Journal of Textual Reasoning

Volume 15
Number 1 *The Talmud as an Ethical Prompt*

March 2024

Appetite for Udders: The Return of the Repressed Mother in b. Hullin 109a–110b

Beth Berkowitz
Columbia University

Journal of Textual Reasoning 15:1 (March 2024)
ISSN: 1939-7518

APPETITE FOR UDDERS: THE RETURN OF THE REPRESSED MOTHER IN B. HULLIN 109A–110B

BETH A. BERKOWITZ
Columbia University

Reading Udders with Freud

Eighteen-year old Ida Bauer, better known as Dora, the pseudonym that Freud gave her, developed a nervous cough and then a total loss of voice in the wake of sexual advances she endured from her father's good friend Mr. K. Ida's father sought out Freud for help with her symptoms. Freud believed Ida's accusations against Mr. K but saw Ida as implicated in the advances, supposing her to be sexually attracted to Mr. K and unconsciously encouraging of him. Ida broke off treatment with Freud, and Freud considered the treatment a failure.

Freud explained the meaning of the voice symptom by what may seem to all but the most devoted Freudians a circuitous route. Dora had heard of the sexual practice of sucking on the penis and had developed a fantasy about it, according to Freud's interpretation, that was expressed in the coughing and voice symptoms. The deeper wish, in Freud's view, was for the breast, however, not the penis. The desire for fellatio represents the "prehistoric impression of sucking at the mother's or

nurse's breast."[1] Freud would eventually blame himself for not identifying Ida's sexual desire for Mrs. K, who had been having an affair with Ida's father.

Evidence for the symbolic link between penis and breast came, for Freud, in the form of the cow's udder. Freud described the udder as an "image intermediate between a nipple and a penis."[2] Because the udder hangs down from the undercarriage of the cow, it appears to the human eye like a penis. The association between udder, breast, and penis came up again for Freud nine years later in his study of Little Hans, who as a three-year-old was reported to have asked his mother whether she had a "widdler" too. She said yes, surprisingly, presumably thinking Hans was referring to her capacity to urinate.[3] Hans's impression that females possess penises was reinforced when he entered a cow-shed and saw a cow being milked. Hans exclaimed, "Oh, look! There's milk coming out of its widdler."[4] Freud's comment on Hans's confusion was similar to the one he had made in Dora's case: "A cow's udder plays an apt part as intermediate image, being in its nature a mamma and in its shape and position a penis."[5] Hans's exclamation continued to inspire Freud as he developed his theory of castration anxiety.

I begin with Freud's view of the udder—as both breast and penis, as that which confuses female with male, as representing in the realm of fantasy the desire for attachment and the fear of loss—as a helpful point of entry into rabbinic discussions of the udder. For Freud, the udder's meaning as a breast is displaced by its positioning as a penis. For the

---

[1] Sigmund Freud, *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria*, ed. Philip Rieff (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1997), 45.

[2] Freud, *Dora*, 45.

[3] On Hans's parents' many obfuscations in the face of Hans's questions, see Peter L. Rudnytsky, *Reading Psychoanalysis: Freud, Rank, Ferenczi, Groddeck* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 22–34.

[4] Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. James Strachey and Anna Freud, vol. 10 (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1995), 7.

[5] Freud, *Standard Edition*, vol. 10, 7.

rabbis too, the udder's "breastness," we will see, is lost as the udder is drained of milk and turned into permitted meat. Yet for both Freud and the rabbis, the mother—and female perspective—proves difficult to forget when thinking about the udder. The Talmud is haunted by the repressed mother, I will show, who appears in various guises throughout the talmudic passage, or "*sugya*," on the udder in b. Hullin 109a–110b. Dora's mutism was understood by feminist playwright Helène Cixous in "Portrait of Dora" as a revolt against male power over women's bodies.[6] The animal mother, symbolized metonymically by the udder, also resists her invisibility within rabbinic dietary law, I will propose.

Joining recent efforts to recover maternal visibility in the narration and production of Jewishness, I look to the animal mother as an even more occluded yet still powerful figure.[7] The animal breast as it emerges in the Hullin *sugya* divides men from women, some rabbis from other rabbis, and Jews in one Babylonian city from Jews in another. It comes dangerously close to causing a violation of the Torah's commands. For Freud and for the Talmud, the udder creates a symptom-producing anxiety about order, ego, and consuming appetites.

In the following discussion, I will take readers through the *sugya* and suggest, in closing, a "diagnosis" for its udder anxiety. I will propose that rabbinic anxiety around the udder emanates from, first, the *exegetical gap* between the biblical prohibition on cooking a kid in his mother's milk and the rabbinic laws about milk and meat and, second, from the *ethical gap*

---

[6] Hélène Cixous, *Selected Plays of Hélène Cixous*, trans. Ann Liddle (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 35–60.

[7] Elisheva Baumgarten, *Mothers and Children: Jewish Family Life in Medieval Europe*, Jews, Christians, and Muslims from the Ancient to the Modern World (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004); Ellen Davina Haskell, *Suckling at My Mother's Breasts: The Image of a Nursing God in Jewish Mysticism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012); Marjorie Suzan Lehman, Jane L. Kanarek, and Simon J. Bronner, eds., *Mothers in the Jewish Cultural Imagination* (Oxford; Portland, OR: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, in association with Liverpool University Press, 2017); Mara H. Benjamin, *The Obligated Self: Maternal Subjectivity and Jewish Thought* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2018); Deena Aranoff, "Mother's Milk: Child-Rearing and the Production of Jewish Culture," *Journal of Jewish Identities* 12.1 (2019): 1–17.

that forms when the mother–child pair of the biblical prohibition is lost from view.

This essay employs the standard feminist methodology of recovering women's voices from texts in which they are normally marginalized.[8] You will hear the voices of women in the street and in the house who pose subversive challenges to standard rabbinic practice. But this essay ultimately takes a somewhat more unusual and admittedly more arguable approach to the text of the Talmud in that it identifies there an "absent referent," a notion I borrow from Carol Adams in her feminist writing on meat: "The absent referent is the literal being who disappears in the eating of dead bodies. The absent referent functions to put the violence under wraps: there is no 'cow' whom we have to think about."[9] It is difficult to establish the presence of the absent referent because it is always an argument from silence. Nevertheless, I propose that a figure lurks behind the laws and stories of this Hullin *sugya*, and that figure is the animal mother, who is, in my reckoning, the absent referent for *kashrut*. The women we meet in this *sugya* who flout or skirt the laws of milk and meat are our guides; they hint to us who or what might be missing. Freud's insights—into the udder's complex symbolism and the power of that which lies hidden—as well as oversights—of the udder's breastness and of Ida's own perspective—furnish my reading that the missing person in this *sugya* is no person at all, but the animal mother buried beneath the sediment of rabbinic legal creativity. With its associative style, polyphonic conversation, and dream-like narrative, the Talmud lends itself, if any work does, to risky readings.

