

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Puncturing the lungs (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its unsuccessful attempt to prove that R' Zeira had retracted his position.

R' Acha bar Yaakov suggests that a Jew is permitted to eat internal organs from an animal that was slaughtered but still convulses but a gentile may not eat those internal organs since for a gentile the animal is considered alive.

R' Pappa rejects the assertion that something could be permitted for a Jew and prohibited for a gentile.

A Beraisa proves that R' Acha bar Yaakov's ruling is incorrect.

It is noted that another Amora also agrees with the ruling in the Beraisa.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a debate whether an animal becomes susceptible to tum'ah just by virtue of the fact that it was slaughtered.

3) Tum'ah

The implication of the Mishnah is that if there was blood the meat would be tamei. This is difficult since one's hands that are second degree tum'ah should not be able to make unconsecrated meat into a third degree tum'ah.

Before answering the question the Gemara presents numerous proofs that the Mishnah refers to unconsecrated meat.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabba bar Avuha explains that the Mishnah refers to unconsecrated meat that was purchased with ma'aser sheni money in accordance with the opinion of R' Meir.

R' Shimi bar Ashi challenges this resolution.

R' Pappa offers another resolution to the question about the Mishnah.

The relevant opinion of R' Shimon ben Elazar is explained.

The Gemara questions whether hands could become beginnings of tum'ah.

A Beraisa that records a dispute between Tannaim proves that hands could become beginnings of tum'ah.

The point of dispute between R' Akiva and Chachamim is explained.

R' Pappa's explanation of the Mishnah is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Elazar in the name of R' Hoshaya offers another explanation of the Mishnah. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Permitted for a Jew, prohibited for a non-Jew

מי איכא מידי דלישראל שרי ולעובד כוכבים אסור

On 32b, Rava explained that Reish Lakish holds that the trachea is the life-source of the lungs, and the intestines are dependent upon their connection to the esophagus. Therefore, Reish Lakish stated that if the trachea was shechted, but the lung became punctured before the esophagus was cut, the shechita is kosher. Even though the lung was punctured before the shechita was completed, once the trachea is cut the lung is immediately considered as if it is no longer connected to the rest of the body of the animal. If, at this point, the intestines would become punctured, before the esophagus is cut, the shechita would not be valid. Their being punctured while they are still connected to the esophagus which is intact causes the animal to be a tereifa.

On our daf, Rav Acha bar Yaakov notes that the rule of Reish Lakish leads us to a fascinating situation. The Jewish people have a law of shechita, and the meat of an animal is permitted to be eaten as soon as shechita is done. The gentiles do not have a mitzvah of shechita, but they must not eat a limb from a live animal (אבר מן החי). Whenever we shecht an animal, the trachea is cut first, followed by the esophagus. As soon as the trachea is cut, the lung immediately becomes permitted, due to shechita, but because the esophagus is not cut, the animal is not yet dead. At that moment, the lung is permitted for a Jew, because shechita was performed on the trachea, but the lung is not permitted for a non-Jew, as it remains אבר מן החי.

When R' Pappa heard this lesson from R' Acha, he thought to ask that it seems peculiar that we now have something (lungs) which is permitted for a Jew but prohibited for a non-Jew. However, R' Pappa refrained from asking, because he realized that R' Acha had taught his lesson with a reasonable explanation.

R' Pappa noted that it is not possible that something be permitted for a Jew but be prohibited for a non-Jew. The idea is that when the Jews accepted upon themselves added levels of holiness, more than their being just Noachides, this commitment included added levels of restriction, not less. Tosafos points out what seem to be a number of exceptions to this rule. A non-Jew who observes Shabbos, or a non-Jew who studies Torah is liable for death. Yet, there is no such penalty for a Jew who observes Shabbos or who learns Torah. In fact, these are mitzvos which we must observe. Tosafos explains, however, that these are not "permitted" for a Jew, but rather commandments which we are obligated to fulfill. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Aveeshai Lev
in honor of the birth and bris of their son*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת
ברוך יהושע בן אלחנן שלמה זלמן
by the Goldstein family*

HALACHA Highlight

Eating unconsecrated food in accordance with the standards of sacred food

חולין שנעשו על טהרת הקדש לית בהו שלישי

Unconsecrated food that was made according to standards of sacred food cannot become third degree tum'ah

