DAF Notes
Insights into the Daily Daf
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

Half and Half is Whole?

The *Gemara* cites a dispute about one who planned on eating half a *zayis – olive size unit* at the wrong time, then planned on eating another half a *zayis* in the wrong place, and then planned on eating another half a *zayis* at the wrong time. Rava says that the first thought, although it had previously combined with the middle thought, reawakens and combines with the last thought, making this sacrifice *piggul*, punishable by *kares*. Rav Hamnuna says that the first thought is already joined with the middle one, and cannot join with the last one to make the sacrifice *piggul*.

Rava cites a proof from a *Mishnah* about impurity. The *Mishnah* says that if a *beitzah – an egg unit* of food impure at the first level mixes with a *beitzah* of food impure at the second level, the mixture has the status of the first level, since it contains the *beitzah* of the first level food. If the mixture was split, each part only has the status of second level food.

Rava infers from the *Mishnah* that if they were reunited, the two halves of a *beitzah* of first level food would combine to give the mixture the status of first level. This is indicated from the continuation of the *Mishnah*, which says that if the two halves separately touch a loaf of *terumah*, they only make it invalid (*third level impurity*), but if they simultaneously touch the loaf, they make it impure (*second level impurity*), showing that the combination of the two halves has the status of first level.

Rav Hamnuna deflects this proof, since in this *Mishnah* there was a full amount (*beitzah*) of impure food at the outset, while in the case of *piggul*, there was never a *k'zayis* at one time that would make it *piggul*.

Rav Hamnuna cites a proof from another *Mishnah* about impurity. The *Mishnah* says that food that became impure due to contact with a source of impurity combines with food that become impure by contact with first level impurity, to jointly make something else impure at the lower level of the two foods.

Rav Hamnuna assumes that even if later more food was added to make a full unit of food made impure from a source of impurity, the food still only has the effect of the lower level food, since the original food already is combined.

Rava deflects this by saying the *Mishnah* may only be discussing a case where no more food was added, but if more was added, it would have the status of first level impurity.

When Rav Dimi arrived, he said that if one planned to eat one half *zayis* in the wrong place, then planned on one half *zayis* at the wrong time, and then planned another half *zayis* at the wrong time, Bar Kapara taught that the sacrifice is *piggul*, since the original half *zayis* cannot prevent the full *zayis* from the combination of the two latter halves.

When Ravin arrived, he said that if one planned to eat one half *zayis* at the wrong time, then planned on one half *zayis* at the wrong time, then planned on one half *zayis* in the wrong place, Bar Kapara taught that it is piggul, since the original half zayis cannot prevent the full zayis from the combination of the two latter halves.

Rav Ashi taught as follows: if one planned to eat half a *zayis* at the wrong time, and then a full *zayis* - half in the wrong place, and half at the wrong time, Bar Kapara taught that it is piggul, since the original half zayis cannot prevent the full zayis from the combination of the two latter halves. (31a1 – 31a3)

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H

What is "Eating"?

Rabbi Yannai says that if one planned for dogs to eat the sacrifice at the wrong time, it is *piggul*, since the verse classifies dogs eating meat as *achilah – eating*: And Jezebel will be consumed by the dogs in the portion of Yizrael.

Rabbi Ami challenges this, since the verse, *A fire that need not be blown shall consume him*, also refers to a fire consuming something as *achilah – eating*, yet the *Mishnah* says that planning on eating half a *zayis* and sacrificing half a *zayis* on the Altar does not make *piggul*, since eating and sacrificing do not combine. This indicates that that fire consuming it, as it does when sacrificing on the Altar, is not considered eating.

The *Gemara* deflects this proof by saying that if one planned for the fire to "eat" the meat, it would be *piggul*, since he used the terminology of "eating." The *Mishnah* is discussing one who planned to "sacrifice" it on the fire of the Altar, which is not the terminology of "eating." (31a3 – 31a4)

What Combines?

Rav Ashi asked whether a sacrifice is *piggul* if he planned for two people to together eat one *zayis* at the wrong time. Is it *piggul*, since a *k'zayis* will be eaten, or is it not *piggul*, since no one person will eat a *k'zayis*?

Abaye proves from the *Mishnah* that it is *piggul*. The *Mishnah* says that planning to eat half a *zayis* and sacrifice half a *zayis* does not combine, implying that planning for two half *zayis's* to be eaten, and what would be the circumstances? – When the intent is to be eaten by two people, and it combines for *piggul*. Indeed this is a proof.

