



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

MISHNAH: In certain respects the prohibition of the fat is stricter than the prohibition of the blood, and in certain respects the prohibition of the blood is stricter than the prohibition of the fat. The prohibition of the fat is stricter, in that the fat is subject to the law of me'ilah,¹ and the penalty for piggul, nossar, and tumah² is incurred by it, which is not the case with the blood. And the prohibition of the blood is stricter, for it applies to cattle, undomesticated animals and birds, whether nonkosher or kosher; but the prohibition of the fat applies to kosher animals only.

GEMARA: From where do we know this?³ — Rabbi Yannai answered: It is written: As it would be separated from the bull of the shelamim offering.⁴ Now what do we learn from the bull of the shelamim?⁵ Indeed, it comes to teach but turns out to be the subject of a teaching; we must compare the bull of the sacrifice of the shelamim with the bull of the anointed

Kohen Gadol; as the bull of the anointed Kohen Gadol is subject to the law of me'ilah, so the bull of the shelamim is also subject to the law of me'ilah.⁶

Rabbi Chanina said to him: And is the following teaching of Rebbe unsatisfactory? The verse: All the fat is for Hashem, signifies that the sacrificial portions of the less holy sacrifices are also subject to the law of me'ilah. — Abaye answered: [Both verses] are necessary [for our purpose]. For had the Merciful One only stated: All the fat, I should have said that only the fat is [subject to the law of me'ilah] but the diaphragm and the two kidneys are not;⁷ the Merciful One therefore stated the verse: As it would be separated. And had the Merciful One only stated the verse: As it would be separated, I should have said that the fat of the fat tail [of a lamb], which is not found in a bull, is not subject to the law

¹ If a person inadvertently makes use of the fat of a sacrifice he commits me'ilah and must bring an asham for atonement. This is not the case with the blood of a sacrifice.

² If a person ate the fat of a sacrifice which was rendered piggul or nossar, i.e., what was left over beyond the prescribed time in which the sacrifice must be eaten, or if the person was tamei at the time he ate the fat, he would, in each alternative, incur guilt twice: for eating fat and also for eating piggul etc.

³ That the law of me'ilah applies to the fat of a sacrifice, whether the sacrifice was of the most holy or less holy kind.

⁴ The sacrificial portions of the bull brought by the anointed Kohen Gadol as his chatas offering are in this verse compared with the bull of the shelamim.

⁵ What is the purpose of the comparison? In fact, with regard to the burning of the sacrificial portions upon the altar, all those portions which are stated in connection with the shelamim are also expressly stated here.

⁶ Although the shelamim is a sacrifice of the less holy kind, and from the time of the consecration of the animal until its sacrifice, it is certainly not subject to the law of me'ilah - as soon as the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice has taken place the sacrificial portions of the animal are subject to the law of me'ilah.

⁷ For the diaphragm and the two kidneys, although sacrificial parts, cannot be comprehended with the term 'all the fat'.

of me'ilah;⁸ the Merciful One therefore stated: All the fat is for Hashem.

Rav Mari said to Rav Zevid: If the fat tail [of a lamb] is included under the term 'fat', should it not then be forbidden to be eaten?⁹ — He replied: It is for your sake that it is written: You shall eat no fat, of bull, or sheep, or goat. [Thus the Torah has forbidden] only such fat as is common to bull, sheep, and goat.

Rav Ashi answered: It is always referred to as 'the fat of the fat tail', but never as 'fat' simply. The Gemara asks: If so, it should not be subject to the law of me'ilah?¹⁰ Obviously then the better answer is that of Rav Zevid.

The Mishnah had stated: Which is not the case with the blood.

The Gemara asks: From where do we know this?¹¹

Ulla answered: Scripture says: To you, that is, it shall be yours.

The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Scripture says. To make atonement, that is, I have given it to you for an atonement and not that you be liable for me'ilah on its account.

⁸ For this verse: As it would be separated speaks of the sacrificial portions of a bull, and therefore cannot include the fat of the fat tail of a lamb.

⁹ For all that fat in a sacrifice which is burnt upon the altar is forbidden to be eaten when the animal is slaughtered for ordinary use.

