



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)