



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

Blood from the Shechitah

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If a man while slaughtering splashed blood on a gourd of *terumah*, Rebbe says: It becomes susceptible to *tumah*. Rabbi Chiya says: It is a matter of doubt (*which will be explained shortly*).

Rabbi Oshaya noted: Since Rebbe says that it is susceptible to *tumah* and Rabbi Chiya says that it is a matter of doubt, on whose view should we rely? Let us then rely upon the view of Rabbi Shimon who has stated that only slaughtering will render an animal susceptible to *tumah* but not the blood (*and since R’ Shimon’s words support the opinion of R’ Chiya that it does not become susceptible to tumah, we shall follow them over Rebbe, for they are the majority*).

Rav Pappa said: They (*R’ Chiya and Rebbe*) all agree that where the blood remained on the gourd from the beginning of the slaughtering until the end that it is rendered susceptible to *tumah* (*for they hold like the Sages that the blood of shechitah can render food susceptible to tumah*); the dispute arises only where the blood was wiped off between the cutting of the first pipe and the second. Rebbe holds that *shechitah* is classified as the entire process of slaughtering from beginning to end, so that here the blood upon the gourd is considered as the blood of a slaughtered animal. Rabbi Chiya, however, holds that *shechitah* is classified

as the last act of the slaughtering only, so that here the blood upon the gourd is regarded as blood from a wound (*and it does not render the gourd susceptible for tumah*). And when Rabbi Chiya said that it is a matter of doubt, he meant that the matter hangs in doubt until the end of the slaughtering - if the blood is still upon the gourd at the end of the slaughtering it will render it susceptible to *tumah*, otherwise, it will not.

The *Gemora* asks: But what then did Rabbi Oshaya mean when he said: Let us then rely upon the view of Rabbi Shimon? These opinions are not synonymous, for according to Rabbi Shimon, blood does not render food susceptible to *tumah*, and according to Rabbi Chiya, it does!?

The *Gemora* answers: They are, at least, in agreement where the blood was wiped off during the slaughtering, for according to this master (*R’ Chiya*), it will not render the gourd susceptible to *tumah* (*for it is the blood of a wound*), and according to the other master (*R’ Shimon*), it will not render the gourd susceptible to *tumah* (*whether it is the blood of a wound or the blood from the shechitah*). [*It emerges that although their reasons are different, the halachah is nevertheless the same.*] The opinion of Rebbe on this point stands by itself, and it has been established that the opinion of one authority does not hold against the opinion of two others.

Rav Ashi explains the *braisa* as follows: When Rabbi Chiya said that it is a matter of doubt, he meant that in a case where the blood was wiped off (*between the cutting of the first pipe and the second*) it will never be settled; for Rabbi Chiya was in doubt if *shechitah* is classified as the entire process of slaughtering from beginning to end (*so that here the blood upon the gourd is considered as the blood of a slaughtered animal*), or is *shechitah* classified as the last act of the slaughtering only (*so that here the blood upon the gourd is regarded as blood from a wound and it does not render the gourd susceptible for tumah*). And when he said that it is a matter of doubt, he meant that it must not be eaten (*for perhaps it is terumah that became tamei*), and yet it must not be burned (*for perhaps it was not susceptible for tumah, and it is forbidden to burn terumah which is tahor*).

The *Gemora* asks: But what then did Rabbi Oshaya mean when he said: Let us then rely upon the view of Rabbi Shimon? These opinions are not synonymous, for according to Rabbi Shimon, blood does not render food susceptible to *tumah* (*and the terumah may be eaten*), and according to Rabbi Chiya, it does (*and it is only the blood that is in the beginning of the shechitah that he has a doubt about!*)?

The *Gemora* answers: They are, at least, in agreement with respect to burning, for according to this master (*R' Chiya*), it cannot be burned (*out of doubt*), and according to the other master (*R' Shimon*), it cannot be burned (*for it is definitely terumah which is tahor*). [*It emerges that although their reasons are different, the halachah is nevertheless the same.*] The opinion of Rebbe on this point stands by itself, and it has been

established that the opinion of one authority does not hold against the opinion of two others. (36a)

Dry Mass of a Minchah

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish inquired: If a dry portion of a *minchah* offering (*where the oil was not mixed well*) were to become *tamei*, would it transmit *tumah* up to the first and second degrees or not? [*If the part of the minchah which came into contact with the oil became tamei, it certainly can become a rishon or a sheini; however, the dry portion, which is only tamei because of the principle of "the sacred esteem of that which is kodesh," perhaps it only can become tamei to the extent of rendering it invalid but not of enabling it to transmit tumah up to the first and second degrees, or is there no such distinction?*]

Rabbi Elozar attempts to provide a proof as follows: Since it is written: *And if water is placed upon the seed (which teaches us that food that came into contact with water is susceptible for tumah)*, what need is there for the verse: *All food that is edible (which water will come upon it will become tamei)*? Does it not come to exclude the case of sacred esteem (*that it can only become invalidated, but it is not subject to the first and second degrees of tumah*)?

