

דף יומי • תלפין • דף ע"ד

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by diving deeper into the sugya of a hanging limb on an animal, exploring the profound halachic difference between an animal that dies on its own versus one that is properly slaughtered. The Gemara brings a beautiful limud from the pesukim of sheratzim to show how death and shechitah affect these limbs differently, and we see a classic yeshivish chakirah between Rav Chisda and Rabba regarding a limb of a dead fetus.

We then move into a fascinating discussion about an eight-month-old fetus, analyzing whether shechitah can purify it from tumas neveilah. This leads us to a deep inquiry by Rav Hoshaya about whether one can perform shechitah on a living fetus while it is still inside its mother's womb, before we begin the next Mishnah which teaches the fundamental halachos of what we find inside a slaughtered animal.

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

עמוד א' DAF 74A

STATEMENT

אין בהן אלא מצות פרוש בלבד.

Therefore, **there is not in them** any Torah prohibition, **but only a mitzvah to separate** oneself from eating them as a Rabbinic safeguard.

STATEMENT

תניב רב יוסף קמיה דרב הונא, ויתניב וקאמר: אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: אכלו לזה – לוקה.

Rav Yosef sat before Rav Huna, and he sat and said: Rav Yehuda says that Rav says: If one ate this hanging limb after the animal died, he **is flogged** for violating the prohibition of eating a limb from a living animal.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה ההוא מרבנן: לא תציתו ליה, הכי אמר רב יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא משמיה דרב: אכלו לזה – אינו לוקה.

One of the Sages said to him: Do not listen to him in his transmission of Rav's ruling, for this is what Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marta says in the name of Rav: If one ate this hanging limb, he **is not flogged**.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב הונא: אנון אמאן נסמוד?

Rav Huna said to Rav Yosef: Upon whom shall we rely to know the true opinion of Rav?

ANSWER

אֶהְדְּרִינָהוּ רַב יוֹסֵף לְאַפִּיָּה, אָמַר לִיה: מַאי קוּשְׁיָא?

Rav Yosef turned his face away in anger and said to him: What is the difficulty? There is no contradiction between the two versions.

EXPLANATION

כִּי אָמַרְי אֲנָא – בְּמִיתָהּ, דְּעוֹשָׁה נִיפּוּל; כִּי אָמַר אִיהוּ – בְּשְׁחִיטָהּ, דְּאִינָה עוֹשָׁה נִיפּוּל.

When I said in Rav's name that he is flogged, it was in a case where the animal died **by death** other than slaughter, which renders the hanging limb as **though it had fallen off** before death, and thus it remains forbidden as a limb from a living animal. When he said in Rav's name that he is not flogged, it was in a case where the animal died **by slaughter**, which does not render the hanging limb as **though it had fallen off** before the slaughter, and therefore the slaughter permits it.

QUESTION

אָמַר רַבָּא: מֵנָּה הָא מְלָתָא דְאַמּוּר רַבָּנִן: מִיתָה עוֹשָׁה נִיפּוּל, שְׁחִיטָה אִינָה עוֹשָׁה נִיפּוּל,

Rava said: From where is this matter that the Sages stated derived, that death renders a hanging limb as though it had fallen off, whereas slaughter does not render a hanging limb as though it had fallen off?

PROOF

דְּכְתִיב: "וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִפֹּל עָלָיו מֵהֶם בְּמָתָם יִטְמָא", לְמַעוּטֵי מַאי?

As it is written regarding the eight creeping animals: "And anything upon which any of them falls, when they are dead, shall be impure." Now, what does the phrase "when they are dead" serve to exclude?

INFERENCE

אֵילִימָא לְמַעוּטֵי בְּחַיָּיהֶם – מִ"נִבְּלָתָם" נִפְקָא,

If we say it is to exclude them during their lifetime, that is already derived from the word "their carcass," which teaches that only their dead carcass imparts impurity.

INFERENCE

אָלָא שְׁמַע מִינָּה: מִיתָה עוֹשָׁה נִיפּוּל, וְאִין שְׁחִיטָה עוֹשָׁה נִיפּוּל.

