



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Transporting the blood of a korban (cont.)

The Gemara inquires whether blood that was not transported by foot could be rectified.

An unsuccessful attempt to resolve this matter is presented.

Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan rules that blood transported without the kohen's moving his feet is invalid.

Ulla infers from this that there is no rectification for this disqualification.

Ulla's inference is successfully challenged.

### 2) Transporting the blood of a korban not by foot

The Gemara states that the issue of not transporting the blood of a korban by foot is subject to a dispute between R' Shimon and the Rabanan. This interpretation of the dispute is challenged by those in Eretz Yisroel.

This challenge is rejected and another reason those in Eretz Yisroel rejected this interpretation is presented.

### 3) Transporting the blood of a korban by a non-kohen

The Gemara relates that the status of blood that was transported by a non-kohen and then returned to the original spot and conveyed by a kohen is a matter of debate between the sons of R' Chiya and R' Yannai.

R' Shimi bar Ashi and Rava disagree about what the previous opinions would hold about blood that was transported by a kohen and then returned to the original spot and transported by a non-kohen.

A discussion regarding Rava's statement is recorded.

Abaye challenges Rava's position from a Baraisa and Rava responds that if the Baraisa is accurate he retracts his position.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What happens if a blood of a korban spills from the vessel onto the floor?  
-----
2. What is the point of dispute between the sons of R' Chiya and R' Yannai?  
-----
3. How did Abaye refute Rava's position?  
-----
4. What is the status of a korban if the kohen received the blood with his left hand?  
-----

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Bringing the blood to the altar a first and second time*

הוליכו כהן והחזירו וחזר והוליכו זר

The Gemara brings a number of inquiries regarding carrying the blood to the altar.

In the first case, a non-kohen took the blood from where the animal was slaughtered and brought it to the altar. This is unacceptable and the service is not valid. If a kohen retrieves the blood and returns it back to its original position and then re-brings it to the altar, one opinion among the Amoraim holds that this corrects the situation and the service is valid. A second opinion contends that the situation cannot be remedied.

The first Amora judges the carrying of the blood based upon the person who brought the blood its final time, whereas the second Amora holds that the first time the blood is brought to the altar is when the service is evaluated.

A second inquiry is presented. A kohen carried the blood properly to the altar, but he then took the blood away and distanced it from the altar. It was then taken by a non-kohen and returned to near the altar. Does this second bringing of the blood, which was done by a non-kohen, disqualify the service?

R' Simi b. Ashi explains that according to the first opinion in the previous case the kohen finally brought the blood and his service is counted. When he returned the blood and brought it the second time the service is acceptable. In the second case it is the non-kohen who brought the blood to the altar its final time, and the service is not valid. According to the second opinion in the first case, the carrying of the blood is judged based upon the first time it is brought. In our case, the kohen originally brought the blood, and the service is valid.

Rava explains that all opinions from the first case would say that the second case is an invalid service. Even according to the one who says that the first one to the altar is the critical one, in our case once the kohen's original service has been erased once he takes the blood away, and the second one to bring the blood to the altar is essential. When it is done by a non-kohen, all agree that the service is not valid.

It is noteworthy that the second case is illustrated in terms of the same kohen who originally brought the blood being the one who took the blood away. Why is the case not where the non-kohen was the one who took the blood away and then returned it, as we find in the first case where the kohen himself removed the blood and then returned it?

Keren Orah concludes that even R' Simi b. Ashi would agree that if the non-kohen is the one who took the blood away and then returned it, even the Amora who credits the original placement of the blood would say that the service would be invalid. The only time we would follow the actions of the kohen who brought the blood originally is when the non-kohen did nothing more than bringing it the second time. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Matzos kneaded by a child

כי פליגי בהולכה רבתי

*They (R' Shimon and Chachamim) disagree about transporting the blood a long distance*

**S**hulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> writes that matzos used for the mitzvah should not be kneaded or baked by a deaf-mute, someone insane or a child. The basis for this ruling is the pasuk that states, *ושמרתם את המצות* – and you should guard the matzos, which teaches that one must have intent while making matzos that they should not become chometz and the three people listed are incapable of having that intent.

