

דף יומי • חלין • דף נ"ה

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by wrapping up a fascinating discussion regarding the precise measurements of the Sages. The Gemara explores whether the term "up to" a certain measure includes that limit or not, bringing proofs from the laws of tumah and taharah in broken clay vessels and bed-ropes. We learn a beautiful, overarching yesod from Rabbi Yochanan that, as a rule, the Sages established their measures stringently to protect the halacha, ensuring we always err on the side of caution in our avodah.

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

צמוד א' DAF 55A

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

שיעורן בכדי סיכת קטן ועד לוג.

The Mishnah states regarding broken clay vessels: **their measure** to remain susceptible to impurity is if they can hold **enough** oil **for the anointing of a small child, and** this applies to a vessel that held **up to a log** when whole.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

מאי לאו לוג כלמטה?

What, is it not teaching that a vessel of exactly a **log** is treated **as** though it were **below** that measure, meaning the term 'up to' includes the log itself?

ANSWER

לא, לוג כלמעלה.

The Gemara answers: **No**, a vessel of exactly a **log** is treated **as** though it were **above** that measure, and 'up to' means up to but not including.

QUESTION

תא שמע: מלוג עד סאה – פרביעית,

Come and hear a proof from the next clause: If the vessel originally held **from a log up to a se'ah**, its broken pieces must hold a **quarter-log** to be tamei.

QUESTION

מאי לאו סאָה פֿלמטה?

What, is it not teaching that a vessel of exactly a **se'ah** is treated **as** though it were **below** that measure?

ANSWER

לא, סאָה פֿלמעלה.

The Gemara answers: **No**, a vessel of exactly a **se'ah** is treated **as** though it were **above** that measure.

QUESTION

תא שמע: מסאָה ועד סאתים – בַּחֲצִי לוג,

Come and hear another proof: If it held **from a se'ah up to two se'ah**, its pieces must hold **half a log** to be tamei.

QUESTION

מאי לאו סאתים פֿלמטה?

What, is it not teaching that a vessel of exactly **two se'ah** is treated **as** though it were **below** that measure?

ANSWER

לא, סאתים פֿלמעלה.

The Gemara answers: **No**, a vessel of exactly **two se'ah** is treated **as** though it were **above** that measure.

OBJECTION

והתנא: לוג – פֿלמטה, סאָה – פֿלמטה, סאתים – פֿלמטה.

The Gemara objects: **But isn't it taught** explicitly in a braisa: A vessel of exactly a **log** is treated **as below** that; a **se'ah** is treated **as below** that; **two se'ah** is treated **as below** that? This proves that 'up to' includes the limit!

RESOLUTION

התם לחומרא, דאמר רבי אבהו אמר רבי יוחנן: כל שיעורי חכמים להחמיר, חוץ מכגרים של בתמים להקל.

The Gemara resolves this: **There** it is interpreted **stringently**, as **Rabbi Abbahu said** in the name of **Rabbi Yochanan**: **All measures of the Sages** are interpreted **stringently**, except for the measure of like a split-bean regarding blood stains, which is interpreted **leniently**. Here, treating the exact limit as 'below' makes the vessel more easily susceptible to tumah, which is a stringency.

INFERENCE

דיקא נמי, דקתני עלה דההיא: חמשה – פֿלמעלה, עשרה – פֿלמטה.

The Gemara notes: The language **is also precise**, as it teaches on that same Mishnah regarding a bed-rope: exactly **five** handbreadths is treated **as above** that, and exactly **ten** handbreadths is treated **as below** that, showing we always rule stringently.

MISHNAH

ניטל הטחול,

We learned in the Mishnah: If **the spleen was removed**, the animal remains kosher.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רב עירא משמיה דרבא: לא שנו אלא ניטל, אבל ניקב – טרפה.

Rav Avira said in the name of Rava: They only taught that it is kosher when it was **removed**, but if it was merely **perforated**, it is a **tereifah**.

OBJECTION

מתיב רבי יוסי בר אבין, ואיתימא רבי יוסי בר זבידא: חותה מעובר שבמעיה – מותר באכילה, מן הטחול ומן הפליות – אסור באכילה.