Rather, learn from this that death renders a hanging limb as though it had fallen off, and slaughter does not render a hanging limb as though it had fallen off.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה רַב אַדָּא בַר אַהֲבָה לְרַבָּא: וְהָא קָרָא בְּשָׂרָצִים כְּתִיב!

Rav Adda bar Ahava said to Rava: But this verse is written regarding creeping animals, which are not subject to slaughter at all! How can we derive a law of slaughter from here?

RESOLUTION

אָמַר לִיה: אִם אֵינוּ עֲנִין לְשָׂרָצִים, דְּלֹא בְּגִי שְׁחִיטָה נִינְהוּ – תִּנְהוּ עֲנִין לְבִהֵמָה.

Rava said to him: If the verse is not needed for the matter of creeping animals, which are not subject to slaughter, apply its matter to an animal, which is subject to slaughter.

OBJECTION

ואבתי מבעי ליה, פצין מיתה: לחין – מטמאים, יבשים – אין מטמאים!

The Gemara objects: **But still**, the phrase "when they are dead" **is needed** to teach that they only defile when they are **similar to** the state of **death**: when they are **moist they impart impurity**, but when they are completely **dry they do not impart impurity**!

RESOLUTION

תרי "במתם" כתיבי.

The Gemara answers: **Two** instances of the phrase "**when they are dead**" **are written**, so one is free for Rava's derivation.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חסדא: מחלוקת באבר דעובר חי, אבל באבר דעובר מת – דברי הכל שחיטה עושה ניהול.

Rav Chisda said: **The dispute** between Rabbi Meir and the Sages regarding a limb of a fetus that protruded **is only regarding a limb of a living fetus**; but regarding a limb of a dead fetus, **everyone agrees** that **slaughter renders** the limb as though it **had fallen off** before the slaughter, and it is not permitted.

STATEMENT

ורבה אמר: כמחלוקת בזה כך מחלוקת בזה.

But Rabba said: **Just as there is a dispute in this** case of a living fetus, **so too there is a dispute in that** case of a dead fetus.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

בן שמונה חי.

Our Mishnah taught: **An eight-month-old fetus born alive** is not rendered pure by slaughtering it, because the concept of slaughter does not apply to its kind.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

OBJECTION

והתנא: בן שמונה חי יוכיח, שאף על פי שיש במינו שחיטה – אין שחיטתו מטהרתו.

The Gemara challenges: **But isn't it taught in a Braisa: An eight-month-old fetus born alive will prove the point, for even though there is slaughter in its kind, its slaughter does not render it pure** from carcass impurity! This contradicts our Mishnah's reasoning.

RESOLUTION

אמר רב כהנא: יש במינו שחיטה אנב אמו, ותנא דידן מינא דאמיה לא פריה.

Rav Kahana said: **The Braisa** considers that **there is slaughter in its kind by virtue of its mother's slaughter**, which permits the fetus inside her; **but the Tanna of our Mishnah does not raise a challenge from the kind of its mother**, as he does not consider that to be "its kind."

QUESTION

וְלֵהָאֵי תַנָּא דְפִרְיָה, טְרֵפָה דְשְחִיטָתָהּ מְטַהֲרָתָהּ מִנָּא לִיָּה?

And according to this Tanna of the Braisa who does raise the challenge, from where does he derive that the slaughter of a tereifah renders it pure from carcass impurity?

ANSWER

נִפְקָא לִיָּה מִדְּרַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב, דָּאֻמַּר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב, וְאָמַרִי לָהּ בְּמַתְנֵיתָא תַנָּא: אָמַר קְרָא
 "וְכִי יָמוּת מִן הַבְּהֵמָה", מְקַצֵּת בְּהֵמָה מְטַמְּאָה וּמְקַצֵּת בְּהֵמָה אֵינָהּ מְטַמְּאָה, וְאִיזוּ זֶה? זֶה טְרֵפָה
 שְשִׁחְטָהּ.

