



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

***Blemishes***

On account of these blemishes we may slaughter a firstborn animal, and any consecrated animals rendered disqualified on account of these blemishes may be redeemed.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the necessity to state this again? Hasn't the *Tanna* stated this in a previous *Mishna*, as follows: On account of these blemishes we may slaughter the firstborn animal?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* was stated for its latter part: any consecrated animals rendered disqualified on account of these blemishes may be redeemed.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely this too is obvious, for if we may slaughter the animal on account of these blemishes, is there any question about redeeming it?

Rather, the *Gemora* explains the necessity as follows: Since it stated in a previous *Mishna* that Ayala also added three cases of blemishes, and the Sages responded that they only heard of those already mentioned, and then the *Tanna* proceeded (*in subsequent Mishnayos*) to give the opinions of individual *Tannaim*; he therefore (*now*) stated anonymously in reference to all these individual

teachings (*to teach us that the halachah is in accordance with them*): On account of these blemishes we may slaughter a firstborn animal, and any consecrated animals rendered disqualified on account of these blemishes may be redeemed.

And on account of the following blemishes we may not slaughter a firstborn either in the Temple (*as an offering, for they are regarded as temporary blemishes*) or in the provinces (*but rather, we must wait for a full-fledged blemish*): White spots on the eye or water (*dripping from the eye*) when it is temporary; molars which have been notched but not uprooted; an animal affected with *garav* (*type of boils*), *yaveles* (*type of wart*) or *chazazis* (*type of boils*); an old animal or a sick one; an animal that has a foul smell; an animal which with a sin has been committed, or an animal which killed a human being on the testimony of one witness or of the owners (*for otherwise, it would be condemned to death*); a *tumtum* (*where a thick membrane covers its genitals, and therefore the gender is not known*) or *androgynous* (*a hermaphrodite – one that has both male and female genitals*). These can be slaughtered neither in the Temple, nor in the provinces. Rabbi Yishmael says: There is no greater blemish than this (*an androgynous; it is nevertheless forbidden to be shorn or to be put to work*). The Sages, however, say: It does not have the law of a firstborn at all, and may be shorn and worked with.

The *Gemora* asks: And is not *garav* a blemish? Is it not written in the Torah: 'or a *garav*'? And also, is not *chazazis* a blemish? Is it not written in the Torah 'or a *yalefes*'? And it has been taught in a *braisa*: *Garav* is the same as *cheres* (which are boils as hard as earthenware); *yalefes* is the same as the Egyptian *chazazis* ('boils' by the Ten Plagues)? And Rish Lakish explained: Why is it called *yalefes*? It is because it continues to cling to one's body until the day of death. [This proves that it is a permanent blemish!?!]

The *Gemora* notes that there is no difficulty regarding *chazazis*, for the one in the Torah refers to the Egyptian *chazazis*, and the *Mishna* is referring to a regular *chazazis* (one that is not permanent). But the *garav* (of the Torah) and *garav* (of the Mishna) present a contradiction!?

The *Gemora* answers: *Garav* (of the Mishna) refers to one where it is moist, and *garav* (of the Torah) refers to one which is dry; the moist one heals (and is therefore regarded as temporary), whereas the dry does not heal (and therefore, it is a full-fledged blemish).

The *Gemora* asks: But does the moist *garav* heal? A Scriptural verse is cited proving that it does not heal.

The *Gemora* answers: Rather explain that there are three kinds of *garav*. The *garav* of the Torah refers to one which is dry both inside and outside (and cannot heal). The *garav* of our *Mishna* refers to where it is moist both inside and outside (and that is why it is listed in those less severe blemishes). The *garav* of Egypt (by the plague of boils) is where it is dry inside and moist outside (and it will not heal).

The *Mishna* had stated: [We may not slaughter a firstborn either in the Temple (as an offering, for they are regarded as temporary blemishes) or in the provinces:] an old animal or a sick one; an animal that has a foul smell.

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural sources for these laws. The *Gemora* explains why each one of the exclusions is necessary (and why I wouldn't be able to derive one from the other).

- Old animal – will not return to its strength, but a sick animal can.
- Sick animal – this is not part of its normal development, but all animals become old.
- Old and sick animal – they both are weak, but a foul-smelling animal is not weak.

Foul-smelling animal – it is repulsive, but the others are not. (41a – 41b)