

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Beracha (cont.)

The Gemara responds to the challenge to the assertion that only a single beracha is recited when slaughtering an undomesticated animal and a bird.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the halacha of one who sees that blood was not properly covered and whether there is an obligation to cover blood that was covered by the wind.

3) Covering the blood

A Beraisa provides the source for the Mishnah's ruling that if the slaughterer did not cover the blood that others should cover the blood.

Two related Beraisos are cited that exposit the same verse.

The second Beraisa related that one who "steals" the mitzvah of covering the blood must compensate the slaughterer. The Gemara inquires whether the reimbursement is for "stealing" the mitzvah or the beracha.

The difference between these two understandings is identified.

The Gemara proves that the compensation is for the berachos.

4) Covering the blood a second time

The source that one is not obligated to cover the blood a second time is cited.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah teaches that the obligation to cover the blood that was covered by the wind is limited to where it became revealed, but if it did not become revealed he is exempt from covering the blood.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

5) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion of what happens when blood becomes mixed with other substances and concludes with guidelines for blood that splatters or is left on the knife.

6) Blood mixed with other substances

A Mishnah is cited that presents a discussion similar to the one recorded in our Mishnah, except that it deals with blood of a korban.

R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan qualifies the Mishnah's ruling.

R' Pappa teaches that this qualification does not apply to the mitzvah of covering the blood.

7) Blood

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel teaches that blood that is any shade of red can atone, render a food susceptible to tum'ah, and it must be covered.

It is initially assumed that the novelty of this teaching is that blood that is any shade can render a food susceptible to tum'ah.

This assumption is unsuccessfully challenged.

An alternative explanation of the novelty of this teaching is presented.

8) Blood serum

R' Yirmiyah of Difti teaches that one who consumes blood serum is liable to kareis, assuming that he consumed an olive's volume.

A Beraisa teaches that blood serum transmits tum'ah via an ohel assuming that there is a revi'is of actual blood.

A Beraisa that discusses the tum'ah of blood serum is cited.

The Gemara challenges the Beraisa's statement that liquids from a corpse are tahor. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Covering the blood—a mitzvah for all Klal Yisrael

שחט ולא כסה וראהו אחר מנין שחייב לכסות שנאמר ואומר לבני ישראל אזוהרה לכל בני ישראל

The Mishnah teaches that if one person shechts a bird or chaya but he does not perform the mitzvah of covering its blood, and someone else sees the blood, the second person has an obligation to cover it. A Beraisa teaches the same halacha taught in the Mishnah, but it elaborates and cites the verse which is the source for the halacha. The verse (Vayikra 17:14) introduces the law of covering the blood with the words, "I have said to Bnei Yisrael, the blood of flesh shall not be eaten." This verse appears in the series of verses which discusses the law of covering the blood of a bird or chaya, and it indicates that this mitzvah is not only an obligation of the one who shechts, but it is rather incumbent upon the entire nation.

Tur (Y.D. #28) writes that if one person shechts but does not cover the blood, anyone else who sees the blood must then cover the blood because this mitzvah is just as any other positive mitzvah which is incumbent upon the entire Jewish nation. Here, the one who does the shechita has the first responsibility to perform the mitzvah, but all others are also commanded.

Prisha (ibid. #25) notes that it is surprising that the Tur gives a reason which is different than that given in our Gemara. Why does he say that others should perform this mitzvah because "it is like all other positive mitzvos," when our Gemara reports that the mitzvah of covering the blood is unique, and the verse specifically obligates the entire Jewish nation to fulfill this particular mitzvah?