He derives it from that which Rav Yehuda says that Rav says, as Rav Yehuda says that Rav says, and some say it was taught in a Braisa: The verse states: "And if there dies of the animal," and the word "of" implies that only a part of the animal class imparts impurity when it dies, and a part of the animal class does not impart impurity. And which is this? This is a tereifah that one slaughtered.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַב הוֹשְׁעִיא: הוֹשִׁיט אֶת יָדוֹ לְמַעַי בְּהֵמָה, וְשָׁחַט בֶּן תִּשְׁעָה חֳדָי, מַהוּ?

Rav Hoshaya raised a dilemma: If one inserted his hand into the womb of an animal and slaughtered a nine-month-old living fetus inside, what is the law?

EXPLANATION

תִּבְעֵי לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר, וְתִבְעֵי לְרַבָּנָן.

Let the question be asked according to Rabbi Meir, and let the question be asked according to the Rabbis.

EXPLANATION

תִּבְעֵי לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר: עַד כָּאֵן לֹא קָאֻמַּר רַבִּי מֵאִיר בֶּן פְּקוּעָה טְעוֹן שְחִיטָה – הֲנִי מִלִּי הֵיכָא דִּינְצָא
 לְאוֹרֵי הָעוֹלָם, אֲבָל בְּמַעַי אִמּוֹ – לֹא שָׁרִיָּא לִיָּה שְחִיטָה. אוּ דִילְמָא, אֲפִילוּ לְרַבָּנָן, אֲרַבְעָה סִימְנִין
 אֲכֻשָׁר בִּיה רַחֲמָנָא.

Let the question be asked according to Rabbi Meir: Perhaps Rabbi Meir only says that a fetus born alive requires slaughter when it has emerged into the air of the world, but inside its mother's womb, slaughter does not permit it? Or perhaps, even according to the Rabbis, the Merciful One made four signs valid in it—the mother's two and the fetus's two—and thus this slaughter is effective.

PROOF

אָמַר רַב חַנְנְיָא, תָּא שְׁמַע: הָרִי שָׁנוּ לָדָה טְרֵפָה מִן הַבֶּטֶן, וְאִי אֵיתָא, מִשְׁכַּחַת לָהּ דְּהֵיָתָהּ לָהּ שְׁעַת
 הַכּוֹשֶׁר, דָּאִי בְּעֵי עֵיִל יָדֶיהָ וְשָׁחֲטָהּ!

Rav Chananya said, come and hear: A Braisa states, "If it was born a tereifah from the womb..." And if it is so that slaughter inside the womb is valid, you could find a case where it had a period of fitness before birth, for if he wanted, he could have inserted his hand and slaughtered it in the womb while it was still healthy!

RESOLUTION

אמר ליה רבא: תני שנוצרה טרפה מן הבטן, ומשפחת לה בבטן חמש רגלים.

Rava said to him: Teach the Braisa as, "If it was formed a tereifah from the womb," and you can find it in a case of an animal with five legs, which was a tereifah from the very moment of its formation.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' השוחט את הבהמה, ומצא בה בן שמנה חי או מת, או בן תשעה מת – קורעו ומוציא את דמו.

MISHNAH: One who slaughters an animal and finds in it an eight-month-old fetus, whether alive or dead, or a nine-month-old fetus that is dead, tears it open and drains its blood, and it is permitted to be eaten without slaughter.

MISHNAH

מצא בן תשעה חי – טעון שחיטה, וחיוב ב"אותו ואת בנו", דברי רבי מאיר.

If he found a nine-month-old fetus that is alive, it requires slaughter, and one is liable for violating the prohibition of slaughtering "it and its offspring" on the same day if he slaughters both it and its mother; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

MISHNAH

וחכמים אומרים: שחיטת אמו מטהרתו.

But the Sages say: The slaughter of its mother permits it for consumption, and it does not require its own slaughter.

עמוד ב' DAF 74B

MISHNAH

רבי שמעון שזורי אומר: אפילו בן חמש שנים וחורש בשדה – שחיטת אמו מטהרתו.

Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: Even if the fetus emerged alive and is now a five-year-old and plowing in the field, the slaughter of its mother renders it permitted to be eaten without any further slaughter.

MISHNAH

קרעה ומצא בה בן תשעה חי – טעון שחיטה, לפי שלא נשחטה אמו.