Rabbi Yosei bar Avin, and some say Rabbi Yosei bar Zevida, challenged this from a Mishnah: If one **cuts from a fetus that is in its mother's womb**, the cut piece is **permitted for eating** when the mother is slaughtered; but if one **cuts from the spleen or from the kidneys** of the mother, the cut piece is **forbidden for eating**.

INFERENCE

הא בהמה גופה שריא!

We infer: **But the animal itself is permitted!** Even though its spleen was cut, it is not a tereifah, which contradicts Rava's ruling that a damaged spleen makes it a tereifah.

ANSWER

הוא הדין דאפילו בהמה גופה שריא, אידי דתנא רישא "מותר באכילה", תנא גמי סיפא "אסור באכילה".

The Gemara answers: The same law applies that even the animal itself is also **forbidden** as a tereifah; but since the first clause taught 'permitted for eating', the last clause also taught 'forbidden for eating' to maintain a parallel structure.

RESOLUTION

ואיפצית אימא: ניקב לחוד, ונחתה לחוד.

And if you wish, say instead: A **perforated** spleen is a **separate case** which makes it a tereifah, and a **cut** spleen is a **separate case** which does not make it a tereifah.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

נִיטְלוּ הַכְּלִיּוֹת.

We learned in the Mishnah: If **the kidneys were removed**, the animal remains kosher.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַכִּישׁ בַּר פָּפָא מִשְׁמִיּה דְרַב: לְקַתָּה בְּכוֹלָיָא אַחַת – טְרֵפָה.

Rakhish bar Pappa said in the name of Rav: If it was diseased in even one kidney, the animal is a tereifah.

EXPLANATION

אָמְרֵי בְּמַעְרְבָא: וְהוּא דְּמִטָּא לְקוּתָא

They say in the West, Eretz Yisrael: And this applies only when the disease reached the white area inside the kidney.

עמוד ב' DAF 55B

EXPLANATION

לְמָקוֹם חֲרִיץ.

The previous statement regarding a kidney defect refers to the location of the crevice.

QUESTION

וְהִיכָא מָקוֹם חֲרִיץ?

The Gemara asks: And where is the location of the crevice on the kidney?

ANSWER

לְחִיּוּרָא דְּתוּתֵי מְתָנִי.

The Gemara answers: This is a reference to the white matter of fat under the loins where the kidney is attached.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב נְחוּנְיָא: שְׁאִילְתִּינְהוּ לְכוּלְהוּ טְרוּפְאֵי דְּמַעְרְבָא, וְאָמְרֵי לִי הֲלָכְתָּא כְּרַכִּישׁ בַּר פָּפָא, וְלִית
הֲלָכְתָּא כְּרַב עֻיָּרָא.

Rav Nechunya said: I asked all the experts on tereifos of the West, Eretz Yisrael, and they said to me: The halacha is in accordance with the opinion of Rakhish bar Pappa in the name of Rav that a diseased kidney renders the animal a tereifah, but the halacha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rav Avira that a perforated spleen renders the animal a tereifah.

EXPLANATION

דַּרְבַּ עוֹרָא נִמְי לָא אִמְרוּ, אֶלָּא בְּקוֹלָשִׁיָּהּ, אֲבָל בְּסוּמְכִיָּהּ – טְרֵפָה,

The Gemara notes: And **even** with regard to the opinion of Rav Avira, we said that the halacha is not in accordance with his opinion **only** if the spleen was perforated in its **thin**, narrow end; **but** if it was perforated in its **thick**, upper end, the animal is indeed a **tereifah**.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי אִישְׁתַּיִיר בֵּיהּ פְּעוּבֵי דִינָר זָהָב – כְּשֶׁרָה.

And even if it was perforated in its thick end, if there remained in it an intact layer of the spleen like the thickness of a gold dinar, the animal is kosher.