The *Gemora* deflects the proof: One verse states the rule with reference to *tumah* emanating from a corpse, and the other verse with reference to *tumah* of a *sheretz* (*the Torah enumerates eight creeping creatures whose carcasses transmit tumah through contact*). And it is necessary to have both verses, for if the rule were stated only with reference to *tumah* emanating from a corpse, I might have thought that in that case only was

it necessary for the food to come into contact with water (*for the law regarding corpse tumah is not so stringent*), inasmuch as a lentil's volume of a corpse will not transmit *tumah*; but with regard to the *tumah* of a *sheretz*, inasmuch as a lentil's volume of a *sheretz* will transmit *tumah*, I might have therefore said that it was not necessary for the food to come into contact with water first. And conversely, if the rule were stated only with reference to *tumah* of a *sheretz*, I would have thought that in that case only was it necessary for the food to come into contact with water (*for the law regarding tumah of a sheretz is not so stringent*), inasmuch as a *sheretz* does not render a person *tamei* for seven days; but with regard to corpse *tumah*, inasmuch as a corpse will render a person *tamei* for seven days, I might have therefore said that it was not necessary for the food to come into contact with water first. Both verses are therefore necessary.

Rav Yosef asked (*to resolve the inquiry*) from our *Mishna*: Rabbi Shimon said: It has been rendered susceptible to *tumah* through the *shechitah*. Presumably this means that when it becomes *tamei*, it would transmit *tumah* up to the first and second degrees. But why? It is not food that came into contact with water?

Abaye replied: It was ordained by the Rabbis that the susceptibility for *tumah* on account of the slaughtering shall have the same effect as though it had come into contact with water.

Rabbi Zeira said: Let us prove it from the following *braisa*: If a man gathered grapes (*into baskets*) for the pressing (*and its juices make it wet*), Shammai says: They are susceptible to *tumah* (*although this juice*

should not render anything susceptible to tumah, for the owner had no desire for it, since it will go to waste when it flows onto the ground; Shammai, however, as a precautionary measure, compares this case with one where the juice was acceptable to the owner, such as a case where they were placed in a container, when it is agreed by all that the juice would certainly render food susceptible to *tumah*), but Hillel says: They are not. Eventually Hillel agreed to Shammai. But why? It is not food that came into contact with water (*that the owner was happy about*; the Rabbis' decree rendered it susceptible to *tumah*, and seemingly, it would be subject to the first and second degrees of *tumah*; the same should apply by the 'sacred esteem of *kodesh*')!

Abaye replied: It was ordained by the Rabbis that the susceptibility for *tumah* in this case shall have the same effect as though it had come into contact with water.

Rav Yosef challenged Abaye: When I cited our *Mishna* where Rabbi Shimon said that it has been rendered susceptible to *tumah* through the *shechitah*, you replied that it was ordained by the Rabbis that the susceptibility for *tumah* on account of the slaughtering shall have the same effect as though it had come into contact with water, and when Rabbi Zeira cited another case you also replied that it was ordained by the Rabbis that the susceptibility for *tumah* in this case shall have the same effect as though it had come into contact with water. So why don't you answer the question raised by Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish and say that it was ordained by the Rabbis that the sacred esteem of *kodesh* shall have the same effect as though it had come into contact with water!?

He replied: Do you think that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish raised the question as to whether it was to be left hanging? [Certainly, the Rabbis declared that it is *tamei* and subject to the first and second degrees of *tumah*.] He raised the question as to whether it was to be burned or not!

The *Gemora* infers from here that the concept of sacred esteem is a Biblical one (for otherwise, there would be no question regarding the burning of any items that came into contact with such *kodesh*). Where, asks the *Gemora*, is the source for this?

Perhaps it is from the following verse (regarding *shelamim*): *And the meat that touches anything which is tamei*. Now, what rendered this meat susceptible to *tumah*? Shall I say it was the blood? This cannot be, for Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that we know that the blood of a consecrated animal does not render food susceptible to *tumah* from the verse: *You shall not eat it; you shall spill it out upon the ground as water*. This teaches us that blood which is spilled out as water renders food susceptible to *tumah*, but blood which is not poured out as water does not. Perhaps then it was the other liquid found in the slaughterhouse (the water that was used to wash the meat in the Courtyard) that rendered the meat susceptible to *tumah*? But this also cannot be the case, for Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina taught that the liquids in the slaughterhouse of the Temple Courtyard are not only *tahor*, but will not even render any food susceptible to *tumah*. You must therefore say that this verse proves that the meat was rendered susceptible to *tumah* by sacred esteem!

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps the verse is to be explained as suggested by Rav Yehudah in the name of Shmuel, for he said that it might refer to the case where a cow consecrated for a *shelamim* was passed through a stream and slaughtered immediately afterwards, so that the water was still dripping from it!

Rather, notes the *Gemora*, it is to be proven from the latter part of the verse, which states: *And the meat*. This includes wood and *levonah* (frankincense); though these are not edible, the Torah includes them. It must therefore be that sacred esteem puts them in the same category as food and renders them susceptible to *tumah*. So too in all cases, the sacred esteem will render food susceptible to *tumah*.

Now, Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish asked as follows: Is the concept of sacred esteem effectual to the extent only of rendering the matter invalid but not of enabling it to transmit *tumah* up to the first and second degrees, or is there no such distinction? The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved. (36a – 37a)

DAILY MASHAL

Let Them Come

Though the Torah mentions only water, six other liquids qualify food to become impure: wine, honey, oil, milk, dew and blood. This is hinted in the verse: "...from all the food to be eaten that there will **come (yavo)** on it water, it is impure" (Vayikra 11:34). The word יבוא is written in full, not as usual in the Torah, and the extra **vav** hints at the other **six** liquids (*Ta'ama Dikera, Shemini*).