I teach Jewish Studies at Barnard College, and my students, whether they have *yeshiva* background or little Jewish background, are equally surprised, I believe, to find themselves putting thinkers like Freud in conversation with the Talmud. Because the Talmud is associated primarily with the sequestered setting of the *yeshiva*, which those both

---

[8] The touchstone for this approach is Tal Ilan, *Mine and Yours Are Hers: Retrieving Women's History from Rabbinic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

[9] Carol J. Adams, *The Pornography of Meat: New and Updated Edition* (Bloomsbury, 2020), 50.

inside and out see as standing in opposition to the so-called secular world, students are led to believe that the Talmud speaks only to interests that are specifically Jewish and religious and not to deep human conflicts and concerns. The discussion that follows is intended to disrupt not only that set of associations—Talmud = yeshiva = religion = Judaism—but also another one that is common and constraining, which is that between psychoanalysis, the individual human psyche, and a phallocentric model of emotion.[10]

The Udder Problem in Mishnah Hullin 8:3

Mishnah Hullin 5–10 treats a series of scriptural commandments related to *hullin*, meat outside the context of sacrifice. Chapter 8 is dedicated to the famous biblical prohibition against cooking a kid in his mother's milk:[11]

> You shall not boil a kid in his mother's milk. (Exod. 23:19, 34:26; Deut. 14:21)

Two major lines of interpretation can be identified in the understanding of this prohibition. One, embodied by Philo's treatment in "On the Virtues," is that cooking a young animal in the fluid meant to sustain him appears callous and cruel.[12] Another, represented by Maimonides, is that cooking a kid in his mother's milk was an idolatrous practice that came to be prohibited on those grounds.[13] The first rationale is ethical, the second theological or cultic.

---

[10] For feminist and queer perspectives on Dora, see Daniela Finzi and Herman Westerink, eds., *Dora, Hysteria and Gender: Reconsidering Freud's Case Study* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2018). For feminist reading of Little Hans, concerned also with animal symbolism, see Kelly Oliver, "Little Hans's Little Sister," *Philosophia* 1.1 (2011): 9–28.

[11] The classic treatment is Menahem Haran, "Seething a Kid in Its Mother's Milk," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30.1 (1979): 23–35.

[12] See appendix. For discussion see Katell Berthelot, "Philo and Kindness towards Animals (*De Virtutibus* 125–147)," *The Studia Philonica Annual*, no. 14 (2002): 48–65.

[13] See appendix. For discussion see Moshe Halbertal, *Maimonides: Life and Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 344–46.

As is typical of the Mishnah, tractate Hullin is not interested in the law's rationale but in its application. The first four mishnahs of m. Hullin 8 address the mixing of milk and meat as it relates to food preparation, cooking, serving, and eating. The udder appears within that section:

> **8:3** A drop of milk that fell on a piece of meat: if it is sufficient to impart flavor to that piece—it is forbidden.
>
> If he stirred the pot, if it is sufficient to impart flavor to that pot—it is forbidden.
>
> The udder: he tears it open and removes its milk.
>
> If he did not tear it open, he does not transgress on its account.
>
> The heart: He tears it open and removes its blood.
>
> If he did not tear it open, he did not transgress on its account.
>
> One who brings up fowl with cheese on the table does not transgress a negative commandment. (m. Hullin 8:3)[14]

This mishnah starts with the problem of milk falling into a pot of cooking meat, moves to the procedure for permitting the consumption of an udder or heart, and closes with the case of poultry being served together with cheese. This mishnah's organization reflects the themes of the larger chapter, which earlier features the serving table (in mishnahs 8:1 and 2), milk (which appears at the beginning of the chapter but then gives way to cheese), and fowl (at the end of 8:1). The concern with blood foreshadows the comparison between blood and fat that closes the chapter (8:6). Mishnah 8:3 pairs eating the udder with eating the heart since both are "meat" organs that contain troubling fluids—milk, because it cannot be mixed with meat, and blood, because it cannot be eaten at all—that are best extracted before cooking (see m. Keritot 5:1).[15]

The mishnah's interest in the udder can be thought to follow four tracks: legal, symbolic/affective, conceptual/cognitive, and moral. The

---

[14] Jordan D. Rosenblum, trans., "Hulin," in *The Oxford Mishnah* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

[15] The liver is another organ filled with troubling fluids—like the heart, blood—discussed in this chapter of b. Hullin.

udder is legally interesting because it is simultaneously milk and meat and therefore presents the kind of category problem dear to legal thought. The udder is of symbolic interest in the ways that Freud describes: the breast is the first node of affect for a mammal, offering nourishment, comfort, and attachment, but also generating frustration and aggression. The udder is of particular interest in its being like the human breast but also different in its position, singleness, and multiple nipples.

The udder is conceptually interesting in the boundary problems it poses. The breast is a transitional space, an idea developed by psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott, between infant and world, with the milk flowing directly from the mother's body to the infant's, with periodic drips, spurts, or spit-up finding their way into the external environment. The milk is doubly "inside": inside the udder, which is itself within the body of the mother cow, goat, or sheep, and then inside the baby's stomach, which is itself within the body of the baby. The udder suggests layers of inside-ness and outside-ness, confusing the divide between inside and out. Udders are, finally, morally interesting in that they suggest a "family values" morality that goes beyond the human. The dietary system makes animals into meat, but the udder pushes back as a reminder of the intimate affective lives of animals. The udder, in sum, invites a variety of lenses as the rabbis grapple with its meanings.[16]

Is Cooking Meat in Milk Ever Permitted?

The ambiguity of the udder as both milk and meat is resolved, seemingly, by the tearing instruction in mishnah 3: "He tears it open and removes its milk."[17] At the same time, tearing seems to be not entirely

---

[16] The rabbinic word for udder, *kahal*, is used more often to refer to *kohl*, makeup, and women's painting of the eyelids. In Aramaic it is used euphemistically to refer to blinding.

[17] In what seems to be a strange coincidence brought to my attention by Marc Brettler, Jeremiah 4:30 combines the language of tearing used here by the Mishnah, *qeriah*, with the imagery of *kohl*, which as I observe in the previous note, is the more common meaning of *kahal*: "And you, who are doomed to ruin, what do you accomplish by wearing crimson, by decking yourself in jewels of god, by enlarging your eyes with kohl (*ki tiqre'i vapukh*

necessary: "If he did not tear it open, he does not transgress on its account." Why not? The opening of the Babylonian Talmud's commentary on this mishnah addresses this question:

> Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said: He does not transgress on its account, and it is permitted.
>
> But we learn: "He does not transgress on its account" --
>
> He does not transgress, but there is a prohibition!

Rav spells out what would seem to be obvious from the mishnah. Even if one does not tear the udder, one may still eat it. The problem, though, is just as obvious. Why then does the mishnah say to tear it in the first place? There must be some prohibition involved, says the editorial voice or *stam*, or the mishnah would not say to do it.

This problem occupies the entire opening section of the *sugya*. Two approaches take shape, one permissive and one restrictive. On the permissive side, the *stam* suggests that one may eat the udder whether or not one tears, either before or after cooking. On the strict side is the *stam*'s proposal, based on an alternative version of Rav's teaching ("and there are those that say Rabbi Zera said in the name of Rav: 'One does not transgress on its account, but it is forbidden'"), that one must tear beforehand, and afterwards is too late. Without tearing prior to cooking and certainly eating, the udder is prohibited.