Prisha explains that Tur understands that if we would not find that all positive mitzvos are the responsibility of the entire nation we would had a different approach to the mitzvah of covering the blood. The verse (Vayikra 17:13) relates that "when a person hunts a chaya or bird that may be eaten, he shall spill its blood and cover it with dirt." This verse would imply that this mitzvah is the direct and specific responsibility of the one who traps and captures the animal and then slaughters it. Accordingly, when the verse continues and says that this mitzvah is for "all Bnei Yisrael" we would say that it applies to all hunters throughout the nation, but, again, only for each person who catches and kills an animal. This would have been a reasonable approach to interpret the verses and the laws of the mitzvah would have followed this understanding. However, Tur notes that once we have a rule that all positive mitzvos are the responsibility of the entire nation, we are forced to re-interpret the verses. We now apply the verse "Bnei Yisrael" to extend the mitzvah to the entire nation, and the emphasis upon the hunter is only to give him priority, but not exclusivity. ■

HALACHA Highlight

Allowing only one person to recite kaddish at a time

מעשה באחד ששחט וקדם חבירו וכסה
It happened once that a person slaughtered and his friend quickly covered the blood

The Gemara recounts an incident in which one person slaughtered and a second person quickly covered the blood. R' Gamliel obligated the second person to pay ten gold coins to the slaughterer for taking his mitzvah. The Gemara questions whether the ten gold coins were for the mitzvah that was taken or for the beracha that the slaughterer was not able to recite. The practical difference between these two approaches is when one person recites birkas hamazon instead of another person who was assigned that task. If the penalty was for taking the mitzvah he would only have to pay ten gold coins since birkas hamazon is a single mitzvah, but if the penalty is for the berachos he would have to pay forty gold coins since birkas hamazon contains four berachos. The Gemara proceeds to prove that the penalty is for taking the berachos. Therefore, if one recites birkas hamazon instead of another person he owes him forty gold coins.

Shach¹ questions why the one who “grabbed” birkas hamazon must pay forty gold coins when the person who was supposed to lead birkas hamazon will still recite all four berachos, so in reality nothing was taken from him. He answers that since the person will be reciting birkas hamazon to himself he is missing out on an essential component of reciting a ber-

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why should one not use his foot to fulfill the mitzvah of covering the blood ?

2. Is there a mitzvah to cover the blood if the blood becomes mixed with other liquids ?

3. Is there an obligation to cover splattered blood ?

4. Under what conditions is one punished with kares for the consumption of blood serum?

acha which is to say it out loud so that others will answer **אמן**. Therefore, “grabbing” birkas hamazon, so that a person will to have to recite birkas hamazon to himself is comparable to taking the berachos from him altogether. Chasam Sofer² utilizes this principle to explain the custom in some places that only one person says kaddish. He contends that the primary benefit to the deceased is not the actual recitation of kaddish; rather it is that the one saying kaddish causes everyone else to answer to the kaddish. As such, if one person reads kaddish he is the cause of everyone’s response, but if many people read kaddish together it takes away from the merit for the deceased since one does not know if he was the cause of the tzibbur’s response. ■

¹ חו"מ סי' שפ"ב ססק"ד.
² שו"ת חת"ס או"ח סי' קנ"ט. ד"ה עוד אני מדבר. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Host and His Guest

"כוס של ברכה ארבעים זהובים..."

Today's daf discusses bentching on a cup of wine.

Sometimes people are unaware of the depth of the halachah and make strange errors. It used to be that yeshiva students would eat at the home of local laymen because the yeshivos did not provide meals. In some towns the talmidim had to pay for their meals, while in others the students were beneficiaries of the local householders' chessed. One student

was a regular visitor at a certain home where he was welcomed with great respect. The homeowner had one son of bar-mitzvah age. Since the student had joined them they had a mezuman. The first time they bentched the owner naturally honored the student.

The next time it was time to bentch the student gently pointed out that the ba'al habayis should allow him to lead the bentching. "After all, our sages say that the guest should lead."

But this annoyed to the homeowner, who was also in mourning for his father. Since the custom in his district was for a mourner to lead, he wished to lead the zimun.

The ba'al habayis consulted with Rav

Yaakov Emden, zt"l, who ruled that the student had erred. "In a place where everyone eats the host's food, it is the right of the host to give this precious mitzvah to whomever he desires. Our sages say that a guest should lead bentching only for the good of the host, since he receives a blessing from this. But you are certainly in your rights to lead. And you should lead to fulfill the custom that a mourner leads. Although there is no source for this, it is the custom since it is fitting for the mourner to do whatever mitzvos he can for the uplifting of his parent's soul. This halachah is according to all authorities and is completely obvious."¹ ■

¹ שו"ת שאילת יעביץ, ח"א, סי' ע"ד. ■

