

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Covering the blood (cont.)

The Gemara continues to explain why R' Dimi and Ravin offered different explanations of Rebbi's ruling to slaughter a bird over water to protect flax from moths.

The Gemara explains how it could happen that R' Chiya's flax would be attacked by moths.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the halachos of covering the blood and the prohibition of "it and its offspring" in the context of someone who is exempt from mitzvos slaughtering the animal.

3) Clarifying Chachamim's opinion

The Gemara questions why Chachamim disagree only regarding the latter ruling related to "it and its offspring."

After searching for an explanation the Gemara decides that Chachamim disagree in both cases and waited till R' Meir finished his presentation before voicing their dissent.

The rationales behind R' Meir and Chachamim's respective positions are explained.

R' Ami's explanation of R' Meir's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

It is reported that on one occasion Rebbi ruled in accordance with R' Meir and on another occasion he ruled in accordance with Chachamim.

It is proven that Rebbi's latter ruling was in accordance with R' Meir.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents the halachos for covering the blood for multiple slaughters.

5) Slaughtering an undomesticated animal and a bird

A Beraisa elaborates on the dispute whether one covering is sufficient when slaughtering an undomesticated animal and a bird or whether each one must be covered separately.

The last statement of Rabanan from the Beraisa is clarified.

6) Beracha

R' Chanina asserts that R' Yehudah agrees concerning the ruling that only a single beracha is recited when slaughtering an undomesticated animal and a bird.

The statement is challenged. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

One beracha for two shechitos

מודה היה ר' יהודה לענין ברכה שאינו מברך אלא ברכה אחת

The Mishnah rules that if someone shechts a chaya and a bird in one place, each of which requires that its blood be covered, the person may shecht them and then perform the mitzvah of covering the blood of both the animals at once, together. R' Yehuda disagrees and says that as soon as the chaya is shechted its blood should be covered, and then the bird may be shechted.

In the Gemara, R' Chanina points out that although R' Yehuda requires that the mitzvah of covering the blood of the chaya not be delayed, R' Yehuda agrees that in regard to the blessing which is recited when the mitzvah of shechting of these two animals is done, only one beracha should be recited.

Rashi explains that after a beracha is recited for the shechita of the first animal, R' Yehuda requires that its blood immediately be covered. Yet, the person may continue and shecht the second animal without reciting a new beracha on its shechita. The Rishonim notice that Rashi implies that it would be necessary, however, for a new beracha to be recited for the covering of the second animal's blood. Rashba explains that Rashi holds that the covering of the first animal's blood does not constitute an interruption between the first shechita and the second shechita. The covering of the first animal's blood is an essential part and a continuation of the first shechita. It is as if the first shechita is still in progress until the second shechita is done, so no new bracha need be said. However, the second shechita is not a continuation of the covering of the first animal's blood. Therefore, we have an interruption between the first covering of blood and the second covering of blood, so a new beracha needs to be recited.

Ritva explains that Rashi holds that when the first beracha on the first shechita was recited, both animals were there and the intent was to perform both shechitos. The covering of the first animal's blood is not an interruption because the person could have covered the blood with one hand and continue directly with the shechita of the second animal simultaneously with his other hand. When he recited a beracha on the covering of the first animal's blood, the blood of the second animal was not yet in front of him, so we are not able to have the beracha apply to it. This is why the second shechita is an interruption, because it is the manner by which the blood of the second animal is brought forth.

Rosh explains that the covering of the first animal's blood is not an interruption because the person's intent is to immediately perform the second shechita, and the covering of the blood does not interfere with his focus. Regarding the covering of the blood itself, the Torah declares that the blood of a bird and that of a chaya each be covered, and these are separate mitzvos, each needing its own beracha. ■

HALACHA Highlight

Honoring someone else with the mitzvah of covering the blood

ואחרים רואין אותן חייב לכסות

And others watch them, the one who observes is obligated to cover the blood

On erev Yom Kippur when people are doing kaparos it is very common for people to ask slaughterers if they could perform the mitzvah of covering the blood. Rav Moshe Shternbuch¹ raises concerns about this practice. Biblically, the mitzvah of covering the blood rests on the shoulders of the slaughterer. Only if the slaughterer does not perform the mitzvah does it transfer to the rest of the Jewish people². Therefore, if the slaughterer allows others to perform the mitzvah of covering the blood he forgoes the mitzvah the Torah placed upon him.