A teaching in the Mishnah's partner corpus, the Tosefta, is cited by the *sugya* to support the permissive position:

---

enayikh)?" The hullin *sugya* expands on tearing in a section that I do not discuss, in which Rav Yehudah instructs that the udder should be torn crosswise, literally by warp and woof in a weaving motion, and then smeared against a wall. The metaphor is disquieting given that weaving is an act of production, while tearing, followed by smearing against a wall, is very much not, but it is the first echo of the feminine—here, the quintessentially feminine labor of weaving—that runs through the *sugya*. See Pratima Gopalakrishnan, "Domestic Labor and Marital Obligations in the Ancient Jewish Household" (PhD diss., Yale University, 2020). I thank Marc Brettler and Pratima Gopalakrishnan and the other members of the North Carolina Jewish Studies Seminar for the wonderful insights they brought to this material when I shared it with them. On this particular matter of tearing, it was also noted that the cutting and smearing of the udder would have the effect of making it unrecognizable.

> Let us say that [the following teaching] supports him: The udder—one tears it and removes its milk. [If] one did not tear it, he does not transgress on its account. The heart—one tears it and removes its blood. [If] one did not tear it, one tears it after cooking it, and it is permitted.[18]
>
> (*Stam*:) A heart is that which requires tearing, but an udder does not require tearing.

The tradition represents essentially the same instruction as the mishnah but with one key difference. The person who does not tear the heart before cooking is directed to do so afterwards, at which point, and only then, the heart becomes permitted to eat. The implication, says the *stam*, is that with the udder, one need not tear even after cooking. Not so with the heart, whose blood must be extracted at some point before eating.

Which position on the udder does the *stam* implicitly support, the restrictive or permissive? A clue lies in the cap-off to this section, when the Tosefta is further quoted as support for the permissive stance:

> It is taught [in a baraita] in accordance with the first version of Rav: An udder that one cooked in its milk is permitted. The stomach [of a suckling lamb or calf (*qevah*)] that one cooked in its milk is prohibited. And what is the distinction between one and the other? The one is collected in his innards, but the other is not collected in his innards.[19]

The udder is contrasted here not with the heart, as in the prior teaching, but with the calf's full stomach, and the milk inside the one with the milk inside the other. The milk of the udder is "not collected in his innards" like the milk of the stomach, explains the Tosefta. Since it never leaves the udder, the milk inside it, as Rashi comments, "does not come under the category of milk."[20] The section ends with the rather shocking idea that one can cook a piece of meat—the udder—in milk.

---

[18] b. Hullin 109b; t. Hullin 8:8 as it appears in Moses Samuel Zuckermandel, ed. *Tosephta; based on the Erfurt and Vienna codices [Tosefta al-pi Kitve-yad 'Erfurṭ Ṿinah]*. (Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1970), 509.

[19] b. Hullin 109b; t. Hullin 8:9.

[20] "*Zeh kanus be-me'av*" on 109b, or, as he says later, "when it comes out it is fully milk (*halav gamur*)."

A Fine Line

The rest of the *sugya* is less about unraveling this mystery than wrapping it in additional layers, as we see later in a story about Yalta, one of the few named women in the Talmud.[21] Yalta makes some ingenious observations about law's relationship to longing:

> Yalta said to Rav Naḥman: Now for anything that the Merciful One prohibited to us, He permitted to us something similar. He prohibited to us blood, yet He permitted to us liver; [He prohibited sexual intercourse with a] menstruating woman, [but permitted sexual intercourse with a woman who discharges] the blood of purity. [God prohibits] the fat of a *behemah* (domesticated animal) [but permits] the fat of a *hayah* (undomesticated animal); pork, the brain of a *shibuta* fish; *giruta* (a non-kosher fish), a fish's tongue; a married woman, a divorced woman during the life of her [ex-] husband; one's brother's wife, his *yevamah* (his brother's widow when the brother dies childless; Deut. 25:5–10); a gentile woman, a "beautiful woman" (who is a prisoner of war; Deut. 21:10–14). We wish to eat meat in milk! Rav Naḥman said to the cooks: "Blow up[22] some udders for her!"

For every item that the law forbids, something comparable is made licit, observes Yalta. These are the pairs with which Yalta illustrates her point:

---

[21] On the figure of Yalta see Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert, *Menstrual Purity: Rabbinic and Christian Reconstructions of Biblical Gender* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), 118–27.

[22] Translation from Marcus Jastrow, "Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature," n.d., 389, http://www.tyndalearchive.com/TABS/Jastrow/. The meaning is uncertain according to Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 405. Rashi understands the verb in accordance with the gemara's subsequent back-and-forth to refer to making kebabs or skewers, but according to the medieval dictionary the Arukh, the idea is to let the udder remain full with milk and to cook it (which makes more sense within the story). The reading of this verb relates to a larger ambiguity within the *sugya* regarding whether one is cooking the meat of the udder in liquid in a pot or roasting it on a spit. If the latter, the problem of cooking meat in milk is somewhat mitigated since the udder's milk can drain off the skewer. See discussion in Tosafot on 109b–110a, *eyno over alav u-mutar* and *ha-hu li-qederah*.

Prohibited	**Permitted**
Blood	Liver
Blood of niddah	Blood of purity
Fat of *behemah*	Fat of *hayah*
Pig	Shibuta brain
Giruta (eel-like fish)[23]	Fish tongue
Married woman	Divorced woman while ex-husband is alive
Brother's wife	*Yevamah*
Gentile woman	*Yefat to'ar* (female prisoner of war)

The pairs fall into the categories of either sex or food. The language shifts between Hebrew and Aramaic, with sex for the most part in Hebrew, food in Aramaic.[24] Though the voice is that of a woman, the perspective is male

[23] Rashi identifies *giruta* with an unkosher bird mentioned earlier in the tractate, but it is a murry or lamprey according to Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 283.

[24] In what appears to be the Palestinian source material in Leviticus Rabbah 22:10, the exegetical starting point is "God frees prisoners" (Ps. 146:7), which is read midrashically as "God permits that which is forbidden." The udder is the final item on the list, whose contents vary in sequence and substance from the story in b. Hullin:

Prohibited	**Permitted**
Fat of behemah	Fat of hayah
Sciatic nerve in hayah	Sciatic nerve in fowl
Slaughter with fowl (is required)	[Slaughter] with fish (is not required)
Blood of niddah	Blood of virginity
Married woman	Imprisoned woman
Brother's wife	Yevamah
Woman and her sister while alive	After death
Wearing kilayim (mixed wool and linen)	A linen cloak with woolen fringes
Flesh of pig	Fish called shibuta

in claiming that the Torah forbids *us* a menstruating woman or the wife of another man. Yalta ends with her wish to eat meat in milk.

The punch line belongs to Rav Nahman, who orders up some udders for his wife. Really it belongs to the student of the *sugya*, who by the end of the story is primed, if they are as clever as this husband-and-wife team, with the solution to Yalta's seemingly unrequitable desire: the udder, the only "kosher" way to eat milk and meat together. Like the other items on the permitted list, the udder has the allure of the taboo, that which the Torah permits but which comes thrillingly close to the forbidden.