STATEMENT

אָמְרֵי בְּמַעְרְבָא: כָּל הַפּוֹסֵל בְּרִיָּאָה – כָּשֶׁר בְּכוֹלָיָא, שְׁהָרִי נִקְבַּ פְּסוּל בְּרִיָּאָה, וְכָשֶׁר בְּכוֹלָיָא, וְכָל שְׁכֵן הֵיכָא דְכָשֶׁר בְּרִיָּאָה – כָּשֶׁר בְּכוֹלָיָא.

They say in the West: Any injury that renders an animal unfit in the lung is kosher in the kidney; for behold, a perforation renders the animal unfit in the lung, but is kosher in the kidney. And all the more so, where an injury is kosher in the lung, it is kosher in the kidney.

QUESTION

מִתְקִיף לֵיהּ רַבִּי תַנְחוּמָא: וְכֵלְלָא הוּא?

Rabbi Tanchuma objects to this: And is this an established rule?

OBJECTION

הָרִי מוּגְלָא, דְּכָשֶׁר בְּרִיָּאָה וּפְסוּל בְּכוֹלָיָא!

But what about pus, which is kosher in the lung since the lung can discharge it, but renders the animal unfit in the kidney?

OBJECTION

וְהָרִי מֵיִם זָפִין, דְּכָשֶׁרִים הֵכָא וְהֵכָא,

And what about clear water, which is kosher here in the lung and there in the kidney, which does not fit the rule that what is kosher in the lung is all the more so kosher in the kidney, as it is equal in both?

ANSWER

אֶלָּא אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: טְרֵפוֹת קָא מַדְמִית לְהֶדְדִּי?

Rather, Rav Ashi said: Are you comparing the laws of tereifos to one another?

EXPLANATION

אֵין אוֹמְרִים בְּטְרֵפוֹת זֶה דּוֹמֶה לְזֶה, שְׁהָרִי חוֹתְכָהּ מִכָּאן וּמִתָּה, חוֹתְכָהּ מִכָּאן וְחִיתָהּ.

We do not say with regard to tereifos: This is similar to that; for behold, one cuts an organ from here and the animal dies, and one cuts an organ from there and it lives. Therefore, we cannot derive the laws of one organ from another.

EXPLANATION

וּמֵיִם זָפִין כְּשֶׁרִים, לָא אִמְרוּ אֶלָּא דְּצִילִי, אֲבָל עֲכִירִי – טְרֵפָה.

The Gemara notes: **And** with regard to **clear water** found in the lung or kidney, which we said is **kosher**, we said so only where they are clear, but if they are cloudy, the animal is a **tereifah**.

EXPLANATION

וכי צילי נמי לא אמרו אלא דלא סריח, אבל סריח – טרפה.

And even when they are clear, we said so only where they are not foul-smelling, but if they are foul-smelling, the animal is a **tereifah**.

STATEMENT

הפוליא שהקטינה, בדקה – עד כפול, בגסה – עד כענכה בינונית.

With regard to a **kidney that shrank**: In a **small animal** like a sheep, it is a **tereifah** if it shrank **until the size of a bean**; in a **large animal** like a cow, it is a **tereifah** if it shrank **until the size of an average grape**.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ניטל לחי התחתון,

The Mishnah stated: If **the lower jaw was removed**, the animal is kosher.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רבי זירא: לא שנו אלא שיכולה לחיות על ידי לעיטה והמראה, אבל אינה יכולה לחיות על ידי לעיטה והמראה – טרפה.

Rabbi Zeira said: They only taught this where the animal is able to live by means of stuffing food into its mouth and cramming it down its throat; but if it is not able to live by means of stuffing and cramming, it is a **tereifah**.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ניטלה האם שלה,

The Mishnah stated: If **its womb was removed**, the animal is kosher.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

תנא: היא האם, היא טרפחת, והיא שלפוחית.

A Sage taught in a Braisa: **This is the womb, this is the tarpachat, and this is the shalpuachit**; they are all names for the same organ.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וחרוטה בידי שמים – כשרה.

The Mishnah stated: **Or if the lung was shriveled by the hand of Heaven**, the animal is **kosher**.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: איזוהי חרוטה? כל שצמקה ריאה שלה.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: **Which is a shriveled lung? Any animal whose lung has shriveled.**

BRAISA

בידי שמים – כשרה, בידי אדם – טרפה.