There was once a child who kneaded the dough for matzos and the author of Teshuvos Eretz Tzvi<sup>2</sup> was asked whether the matzos may be used to fulfill the mitzvah of eating matzah at the seder. He cited a colleague who permitted under certain conditions the use of these matzos if there are no other matzos available. If an adult cut the dough into the piece that the child kneaded, it would be unnecessary for the dough to be kneaded since as long as the matzah is not a tefach thick it may be used for the mitzvah. Accordingly, since the dough cut by the adult was already a size usable for the mitzvah the kneading performed by the child was unnecessary and consequently does not negatively impact the matzos.

Teshuvos Eretz Tzvi challenged this ruling from our Gemara. The Gemara presents a disagreement between R' Shimon and Chachamim whether improper thought while transport-

(Overview...continued from page 1)  
הדרן עלך כל הזבחים

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates different circumstances and people that could invalidate a korban.

### 5) Non-kohen

The source that a non-kohen invalidates a korban is presented.

This source is unsuccessfully challenged.

D'vei R' Yishmael presents an alternative source that a non-kohen invalidates a korban. ■

ing the blood of a korban invalidates the korban. According to R' Shimon it does not, since transporting the blood is not an essential service, for if the animal was slaughtered next to the altar it would not be necessary to transport the blood. Chachamim disagree and maintain that improper thought while transporting the blood does invalidate the korban. Although it is true that it is not always necessary to transport the blood, when it is transported it is considered part of the service of the korban and thus an improper thought will invalidate the korban. Since the halacha follows Chachamim we should also conclude that although kneading the dough was not necessary, nevertheless, once it was done the correct intent is necessary and since a child is incapable of that intent the matzah may not be used for the mitzvah. His final position, however, is that the matzos are valid in accordance with the position of his colleague. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' ת"ס סעי' א'.

2. שו"ת ארץ צבי ח"ב סי' ל"ה. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Shechitah while sitting

"כל הדמים שקבלו... יושב"

**A**certain shochet was very exhausted one day and decided to shecht while seated. This worked so well for him that he began setting things up so he could shecht while seated every day. When someone caught him shechting seated he was appalled. "Don't you know that we shecht while standing?" he cried.

The community wondered whether they should oust him, since it is clear in the achronim that it is forbidden to shecht while seated. Since he was a qualified shochet, they asked their rav if they

should find a better candidate.

When this question was brought to Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt"l, he ruled that they need not depose the shochet. "Just because he doesn't know the opinion of the Kneses Hagedolah brought in the Be'er Heitev and the Pri Megadim that one may not shecht while seated does not mean that he should be deposed. First of all, the Pri Chadash rules that it is permitted to shecht while seated. The Pri Megadim too, permits in a situation of great financial loss, although he only tends to permit it **בדיעבד**.

"But this halachah requires further study, since it seems to contradict the Mishnah and Gemara in Zevachim 31. The mishnah there implies that a p'sul may only slaughter a sacrifice **בדיעבד**, but

the Gemara explains that this is only true regarding a tamei who sheched; all other psulim are permitted even l'chatchilah. So although we find in Zevachim 15 that sitting is a p'sul regarding the other avodos, it seems clearly mutar l'chatchilah to even slaughter an offering while seated.

"We must explain that those who prohibit understood that nowadays it is more likely that one who slaughters while seated will press on the knife—drisah—which invalidates the shechitah. Yet **בדיעבד** this is permitted since we do not add new prohibitions unless we have a source that compels us to in the Gemara and rishonim. Or unless it was the custom..."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. אגרות משה, יו"ד ח"א, סי' ב' ■