9; Shach; Siman 99)

A Lung Removed by a Non-Jew or Unlearned Person

If a non-Jew or an unlearned Jew removed the lung from the animal before the internal examination, and the intact lung is before us without defect, it still requires inflation, lest there were adhesions that the remover detached. Therefore, lukewarm-water examination is also needed, to see if it bubbles anywhere. (AH §10)

- Some are stringent since we are not expert in examination where examination is required by law, but this is an excessive stringency, and the great *Acharonim* permitted; certainly one need not be stringent where there is a loss. (AH §10; Taz)

One should inspect the ribs lest adhesions were torn off in removing the lung. (AH §10)

If it was not inflated at all, it is permitted only where there is a great loss, or in kids and lambs. (AH §10)

If it was deliberately not inflated, it is forbidden even *bedieved*. (AH §10)

The Slaughterer Who Departs Before Examination

If the slaughterer slaughtered and left before examination, and waiting for his return would spoil the meat, one great authority permitted eating without examination, as in the case of a lost lung; this is a great leniency. (AH §11; Kereisi U'Pleisi)

Where the slaughterer transgressed the enactment brazenly and deliberately, it is difficult to permit, and better to treat the slaughterer as a damager who must pay the animal's owner his loss. (AH §11)

- **If he was compelled to leave**, his case is like a lost lung; **if he left deliberately**, it is hard to permit and he is liable to pay, even though this is unrecognizable damage. (AH §11; *Gittin* 53a)

There is basis to permit: the case is like nullifying a forbidden substance, where it is forbidden only to one who knew it was nullified for his benefit; but here the owner would certainly not be pleased, so he is not to be penalized — though the matter requires further study. (AH §12; Maharshal, Yam Shel Shlomo, *Chullin*, ch. 7 (*Gid HaNasheh*) §59)

Guarding the Animal Between Slaughter and Examination

One who slaughters for a non-Jew intending to sell the meat to a Jew should not leave the animal in his hands between slaughter and examination, lest he insert his hand through the neck-cut and detach the adhesions; the same applies to a suspect Jew. (AH §13)

Bedieved it is permitted, since there is a double doubt — whether he inserted his hand, and, even if he did, whether there was an adhesion. (AH §13; Levush)

- The essential reason is that since lung examination is Rabbinic, we follow the lenient side in a doubt. (AH §13; Rema §17)

If the butchers are accustomed to do this, one must be concerned even *bedieved*, as it is like deliberate; and *lechatchilah* one must be careful in every case. (AH §13)

Conflicting Testimony of Examiners

If an examiner withdrew his hand and declared the animal *tereifah*, and then another inserted his hand and found no *tereifus*, the first is believed — for the second may have forced his hand and dislodged the adhesion, or the first dislodged it upon withdrawing. (AH §14; Shach)

Moreover, the *Torah* entrusted the examiner regarding *shechitah* and examination while he is engaged in it, and once he declared *tereifah* he is like two witnesses whom a single witness cannot contradict; hence even if two inserted their hands and found nothing, the first is still believed. (AH §14)

If the examiner declared he found a *tereifus* in the lung, and it then became clear the diaphragm had not yet been opened so he could not have reached the lung, and once opened and examined no *tereifus* was found — it is kosher, and it is not even forbidden to him personally, for we attribute the matter to an error rather than to an uncommon occurrence. (AH §15)

This applies only when he said he found *tereifus* in the lung; **but if he said "*tereifah*" without specifying**, the unopened diaphragm does not help, for perhaps he found *tereifus* in another organ. (AH §15; Taz)

- If he says his intent was the lung and he erred about the diaphragm being opened, it appears he is believed; some say he is not believed, but this does not appear correct, since the examiner is not suspect. (AH §15; Simla Chadasha §49)

If one examiner says the adhesion was irregular (*shelo kesidran*) and *tereifah*, and another examiner contradicts him saying it was regular (*kesidran*) and kosher: if the first came to *beis din* first, he is believed like two witnesses and a single witness cannot contradict him. (AH §16)

If both came together, we set witness against witness and leave the animal in its presumption of permissibility, and it is kosher. (AH §16)