If it shriveled **by the hand of Heaven**, such as from fright of thunder, the animal is **kosher**; but if it shriveled **by the hand of man**, such as if a person frightened it, it is a **tereifah**.

BRAISA

רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר: אף בידי כל הבריות.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: **Even by the hand of any creature**, such as the roar of a lion.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: רבי שמעון בן אלעזר ארישא קאי ולקולא, או אסיפא קאי ולחומרא?

A dilemma was raised before them: Does Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar refer to the **first clause** of the Braisa, and his ruling is **for leniency**, meaning that even the roar of a lion is considered like the hand of Heaven and the animal is kosher? **Or does he refer to the latter clause**, and his ruling is **for stringency**, meaning that if it was shriveled by any creature, it is like the hand of man and the animal is a tereifah?

PROOF

תא שמע, דתנא: חרוטה בידי אדם – טרפה, רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר: אף בידי כל הבריות.

Come and hear a proof, as it is taught in a Braisa: A lung shriveled **by the hand of man** renders the animal a **tereifah**; Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: **Even by the hand of any creature** it is a tereifah. This proves he refers to the latter clause for stringency.

STATEMENT

רָבָה בַּר בַּר חָנָה הָיָה קָאָזִיל בְּמִדְבָּרָא, אֲשֶׁכַח הִנָּהוּ דִּיכְרִי דְצִמְיָק רִיאַה דִּידְהוּ.

The Gemara relates: Rabba bar bar Chana was traveling in the desert, and he found certain rams whose lungs were shriveled.

STATEMENT

אַתָּא שְׂאִיל בִּי מִדְרָשָׁא, אָמְרוּ לִיה:

He came and asked in the study hall how to determine the cause of the shriveling. They said to him as follows:

ANSWER

בְּקִיטָא – אֵייתִי מְשִׁיכְלִי חִיּוּרִי, וּמְלִינָהוּ מִיָּא קָרִירִי, וְאַנְחִינָהוּ מֵעַת לָעַת.

In the summer, bring white basins, and fill them with cold water, and place the lungs in them for twenty-four hours.

ANSWER

אִי הִדְרוּ בְּרִיזִין – בִּידֵי שָׁמַיִם הִיא וּכְשָׁרָה, וְאִי לָא – טְרֵיפָה.

If they return to their healthy state and expand, it was by the hand of Heaven and the animal is kosher; but if not, it is a tereifah.

ANSWER

בְּסִיתוּא – אֵייתִי מְשִׁיכְלִי שִׁיחוּמִי, וּמְלִינָהוּ מִיָּא פְּשׁוּרִי, וְאַנְחִינָהוּ מֵעַת לָעַת.

In the winter, bring dark basins, and fill them with luke warm water, and place the lungs in them for twenty-four hours.

ANSWER

אִי הִדְרָא בְּרִיא – כְּשָׁרָה, וְאִי לָא – טְרֵיפָה.

If it returns to its healthy state, the animal is kosher; but if not, it is a tereifah.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הֶגְלוּדָה:

The Mishnah stated: **An animal whose hide was removed**, Rabbi Meir deems it kosher and the Sages deem it a tereifah.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

תַּנּוּ רַבָּנָן: הֶגְלוּדָה – רַבִּי מֵאִיר מְכַשִּׁיר וַחֲכָמִים פּוֹסְלִים,

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: In the case of **an animal whose hide was removed**, Rabbi Meir deems it kosher and the Sages deem it unfit,

BRAISA

וּכְבֵּר הָעִיד אֶלְעָזָר סֵפֶרָא וְיוֹחָנָן בֶּן גּוּדְגָדָא עַל הַגְּלוּדָה שְׁפִסּוּלָהּ.

and Elazar the scribe and Yochanan ben Gudgeda already testified concerning the flayed animal that it is unfit.

BRAISA

אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן בֶּן עֲלֵעָזָר: חֲזַר בּוֹ רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Rabbi Meir retracted his view and agreed with the Sages.

QUESTION

מִכָּלְל דְּלִרְבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר פְּלִיג רַבִּי מֵאִיר בְּגִלּוּדָה?