The Lax Ladies of Tattlefush

The udder's air of taboo might help to explain Rav's stringency in the story to which I turn next. Rav pays a visit to the wonderfully named village of Tattlefush, where he overhears a two women chatting.[25] One is asking the other for cooking tips:

> When Rav arrived in Tattlefush, he heard a certain woman saying to her friend: How much milk does it require to cook a quarter weight of meat? He said: They are not educated in [the prohibition of] meat in milk. He tarried and prohibited udders to them.

Rav does not like what he hears. He infers from their conversation that they are not versed in the prohibition of milk and meat. Whether that is the case, or whether the women know of it but choose not to adhere to it, Rav takes extreme action. Rather than teach the prohibition itself, Rav goes a few steps further and issues a total prohibition on udders. Even the

Fat (that is forbidden in cattle)	Fat (that is permitted)
Blood	Spleen
Meat with milk	Udder

[25] Ben Zion Eshel, *Jewish Settlements in Babylonia during Talmudic Times* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), 125–26 says that the location cannot be ascertained but speculates that Tattlefush is a village near Sura given Rav's association with Sura. Manuscript variants of the village name include Latush, Lafush (Hamburg 169), Tutlafish (Vatican 120-121), and Tattlefus (Vatican 122).

restrictive position attributed to Rav above permits udders if they are properly torn.

The Tattlefush tale is told in connection with a debate over the origins of Rav's restrictive position:

> When Rabbi Elazar ascended [from Babylonia to Palestine] he found Zeiri. He said to him: Is there a *tanna* (i.e., an early rabbi) who taught Rav an udder? He showed him Rav Yitzḥak bar Avudimi. He said to him: I did not teach Rav an udder at all; rather, Rav found a valley and fenced it in with a fence.
>
> … Rav Kahana teaches thus; Rabbi Yose bar Abba teaches: I taught him the udder of a nursing mother. And due to the sharpness of Rabbi Ḥiyya, he taught an unspecified udder.

Rabbi Elazar wants to know from Zeiri which transmitter is responsible for Rav's prohibition. Rav Yitzhak bar Avudimi chalks up Rav's stance to his hard-line legal philosophy, expressed with the eloquently redundant "fencing it in with a fence."[26] Rabbi Yosi bar Abba attributes it instead to Rav's misunderstanding of Rabbi Hiyya, who, being too smart for his own good, assumed Rav would understand that only in certain cases—an actively nursing animal mother "whose breasts have a great deal of milk collected in them" (Rashi)—is the udder a problem. By the section's end, one is left to wonder what went wrong in this rabbinic game of telephone. As in the story of the dangerous cat I have written about in another context (BQ 80a–b), Rav reacts with an outsize ruling.[27] Rav's fence evokes Trump's wall, a disproportionate and likely ineffective response intended

---

[26] This line about Rav appears also in b. Eruvin 6a. On the fence metaphor, see Siegfried Stein, "The Concept of the 'Fence': Observations on Its Origin and Development," *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History: Presented to Alexander Altmann on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 1979, 301–29; Judah Goldin, *Studies in Midrash and Related Literature*, ed. Barry L. Eichler and Jeffrey H. Tigay (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1988), 3–25; Johann Cook, "Towards the Dating of the Tradition 'the Torah as Surrounding Fence,'" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 24.2 (1998): 25–34. Thanks to Jonathan Schofer for these references.

[27] Beth A. Berkowitz, *Animals and Animality in the Babylonian Talmud* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 120–152.

to conceal and distract from deeper tensions—tensions that I will explore in my conclusion.

The Tattlefush story bears resemblances to the one about Yalta. In both, women defy the prohibition against milk and meat. Yalta brazenly declares her appetite for meat cooked in milk, while the female friends of Tattlefush casually converse about it. The consequences are diametrically opposed. For Yalta, the udder redirects the wish for the forbidden into licit channels. For the women of Tattlefush, the udder itself become forbidden. It is the difference between bending the law to desire—Yalta has a keen eye for this—and bending desire to the law, which Rav does with a little too much law-and-order enthusiasm. In both stories, men make the ultimate call.

The impression left by the sequence is that Rav's stringent stance on the udder reflects the flaws of rabbinic transmission. The informal communication of women in the marketplace conveys specific, clear, and useful information ("A quarter [weight] of meat, how much milk does one need for cooking"?), while the formal communication of rabbis, by contrast, seems filled with glitches and results in draconian measures.

Dinner at Rav Pappi's

The next episode—set in a later rabbinic era, the fourth and fifth generations of talmudic rabbis rather than the first, second, and third, as the prior stories were and subsequent story will be—is a dinner at Rav Pappi's. The udder continues to be divisive, here getting in the way of rabbis enjoying a meal together:

> Ravin and Rav Yitzḥak bar Yosef arrived at the house of Rav Pappi. They brought before them a dish of udder. Rav Yitzḥak bar Yosef ate. Ravin did not eat. Abaye said: Bereaved Ravin (*Ravin takhla*), why do you not eat? After all, Rav Pappi's wife is the daughter of Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa, and Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa was a master of good deeds. If she had not heard it in her father's house, she would not have made [it].

Ravin is called by the moniker *takhla*, a possible word play on udder (*kehal*) and a reference, according to Rashi, to having buried his children, an apt association for a story about a disemboweled udder. The total ban on

udders introduced by Rav in Tattlefush appears to have had its influence, with Ravin refraining from eating an udder supper with his colleagues.

How is the division among rabbis adjudicated? Through the woman of the house. Abaye notes that Rav Pappi's wife is the daughter of Rabbi Yitzhak Nappaha, said to be a man of upstanding behavior. If Rav Pappi's wife had not learned in her father's model household to eat udders, she would not be serving them in her own, says Abaye. Abaye highlights the role of women in transmitting halakhic standards in a mimetic model that offers an alternative to formal rabbinic transmission.[28] Women's informal modes of transmission come across once again—recall the women of Tattlefush—as effective and unifying, while the rabbis get gummed up in their disagreements. Once again, the female figures in the story are associated with cooking and eating udders.

Gorging before Yom Kippur

The climactic story of the sugya features the trickster figure Rami bar Tamrei, named also Rami bar Diq'ulei satisfying his appetite for udders:[29]

> In Sura they do not eat udders; in Pumbedita they do eat udders. Rami bar Tamrei, who is Rami bar Diq'ulei, from Pumbedita, arrived in Sura on the eve of Yom Kippur. Everyone brought out their udders and threw them away. He went and gathered them and ate them.

The story begins with background information. Sura's custom is not to eat udders—Rav's ban in Tattlefush must have taken hold there—while Pumbedita's is. Rami bar Tamrei arrives in Sura on the eve of Yom Kippur, just as all the Suran Jews are discarding their udders while they prepare their pre-fast feasts. Rami bar Tamrei takes the opportunity to scoop up the discarded udders and make for himself a meal of udders.

