



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Use of the right hand (cont.)

The Gemara continues to discuss the necessity of Rava's teaching in light of the fact that it seems to be overlapped by other teachings.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah rules that if the blood spills on the floor before received by the kohen it is invalid.

### 3) Receiving the blood

A Baraisa presents different requirements for receiving the blood of a korban.

The rationale behind the exposition is explained.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav teaches that all of the blood of the korban must be received.

The exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel teaches that one who slaughters must raise his knife so that the blood does not drip from the knife into the receiving bowl.

Abaye explains how the kohen would wipe off the blade of the slaughtering knife.

R' Chisda in the name of R' Yirmiyah bar Abba teaches that the veridim blood vessel must be placed into the bowl that receives the blood.

The same ruling is cited in the name of R' Assi citing R' Yochanan.

### 4) The airspace of a utensil

R' Assi inquired about the status of blood that flowed into the bowl but the bottom of the bowl broke before the blood could be caught.

R' Yochanan cited a source that indicates that something that is in the airspace of a utensil is considered to be at rest in the utensil.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What halachos are derived from the words מדם הפר?
2. Why is it necessary for the slaughterer to lift the knife after slaughtering?
3. What material could be used to divert water to be used for the parah adumah?
4. Explain שעות פוסלות בקדשים.

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*No blemish may be inflicted upon the offering*

הצורם אוון הפר ואחר כך קיבל דמו פסול

A blemish disqualifies an animal from being brought as an offering. "Any [animal] in which there is a blemish you shall not offer it." (Vayikra 22:20) In our Gemara, R' Yochanan teaches that a blemish disqualifies the offering even if it occurs to the animal between the time it is slaughtered and the moment the blood is collected. He says that if someone places a scratch on the ear of an ox after it has been slaughtered, but before its blood had been collected, the offering is no longer valid. The verse states (Vayikra 4:5), "the kohen shall take the blood of the ox." This teaches that at the moment the blood is taken, it must be taken from "the ox," which suggests that the ox must be intact and complete, without a blemish, just as it was before it was slaughtered. Although this verse appears in the context of the ox of the kohen gadol, Rava brings a Baraisa which extends this halacha to all offerings.

Chidushei HaGri"z presents an inquiry to help define this halacha. Is the requirement that the animal not be blemished even after it is slaughtered an extension of the same rule which applies to the animal when it was alive? Or, perhaps the rule of blemishes does not apply at all after the animal is no longer alive, but the Torah introduces a new law, based upon the verse that the blood be taken "from the ox," that the animal must be intact just as it was before it was slaughtered.

Rava notes that this halacha applies not only to the bull of the Kohen Gadol, where the source of this law is found, but also to offerings such as the Pesach. Regarding slaughtering this offering, the Torah says (Shemos 12:4,5), "A perfect lamb, a male, within its first year shall it be (תהיה) for you." The words "תהיה לכם" teaches that the subsequent service of the offering must be done while the animal is still "perfect." From the inference that the animal remain "תמים – perfect" it seems that this law is an extension of the regular rule while it was still alive that an animal be without blemish.

However, the conclusion of the Gemara is that Rava's insight is not learned from the word "תמים – perfect," but rather from the word "תהיה." This teaches that the animal must remain less than one year old during the duration of the various services, but the rule not to cause a blemish even after the slaughter is learned from the fact the Torah taught this rule in reference to the bull of the Kohen Gadol. Accordingly, the inquiry regarding the nature of why the bull must not be blemished after its slaughter until the blood is collected remains unresolved.

Tosafos in Yoma (49b, ד"ה שאני) seems to explain that the word תמים is still used to teach this lesson, which would indicate that this rule is an extension of the requirement that there be no blemish upon the animal while it was alive. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Interrupting while putting on tefillin

אוויר שאין סופו לנוח כמונח דמי וכי

*Airspace in which the object will not come to rest is considered as though it is at rest etc.*

**R'** Assi expresses uncertainty about the validity of a korban when a kohen was ready to receive the blood and the bottom of the utensil broke after the blood entered the airspace of the utensil but had not yet touched the bottom. Do we say that entering the airspace is considered as if it is at rest even though it will not come to rest in the utensil, or not. The Gemara's conclusion is that it is not considered as though it came to rest and thus the korban is invalid since its blood spilled without being captured by a utensil.