The Gemara asks: By inference, according to Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, did Rabbi Meir initially disagree regarding a flayed animal?

OBJECTION

וְהִתְנִיָּא: אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר: לֹא נִחְלְקוּ רַבִּי מֵאִיר וְחֻכְמִים עַל הַגְּלוּדָה שְׁפִסּוּלָהּ,

But isn't it taught in a different Braisa: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Rabbi Meir and the Sages did not disagree concerning a flayed animal, for all agree that it is unfit,

BRAISA

וּכְבֵּר הָעִיד רַבִּי אוֹשְׁעִיָּא בְּנֵו שֶׁל רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הַבֶּשֶׂם לְפָנֵי רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא מְשׁוּם רַבִּי טַרְפוֹן עַל הַגְּלוּדָה שְׁפִסּוּלָהּ,

and Rabbi Oshaya the son of Rabbi Yehuda the spice merchant already testified before Rabbi Akiva in the name of Rabbi Tarfon concerning a flayed animal that it is unfit,

BRAISA

וְאִם נִשְׁתַּיֵּיר בּוֹ כֶּסֶלַע – כְּשֶׁרָהּ.

and if there remained on it a piece of hide the size of a sela, the animal is kosher. This implies they never disagreed at all!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: מַאי "לֹא נִחְלְקוּ"? לֹא עָמַד רַבִּי מֵאִיר בְּמַחֲלוּקָתוֹ.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: What is the meaning of "they did not disagree"? It means Rabbi Meir did not persist in his disagreement, but rather retracted.

STATEMENT

אָמַר מֶר: אִם נִשְׁתַּיֵּיר בּוֹ כֶּסֶלַע – כְּשֶׁרָהּ.

The Gemara analyzes the Braisa: The Master said above: If there remained on it a piece of hide the size of a sela, the animal is kosher.

QUESTION

הֵיכָא?

The Gemara asks: **Where** must this piece of hide be located?

ANSWER

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: על פני השדרה כולה.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: It must be along the entire spine.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: דאריה וקטין, דכי מצרף לה הוי כסלע, או דלמא ברוחב סלע על פני השדרה כולה?

A dilemma was raised before them: Does this mean a strip of hide that is long and thin, which when you combine it together it has the total area of a sela? Or perhaps it must be the width of a sela along the entire spine?

PROOF

תא שמע, דפריש רבי נהוראי משמיה דשמואל: ברוחב כסלע על פני כל השדרה כולה.

Come and hear, as Rabbi Nehorai explained in the name of Shmuel: It must be the width of a sela along the entire spine.

STATEMENT

רבא בר בר חנה אמר: ראשי פרקים.

Rabba bar bar Chana said: The remaining hide must be on the tips of the joints of the limbs.

STATEMENT

רבי אלעזר בן אנטיגנוס משום רבי אלעזר ברבי ינאי אמר: מקום טיבורו.

Rabbi Elazar ben Antigonus said in the name of Rabbi Elazar the son of Rabbi Yannai: It must be on the place of its navel.

QUESTION

בעי רבי ינאי ברבי ישמעאל: ניטל מקום השדרה וכולו קיים, ניטל מקום טיבורו וכולו קיים, ניטלו ראשי פרקים וכולו קיים, מאי?

Rabbi Yannai the son of Rabbi Yishmael raised a dilemma: If the place of the spine was removed but all the rest of the hide remained, or if the place of its navel was removed but all the rest remained, or if the tips of the joints were removed but all the rest remained, what is the law?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara concludes: The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

STATEMENT

אמר רב: כל העור פולו מציל בגלוידה, חוץ מעור בית הפרסות.

Rav said: Any part of the hide saves the animal from being a flayed animal if it remains, except for the hide of the hooves.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אפילו עור בית הפרסות נמי מציל.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Even the hide of the hooves also saves the animal.

QUESTION

בעא מיניה רבי אסי מרבי יוחנן: עור בית הפרסות מהו שיציל בגלודתו?

Rabbi Assi asked Rabbi Yochanan: What is the law regarding the hide of the hooves, whether it saves in the case of a flayed animal?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: מציל.