---

[28] Haym Soloveitchik, "Rupture and Reconstruction: The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy," *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought* 28.4 (1994): 64–130. In several manuscripts (Hamburg, Munich, and Vatican), Rav Pappi's wife is said to have seen rather than heard the practice, offering a visual rather than auditory model of cultural transmission.

[29] *Tamar* refers to the date fruit, *diqla* to the palm tree from it grows.

Rami bar Tamrei's dinner draws the attention of Rav Hisda, to whom Rami is brought.[30] The two rabbis engage in a tête-à-tête about Rami's questionable behavior:

> They brought him before Rav Ḥisda. He said to him: Why would you do this? He said to him: I am from the place of Rav Yehudah, which eats. He said to him: And do you not hold [by the principle that] they impose upon him the stringencies of the place that he left and the stringencies of the place to which he went? He said to him: I ate them outside the boundaries [of Sura].
>
> And with what did you roast them? He said to him: Grapeseeds. Perhaps they were from wine used for a libation to idolatry? He said to him: They were [there] for twelve months.[31] Perhaps they were stolen? He said to him: There would have been despair of the owners, as grass was growing among them. He saw that he had not put on tefillin. He said to him: What is the reason that you have not put on tefillin? He said to him: He is (i.e., I am) suffering from intestinal illness, and Rav Yehudah said that one who has intestinal illness is exempt from tefillin. He saw that he had not placed (*rami*) threads (of tzitzit). He said to him: What is the reason that you do not have the threads? He said to him: It is a borrowed robe, and Rav Yehudah said with regard to a borrowed robe that during all of the [first] thirty days one is exempt from tzitzit.

Rav Hisda's first challenge is direct and simple: "Why would you do this?" How could you eat udders in a town that forbids them? Rami's response is to identify himself as hailing from "the place of Rav Yehudah." This locative will resurface at the end of the story.

When Rav Hisda objects to Rami's disrespect for local custom, Rami claims to have had his pre-fast meal on the outskirts of Sura, where town custom does not apply. When accused of using grapeseed oil derived from idolatrous libation wine or, alternatively, stolen seeds, Rami declares his grapeseeds to be too old to be prohibited on those counts. When Rav Hisda asks Rami why he is not wearing tefillin, Rami notes that his stomachache (from all those udders?) has absolved him of the obligation,

---

[30] In manuscripts (Hamburg, Munich, Vatican), Rami is bound in what appears to be more of an arrest.

[31] See b. Avodah Zarah 34a.

according to the opinion of Rav Yehudah. When Rav Hisda asks Rami why he does not place (*rami)* tzitzit on his garments (a Rami who does not *rami*!), Rami has an answer for that too. His garment is borrowed, and so tzitzit are not required, again according to the opinion of Rav Yehudah.

Did Rami really use aged grapeseeds to roast his udders and then eat them outside the town limits? Did he not bother with tefillin because he had a stomachache, and was his garment in fact borrowed? The point is Rami's capacity to deflect any legal argument thrown (Aramaic: *rami*!) his way. The coup de grâce for Rav Hisda comes when a man is hauled in for having dishonored his mother and father. As Rav Hisda's henchmen prepare to flog the offender, Rami tells them to back off:

> Meanwhile, they brought in a certain man who would not honor his father and mother. They tied him up. He said to them: Leave him alone, as it is taught (in an early rabbinic tradition): With regard to any positive commandment whose reward is stated alongside it, the earthly court is not meant to enforce it.

Rami stops them with an authoritative teaching. Only the heavenly court punishes a sin whose rewards are explicit in the Torah, as is the case for honoring parents, which is said to merit long life.[32]

Whether the man is flogged or not, one will never know, but Rami finally earns the grudging respect of Rav Hisda:

> He said to him: I see that you are very sharp. He said to him: If you were in the place of Rav Yehudah, I would show you my sharpness!

You're quite the smart aleck, says Rav Hisda to Rami. Just you wait, Rami responds. Go to Rav Yehudah's residence, and I'll show you smart.

Rami's sparring with Rav Hisda indexes a variety of halakhic topics: legal pluralism; libation wine; loss and theft; tefillin; tallit; borrowed items; honor of father and mother; just penalties. Like the Yalta story, this

[32] Deuteronomy 5:16.

story celebrates the legal work-around.[33] One may need to eat on the outskirts of town, or make do with fish brains instead of pork, but one can get fairly close to fulfilling one's wishes, whatever is the law. Rav Yehudah, whom Rami invokes at the beginning, middle, and end of his repartee, embodies the power of legal wit to achieve one's desired results, and Pumbedita, Rav Yehudah's "place," provides its locus. The Suran Rav, a central figure throughout the *sugya*, represents an alternative type of legal power, that of "finding a valley and fencing it in." The udder is the battleground over which these two models vie with each other.

Diagnosis: The Repressed Mother

The image of the rabbi gorging on udders on the outskirts of the city as the day of atonement arrives captures the liminal tone of the *sugya* as a whole. The udder's ambiguity—meat and milk at once, permitted by some and prohibited by others—highlights competing models of legal reasoning and ruling. On the one hand is the repressive stringency of Rav, who reflects a tradition that is misunderstood, broken, or reactionary, while on the other is the playful tricksterism of Rami and Yalta. Alongside these models is one of women trading information in their daily domestic lives.

Let me suggest in closing that it is not only unconscious sexual fantasies that the udder embodies. The rabbis elsewhere use suckling as a metaphor for rabbinic transmission, so it is not entirely surprising for it to evoke such reflection here.[34] But the udder specifically, and the laws of meat and milk more generally, bring to the surface some fairly inconvenient truths about rabbinic law. David Kraemer points out, first of all, the *novelty* of the rabbinic separation of meat from milk.[35] This is a new

---

[33] On the celebration of dialectical ability that is distinctive to the Bavli, see Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 39–53.

[34] Haskell, *Suckling at My Mother's Breasts*, 15–38.

[35] David Charles Kraemer, *Jewish Eating and Identity through the Ages* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2007), 39–54.

Jewish eating practice introduced by the rabbis. Kraemer sees in the practice a preoccupation with the binaries of male/female, life/death, common/uncommon, temple/no temple, and rabbinic/non-rabbinic. To mix milk with meat is to collapse these structuring principles. The fact that this separation is a "weird" new prohibition is recognized in the rabbinic texts themselves, which call it a *hiddush*, or novel law (b. Hullin 108a).[36]

Jordan Rosenblum observes also that this new practice relies upon a hermeneutic of *generalization*.[37] "Do not cook a kid in his mother's milk" means, for all intents and purposes, that a baby goat should not be cooked in *his* mother's milk. For the rabbis, though, the prohibition extends to *any* animal in *any* milk, even to fowl, who produce no milk at all. The particularity of the mother/child pair is lost as the rabbis develop broad categories of *basar be-halav*, meat in milk.