But if one tore her open, meaning he killed the mother animal without halachic slaughter, and found in her a live nine-month-old fetus, it requires slaughter, because its mother was not slaughtered.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' אמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי אושעיא: לא הילכו בו אלא על עסקי שחיטה בלבד.

GEMARA: Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said: They did not discuss the status of this live nine-month-old fetus except regarding the matter of slaughter alone, to permit its meat.

QUESTION

למעוטי מאי? למעוטי חלב וגיידו.

The Gemara asks: **What does** this statement serve **to exclude**? The Gemara answers: It serves **to exclude its fat and its sciatic nerve**, which remain prohibited as in any other animal.

OBJECTION

חלב דמאי? אילימא: חלב דשלי, מפלג פליגי!

The Gemara asks: **The fat of what** part? **If we say** it means **the fat of the fetus** itself, but **they disagree** about this in a braisa!

PROOF

דתנא: גיד הנשה נוהג בשליל וחלב אסור, דברי רבי מאיר. רבי יהודה אומר: אינו נוהג בשליל וחלב מותר.

As it is taught in a braisa: **The sciatic nerve applies to a fetus and its fat is prohibited**; these are **the words of Rabbi Meir**. **Rabbi Yehuda says**: It does not apply to a fetus and its fat is permitted.

EXPLANATION

ואמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי אושעיא: מח לוקת בכו תשעה חי, והלה רבי מאיר לשיטתו, ורבי יהודה לשיטתו.

And **Rabbi Elazar said** that **Rabbi Oshaya said**: **This dispute is regarding a live nine-month-old fetus**, and **Rabbi Meir followed his reasoning** that it is an independent animal, and **Rabbi Yehuda followed his reasoning** that it is part of its mother. Thus, they do not agree that its fat is prohibited!

OBJECTION

אלא, חלב דגיד מפלג פליגי, דתנא: גיד הנשה – מחטט אחריו בכל מקום שהוא, וחותה שמנו מעיקרו, דברי רבי מאיר. רבי יהודה אומר: גוממו עם השופי.

Rather, say that **Rabbi Oshaya meant the fat of the sciatic nerve** of the fetus. But they also **disagree** about that, as it is **taught** in a braisa: Regarding **the sciatic nerve**, one **scrapes** after it in any place that it is, and **cuts away its fat from its root**; these are **the words of Rabbi Meir**. **Rabbi Yehuda says**: One **cuts it level with the flesh** and does not need to **scrape** the fat.

RESOLUTION

אלא אי אתמר – הכי אתמר, אמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי אושעיא: לא היכלו בו אלא על עסקי אכילה בלבד, למעוטי רובעו, וחורש בו.

Rather, if it was stated, it was stated like this: **Rabbi Elazar said** that **Rabbi Oshaya said**: They did not discuss the status of the fetus **except regarding matters of eating alone**, but for other matters it is a full animal, **to exclude one who copulates with it, and one who plows with it** together with another species, which are prohibited by all.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: לדברי המתיר בחלב – מתיר בדמו, לדברי האוסר בחלב – אוסר בדמו.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: According to the words of the one who permits its fat—namely Rabbi Yehuda—he also permits its blood; according to the words of the one who prohibits its fat—Rabbi Meir—he also prohibits its blood.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אף לדברי המתיר בִּחְלָבוֹ – אוֹסֵר בְּדָמוֹ.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Even according to the words of the one who permits its fat, he prohibits its blood.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רבי יוחנן לרבי שמעון בן לקיש: קורעו ומוציא את דמו.

Rabbi Yochanan raised an objection to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish from our Mishnah: One tears it and removes its blood, which shows that its blood is prohibited even though its fat is permitted!

RESOLUTION

אמר רבי זירא: לומר שאין ענוש כרת.

Rabbi Zeira said: Reish Lakish meant to say only that eating its blood is not punishable by kares, whereas Rabbi Yochanan holds that it is.

QUESTION

למאן קאמרי? לרבי יהודה, לא יהא אלא דם התמצית, דתנא: דם התמצית באזהרה, רבי יהודה אומר: בהכרת.