¹⁰ For the law of me'ilah in respect of the fat of less holy sacrifices is derived from the verse: All the fat is for Hashem; and if the fat of the fat tail is not included under the term 'fat', it cannot then be subject to the law of me'ilah.

¹¹ That the blood of a sacrifice is not subject to the law of me'ilah.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Scripture says. It is, that is, it is the same before the atonement as after the atonement: just as after the atonement [the residue of the blood] is not subject to the law of me'ilah, so before the atonement [the blood] is not subject to the law of me'ilah.

The Gemara asks: Perhaps I ought to say: It is the same after the atonement as before the atonement: just as before the atonement it is subject to the law of me'ilah, so after the atonement it is subject to the law of me'ilah?

The Gemara answers: There is nothing that is subject to the law of me'ilah once its mitzvos have been performed.

The Gemara asks: But is there not? Surely there is the case of the removal of the ashes [from the altar],¹² which [ashes] are subject to the law of me'ilah even though the mitzvos therewith have been performed, for it is written: And he shall put them beside the altar!

The Gemara answers: This case of the removal of the ashes and that of the garments of the Kohen Gadol¹³ are two texts which teach the same thing, and one may not draw any conclusions from two texts which teach the same thing.¹⁴

The Gemara notes: This, however, would be right according to the Rabbis who declare that the verse: And he shall leave

¹² Every morning the ashes of the olah offering upon the altar were scooped up in a firepan and were deposited on the east side of the ramp leading to the altar. It was forbidden to derive any use from them.

¹³ The garments worn by the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur when he entered the innermost Sanctuary, the Holy of Holies, had to be put away never to be used again, either by an ordinary Kohen for his regular services or by a Kohen Gadol for service on Yom Kippur of the following year.

¹⁴ These two cases are therefore exceptions to the rule stated above, that after the performance of its mitzvos a thing cannot be subject any more to the law of me'ilah.

them there, teaches that they [sc. the garments] must be hidden away; but according to Rabbi Dosa who declares that the verse teaches that [the Kohen Gadol] shall not wear them on a subsequent Yom Kippur,¹⁵ what is to be said?

Rather [say] that the case of the removal of the ashes and that of the heifer whose neck was to be broken¹⁶ are two texts which teach the same thing, and one may not draw any conclusions from two texts which teach the same thing.

The Gemara asks: This is well according to the one who maintains that one may not draw conclusions from such texts, but according to the one who maintains that one may draw conclusions from such texts, what is to be said?

The Gemara answers: There are two limiting particles stated: here it is written: And he shall put them [excluding others], and there it is written: Whose neck was broken [limiting it to this case only].

¹⁵ An ordinary Kohen, however, may wear these garments during the year.

¹⁶ The heifer, after the performance of the mitzvos with regard to it, had to be buried in the very place where the ceremony was performed, and it was forbidden to derive any use from it.

¹⁷ If a man ate the blood of a sacrifice which remained over beyond the prescribed time within which its meat may be eaten, he is liable only for eating blood, but not, in addition, for eating nossar.

¹⁸ If a man who was tamei ate the blood of a sacrifice, he is liable only for eating blood, but not, in addition, for eating it while tamei.

¹⁹ I.e., if the sacrifice was rendered piggul and a man ate of its blood he would not be liable for eating piggul.

²⁰ By the proper sprinkling of the blood the sacrificial portions are rendered permissible to be burnt upon the altar, and the meat to be consumed by the Kohen or owner. Therefore if the sacrifice was rendered piggul and a man ate of the meat or of the sacrificial portions he would be liable; but if he ate of the

blood, which is what renders others permissible, he would not be liable.

Why are the three different texts with regard to the blood necessary? One excludes blood from the law of nossar,¹⁷ another excludes it from the law of me'ilah, and the third excludes it from the law of tumah.¹⁸ No text, however, is necessary to exclude it from the law of piggul,¹⁹ for we have learned: Whatever is rendered permissible, whether for man or for the altar, one is liable on account of it [to the kares penalty] for piggul,²⁰ but the blood is itself that which renders [other parts of the offering] permissible.