Rava asked whether a sacrifice is *piggul* if one planned to eat a *k'zayis* at the wrong time, over a period longer than the time to eat a *pras – half a loaf of bread*, which is the time within a person must eat a *k'zayis* of any prohibited food to be liable. If we compare the eating of the sacrifice at the wrong time to other mundane prohibited eating, which must be within this period, this intent would not make it *piggul*. But, if we compare it to the "eating" of the Altar, which takes a long time, this intent would make it *piggul*.

Abaye attempts to prove from the *Mishnah* that it would be *piggul*. The *Mishnah* says that planning to eat half a *zayis* and sacrifice half a *zayis* does not combine, implying that planning to eat two half *zayis*'s in a similar fashion to sacrifice would be *piggul*. Since sacrificing takes longer, this would prove that it is *piggul*.

The *Gemara* deflects this, saying that perhaps the *Mishnah* is referring to a large pyre on the Altar, which would consume a *k'zayis* during this period, and only eating similar to that would be *piggul*. (31a4 – 31b1)

Thinking about what?

The *Mishnah* says that if one planned on eating half a *zayis* and sacrificing half a *zayis*, this does not combine. The *Gemara* infers that if one planned to eat that second half *zayis*, instead of sacrificing it, it would be *piggul*, even though the half *zayis* that would be sacrificed is not normally eaten.

The *Gemara* says that this is inconsistent with the earlier section of the *Mishnah*, which said that only intent to eat something "which is eaten" makes a sacrifice *piggul*.

Rabbi Yirmiyah says that the latter part of the *Mishnah* is Rabbi Eliezer, who says consumption of the Altar and of a person are interchangeable.

The *Gemara* cites a *Mishnah* about one who plans to eat something not normally eaten, or sacrifice something that is not normally sacrificed at the wrong time. The Sages say it is valid, as these are not valid forms of consumption, while Rabbi Eliezer says it is invalid, since the types of consumption are interchangeable.

L'zecher Nishmas HaRav Raphael Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel Marcus O"H

Abaye says that this latter section can also follow the Sages, since the *Mishnah* does not mean to infer that if one planned to eat the half *zayis* that would have been sacrificed, it would be *piggul*.

The *Gemara* attempts to explain what this section of the *Mishnah* is teaching. It cannot be teaching that if one would plan to eat a second half *zayis* of meat (*which is normally eaten*), we already know that from the start of the *Mishnah*, which says that if one planned on half a *zayis* at the wrong time and half a *zayis* in the wrong place, it is invalid. It cannot be teaching that eating and sacrificing do not combine, since we would know that from the earlier statement of the *Mishnah* that planning to eat half a *zayis* of meat (*which is normally eaten*) and planning to eat half a *zayis* of sacrificed items (*which are not normally eaten*), does not make it *piggul*. If planning to eat these two items does not combine, even though they are both plans to eat, surely planning to eat one half and sacrifice one half should not combine, since they are two different actions.

The *Gemara* says that we would not know this from the first statement, since we may have thought that eating sacrificed items is not a valid act, and therefore cannot combine, but sacrificing these items, which is a normative act, may have combined. Therefore, the *Mishnah* had to teach that they do not combine, and not to teach any other implications. (31b1 – 31b3)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU,
KOL HAZEVACHIM

All may Sacrifice

The *Mishnah* says that anyone who slaughters a sacrifice is valid, since slaughtering any sacrifice (*even the more severe kodshei kodashim*) may be done by all – non-*Kohanim*, women, slaves, and impure people, as long as an impure person does not touch the meat. Since their slaughtering is valid, any incorrect thoughts they had invalidates the sacrifice. (31b4)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Combining Halves

The *Gemara* cites a dispute between Rava and Rav Hamnuna about whether planning to eat half a *k'zayis* at the wrong time, followed by planning to eat half a *zayis* in the wrong place, can combine with a final plan to eat another half *k'zayis* at the wrong time. Rava cites a proof that it does combine from a *Mishnah* which states that a *beitzah* of *rishon* food *(at the first level of impurity*) that combines with a *beitzah* of *sheini* food (*at the second level*) retains its status, even when the mixture was split and recombined. Rav Hamnuna deflects this by saying that "there, you have a unit, but here you do not."