The Gemara asks: According to whom are they saying this? According to Rabbi Yehuda. But let it be no less than the blood of exudate, as it is taught in a braisa: The blood of exudate is subject to a negative prohibition, but Rabbi Yehuda says: It is subject to kares!

ANSWER

תרגמא רב יוסף בריה דרב סלא חסידא קמיה דרב פפא: אית ליה לרבי יהודה "דם" ו"כל דם", כל היכא דמיתייב אדם הנפש – מיתייב אדם התמצית, וכל היכא דלא מיתייב אדם הנפש – לא מיתייב אדם התמצית.

Rav Yosef the son of Rav Salla the Pious explained it before Rav Pappa: Rabbi Yehuda holds that the Torah writes 'blood' and 'any blood'; therefore, wherever one is liable for the blood of life, he is liable for the blood of exudate, and wherever one is not liable for the blood of life—such as the fetus, whose life is covered by its mother's slaughter—he is not liable for the blood of exudate.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: מהו לפדות בכֶּן פְּקוּעָה?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the law as to whether one may redeem a firstborn donkey with a ben pekua—a fetus found alive inside a slaughtered animal?

EXPLANATION

אליבא דרבי מאיר לא תיבעי לך, דכיון דאמר טעון שחיטה – שָׁהּ מַעֲלִיא הוּא.

According to Rabbi Meir, do not raise the dilemma, because since he says it requires slaughter, it is a proper lamb in every way and may be used.

QUESTION

כִּי תִיבָעִי לָךְ אֶלֶיכָא דְרַבְנָן, דְּאָמְרִי: שְׁחִיטַת אִמּוֹ מְטַהֲרָתוֹ, מֵאִי?

When you should raise the dilemma is according to the Rabbis, who say: The slaughter of its mother renders it permitted. What is the law?

QUESTION

כִּינּוּן דְּאָמְרִי שְׁחִיטַת אִמּוֹ מְטַהֲרָתוֹ – כְּבִשְׂרָא בְּדִיקוּלָא הוּא, אוּ דִּילְמָא, כִּינּוּן דְּרַהֲיִט וְאֲזִיל וְרַהֲיִט וְאֵתִי – "שֶׁה" קָרִינָא בִּיהּ?

Do we say: Since they say the slaughter of its mother renders it permitted, it is like meat in a basket, and not a living lamb? Or perhaps, since it runs back and forth, we call it a 'lamb'?

STATEMENT

מַר זוּטְרָא אָמַר: אֵין פּוֹדִין, וְרַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: פּוֹדִין.

Mar Zutra said: We do not redeem with it. And Rav Ashi said: We do redeem with it.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיהּ רַב אֲשִׁי לְמַר זוּטְרָא: מֵאִי דַעְתָּךְ? דְּגַמְרַת "שֶׁה" "שֶׁה" מִפְסָחִים?

Rav Ashi said to Mar Zutra: What is your reasoning? That you derive the word 'lamb' here from the word 'lamb' from the Pesach offering?

OBJECTION

אִי מָה לְהֶלֶן – זָכָר, תָּמִים, וּבֶן שָׁנָה, אֶף כָּאֵן – זָכָר, תָּמִים, וּבֶן שָׁנָה!

If so, just as there it must be a male, unblemished, and in its first year, so too here it must be a male, unblemished, and in its first year! But we know that is not required.

ANSWER

"תַּפְדָּה" "תַּפְדָּה" רִיבָה.

Mar Zutra replied: The Torah's repetition of 'you shall redeem' 'you shall redeem' included other types of lambs.

OBJECTION

אִי "תַּפְדָּה" "תַּפְדָּה" רִיבָה, אֶפִּילוּ כָל מִילֵי נֶמִי, אִם כֵּן "שֶׁה" "שֶׁה" מֵאִי אֶהְיֶי לָךְ?

Rav Ashi asked: If 'you shall redeem' 'you shall redeem' included everything, then even anything else also should be valid! If so, what did the gezerah shavah of 'lamb' 'lamb' accomplish for you?

QUESTION

אֵיבָעִיא לְהוֹ: מַהוּ לְמִנּוֹת בּוּ רֵאשׁוֹן וְשֵׁנִי?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the law as to whether we count first and second degrees of ritual impurity in it, as we do with food, or is it like a living animal which cannot become tamei?

