



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

### ***Veins in the Jaw***

Rabbi Abba said in the name of Rav Huna who said it in the name of Rav: The veins in the jaw are forbidden (*on account of the blood contained in it, which is difficult to be removed*), and a *Kohen* who does not know how to remove them should not be given this portion.

The *Gemora* notes, however, that this is not correct, for if the meat is roasted, the blood will flow out, and if it is cooked in a pot, having first been cut up and salted, the blood will have flowed out. (133a)

### ***Snatching the Gifts***

Rava said: Rav Yosef once tested us by asking us the following question: If a *Kohen* snatches the *Kohanic* gifts (*for himself, when, in truth, they were intended to be given to a different Kohen*), is this a sign of his zeal for the *mitzvah* or of his contempt for the *mitzvah*? And we replied that the Torah says: *They shall give*, but he shall not take it himself.

Abaye (*who was a Kohen*) said: “At first I used to snatch the *Kohanic* gifts, for I said to myself, ‘I am showing my zeal for the *mitzvah*,’ but when I heard the teaching, ‘*They shall give*, but he shall not take it himself,’ I would no longer snatch it, but rather, I would say to all, ‘Give them to me,’ and when I heard that which was taught in the following *braisa* (*regarding the sons of Shmuel, who were Leviim*): *They turned aside after monetary gain*; Rabbi Meir said: *Shmuel’s sons used to ask for the portions themselves (and since they were the greatest in their generation, everyone would give them; this resulted in that the other poor Leviim received nothing, and it was regarded as stealing)*, I decided not to ask for

them, but would accept them if they were given to me. And when I heard the that which was taught in the following *braisa*: *The righteous Kohanim would withdraw their hands (from the lechem hapanim, for eating a portion the size of a bean would not be regarded as a mitzvah)*, but the gluttons would take their shares, I decided not to accept them at all, except on the day before *Yom Kippur*, so as to establish myself as one of the *Kohanim*.

The *Gemora* asks: But he could have raised his hands (*for the Priestly blessing to show that he was a Kohen*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Time prevented him (*from reciting the Blessing, for that was the time he used to teach his students*). (133a)

### ***Acquiring for Another before taking Possession***

Rav Yosef said: A *Kohen* in whose neighborhood there lives a Torah scholar who is in dire need, may assign to him the *Kohanic* gifts even though they have not yet come into his possession; provided that the *Kohen* is popular among the *Kohanim* and *Leviim* (*for since he regularly receives the gifts, it may be regarded as if he has received them already*).

Rava and Rav Safra once visited the house of Mar Yochana the son of Rav Chana bar Adda, and others say it was the house of Mar Yochana the son of Rav Chana bar Bizna, and he prepared for them a third-born calf (*which is the tastiest*). Rava said to the attendant (*who waited upon them, and who was a Kohen as well*), “Assign to me the gifts, for I wish to eat the tongue with mustard.” He assigned them to him. Rava

ate it, but Rav Safra would not eat it (*for a Kohen did not first take possession of it*). There came to Rav Safra the following verse in a dream: *Like a worn-out garment in cold weather, and as vinegar upon alum, so is he that sings songs of Torah to one with a poor mind (who doesn't understand what he is being taught)*. He then came before Rav Yosef and said to him, "Perhaps it was because I violated the master's teaching that this verse came to me?" But Rav Yosef replied, "I said it of a stranger only (*who is not pressured to give the gifts to the other person*), but an attendant must assign it to him even against his will, and furthermore, I said it in respect of one who is desperate for the gifts, but here he could have managed without them."

Rav Safra asked: But then why did this verse appear to me?

Rav Yosef replied: It referred to Rava.

Rav Safra asked: Then why did it not appear to Rava?

Rav Yosef answered: He was under Divine censure (*for unnecessarily asking for rain*).

Abaye asked Rav Dimi: To what does the simple meaning of the above verse refer?

He replied: It is to one who teaches a disciple that is not of fine character, for Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: Whoever teaches a disciple that is not of fine character will fall into Gehinnom.

Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rav: Whoever teaches a disciple that is not of fine character is as one that throws a stone at a *Mercuris* (*for it is honor to the avodah zarah; so too, he is honoring the evil student*). (133a)

### Marking the Meat

The *Mishna* had stated that if one is a partner with them (*a Kohen or an idolater*), he needs to mark the meat (*so people*

*will realize that it does not entirely belong to him, and it is not subject to the law of the Kohanic gifts*).

The *Gemora* notes that this is so, apparently, even regarding an idolater. But, the *Gemora* asks, a contradiction can be pointed out from the following *braisa*: If a man partners in an animal with a *Kohen* he must mark the meat; if he is a partner with an idolater, or if the animal was a consecrated animal that had become disqualified, there is no need to mark it.?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* must be referring to a case where the idolater was sitting in the butcher's store (*which indicates to all that he is a partner*).

The *Gemora* asks: But then in the case of the *Kohen* we must also suppose the same circumstances - that he was sitting in the butcher's store; why then is it necessary to mark the meat? It must be because people might say that he is only there to buy meat (*but he is not a partner*). Then in the case of the idolater as well, people might say that he is only buying meat, will they not?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* must be referring to a case where the idolater was sitting on the money chest (*which indicates to all that he is a partner*).

The *Gemora* asks: But then in the case of the *Kohen* we must also suppose the same circumstances - that he was sitting on the money chest; why then is it necessary to mark the meat? It must be because people might say that he merely trusted him (*the Kohen - to guard the money*). Then in the case of the idolater as well, people might say that he merely trusted him?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no trust among idolaters.

Alternatively, you may answer that an idolater (*when he is a partner*) usually cries out (*that his Jewish partner is not charging the correct price*). (133a – 133b)

### **Marking the Meat of Disqualified Offerings**

The *braisa* had stated: If the animal was a consecrated animal that had become disqualified, there is no need to mark it. This shows that it is evident to all (*that it is a disqualified offering*). But, the *Gemora* asks, we have learned in a *Mishna*: Consecrated animals that have become disqualified may (*after they have been redeemed*) be sold and slaughtered in the market (*and it is not regarded as degrading; this is because their proceeds become sacred and are used for the purchase of other sacrifices*), and they may be weighed out by the *litra* (*like all other animals*).

Rav Adda bar Ahavah suggested before Rav Pappa that the *braisa* refers only to those animals that are sold in the house. [*This is referring to a bechor or ma'aser which developed a blemish. They are not redeemed, and if the owner wishes to sell them, he must do so from the house.*] (133b)

### **Partner in Part**

Rav Huna said: If he (*a Kohen or an idolater*) is a partner in the head of the animal only, one is exempt from giving the jaws (*which is in the head; he is still, however, obligated to give the foreleg and the abomasum*). If he has a share in the arm, one is exempt from giving the foreleg. If he has a share in the innards, one is exempt from giving the abomasum. Chiya bar Rav said: Even if he is only a partner in one of these parts, one is nevertheless exempt from all the gifts.

The *Gemora* challenges Chiya bar Rav's opinion from the following *braisa*: If he (*a Kohen or idolater*) said, "The head shall be mine and the rest of it is yours," or even if he said, "One hundredth part of the head shall be mine," he is exempt (*from the Kohanic gifts*). If he said, "The foreleg shall be mine and the rest of it is yours," or even if he said, "One hundredth part of the foreleg shall be mine," he is exempt. If he said, "The innards shall be mine and the rest of it is yours," or even if he said, "One hundredth part of the innards shall be mine," he is exempt. Now this (*the first ruling*) means, does it not, that he is exempt from the giving of the jaw, but liable to give

the others; likewise, that he is exempt from the foreleg, but liable to give the others; and so also that he is exempt from the abomasums, but liable to give the others?

The *Gemora* answers: No, it means that he is exempt from all the gifts.