Rashi learns that Rav Hamnuna is saying that in the case of impurity, you began with a full unit, and therefore its combination with the *sheini* food does not prevent it from recombining later to retain the status of a *beitzah* of *rishon* food. However, in the case of *piggul*, there never was a full unit of a *k'zayis* before it combined with the second plan, and therefore it cannot combine.

Rabbeinu Tam (Tosfos 31a Hasam) objects, saying that the Rav Hamnuna should have said, "there, you *had* a unit." Instead, Rabbeinu Tam says that Rav Hamnuna is referring to the *sheini* food, and says that since the *sheini* food had a full unit, it does not attach the *rishon* food to itself, allowing to recombine with its other half later.

Rav Hamnuna cites a proof that they do not combine from a *Mishnah* which states that food that is a *rishon* combines with food that is *sheini* to create a unit of a *beitzah* at the status of *sheini*.

Rashi, who limits Rav Hamnuna to a case where there never was a full unit before the first mixture, must understand this *Mishnah* to refer to a case of *rishon* food which was never a *beitzah*, but became impure when being less than a *beitzah*.

Rashi, following his position in many other places, says that although food cannot make other things impure unless it has a *beitzah* unit, it itself can become impure even if it is less than a *beitzah*.

Rabbeinu Tam differs, and maintains that food cannot itself become impure if it is less than a *beitzah*.

However, Tosfos (31a Amar) explains that Rabbeinu Tam can explain this *Mishnah* as a case where the *rishon* food came from a full *beitzah* that had become impure, since Rav Hamnuna does not say that any time the original food had a unit, it cannot recombine. As long as the mixture it joined does not have a unit, the first food cannot recombine. Therefore, even if the *rishon* food came from a *beitzah*, as long as the *sheini* food it fell into does not now have a *beitzah*, it cannot recombine with other *rishon* food later.

Women Slaughtering

The *Mishnah* states that slaughtering of a sacrifice is valid, no matter who performed it. The *Mishnah* includes women in the list of those whose slaughtering is valid.

Tosfos (31b Shehashechita) notes that the *Gemara* says that not only is their slaughtering valid, they are permitted to slaughter. Of the list mentioned in the *Mishnah*, only someone impure is not permitted to slaughter, since we are concerned he may make the sacrifice impure. Nonetheless, if he did slaughter without touching the animal, the slaughtering is valid.

Tosfos notes that the book "Hilchos Eretz Yisroel" prohibits women from slaughtering animals (*for regular consumption*), but this *Mishnah* and *Gemara* disprove this restriction. Similarly, this book states that if one slaughtered without a blessing or when not clothed, the slaughtering is invalid, but there is no such indication in the *Gemara*. Tosfos concludes that the restrictions in this book are stringencies created by the author, and not mandated by the *Gemara*. The Shulchan Aruch (YD 1:1) rules like Tosfos, and permits women to slaughter, while the Rama notes that the custom is to not allow women to slaughter. See Bais Yosef (YD 1) and Shach (YD 1:1) for further details on this custom.

DAILY MASHAL

Eli Ruled That Chanah Could Slaughter

Chazal recount in Berachos 31b that when Chanah brought her son Shmuel to the Sanctuary at Shiloh, he ruled in the presence of Eli HaKohen that a sacrifice may be slaughtered by a non-*Kohen*. Though Eli agreed with him, he condemned him to death for ruling halachah in the presence of his *rav*. Then Chanah cried out, "I am the woman who was standing here with you." What kind of answer was that?

But from the verse "who was standing with you" (Shmuel I, 1:26), *Chazal* learnt (Berachos, ibid.) that one mustn't sit within 4 *amos* of someone who is praying, as Eli also stood while she was praying.

HaGaon Rav M.Y. Zaksh of Yerushalayim zt"l said that that is because someone who is praying is like someone who is offering a sacrifice and his place is like the *Azarah* and "there is no sitting in the *'Azarah*."

That was Chanah's answer to Eli: You stood while I was praying though I am a woman and disqualified for service in the Sanctuary and it could only be because I am fit to slaughter. If so, you have already ruled that we don't need a *kohen* to slaughter and therefore Shmuel didn't innovate anything when he said that a non-*kohen* may slaughter as you ruled so a few years ago and the matter is well known (*Milei DeMordechai*).