STATEMENT

רבי יוחנן אמר: מונין בו ראשון ושני.

Rabbi Yochanan said: We count first and second degrees of impurity in it, because it is considered slaughtered meat.

STATEMENT

רבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר: אין מונין בו ראשון ושני, נעשה כפאגוז המתקלקש בקליפתו.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish says: We do not count first and second degrees of impurity in it; it is made like a nut that rattles in its shell, meaning it is a separate living body inside the mother.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רבי שמעון בן לקיש לרבי יוחנן: הפשר מצע נבלה – דברי רבי מאיר. וחקמים אומרים: מצע טרפה שחוטה.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish raised an objection to Rabbi Yochanan from a Mishnah: The fetus's flesh is considered the touch of a carcass; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. And the Sages say: It is like the touch of a slaughtered treifah.

OBJECTION

בשלמא לדידי, דאמינא חד גופא הוא – היינו דאיתכשר בדמא דאמיה, אלא לדידך, במאי איתכשר?

Granted according to me, who says it is one body with the mother, that is how it became fit to receive impurity through the blood of its mother's slaughter. But according to you, how did it become fit? It was never touched by liquid!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: בשחיטה, וברבי שמעון.

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: It became fit through the slaughter itself, and according to Rabbi Shimon who holds that slaughter makes meat fit to receive impurity even without liquid.

OBJECTION

איתיביה רבי יוחנן לרבי שמעון בן לקיש: עבר בנהר – הוכשר, הלה לבית הקברות – נטמא.

Rabbi Yochanan raised an objection to Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish from a braisa: If the fetus crossed a river, it became fit to receive impurity; if it went to a cemetery, it became tamei.

OBJECTION

בשלמא לדידי דאמינא תרי גופי נינהו, משום הכי הוכשר – אין, לא הוכשר – לא, אלא לדידך דאמרת חד גופא הוא, הא איתכשר בדמא דאמיה!

Granted according to me, who says they are two bodies, that is why the braisa says: if it became fit by crossing the river, yes, it can become tamei, but if it did not become fit, no. But according to you, who says it is one body, it was already made fit by the blood of its mother's slaughter!

SUMMARY

The daf establishes that while the natural death of an animal renders a hanging limb as if it had fallen off beforehand (leaving it forbidden as a limb from a living animal), a proper shechitah does not have this effect, and thus the shechitah successfully permits the limb. We learn that this distinction is derived from the words 'when they are dead' written by sheratzim. The Gemara then discusses the status of an eight-month-old fetus, clarifying that its shechitah is ineffective to purify it from tumah because shechitah does not apply to its kind, though we explore how its mother's shechitah might connect to this definition. Finally, the Gemara presents a dilemma regarding whether shechitah can be performed on a fetus inside the womb, and introduces the Mishnah ruling that a found eight-month fetus (alive or dead) or a dead nine-month fetus is permitted through the mother's shechitah, whereas a live nine-month fetus requires its own shechitah.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, the Gemara discusses the status of a limb that is partially severed and hanging from a live animal. When the animal dies, we must determine if this hanging limb is considered to have fallen off before death, or if it is still considered connected. This concept of "nipul", whether something hanging by a thread is already deemed fallen and separated, is a profound lesson in our own spiritual lives.

How often do we find ourselves "hanging by a thread" in our avodah? We might feel disconnected from our learning, our tefillah, or our passion for Yiddishkeit, feeling as though we are barely holding on. The yetzer hara whispers to us that we are already spiritually detached, that we have already fallen. But the Torah teaches us otherwise: as long as there is a connection, as long as the animal is slaughtered properly, we do not say it has fallen. You are still connected.

Never write yourself off as detached just because the connection feels weak. Even a thin thread of desire to do the ratzon of Hashem keeps you fully attached to the source of life. Your job is not to despair over the fraying connection, but to strengthen it, knowing that in the eyes of the Aibershter, you are still completely there.

Today, identify one area of your avodah where you feel weak or disconnected, and perform one small, deliberate act of connection, a single minute of focused tefillah or learning, to show that you are still firmly attached.