Chochmas Adam³ writes that if the slaughterer wants to allow someone else to perform the mitzvah he must appoint him as his agent. The mitzvah is incumbent upon the slaughterer but he may appoint an agent but if he wants to merely honor someone else with the mitzvah the slaughterer loses his mitzvah. Tevuos Shor⁴ disagrees and maintains that the slaughterer may even honor someone else with the mitzvah of covering the blood. Rav Shternbuch comments that even according to Tevuos Shor it is only when one honors a Torah scholar that one may give another the mitzvah to perform. The reason is that although he forgoes the mitzvah of covering the blood he nevertheless fulfills the mitzvah of honoring a Torah scholar. If he honors a regular person he

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why didn't R' Chiya's merit protect his flax from moths ?

2. According to the Gemara's conclusion what is the case/s disputed by Tanna Kamma and R' Meir ?

3. What was Rebbi's position regarding the dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim ?

4. Is it permitted to cover the blood of many animals in one act ?

does not fulfill another mitzvah as a replacement for the mitzvah of covering the blood and therefore, it would seem that the slaughterer should not allow others to do the mitzvah.

The way that this should be handled is for the bird owner to appoint the slaughterer as his agent to fulfill the mitzvah of slaughtering. This may be done because the primary mitzvah of slaughtering rests on the one who is interested in eating. Once the mitzvah is the bird owner's the mitzvah of covering the blood that is related to the mitzvah of slaughtering also rests on the bird owner's shoulders and as such it is acceptable for him to perform that mitzvah. ■

¹ שו"ת תשובות והנהגות ח"ג סי' רמ"ב.
² ע"י שו"ת יו"ד סי' כ"ח סעי' ח'.
³ חכמת אדם כלל ח' סעי' ב'.
⁴ תבואות שור סי' כ"ח סעי' ט'. ■

STORIES off the Daf

"For the Sake of My Son Chanina"

"בשביל חנינא בני וחנינא בני די לו בקב
 חרובין..."

The house of Rav Yitzchak of Bohush, ז"ל, was quite poor. To try and allay the situation, the Bohusher Rebbeztzin a"h purchased a lottery ticket and asked her husband to daven that their number be drawn. To her surprise the rebbe gently refused. "A rebbe's job is to daven for the livelihood of his chassidim. This will automatically send us our livelihood as well. We find in Chullin 86 that people are given a livelihood in the merit of the tzaddik. If the tzaddik asks primar-

ily for his own needs, he limits the influx he will draw down to his own needs. How can I do anything that may damage my beloved flock?"

As is well known, Rav Yisrael of Ruzhin, ז"ל, lived a life of wealth. He had a beautiful coach, a palatial dwelling and many outer trappings of royalty. To a simple person this appears strange. In retrospect we learn about what he did and the wondrous Torah he revealed we understand that his every act was for the sake of heaven. But while he was alive many criticized him for what they perceived as unnecessary grandeur.

A certain person actually chided the rebbe about his opulent lifestyle. "In Chullin 86 we find that although the entire generation was supported in the merit of Chanina ben Dosa he himself

lived on only a kav of carobs from Shabbos to Shabbos..."

The rebbe responded with characteristic brilliance. "That Gemara is a proof to the contrary. The bas kol exclaimed there, 'the entire world is ניזון, supported, בשביל, or in the merit of my son Chanina.' Rashi in Gittin 12 explains the difference between ניזון and מפרנס. The former connotes limited support while the later alludes to being generous. The word בשביל also means 'in the channel.' This teaches that the world was supported through Chanina's channel. He was poor, therefore his generation suffered from poverty. But if a tzaddik lives a wealthy lifestyle he can draw down wealth for his entire generation!"¹ ■

¹ שיח יצחק, ע"י קס"ז ■