The udder belies both these moves. The novelty of the law and the generalization upon which it rests come into view with the udder, the organ in which milk originates and through which the infant attaches to her mother. The central image of the scriptural prohibition reasserts itself, as does the particularity of the mother/child pair. In recalling the repressed mother, the udder gives the lie to rabbinic law, exposing its labyrinthine logics of innovation and generalization. The permissive position of the *sugya*, in admitting the presence of the milk-filled udder, might be read as recentering the animal mother and, if only subconsciously, reminding rabbinic diners of the gap between biblical law and rabbinic practice. The prohibitive position associated with Rav, in banning the udder, keeps the animal mother out of sight, buried under layers of rabbinic lawmaking. "There is no mother here," the ban seems to say.[38] The *stam* does not so much side with either stance as expose the

---

[36] Parallels in b. Pesahim 44b and b. Nazir 37a-b.

[37] Jordan Rosenblum, *The Jewish Dietary Laws in the Ancient World* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 95–97.

[38] One could read the permissive position, on the other hand, not as recentering the animal mother but as denying her presence, along the lines of the Tosefta's presentation: the milk in

strategies by which Rabbis navigate the exegetical and ethical gaps that are opened up by their project.

Thus does the udder invite reflection on rabbinic tricksterism, on the capacity of the rabbi to argue nearly anything. This is precisely Yalta's point when she shows how little daylight there is between the permitted and the prohibited. The female figures in this *sugya*, along with the udder itself, betray the fiction on which the law rests, resisting the displacement of the mother/child both in the rabbis' legal substance (milk and meat) and the rabbis' legal form (bet midrash instruction). Female modes of production, reproduction, attachment, and transmission prove more reliable, less brittle, than ones adopted by the rabbis, and especially by Rav in his restrictive position. The repressed female returns in the women of this *sugya*, in the female body and its fluids, and most of all, in the udder. The *sugya* opposes laxity with stringency, tricksterism with dim-wittedness, women with men, humans with animals, and demonstrates, with respect to all of them, the power of appetite and the ambivalence of attachment.

We circle back, then, to Freud, and to his insights and oversights about the udder. Freud reveals the power of the udder to expose that which is normally hidden, which, in the case of rabbinic law, I argue, is the animal mother and, beyond that, the affective lives of animals that must be suppressed if we are to eat them. That the *sugya*'s questions can arise at all—is the udder permitted, is it prohibited, is its milk really milk—bears not a little irony since the milk of the animal mother is precisely the target of the Torah's restriction.[39] The *sugya* of the udder, in my reading of it, invites those accustomed to rabbinic practice to see the irony in it: Yalta with her legal loopholes, the ladies of Tattlefush with their casual disregard of this entire area of law, Rav Pappi's wife with her mimetic traditions, and Rami bar Tamrei with his tricksterism. But what Freud

---

her udder isn't really milk. I don't intend here to say there is only one reading of the symbolism in these positions, or in the udder itself and in the eating of the udder.

[39] Though the Torah is not, of course, explicitly concerned with the use of the animal mother's milk to cook the flesh of the animal mother herself (as opposed to the flesh of her child), which is the scenario under consideration here.

missed, and the *sugya* too, is the violence behind all the interpretive games (a gender-based violence, Carol Adams would remind us). A twenty-first-century perspective permits us to see in Freud's case study the trauma entailed in a father's friend's sexual advances towards his eighteen-year-old daughter, and in the toleration for the behavior by the adults in her circle. That perspective permits us to see in the udder *sugya* the suffering that farm animals experience when separated at birth and deprived of bonds of intimacy or sociality, to say nothing of the pure pain and brutality that most today encounter in industrial livestock production.[40] Just as Little Hans must not have been convinced, at least for very long, when told that the cow has a widdler too, so too must we readers of the udder *sugya* somewhere along the way realize that the animal mother, *her* relationship to *her* child, and not the generic abstractions that the rabbis call "meat" and "milk" is the concern that brought these laws into being in the first place. When read with and against Freud, the *sugya* teaches about the damage done when rabbinic law turns from creative to coercive, when rabbinic lines of transmission are privileged and female traditions of teaching ignored, and when all traces of motherhood are destroyed even as we can hear the drip-drip-drip of breastmilk.

Talmud as Ethical Prompt

Let me offer suggestions for teaching this material and reflecting on its ethical stakes. I envision teaching the udder as an ethical prompt in five units: Bible, Mishnah, Talmudic Law, Talmudic Story, and Ethical Reflection. In the Bible unit, students study the biblical prohibition on cooking a kid in his mother's milk alongside ancient, medieval, and modern scholarly theories on the meaning of the prohibition, contrasting the compassion rationale represented by Philo with the idolatry explanation advocated by Maimonides.[41] A debate among students might be staged to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of each rationale.

---

[40] See note 43 below on the impact of maternal separation on farm animals.

[41] A good starting point is Haran, "Seething a Kid in Its Mother's Milk."

In the second unit, students study m. Hullin 8:3. They first identify the concerns regarding milk and meat that occupy the early Rabbis and then consider how the Rabbis got there from the biblical verse. Reading Kraemer and Rosenblum will help students to articulate the discrepancies between the Bible's formulation and the Mishnah's generalized prohibition. Students should zero in at this stage on the distinctive problems that the udder poses to the prohibition on mixing meat with milk.

The goal of the third unit is to work through the Talmud's two major legal positions on the udder, one permissive and one restrictive, both attributed to Rav through different transmissions. The students can consider whether the early rabbinic traditions cited within the *sugya* support one position or the other—in my reading, they support the permissive position—and whether the editorial voice of the Talmud sees it that way too. At this point, the students might further consider the anomalous character of the udder and the complexity of the legal response it generates.[42]

In a robust fourth unit, students will perform literary analysis on the four talmudic stories discussed above: Yalta and Rav Nahman in "A Fine Line"; "The Lax Ladies of Tattlefush"; "Dinner at Rav Pappi's"; and Rami's visit to Sura in "Gorging before Yom Kippur." Students will juxtapose the talmudic stories with the case studies of Freud, asking: How does the udder channel various appetites and fantasies? What is the role of gender, sex, and species for both Freud and the Talmud in their treatments of the udder? Students might consider questions raised by the sugya not only about sex and species but also about problems central to the rabbinic project. How does law manage ambiguity? How does story inform law?

Literary analysis will give way to moral reflection as the students read selections from Carol Adams's *Sexual Politics of Meat*, which inspired me

---

[42] Students might find illuminating, as a comparison, Steven D. Fraade, "Navigating the Anomalous: Non-Jews at the Intersection of Early Rabbinic Law and Narrative," in *Legal Fictions*, vol. 147, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 345–64.

to make the connections between feminism and veganism that shape my reading of the udder.[43] The abuses of the dairy and meat industry are well known. Even at its kindest, however, dairy farming relies upon separation of the kid, lamb, or calf from nursing mother. As a mother and having a mother, I balk at the practice of animal family separation. As a feminist, I balk at the practice of commodifying mother's milk. As a critic of anthropocentrism, I take trauma to parents and children to be a moral problem when it is inflicted not only on humans but also on other animals. Students can be assigned to read scientific studies that offer empirical evidence for the trauma of maternal separation in farm animals.[44] The ethical payout of this material is, then, an intersectionalist approach that combines a feminist perspective—the recovery of women's voices and attention to their ingenuity, agency, and appetites—with a vegan one that allows for "women" to extend beyond the human.