CHAPTER IX

MISHNAH: The hide, gravy, sediment, alal, bones, sinews, horns and hoofs combine [to make up the minimum quantity in order] to convey food-tumah,²¹ but not to [make up the minimum quantity in order to] convey neveilah-tumah.²²

blood, which is what renders others permissible, he would not be liable.

²¹ Each of the substances enumerated would be reckoned together with a piece of meat less than an egg's bulk, so as to make up the quantity of an egg's bulk and, if tamei, would convey tumah to other foodstuffs or liquids. With regard to some of the substances, e.g., the gravy, the sediment and the sinews, the reason why they would be reckoned together with the meat is because, although they are not eaten alone, they would be eaten together with the meat, and are therefore regarded as foodstuffs. And with regard to the other substances, e.g., the hide, bones, horns and hoofs, the reason is because each forms a protection or covering to a foodstuff and is therefore regarded as one with the foodstuff.

²² If the meat was neveilah these substances would not combine with the meat in order to make up an olive's bulk, the quantity necessary in order to convey tumah to men or vessels.

Similarly, if a man slaughtered an tamei animal for an idolater and it still writhes convulsively, it can convey food-tumah,²³ but it can only convey neveilah-tumah after it is dead, or its head has been chopped off.

Scripture] has [thus] intimated more cases that convey food-tumah than those that convey neveilah-tumah.

Rabbi Yehudah says: if so much of alal was collected together²⁴ so that there was an olive's bulk in one place, one would thereby become liable.²⁵

GEMARA: We have learned [here in our Mishnah] what our Rabbis have taught elsewhere: Protections²⁶ [can be included to make up the quantity required] for a lighter tumah,²⁷ but protections cannot [be included to make up the quantity required] for a graver tumah.²⁸

From where do we know that protections can be included for a lighter tumah? — From the following teaching of a Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written: Upon any seed of a seed-plant which is to be sown, that is to say, in the manner in which men take out the seeds for sowing: wheat in its husk, barley in its husk, lentils in their husks.²⁹ And from where do

²³ If it was touched by anything tamei. For although at this moment the animal may not be eaten, either by the Jew who slaughtered it, for it is an unclean animal, or by the idolater, since by its death only is an animal rendered permitted to an idolater, and not by the slaughtering), nevertheless the act of slaughtering performed by the Jew has the effect that the animal be deemed a foodstuff immediately, for this could only have been the intention and purpose of the slaughtering.

²⁴ Although alal by itself is not a foodstuff, if one collected a number of pieces together so that there was an olive's bulk in one place, this action is significant and renders the bulk a foodstuff.

we know that protections cannot be included for a graver tumah? — From the following which our Rabbis taught: [He who touches] its carcass [shall be tamei], but not he who touches the hide which has not an olive's bulk of flesh attached to it. I might also think that he who touches [the hide] at a part where the flesh is attached on the other side shall not be tamei, Scripture therefore says: 'Shall be tamei. What does this mean? — Rava, others say: Kadi, replied: There is something missing [in that passage] and it should read as follows: [He who touches] its carcass [shall be tamei], but not he who touches the hide which has not an olive's bulk of flesh attached to it, even though the hide brings it up to an olive's bulk. I might then also exclude the case of the hide which has an olive's bulk of flesh attached to it, so that if a man were to touch the hide at a part where the flesh is attached on the other side he would not, [I suggest,] be tamei, for it [the hide] does not act even as a 'handle; Scripture therefore says: Shall be tamei.

²⁵ If this accumulated bulk was taken from a neveilah and a man touched it and later entered the Temple or ate consecrated food, he would be liable to the penalty of kares.

²⁶ I.e., that which surrounds and encloses foodstuffs, e.g., the husk of grain, the peel of fruit, the shell of nuts, the hide of an animal, etc.

²⁷ That condition of tumah which can only render tamei foodstuffs and liquids, provided there was an egg's bulk of the tamei matter.

²⁸ Neveilah-tumah. The condition of tumah that can even render tamei men and vessels, provided there was an olive's bulk of the tamei matter.

²⁹ I.e., by seed is meant the grain together with its husk; hence the protection of food is considered as part of the food itself.