Halachos Ketanos<sup>1</sup> applies this discussion to tefillin. Shulchan Aruch<sup>2</sup> rules that one is not permitted to interrupt between putting on his tefillin shel rosh and his tefillin shel yad. According to Rema<sup>3</sup> if one interrupts between putting on his tefillin shel rosh and his tefillin shel yad he is required to recite two berachos when putting on his shel rosh. It happened once that a person put on his shel yad and while holding his shel rosh over his head he interrupted by speaking to another person. Initially Halachos Ketanos suggested that since the shel rosh was over the airspace of the head and would eventually come to rest on the head it is considered as though it was already at rest and thus his conversation was not considered an interruption between the shel yad and the shel rosh. He then raises an uncertainty about the application of this concept to the case of tefillin. The Gemara's application of this concept may be limited to things that are in the air. Things that are flying in the air may be considered at rest as soon as they enter the airspace of

(Overview...continued from page 1)

This response is further clarified.

Two additional versions of this exchange are presented.

A Mishnah is cited regarding the gathering of water for use for the parah adumah.

R' Chiya in the name of R' Yochanan infers from this Mishnah that the airspace of a utensil is considered like the interior of a utensil.

An alternative explanation of the Mishnah is suggested but rejected.

Another comment related to the Mishnah discussing the water for use with the parah adumah is cited.

### 5) Receiving the blood (cont.)

R' Zeira in the name of Rebbi taught that if the ear of a korban becomes nicked after its slaughter but before the blood is received it is invalid.

It is noted that this source addresses only kodshei kodoshim so Rava offers a source for kodshei kalim.

Abaye challenges Rava's source.

Rava infers from this discussion that an animal that is hours beyond its first year could disqualify the animal for use as a korban. ■

a utensil. Tefillin are not flying through the air, they are being held in one's hand and it is not clear that the principle applies since it is possible that the person may decide not to place the tefillin on his head. Beur Halacha<sup>4</sup> cites the analysis of Halachos Ketanos and then mentions that Artzos Hachaim proves that the principle does not apply to the case of tefillin. ■

1. שו"ת הלכות קטנות ח"ב סי' מ"ב.

2. שו"ת או"ח סי' כ"ה סעי' ט"ו.

3. רמ"א שם.

4. ביאור הלכה שם ד"ה ואם הפסיק. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Sharp Words

"...תרדא"

**S**omeone once learned today's daf and was bothered by the sharp expression "תרדא." A talmid once asked Rav Moshe Soleveitchik, zt"l, to explain what appeared to be nothing less than a gross insult on today's daf. "How can Rav Chiya bar Abba call Rav Zeira a "תרדא" which Rashi says means a confused fool? And the pshat of the Aruch—that it means a 'drooling fool'—doesn't sound much better! How can he

denigrate Rav Zeira in such a sharp way? Do we not find that talmidei chachamim increase peace in the world?"

Rav Soleveitchik replied with a parable. "Two men attended a concert given by a famous orchestra. The first man, who was something of a dilettante, heartily enjoyed the music which was the most flawless playing he could remember hearing. By contrast, the second man remained for only a short while. After just a few minutes, he made a very pained face, got up, and stalked out, obviously offended for some reason. After the concert, people tried to figure out why one friend had remained and obviously enjoyed the presen-

tation, while the other had left early in such an abrupt fashion.

"The man who had left was a world-renowned expert in music and he had noticed that the conductor had erred slightly. Since he was used to symphonies that were perfect, he could not stay the moment he heard what to him was a jarring error. The other man was used to poor fare and quite enjoyed the show, since he was unable to discern the errors in the playing."

Rav Soleveitchik concluded, "If you understand this parable, there is no question at all..."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. והאיש משה ■