Reflection on the key ethical concerns raised by the *sugya*—control of female bodies both human and animal, killing and consumption of animals—should entail not preaching but prompting. It is a tough sell to say that classical rabbinic literature demands either feminism or veganism from its readers. The ethical end goal of studying the udder *sugya* is to de-invisibilize or to re-present the animal mother within the laws of *kashrut*. In the very last step, students can extrapolate to areas of law where there may be lurking other invisibilized figures repressed by deeply ingrained and perhaps willful blindness. Who or what else is missing from Jewish ethics? What laws and stories in the Talmud, when read alongside contemporary thinkers, might help us recover them?

---

[43] Carol J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (New York, NY: Bloomsbury USA, 2015).

[44] J. P. Damián et al., "Behavioural Response of Grazing Lambs to Changes Associated with Feeding and Separation from Their Mothers at Weaning," *Research in Veterinary Science* 95.3 (December 1, 2013): 913–18; Julie Føske Johnsen et al., "The Effect of Physical Contact between Dairy Cows and Calves during Separation on Their Post-Separation Behavioural Response," *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 166 (May 1, 2015): 11–19.

Appendix: Primary Texts for Teaching

Unit 1: Bible

Exodus 23:19; 34:26, Deuteronomy 14:21

You shall not boil a kid in his mother's milk.

לֹא-תְבַשֵּׁל גְּדִי בַּחֲלֵב אִמּוֹ

Philo, *On the Virtues* 143[45]

He now crowns his bounty with the words, "Thou shalt not seethe a lamb in his mother's milk." For he held that it was grossly improper that the substance which fed the living animal should be used to season and flavour the same after its death, and that while nature provided for its conservation by creating the stream of milk and ordaining that it should pass through the mother's breasts as through conduits, the licence of man should rise to such a height as to misuse what had sustained its life to destroy also the body which remains in existence. If indeed anyone thinks good to boil flesh in milk, let him do so without cruelty and keeping clear of impiety. Everywhere there are herds of cattle innumerable, which are milked every day by cowherds, goat-herds and shepherds, whose chief source of income as cattle rearers is milk, sometimes liquid and sometimes condensed and coagulated into cheese; and since milk is so abundant, the person who boils the flesh of lambs or kids or any other young animal in their mother's milk, shows himself cruelly brutal in character and gelded of compassion, that most vital of emotions and most nearly akin to the rational soul.

---

[45] Philo, *On the Virtues*, trans. F.H. Colson, vol. 8, Loeb Classical Library 341 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939), 250–51.

Maimonides, *Guide for the Perplexed* 3:48[46]

As for the prohibition against eating *meat [boiled] in milk*, it is in my opinion not improbable that—in addition to this being undoubtedly very gross food and very filling—*idolatry* had something to do with it. Perhaps such food was eaten at one of the ceremonies of their cult or at one of their festivals. A confirmation of this may, in my opinion, be found in the fact that the prohibition against eating *meat [boiled] in milk,* when it is mentioned for the first two times, occurs near the commandment concerning pilgrimage: *Three times in the year, and so on*. It is as if it said: When you go on pilgrimage and enter *the house of the Lord your God*, do not cook there in the way they used to do. According to me this is the most probable view regarding the reason for this prohibition; but I have not seen this set down in any of the books of the Sabians that I have read.

ואמנם איסור 'בשר בחלב' עם היותו מזון עב מאד בלא ספק ומוליד מלוי רב אין רחוק אצלי שיש בו ריח 'עבודה זרה' אולי כך היו אוכלים בעבודה מעבודותיה או בחג מחגיהם. וממה שמחזק זה אצלי - זכור התורה אותו שני פעמים תחילת מה שציותה עליו עם מצות החג "שלש פעמים בשנה וגו'" כאילו אמר בעת חגכם ובואכם לבית 'יי אלוקיך' לא תבשל מה שתבשל שם על דרך פלוני כמו שהיו הם עושים. זהו הטעם החזק אצלי בענין איסורו - ואמנם לא ראיתי זה כתוב במה שראיתי מספרי הצאבה

[46] Translation to Hebrew from Judeo-Arabic by Samuel ibn Tibbon; translation to English from Moses Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, trans. Shlomo Pines, vol. 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 599.

Unit 2: Mishnah

m. Hullin 8:3

A drop of milk that fell on a piece of meat: if it is sufficient to impart flavor to that piece—it is forbidden.
If he stirred the pot, if it is sufficient to impart flavor to that pot—it is forbidden.
The udder: he tears it open and removes its milk.
If he did not tear it open, he does not transgress on its account.
The heart: He tears it open and removes its blood.
If he did not tear it open, he did not transgress on its account.
One who brings up fowl with cheese on the table does not transgress a negative commandment.

טיפת חלב שנפלה על חתיכה אם יש בה בנותן טעם באותה חתיכה אסור
נוער את הקדירה אם יש בה בנותן טעם באותה הקדירה אסור
הכחל קורעו ומוציא את חלבו
לא קרעו אינו עובר עליו
הלב קורעו ומוציא את דמו
לא קרעו אינו עובר עליו
המעלה את העוף ואת הגבינה על השולחן אינו עובר בלא תעשה[47]

Unit 3: Talmudic Law

b. Hullin 109b

Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said: He does not transgress on its account, and it is permitted.
But do we not learn: "He does not transgress on its account" --

[47] Mishnah text from the standard printed edition.

He does not transgress, but there is a prohibition!

אמר רבי זירא אמר רב אינו עובר עליו ומותר
והא אנן תנן אינו עובר עליו
מיעבר הוא דלא עבר הא איסורא איכא[48]

Let us say that [the following baraita] supports him: The udder—one tears it and removes its milk. [If] one did not tear it, he does not transgress on its account. The heart—one tears it and removes its blood. [If] one did not tear it, one tears it after cooking it, and it is permitted.
(*stam*:) A heart is that which requires tearing, but an udder does not require tearing.

לימא מסייע ליה הכחל קורעו ומוציא את חלבו לא קרעו אינו עובר עליו הלב קורעו ומוציא את דמו לא קרעו קורעו לאחר בשולו ומותר
לב הוא דבעי קריעה אבל כחל לא בעי קריעה

And there are those who say: Rabbi Zeira said that Rav said: He does not transgress on its account, and it is forbidden.

ואיכא דאמרי א"ר זירא אמר רב אינו עובר עליו ואסור

It is taught [in a baraita] in accordance with the first version of Rav: An udder that one cooked in its milk is permitted. The stomach of a suckling lamb or calf (*qevah*) that one cooked in its milk is prohibited. And what is the distinction between one and the other? The one is collected in his innards, but the other is not collected in his innards.

---

[48] Talmud text from the standard printed edition.

