



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

A Burn and a Blow

Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Shmuel: If one made a knife white-hot and slaughtered with it, the slaughtering is valid, because the sharpness of the blade precedes the effect of the heat. [A proper *shechitah* is when one continuously cuts the majority of the two *simanim* – pipes (the trachea and the esophagus); they cannot be burned. In this case, we assume that the *simanim* are cut before they are burned.]

The *Gemora* asks: But what about the sides of the knife (that burn the *sinanim* before they are cut)?

The *Gemora* answers: The place of the slaughtering opens wide (and therefore, the *simanim* do not get burned by the hot knife).

They inquired: If one made a spit white-hot and struck another person with it (causing the person to develop a *tzara’as* affliction in that spot), is the resulting wound to be regarded as an inflammation (*shechin*) or as a burn (*michveh*)?

The *Gemora* asks: What is the difference between the two? It was taught in a *braisa*: *Tzara’as* of an inflammation and *tzara’as* of a burn cause a person to become *tamei* at the end of one week by one of two symptoms: either by white hair (sprouting from the wound), or spreading. The Torah dealt with them separately to teach us that they

cannot combine with each other (for the minimum size requirement to become *tamei*). And it was taught in a *Mishna*: What is *shechin* and what is a *michveh*? A wound caused by wood (being hit with it), or rock, or marc of olives (after the oil has been squeezed out of the olives, they are extremely hot), or the hot springs of Tiberias, or any wound from heat that is not caused by fire (including a wound caused by lead just taken from the mine), is *shechin* (inflammation). And what is a *michveh*? A burn caused by a coal, or hot ashes, or boiling lime, or boiling gypsum, or any burn that is caused by fire (including a burn caused by water heated by fire), is a *michveh* (burn). And it was taught in a *braisa*: In the case of a wound which is both a *shechin* and a *michveh*, the *halachah* is as follows: the injury which is the most recent annuls (and supersedes) the one which was there beforehand (and it is classified as the new one).

The *Gemora* now explains the inquiry: The circumstances of our case are as follows: A person had an inflammation (*shechin*) of the size of half a *gris* (and in order to be rendered *tamei*, it must be the size of a complete *gris*) and was struck close to it with a white-hot spit. This caused another wound of the size of half a *gris*; the result being that the entire wound is now the size of a complete *gris*. In such a case, how are we to consider the resulting wound? Is it the blow that took effect first, and the burn caused by the heat that followed supersedes the effect of the blow, so that the entire wound is composed of *shechin* (from the inflammation) and a *michveh* (from the burning)

- each to the extent of half a *gris*, which do not combine to make him *tamei*? Or, does the heat take effect first, and the blow that followed supersedes the effect of the heat, and consequently the entire wound is composed of two *shechin's* - each to the extent of half a *gris*, which combine to make him *tamei*?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from that which Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Shmuel: If one made a knife white-hot and slaughtered with it, the slaughtering is valid, because the sharpness of the blade precedes the effect of the heat. This proves that the blow precedes the heat!

The *Gemora* rejects this proof, for in the case of a sharp edge (*the blow is first, for the heat is not so intense*), it is different.

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *braisa*: If one made a spit white-hot and struck another person with it (*causing the person to develop a tzara'as affliction in that spot*), the wound is treated as a burn from fire. This proves that the blow precedes the heat!

The *Gemora* rejects this proof as well, for the *braisa* is referring to a case where the wound was made by a thrust with the point of the spit, which is similar to the sharp edge. (8a)

Knife used for Idolatry

Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: A knife which has been used for idolatry may be used for slaughtering, but it cannot be used for cutting meat.

The *Gemora* explains: It may be used for slaughtering (*even though it is forbidden to derive benefit from it*), for the slaughtering damages the animal (*for a living animal is*

more useful and of more value than a slaughtered one; for, living, it may be used for breeding, plowing and for food, but slaughtered, it can only be eaten). It may not be used for cutting up meat, for by doing so, one improves its value.

Rava noted: There are times when one would be forbidden to slaughter with it, and that is if the animal was dangerously ill (*for then, the slaughtering will be an improvement*); and there are times when one would be permitted to cut up meat with it, and that is if the meat was in choice pieces intended for a present (*and cutting them up decreases their value*).

The *Gemora* asks: But should there not be a prohibition on account of the forbidden fat (*that it absorbed when it was used to cut the non-kosher meat; consequently, when the knife is cutting now, it will be infusing some of the non-kosher flavor into the kosher meat*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It was a new knife (*and was only forbidden because it was designated to be used for idolatry*).