He said to him: It saves.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה, למדתנו רבינו: אלו שעורותיהן כבשרן – עור בית הפרסות!

Rabbi Assi said to him: But did you not teach us, our Rabbi, in a Mishnah regarding the laws of ritual impurity: These are the animals whose hides are like their flesh, and among them is listed the hide of the hooves? Since it is considered flesh, it should not count as hide to save the animal!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אל תקניטני, שב לשון יחיד אני שונה אותה.

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: Do not provoke me, for I learn that Mishnah as the view of a single Tanna, which is not the accepted halacha.

PROOF

דתנא: השוחט את העולה להקטיר כזית מעור של תחת האליה חוץ למקומו – פסול, ואין בו פרת;

As it is taught in a Braisa: One who slaughters an olah-offering with the intention to burn an olive's bulk of the hide under the tail outside its proper place, the offering is unfit, but there is no punishment of kares for it;

PROOF

חוץ לזמנו – פגול, וחיובין עליו פרת.

if he intended to burn it outside its proper time, it is piggul, and one is liable to kares for it. This is because this hide is considered like flesh.

PROOF

אליעזר בן יהודה איש איבלים אמר משום רבי יעקב, וכן היה רבי שמעון בן יהודה איש [כפר] עיכוס ואמר משום רבי שמעון:

Eliezer ben Yehuda of Evelayim said in the name of Rabbi Yaakov, and so Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda of Kefar Akos would say in the name of Rabbi Shimon:

PROOF

אֶחָד עוֹר בֵּית הַפָּרְסוֹת, וְאֶחָד עוֹר הָרֹאשׁ שֶׁל עֵגֶל הָרֶה, וְאֶחָד עוֹר שֶׁל תַּחַת הָאֵלֶּיָּהּ, וְכָל שְׁמֵנוּ חֲכָמִים גָּבִי טוֹמְאָה אֵלּוּ שְׁעוֹרוֹתֵיהֶן כְּבָשָׂרוֹ.

Both the hide of the hooves, and the hide of the head of a tender calf, and the hide under the tail, and all those that the Sages enumerated regarding impurity as 'those whose hides are like their flesh' are indeed considered hide for all other matters, showing that the view equating them to flesh is only a minority opinion.

SUMMARY

The Gemara then transitions into the practical halachos of tereifos, focusing on the internal organs of the animal. We learn that while the complete removal of the spleen or kidneys leaves the animal kosher, specific localized damage—such as a perforation in the thick, upper end of the spleen, or a disease that reaches the white area of the kidney—can render the animal a tereifah. Finally, Rav Ashi teaches us a fundamental principle in the laws of tereifos: we cannot compare the vulnerability of one organ to another, as the complex nature of the body means what is fatal in one area may be perfectly survivable in another.

לְמַעֲשָׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In today's daf, we learn a profound principle about the nature of halacha and life: "Ein omrim b'treifos zo domeh l'zo"—we do not compare different laws of treifos to one another. The Gemara explains that you cannot make a logical comparison between the lung and the kidney, because "you can cut here and the animal dies, but cut there and it lives." What looks like the exact same wound can be fatal in one organ but completely harmless in another.

This is a powerful lesson for our own avodah. How often do we look at a friend or a neighbor and compare our spiritual struggles to theirs? We see someone else facing a challenge and think, "If they can handle that so easily, why am I struggling so much with this?" Or we look at our own lives and wonder why a small setback in one area completely knocks us off our feet, while a major challenge in another area barely affects us.

The Aibershter created each of us with a unique spiritual anatomy. Our neshama has its own sensitive areas, its own "lungs" and "kidneys." What is a minor scratch for one person can be a deep, painful wound for another. We cannot compare our spiritual health or our struggles to anyone else's, nor can we compare our reactions to different situations in our own lives. Hashem knows exactly where you are sensitive and where you are strong.

Today, when you feel yourself starting to compare your spiritual progress, your struggles, or your reactions to those of someone else, stop and remind yourself: "My neshama is unique. I will focus only on the specific avodah Hashem has given to me, without comparing myself to others."