

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Blood serum (cont.)

The challenge to the Beraisa's statement that liquids from a corpse are t'horim is rejected.

The reason Chazal were more stringent with secretions of a zav but were not stringent with secretions of a corpse is explained.

2) Splattered blood

Two Beraisos are cited that present the source that there is an obligation to cover splattered blood.

The point of dispute between the different opinions in the Beraisa is explained.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the materials that may be used to cover blood.

4) "Fine" and "coarse" sand

Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan defines "fine" sand.

According to a second version he offered a definition of "coarse" sand.

The difference between these two versions is identified.

A Beraisa elaborates on the Mishnah's rulings.

An alternative manner of expositing the pesukim is suggested but rejected.

5) Covering the blood

R' Nachman bar R' Chisda taught that blood may only be covered in a material in which seeds can be planted and it causes them to sprout.

Rava declared that this ruling is unfounded.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok asked Rava why he finds the ruling unfounded.

R' Zeira explains one of the Beraisos's rulings.

A related Beraisa is cited.

Bais Shammai's opinion is clarified.

Another Beraisa enumerates additional substances that may be used to cover the blood.

Rava connects Avrohom Avinu's remark that he is but earth and ashes and mitzvos that involve earth and ashes.

The reason he did not mention the mitzvah of covering the blood is explained. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Alternative materials to cover the blood

היה מהלך במדבר ואין לו אפר לכסות וכו' היה מהלך בספינה ואין לו עפר לכסות וכו'

Rav Nachman taught that the substance used to cover the blood of a chaya or bird must be dirt or soil which is capable of sustaining plant growth. If, however, one has sand or dirt which is arid, salty or otherwise infertile, it may not be used for this mitzvah. Rava challenged Rav Nachman, and he referred to his view as implausible. Rav Nachman responded by citing the Beraisa from which he learned this rule regarding the dirt for covering blood.

The Beraisa discusses someone travelling in the desert who had no dirt to cover the blood of an animal he wished to shecht. He may take a gold coin and grind it into powder to cover the blood. If he is on a boat and he has no dirt, he should take his cloak and burn it. He may then use the ashes to cover the blood.

The first illustration of the Beraisa where a person is in a desert indicates that although there is obviously an abundance of arid and infertile sands of the desert these are nevertheless not valid for the mitzvah, thus requiring that the person search for an alternative, such as the grindings the golden coin.

Sefer Lev Aryeh notes that the Beraisa uses two distinct examples where a person has no soil available for the mitzvah, and in each case it provides a different, creative alternative. In regard to the desert it suggests that a person grind a coin, while in reference to the boat it suggests that he burn his cloak. The Beraisa should have combined the cases and said that if a person has no soil because he is in a desert or on a boat, he should grind a coin or burn his shirt. Why did the Beraisa not combine the cases and offer both alternatives for both scenarios?

He explains the Beraisa by noting another point. If the person in the desert has a coin, and he also has wood and fire, it would obviously be better to grind the wood into wood dust, rather than to grind a gold coin. If he has no wood or fire, what reason is there to shecht the bird, when he has no way to prepare it to eat? It must be that he will wait until he arrives at some settlement, but if so he could wait until then to do the shechita itself and he can obtain some dirt for the mitzvah! It must be, therefore, that the person happened to catch an animal in the desert, and he is afraid that if he waits until he arrives in a village in order to slaughter it, it might run away. He therefore wants to slaughter it now and wait until he arrives in a village when he will prepare it and cook it. This is why he has to use a gold coin.

The example on the boat is not where he caught the animal just then. He brought the bird with him on board, and together with it he prepared wood and fire to cook the bird. He does not have dirt, but he does have wood and fire, but these he needs for cooking. This is why he chooses to burn his cloak. ■

HALACHA Highlight

Is it required l'chatchila to cover all of the blood?

אבל יש שם דם שלא הוא פטור מלכסות

But if there is blood other than this he is exempt from covering [the splattered blood]

R' Yehudah teaches that blood that splatters on the walls of the slaughtering pit or the blood that is left on the slaughtering knife need not be covered. If there is no other blood from the bird or animal to cover one must gather the splattered blood but otherwise it is not necessary. Shulchan Aruch¹ cites this opinion as halacha. The Gemara above (85b), however, recounts an incident in which moths were eating R' Chiya's flax. Rebbi advised him to slaughter a bird over the container in which the flax was soaking and the smell of the bird's blood would keep the moths away. The Gemara questions the permissibility of this advice when one is obligated to cover the blood of a slaughtered bird. The Gemara answers that Rebbi, in fact, instructed him to first render the animal a tereifah or kill it in a manner other than slaughtering and thereby exempt himself from the mitzvah of covering the blood. This ruling is also cited in Shulchan Aruch². According to the teaching of R' Yehudah the Gemara should have answered that Rebbi instructed R' Chiya to cover only some of the blood and the remainder should be mixed into the container with the flax. Why was it necessary for the Gemara to suggest that the bird was rendered a tereifah or was not slaughtered?

REVIEW and Remember

1. Must all of the blood be covered ?

2. What material may be used to cover the blood?

3. Is it necessary for the substance used to cover the blood to be capable of allowing the sprouting of seeds ?

4. What is the point of dispute between Beis Hillel and Beis Sham-mai ?

Teshuvos Beis Shlomo³ answered that this indicates that l'chatchila one is obligated to cover all of the blood. It is only **בדיעבד** if some of the blood splatters or remains in the knife that we do not obligate him to gather that blood together to cover it since he has blood to cover anyways. However, the blood that is at the bottom of the slaughtering pit must be covered entirely. For this reason it was not allowed for R' Chiya to cover just a small quantity of the bird's blood and pour the rest into the container with the flax. If the blood is available it must be covered and that is why he had to create a circumstance in which it would not be necessary to cover the blood. ■

¹ שו"ע יו"ד סי' כ"ח סעי' ט"ו.

² שו"ע שם סעי' י"ח.

³ מובא דבריו בגליון מהרש"א ליו"ד שם סעי' ט"ו. □

STORIES off the Daf

Dust and Ashes

”בזכות שאמר אברהם אבינו ואנכי עפר ואפר...”

Everyone was invited to a resplendent banquet. The most distinguished guest arrived but he was notable for his modesty as much as his great achievements. Instead of taking a seat at the front of the room where the most prominent people usually sit, he chose to sit in the back of the room. His host wondered what to do. He did not wish to dictate to this modest man where to

sit, yet it was surely not right for this man to sit with the simple folk.

The host decided to honor this man through his seat choice. Instead of seating the most important people in the front of the room, he placed them near this humble man. In this way, he showed him honor by respecting his preference.

The Mishlei Yaakov, zt”l, uses this parable to explain the connection between Avraham's humility—“I am dust and ashes”—and the two mitzvos that God gave him as a reward—the ashes of the para adumah and the dirt added to the sotah waters. To show how precious Avraham Avinu was to Him, God “brought” these two mitzvos to his

humble place of dirt and ashes.¹

The Beis HaLevi, zt”l, explains the concept of dirt and ashes more deeply. “Dirt has no form yet it can be used to fashion something. Ashes are the opposite. Ashes come from something that had a form but can no longer be used to fashion anything. The mitzvos that God granted are measure for measure. Ashes of the parah purify someone for the future. And the dirt placed in the sotah's water clarifies if she was pure in the past.”² ■

¹ משלי יעקב, פרשת וירא

² בית הלוי, פרשת וירא ■