The *Gemora* asks: But if it is new (*it should not be prohibited at all*), both according to Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva, is only an accessory that serves the idol, and both Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva hold that accessories are only forbidden once they are worshipped!?

The *Gemora* suggests two answers: Either it was used for cutting up wood for the idol (*so it is forbidden to use, for it was actually used for an idol; however, there are no absorptions*), or you can say that it was an old knife which was heated in fire (*which purged any absorptions that it might have contained*). (8a – 8b)

Absorptions

It was stated: If a man slaughtered with the knife of an idolater (*one that was used to cut non-kosher meat*), Rav says: He must peel (*the outer surface of the meat that came in contact with the knife, for as the knife was cutting, it infuses the meat of the kosher animal with the non-kosher fat that was on its blade*). Rabbah bar bar Chanah says: He only needs to rinse it (*for he maintains that the forbidden fat does not become absorbed into the meat; rather, it merely adheres to its surface, and can therefore be scrubbed away*).

The *Gemora* asks: Shall we say that the point of issue between them is the following: Rabbah bar bar Chanah holds the view that the place of the *shechitah* is cold (*and therefore cannot absorb at all*), whereas Rav maintains that it is hot (*and therefore it is able to absorb the forbidden flavor from the knife*).

The *Gemora* disagrees and suggests that they both hold the view that the place of the *shechitah* is hot; therefore, he who says that it must be peeled is clearly understood, but he who says that he only needs to rinse it holds that while the *simanim* (*the pipes*) are busy spurting out blood, they will not absorb any of the forbidden flavor.

There are others who state as follows: They both hold the view that the throat is cold; therefore, he who says that he only needs to rinse it is clearly understood, but he who says that it must be peeled holds that due to the pressure of the knife, the flesh absorbs the forbidden flavor.

A knife which was used for slaughtering an animal found to be a *tereifah* (*an animal with a physical defect that will cause its death; it is forbidden to be eaten even if it was slaughtered properly*) is the subject of a dispute between Rav Acha and Ravina (*regarding how to clean it before using it to slaughter another animal*). One says that it must

be purged with boiling hot water (*in order to rid the knife of its forbidden fat absorptions from the tereifah*), and the other says that it may be washed even with cold water (*for he holds the view that the place of the shechitah is cold and therefore cannot absorb at all*). The *Gemora* notes that the *halachah* follows the opinion that a washing with cold water is sufficient. And if a rag made from a curtain is available, wiping with it is sufficient, and nothing more is required.

The *Gemora* asks: Now what is the reason of the one who says that it must be purged with boiling hot water? Is it not because it absorbed forbidden fat (*during the slaughtering*)? If so, even after slaughtering an animal which is permitted to be eaten, it should also require purging with boiling hot water, for it absorbed the forbidden flavor of the limbs of a living animal? [*There is a prohibition against eating the limbs of a live animal; accordingly, as soon as the slaughtering begins, the knife is absorbing its forbidden flavor, and should require a cleansing before being used again!*? Rashi states that we are not concerned about it absorbing blood, for the knife is hard and cannot absorb blood.]

The *Gemora* answers: The knife only absorbs the fat when the place of the *shechitah* is hot, and it becomes hot only at the end of the slaughtering; at that time, the animal is already permitted.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: A butcher requires three separate knives: one for slaughtering (*so that it should be free from any nicks*); one for cutting meat; and one for cutting away the forbidden fat.

The *Gemora* asks: But why should he not use the same knife - first for cutting meat and then for cutting the fat?

The *Gemora* answers: It is forbidden to do so lest he cut the fat with it first and then the meat.

The *Gemora* asks: But even now, he might confuse the knives!?

The *Gemora* answers: Since he must have two separate knives, he will undoubtedly make a distinguishing mark on each of them.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: A butcher requires two separate pails of water: one in which he washes the meat and one in which he washes the fat.

The *Gemora* asks: But why should he not use the same pail - first for washing the meat and then for washing the fat?

The *Gemora* answers: It is forbidden to do so lest he wash the fat in it first and then the meat.

The *Gemora* asks: But even now, he might confuse the pails!?

The *Gemora* answers: Since he must have two separate pails, he will undoubtedly make a distinguishing mark on each of them. (8b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

What is Yad Soledes?

Many *halachos* concern cooking and heat. It is forbidden to cook on *Shabbos* and the cooked food becomes forbidden (Chullin 15a). It is forbidden to cook meat with milk. Hot utensils exude and absorb tastes by means of heat, etc.