If two witnesses contradicted him, even if he came first they are believed, for two are set against two and the animal stands in its presumption of permissibility. (AH §16)

- Since by Rabbinic law we do not rely on a presumption where there are two against two, perhaps it is forbidden here too; the matter requires deliberation. (AH §16; *Yevamos* 31a)

Dispute Between Buyer and Seller of a Lung

One who buys a lung and says he found in it an adhesion rendering it *tereifah*, while the seller says it was in a kosher location: if both came to *beis din* together, there is no testimony, and it is like an animal whose lung was lost before examination — thus, according to our practice, permitted only where there is a great loss. (AH §17; Beis Yosef §17)

If the buyer came to *beis din* first, he is like two witnesses and the seller cannot contradict him. (AH §17)

Some hold that in this case it is permitted in every situation even according to our practice: the stringency for a lost lung is due to concern for common adhesions, but here, where we see no multiple defects and only the buyer claims one fatal adhesion which the seller denies, we leave it in its presumption of permissibility; moreover here it was examined, only there is a dispute. (AH §17; Taz; Shach)

The buyer is believed even though the animal was never in his hand, only the lung, since the *Torah* entrusts each Jew regarding his own; now the lung is his, and once he is believed about the lung the whole animal is forbidden — unless the seller contradicts him and both came together. (AH §17)

The Nature of Adhesions: Whether an Adhesion Implies a Perforation

Rashi and his school hold there is no adhesion without a perforation: the adhesion comes from a perforation, the thickened fluid seeping out little by little, congealing into a membrane; and though the adhesion seals the perforation, we hold that a membrane arising from a wound in the lung is not a valid membrane, as it is destined to burst. (AH §18; *Chullin* 46b)

By this reasoning the *Rishonim* dispute a suspended adhesion (*sircha teluyah*): some hold it is *tereifah* since there is no adhesion without a perforation. (AH §18; Rashba and Ran)

- Others hold a suspended adhesion is not from a perforation, since a perforation-adhesion attaches to a nearby place, whereas a suspended one is merely a spread of the lung's moisture and does not come from a perforation. (AH §18; Rosh §14)

A question arises: why not fear it was attached elsewhere and detached; the answer is that if it had detached it would have been perforated at that time. (AH §19; Beis Yosef)

- **By Rashi's view** a suspended adhesion requires examination, and the Rambam ruled it needs inflation to see there is no perforation; though the Tur and *Shulchan Aruch* write it needs no examination — that follows the view that there is an adhesion without a perforation. The essential law by Rashi's view is that a suspended adhesion requires examination. (AH §19; Rambam, end of Hilchos Shechitah, ch. 11)

Adhesion From Place to Place on the Same Lobe

An adhesion running from place to place on a lobe or on the body of the lung itself has the law of a suspended adhesion and is kosher. (AH §20; Beis Yosef §9)

- Some hold that by Rashi's view it is *tereifah*, since it is attached to another place and there is no adhesion without a perforation. (AH §20; Yam Shel Shlomo and Taz)

The reason for permitting: it is even a full adhesion, but the sealing is likewise full, since both ends lie in one place resting undisturbed, forming a good seal, and it is not like a membrane arising from a wound. (AH §20; Tevuos Shor)

Regular (Kesidran) Adhesions

A *kesidran* adhesion — between lobes lying in their natural order — is kosher even though it too comes from a perforation, because, lying where the lobes rest one upon another, it does not detach and its membrane grows firm. (AH §21; *Chullin* 46b; Rashi)

It is not comparable to a membrane arising from a wound which is destined to burst, because here it has two anchoring ends, one strengthening the other; and its concern for perforation is only on one side, the other side having attached where it met a healthy place, which reinforces and seals the perforated side as well — whereas a wound-membrane has weak anchoring only at the wound-site and is destined to burst. (AH §21; Pri Megadim)

Reconciling Rashi's View With What We Observe

A difficulty on Rashi's view: if every adhesion comes from a prior perforation, why do we observe adhesions in almost most animals, yet an actual perforation without an adhesion is not found even in one in a hundred; and it is established that most