The *Gemora* asks: Then why does it not expressly state that he is exempt from all the gifts? And furthermore, it has been expressly taught: If he (*a Kohen or idolater*) said, "The head shall be mine and the rest of it is yours," or even if he said, "One hundredth part of the head shall be mine," he is exempt from giving the jaw, but he is liable to give the others! This is surely a refutation of the view of Chiya bar Rav. It is indeed a refutation.

Rav Chisda said: The following *braisa* misled Chiya bar Rav: Twenty-four *Kohanic* gifts were bestowed upon Aaron and his sons. All these were granted to him by means of a generalization followed by a specification which was in its turn followed again by a generalization (*the entire Torah*) and a *covenant of salt* (*all the korbanos*), so that to fulfill them is like fulfilling the entire Torah, which is expounded by generalization, specification and generalization and like offering all of the sacrifices forming the covenant of salt, whereas to transgress them is like transgressing the entire Torah, which is expounded by generalization, specification and generalization and like offering all of the sacrifices forming the covenant of salt. They are: Ten to be partaken in the Temple, four in Yerushalayim and ten within the borders of *Eretz Yisroel*. The ten in the Temple are: A *chatas* offering of an animal, a *chatas* offering of a fowl, an *asham* offering for a known sin, an *asham* offering for a doubtful sin, the *shelamim* offering of the congregation, the *log* of oil in the case of a *metzora*, the remnant of the *korban omer*, the two loaves, the show bread and the remnant of meal offerings. The four in Yerushalayim are: the firstborn animals, the first of the first fruits, the portions separated in the case of the *todah* offering and from the ram of the *nazir* and the skins of the holy sacrifices. The ten to be partaken in the borders of



*Eretz Yisroel* are: *terumah*, the *terumah* of the tithe, *challah*, the first of the fleece, the gift portions of unconsecrated animals, the redemption of the firstborn son, the redemption of the firstborn of a donkey, a consecrated ancestral field, a *cherem* field and payment for a robbery committed upon a convert. [The *Gemora* explains how this braisa misled him.] Now, he thought that since the gift portions were counted as one item in the list, they are considered one. This, however, is not the case, for can it be said that the portions separated in the case of the *todah* offering and from the ram of the *nazir* are considered one merely because they are counted as one item? Surely, they are counted as one item because they are similar to each other; then in this case as well, they are counted as one item only because they are similar to each other.

The question was raised: What is the law if he said, “The head shall be yours and all the rest of it shall be mine”? Do we have regard to the part of the animal on which the obligation rests and this part belongs to the *Yisroel*, or do we go by the major portion of the animal, and this belongs to the *Kohen*?

The *Gemora* proves this from the following *braisa*: If an idolater or a *Kohen* handed over sheep to a Jew to shear them, he is exempt from (*giving to the Kohen*) the first of the fleece. If a man bought the fleeces of a flock belonging to an idolater, he is exempt from the first of the fleece. In this respect, the law of the foreleg and the jaw and the abomasum is stricter than the law of the first of the fleece. This proves that we have regard to the part of the animal upon which the obligation rests. This indeed proves it. (133b)

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***The Reward for Slaughtering, Blessing and Examining***

A person who slaughters a mundane animal gives the foreleg, cheeks and stomach to a *kohen*. Ibn Ezra explains (Devarim 18:1) that these gifts were chosen as the *kohen* who slaughters *korbanos* with his arm should receive the foreleg.

The cheeks allow him to pronounce the *berachah* of the *kohanim* and the stomach is given as reward for examining the animal. What is the examining? Rabbi Aharon Levin, the *av beis din* of Risha, explains that this doesn't mean examining for *treifos* as we have learnt (11a) that they didn't have to examine the sacrifices for *treifos*, but the Rivash (163) sides with the opinion that they examined the lungs.

### ***The Means to Eat Belong to the Kohen***

HaGaon Rav Z. Sorotzkin zt"l explains that separating *terumah* and *ma'aseros* serves to bless the growth in the field and giving the foreleg, cheeks and stomach serves to grant a blessing while eating as when we eat, the food needs a stomach to digest it, cheeks – i.e., a mouth and teeth – to chew and an “arm” to bring the food to our mouths.