All these *halachos* depend on a temperature defined by *Chazal* as *yad soledes* - the hand withdraws (*Shabbos* 40b; *Chulin* 105a, b; etc.). In other words, the temperature needed for these *halachos* is such that a person who comes in contact with such heat withdraws his hand. However, there is no exact definition that helps us to know the temperature from which a person withdraws his hand. Many Acharonim tried to tackle this problem, to translate *yad soledes* into temperatures now in practice and at least determine the exact degree from which, according to all opinions, a person withdraws his hand.

HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Feinstein zt"l discussed this issue a few times and in one of his responsa (*Igros Moshe, O.C.*, IV, 74) he writes that the range of doubt as to *yad soledes* is between 43 and 71 degrees Celsius. In other words, it is clear that a hand does not withdraw from less than 43 degrees and that all agree that a hand withdraws from over 71 degrees but there is no clear agreement as to the temperatures in between.

However, other *poskim* prove that *yad soledes* is much less than 71 degrees as in the second half of our tractate (105a, b) the *Gemora* discusses washing one's hands (*netilas yadayim*) with warm water to the degree of *yad soledes*. It is obvious that one cannot wash one's hands in such heat (*Meor HaShabbos*, 1, 2, remark 14).

Regarding the temperature under which a hand does not withdraw, it has been passed down in the name of the Chazon Ish zt"l (see *Meor HaShabbos*, *ibid*, *se'if* 6 and the remarks) that there should be no concern for less than 40 degrees. HaGaon Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach zt"l (*Responsa Minchas Shlomo*, 91, S.K. 8) offers fine proof for such. The *Bahag* wrote that an animal's milk is defined as cool at the time of milking. As the temperature of milk during milking may approach 40 degrees, it is evident that this temperature is considered cool. Rav Auerbach

continues that not only that but 45 degrees is not *yad soledes*, as proven from our *sugya*.

Rav and Rabbah bar bar Chanah disagree in our *Gemora* as to if the neck area of an animal (*beis hashechitah*) is boiling or cool. Accordingly, they disagree as to if the *beis hashechitah* can absorb a forbidden taste contained in the knife. If the *beis hashechitah* is boiling, it absorbs the taste but if it is cool, it does not. The *Gemora* then cites an opinion that their disagreement concerns another issue and that both agree that the *beis hashechitah* is cool.

Rashi and the Rosh ruled likewise and although we rule strictly according to Tosfos, that the *beis hashechitah* is considered boiling (*Shulchan Aruch, Y.D. 10:2*), this is only *lechatchilah* - a first preference (*Shach, ibid, S.K. 14*; aside from that, our tractate further explains that this matter only concerns the end of slaughtering but at the start of slaughtering all agree that the *beis hashechitah* is cool; moreover, Ritva explains [*Shabbos 42a*] that even those who hold that the *beis hashechitah* is boiling, "at any rate, it is not so boiling that a hand withdraws from it"; see *Minchas Shlomo, ibid, in the name of Rosh Yosef*, that all agree that this does not really mean boiling).

From here on our way is short. All we have to do is to determine the temperature of the *beis hashechitah* and then we can clearly know that it is not *yad soledes*.

The temperature of a feverish duck when being slaughtered: Indeed, says Rav Auerbach, the *poskim* do not distinguish between the *beis hashechitah* of an animal and that of fowl. While a person's average temperature is 37 degrees and the average temperature of cattle is 40 degrees, a duck's temperature is close to 45 degrees. At the time of slaughtering its blood temperature increases by at least one degree and if it is sick, it may reach 48 degrees! But even if we remove the increase of its sickness

and the increased temperature at the time of slaughtering, we are still left with the clear knowledge that 45 degrees are not *yad soledes*.

GLOSSARY

simanim – pipes (the trachea and the esophagus)
tzaraas - a group of skin conditions, for which the Torah decrees tumah; the person is regarded as an *av hatumah*
shechin- inflammation
michveh - burn
Gris – size of a bean
Shechitah - slaughtering

DAILY MASHAL

Kodesh Kodoshim

There once was a stingy rich man with many quirks, including his fondness of being the *chazan*. His voice was not the best but once he stood at the *amud*, there was no one happier than him or more forlorn than his audience. Rabbi Aizel Charif said about him: The *Gemora* says that the Jews are holy. Some want but don't have and some have but don't want. The rich man is actually *kodesh kodoshim*. Concerning charity, he has but doesn't want and concerning being a *chazan*, he wants but doesn't have... (*HaOtzar Hayehudi, 1459*).