The Gemara mentions the concept of a person eating his unconsecrated food in accordance with the standards of sacred food. Magen Avrohom¹ references a question that is asked about the practice of eating unconsecrated food in accordance with the standards of sacred food. The mitzvah of onah for talmidei chachamim is on Friday night. That means that after they go to the mikvah Shabbos morning for tum'as keris for the remainder of the day they are tevulei yom – lit. those who immersed that day – and have the status of a second degree tum'ah. What then could they eat since the food that they touch should become third degree tum'ah since sacred food could reach third degree tum'ah? He cites an answer that our Gemara teaches that unconsecrated food that is eaten in accordance with the standards of sacred food does not become tamei with third degree tum'ah.

Magen Avrohom¹ challenges this answer from a number of perspectives. First and foremost the Gemara indicates that those who eat unconsecrated food in accordance with the standards of sacred food must be concerned with the fact that the unconsecrated food could become third degree tum'ah. Additionally, he wondered what would these people do if they had come in

REVIEW and Remember

1. Is it permitted to eat meat taken from an animal before it dies ?

2. How do we know that the Mishnah does not refer to korbanos ?

3. How does a hand become first degree tmei'ah ?

4. Does unconsecrated food reach third degree tum'ah ?

contact with a corpse. Since they are first degree tum'ah any food that they touch is second degree tum'ah. In his second resolution he suggests that they ate bread that did not become susceptible to tum'ah. How is it possible to make bread that is not susceptible to tum'ah? One possible method² is to use fruit juice rather than water. This procedure raises another problem and that is whether it would be permitted to use bread made with fruit juice for lechem mishneh on Shabbos. Another solution is based on the assertion that water that has an accompanying name is not considered water for matters of tum'ah. Therefore if one uses “salt-water” or “boiling-water” one could make bread that is usable for lechem mishneh according to all opinions and yet the bread will not be susceptible to tum'ah since the water had an accompanying name. ■

¹ מג"א סי' ר"פ.

² אור המאיר (ביליץ) ח"א קו"א סי' כ"ט. ■

STORIES off the Daf

Disgracing the Avodah

”ולא יצא מהן דם כשרים...”

A certain shochet wore many layers but his hands were always cold. He realized that light gloves would help solve his problem, but when he asked a rabbi about this he was told that one may not shecht while wearing gloves. The rabbi explained, “This is clear from Pesachim 57. There we find that when Yissachar Ish Kfar Barkai wrapped his hands while doing the avodah he was punished since wearing gloves disgraced the avodah. The same holds true for shechitah.”

But when this question reached Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt”l, he disagreed. “It is clear from Rashi and Tosafos in Sukkah 42 that wearing gloves is not always a disgrace

to a mitzvah. Rashi there permits wearing gloves while taking the four species on Sukkos. Although Tosafos disagrees, this is only because he holds that the gloves are a hefsek between his hands and the mitzvah. Both agree that wearing gloves does not disgrace this mitzvah.

“There are two reasons why Yissachar Ish Kfar Barkai’s use of gloves disgraced the avodah. Firstly, the avodah requires kohanim to handle blood. They are obligated to do so with love and joy, not to avoid dirtying his hands with this mitzvah. Secondly, it appeared to onlookers that one who does the avodah with gloves is disgusted by this mitzvah. Since we find in Chullin 33 that one can slaughter an animal without any blood emerging, blood is clearly not a necessary part of the mitzvah, so why is wearing gloves a disgrace?

He added, “Although one might make a slight case for how this looks to onlookers,

there is still an essential difference between kodoshim and regular shechitah. Regarding regular shechitah there is no mitzvah to shecht for oneself. But avodah must be done by a kohen who is required to cherish the avodah, as we see from Tosafos in Yoma 12. Possibly wearing gloves is an apparent contradiction to cherishing the avodah. Nevertheless, since this final differentiation is not clear, it is preferable to shecht without gloves. But one may wear gloves while shechting due to the cold or some other consideration.”

Rav Moshe concluded with a clarification. “I only discuss wearing thin gloves. Heavy gloves interfere with the shochet’s ability to ascertain whether he did a slight derisah or shehiyah and are therefore forbidden.”¹ ■

¹שו"ת אג"מ, יו"ד ח"ב, סי' ט"ז