תניא כלישנא קמא דרב כחל שבשלו בחלבו מותר קבה שבשלה בחלבה אסור ומה הפרש בין זה לזה זה כנוס במעיו וזה אין כנוס במעיו

Unit 4: Talmudic Story

b. Hullin 109b, Story 1: "A Fine Line"

Yalta said to Rav Naḥman: Now for any item that the Merciful One prohibited to us, He permitted to us a similar item. He prohibited to us blood, yet He permitted to us liver; [likewise, God prohibited sexual intercourse with a] menstruating woman, [but permitted sexual intercourse with a woman while she discharges] the blood of purity. [The Torah prohibits] the fat of a domesticated animal [but permits] the fat of an undomesticated animal; pork, the brain of a *shibuta* fish; *giruta* (a non-kosher fish), the tongue of a fish; a married woman, a divorced woman during the life of her [ex-]husband; one's brother's wife, his *yevamah* (his brother's widow when the brother dies childless); a gentile woman, a "beautiful woman" (who is a prisoner of war; Deut. 21:10–14). We wish to eat meat in milk! Rav Naḥman said to the cooks: "Blow up some udders for her!"

אמרה ליה ילתא לרב נחמן מכדי כל דאסר לן רחמנא שרא לן כוותיה אסר לן דמא שרא לן כבדא נדה דם טוהר חלב בהמה חלב חיה חזיר מוחא דשיבוטא גירותא לישנא דכוורא אשת איש גרושה בחיי בעלה אשת אח יבמה כותית יפת תאר בעינן למיכל בשרא בחלבא אמר להו רב נחמן לטבחי זויקו לה כחלי

b. Hullin 110a, Story 2: "The Lax Ladies of Tattlefush"

When Rav arrived in Tattlefush, he heard a certain woman saying to her friend: How much milk does it require to cook a quarter weight of meat?

He said: They are not educated in [the prohibition of] meat in milk. He tarried and prohibited udders to them.

דרב איקלע לטטלפוש שמעה להההיא איתתא דקאמרה לחבירתה ריבעא דבשרא כמה חלבא בעי לבשולי אמר לא גמירי דבשר בחלב אסור איעכב וקאסר להו כחלי

(Before the story) When Rabbi Elazar ascended [from Babylonia to Palestine] he found Zeiri. He said to him: Is there a *tanna* who taught Rav an udder? He showed him Rav Yitzḥak bar Avudimi. He said to him: I did not teach Rav an udder at all; rather, Rav found a valley and fenced it in with a fence…

(After the story) … Rav Kahana teaches thus; Rabbi Yose bar Abba teaches: I taught him the udder of a nursing mother. And due to the sharpness of Rav Ḥiyya, he taught an unspecified udder.

כי סליק רבי אלעזר אשכחיה לזעירי אמר ליה איכא תנא דאתנייה לרב כחל אחוייה לרב יצחק בר אבודימי אמר ליה אני לא שניתי לו כחל כל עיקר ורב בקעה מצא וגדר בה גדר...

... רב כהנא מתני הכי רבי יוסי בר אבא מתני אנא כחל של מניקה שניתי לו ומפלפולו של רבי חייא שנה ליה כחל סתם

b. Hullin 110a, Story 3: "Dinner at Rav Pappi's"

Ravin and Rav Yitzḥak bar Yosef arrived at the house of Rav Pappi. They brought before them a dish of udder. Rav Yitzḥak bar Yosef ate. Ravin did not eat. Abaye said: Bereaved Ravin, why do you not eat? After all, Rav Pappi's wife is the daughter of Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa, and Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa was a master of good deeds. If she had not heard it in her father's house, she would not have made it.

רבין ורב יצחק בר יוסף איקלעו לבי רב פפי אייתו לקמייהו תבשילא דכחל רב יצחק בר יוסף אכל רבין לא אכל אמר אביי רבין תכלא אמאי לא אכל מכדי דביתהו דרב פפי ברתיה דר' יצחק נפחא הואי ור"י נפחא מריה דעובדא הוה אי לאו דשמיע לה מבי נשא לא הוה עבדא

b. Hullin 110a–110b, Story 4: "Gorging before Yom Kippur"

In Sura they would not eat udders, but in Pumbedita they would eat udders. Rami bar Tamrei, who is Rami bar Dikulei, from Pumbedita, arrived in Sura on the eve of Yom Kippur. Everyone brought out their udders and threw them away. He went and gathered them and ate them.

They brought him before Rav Ḥisda. He said to him: Why would you do this? He said to him: I am from the place of Rav Yehudah, which eats. He said to him: And do you not hold by the principle that they impose upon him the stringencies of the place that he left and also the stringencies of the place to which he went? He said to him: I ate them outside the boundaries [of Sura]. And with what did you roast them? He said to him: Grapeseeds. Perhaps they were from wine used for a libation to idolatry? He said to him: They were [there] for twelve months. Perhaps they were stolen property? He said to him: There would have been despair of the owners, as grass was growing among them. He saw that he had not put on tefillin. He said to him: What is the reason that you have not put on tefillin? He said to him: He (i.e., I) is suffering from intestinal illness, and Rav Yehudah said that one who has intestinal illness is exempt from tefillin. He saw that he had not placed (*rami*) threads (of tzitzit). He said to him: What is the reason that you do not have the threads? He said to him: It is a borrowed robe, and Rav Yehudah said with regard to a borrowed robe that during all of the first thirty days one is exempt from tzitzit.

Meanwhile, they brought in a certain man who would not honor his father and mother, and they tied him up. He said to them: Leave him alone, as it is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to any positive commandment whose reward is stated alongside it, the earthly court below is not meant (literally: warned) to enforce it.

He said to him: I see that you are very sharp. He said to him: If you were in the place of Rav Yehudah, I would show you my sharpness!

בסורא לא אכלי כחלי בפומבדיתא אכלי כחלי רמי בר תמרי דהוא רמי בר דיקולי מפומבדיתא איקלע לסורא במעלי יומא דכפורי אפקינהו כולי עלמא לכחלינהו שדינהו אזל איהו נקטינהו אכלינהו

אייתוה לקמיה דרב חסדא אמר ליה אמאי תעביד הכי אמר ליה מאתרא דרב יהודה אנא דאכיל אמר ליה ולית לך נותנין עליו חומרי המקום שיצא משם וחומרי המקום שהלך לשם אמר ליה חוץ לתחום אכלתינהו ובמה טויתינהו אמר ליה בפורצני ודלמא מיין נסך הויא אמר ליה לאחר שנים עשר חדש הוו ודלמא דגזל הוה אמר ליה יאוש בעלים הוה דקדחו בהו חילפי חזייה דלא הוה מנח תפילין אמר ליה מאי טעמא לא מנחת תפילין אמר ליה חולי מעיין הוא ואמר רב יהודה חולי מעיין פטור מן התפילין חזייה דלא הוה קא רמי חוטי אמר ליה מאי טעמא לית לך חוטי אמר ליה טלית שאולה היא ואמר רב יהודה טלית שאולה כל שלשים יום פטורה מן הציצית

אדהכי אייתוה להההוא גברא דלא הוה מוקר אבוה ואמיה כפתוהו אמר להו שבקוהו דתניא כל מצות עשה שמתן שכרה בצדה אין בית דין שלמטה מוזהרין עליה

אמר ליה חזינא לך דחריפת טובא אמר ליה אי הוית באתריה דרב יהודה אחוינא לך חורפאי