

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Types of blood (cont.)

A Baraisa continues to elaborate on the type of blood prohibited for consumption.

The exposition of the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Ada bar Avin asserts that the wording in the Baraisa indicates that the blood of a koy is also prohibited because the author of the Baraisa maintains that koy is a creature unto itself.

The sources that other prohibitions also apply to the koy are presented.

### 2) People transmitting light tum'ah

The Baraisa that stated that people do not transmit light tum'ah is unsuccessfully challenged from a Mishnah.

The Gemara spends some time questioning whether a human corpse can transmit food tum'ah, as well as a circumstance in which an animal carcass will transmit food tum'ah.

Additional sections of the Baraisa are clarified.

### 3) Sheretz blood

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav rules that one receives lashes for consuming the blood of a sheretz only if he consumed an olive's volume of that blood.

This ruling is challenged and the Gemara is forced to revise Rav's teaching.

### 4) Fish blood

Rav rules that one may not consume blood collected in a utensil.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 5) Human blood

R' Sheishes rules that there is not even a mitzvah to refrain from human blood.

This ruling is challenged. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is a כוי?
2. What is טומאה חמורה?
3. From what type of kilayim are birds exempt?
4. Why is it prohibited to consume fish blood collected in a utensil?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Blood from one's mouth in one's mouth is permitted*

דם שעל גבי ככר גוררו ואוכלו של בין השיניים מוצצו ובולעו ואינו חושש

Rav taught that blood of fish which is collected together in a cup is prohibited to be eaten. A Baraisa is brought to challenge Rav, where we find that blood from fish is permitted to be eaten. The Gemara clarifies that the Baraisa permits blood of a fish to be eaten if it is still together with the fish, in which case it is obvious that this blood is from a fish. However, Rav prohibits the blood of a fish which is separate from the fish and collected in a cup. In this case, Rav says that the Rabbis prohibit blood in order to avoid confusion that people might think it is blood from a mammal, and mistakenly think that all blood is permitted.

We find that the Baraisa permits blood of a fish as long as it is not separate from the fish itself. Accordingly, Rav must understand that the previous statement of that same Baraisa regarding blood of a human which is prohibited must be referring to a corresponding situation, where the blood of a human is still connected to the person. The Gemara notes a problem with this, as another Baraisa clearly states that if a person bit into a loaf and finds blood on the bread, the Rabbis require that it must be scraped off before eating the rest of the loaf. The question is that Rav holds that blood of a person not collected together is prohibited, while the Baraisa holds that blood on the loaf is technically not prohibited, and it is only the Rabbis who recommend to scrape it off before eating the loaf.

The Gemara therefore retracts its original answer and explains that Rav and the Baraisa are dealing with blood collected in a cup. Therefore, blood of a fish is prohibited, because it is not recognizable that it is from fish. The Baraisa which permits blood of a fish which is collected in a cup is referring to where there are scales in the blood, thus indicating that it is fish blood.

The Baraisa also ruled that blood between a person's gums is permitted as long as it has not come out of one's mouth. Rashi and Tosafos (first explanation) explain that at this point, the blood is still considered connected to one's mouth, and there is no need to distance oneself from swallowing it.

In his second explanation, Tosafos says that human blood is prohibited due to "mar'is ayin," that people might

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Examining eggs for blood spots

אוציא דם ביצים

I exclude blood of eggs

The Gemara derives from a pasuk that blood found in eggs is not included in the Biblical prohibition against eating blood. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> offers two explanations of this halacha. In his first approach he explains that any blood found in an egg is not Biblically prohibited even if it is found in the spot where the chick develops. Even though it would develop into flesh, since at the moment it is not flesh it is Biblically permitted. However, it is prohibited Rabbinically to consume blood found in eggs even if it is consumed together with the rest of the egg. In the second approach Tosafos writes that it is only blood that is found away from where the chick develops that is excluded from the Biblical prohibition since that blood would never develop into a chick. Blood that is in the place where the chick develops is Biblically prohibited. However, he adds that since the majority of eggs do not have blood in the place where the chick develops it is permitted to eat an egg even without checking it to confirm that there is no blood. Additionally, he confirms that common practice is for people to consume eggs without examining them first for blood spots. Rashba<sup>2</sup> adds that the practice to examine eggs before putting it into a food represents a stringency and an expression of sanctity on the part of the Jewish people but it is not mandated.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

mistakenly think that it is blood from a mammal and that such blood is permitted. However, blood in a person's gums clearly comes from a person, so this issue is not a problem. Rashi to Kesubos (60a) also says that blood from one's teeth is permitted because no one sees it, and no one will confuse it with animal blood.

Sefer Be'er Sheva asks that whenever mar'is ayin is an issue, we prohibit it even when the act is done in utmost privacy. Why, then is blood in the mouth not prohibited? Be'er Sheva answers that mar'is ayin of a rabbinic law is permitted in a private setting, and that of a Torah law is prohibited even in utmost privacy. ■

Shulchan Aruch<sup>3</sup> rules that it is permitted for one to eat roasted eggs even though it is impossible to examine the eggs beforehand. Rema<sup>4</sup> adds that in general it is unnecessary to examine whether an egg has blood since we rely on the majority that indicates that eggs do not have blood. However, there is a custom to examine eggs that are used for cooking before adding them to another food. Bach<sup>5</sup> asserts that when it is possible to check an egg for blood one is obligated to do so and one may not rely upon the majority when the matter could be easily confirmed. He cites Sha'arei Dura who asserts that the practice of checking eggs before adding them to a food is a stringency and is not required according to halacha. ■

1. תוס' חולין ס"ד: ד"ה והוא ושם ע"ה וד"ה סימני.
2. רשב"ה שם ד"ה ועכשיו.
3. שו"ע יו"ד סי' ס"ו סעי' ח'.
4. רמ"ה שם.
5. ב"ח שם. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## "Sha'atnez-Free"

שצימרו אין חייבין עליו משום כלאים

Today's daf discusses the halachos of kilayim.

In Eastern Europe—the chances that something purchased without a label is sha'atnez is fairly likely. Linen is very cheap there, and it is naturally a favorite component of clothing manufactured in those countries. Strangely, in places near kivrei tzaddikim, the local sellers have become sensitized to the problem and actually attach a tag which proclaims that their merchandise is all

polyester—even though even a cursory glance shows that it contains wool.

A certain man in Soviet Russia wished to be careful not to wear garments containing sha'atnez. But, of course, it was very rare to find a tailor who would claim that the garments he fashioned were sha'atnez-free. Finally, after much searching and heartache, he found out about a tailor in a distant city who claimed to sell only sha'atnez-free garments.

With great difficulty, this man travelled all the way to that city to purchase new garments which he desperately required. But before he measured for the new clothes, he asked the tailor about the rumor. "Is it really true that you are

certain the garments you sell are not sha'atnez?"

"Absolutely," replied the man. "I only sell garments sewn by my own hand and I guarantee that no linen at all was used."

This man became a regular customer with this tailor, until years later he finally escaped the Soviet Union, and made his way to America. When he was there he took his garments in to be checked for sha'atnez, just to be sure the tailor had told the truth. To his horror he learned that there was linen sewn into all of the supposedly kosher garments.<sup>1</sup> ■

1. תורת הבגד ■