

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Baraisa (cont.)

It is suggested that the reference to wood should be deleted from the Baraisa and the correct reference is to libations.

A related Baraisa is cited and the author is identified as R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Berokah.

2) Blood

The necessity for an exposition to teach that blood is not salted is questioned and explained.

Zeiri states that one does not violate the prohibition against consuming blood that is cooked.

Abaye challenged this ruling from a Baraisa.

Rava attempted to resolve this ruling but Abaye defended his position.

Abaye then offered a possible solution for Rava which reminded Rava of a related teaching.

Rava offers his own ruling concerning dried blood.

R' Pappa elaborates on this position.

R' Gidal in the name of Zeiri rules that blood, whether dry or moist, constitutes an interposition for immersing.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Salt

The Gemara continues to expisit the pesukim that discuss salting a Mincha.

The term תבונה is explained,

Abaye rejects this explanation and suggests an alternative explanation.

Rava rejects this explanation and suggests an alternative explanation and R' Ashi explains the meaning of the term תבונה.

The process for salting a korban is described and Abaye adds that the same procedure is done for salting meat in general.

A Baraisa presents the parameters for committing me'ilah by benefitting from salt of a korban.

R' Masna identifies the related exposition.

A Mishnah teaches that it was stipulated that kohanim may benefit from salt of a korban.

Shmuel limits this ruling to korbanos but they may not benefit from salt while eating.

The Gemara searches for the meaning of Shmuel's words "korbanos" and "eating."

Ravina suggests proof to the Gemara's understanding of Shmuel's words.

R' Mordechai challenges this proof from a statement of R' Shisha. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Salt found on the ramp and on the top of the Altar

שעל גבי הכבש ושבראשו של מזבח אין מועלין בו

The Baraisa teaches that the halacha of me'ilah does not apply to salt which is found on the ramp leading up to the Altar, or to salt found on the top of the Altar. Rashi explains that this halacha is referring to the salt that fell to the side while the limbs of the offerings were being salted on the ramp of the Altar, or to salt which fell to the side on top of the Altar while salting the kometz of a minchah. In both of these cases, the salt which fell no longer has any function. Therefore, one would not be liable for me'ilah if he would take that salt and use it for his personal benefit.

Keren Orah explains that the words of Rashi teach that the laws of me'ilah do not apply only to salt which fell during the process of salting the limbs or minchah. However, salt which was originally placed on the ramp to be used for salting is still useful, and no one is allowed to take from it for his personal use. This leads us to say that any salt which is still on the limbs of the offerings is also included in me'ilah.

Keren Orah asks why the Gemara brings Rav Masna who immediately inquires regarding the verse from where we learn that me'ilah applies to the salt that is on the limbs? We already know that the salt which is placed upon the ramp of the Altar is property of the Mikdash, waiting to be used; in what manner would the law of me'ilah be suspended when it is placed on the limbs? The Gri"z adds that the purpose of placing salt upon the limbs when they are still on the ramp is to then carry the salted limbs and place them on the top of the Altar. At the point they are being carried to the Altar the main service of burning the limbs has not even been accomplished, so why would we think that me'ilah does not apply to the salt, that we need a verse to teach that me'ilah is still in effect?

Keren Orah and the Gri"z answer by explaining the case of the Gemara a bit differently than did Rashi. They explain that "salt on the ramp and salt on the Altar" refer to the stockpile of salt which is placed there in order to be used to salt the limbs or the minchah. Yet, me'ilah only applies after the salt has been placed on the limbs or on the minchah, but not beforehand. The salt itself is not an offering, as its purpose is to be used for the mitzvah of salting the offerings. Items which themselves are not for an offering are not in the category of "the sanctified portion of the holy," and me'ilah does not apply to them. The proof from the verse in Yechezkel which Rav Masna cites teaches us that me'ilah does apply to the salt, but only after it is placed on the limbs or on the minchah. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Salting meat on both sides

אמר אביי וכן לקדירה

Abaye said: The same [procedure is used for preparing meat to be cooked in a] pot

The Gemara teaches that the salting of a korban in the Beis HaMikdash does not require a quantity of salt that would give a taste to the meat. Rather, they would bring a limb and salt one side and then they would turn it over and salt the second side and then put the limb on the altar. Abaye states that the same procedure is done when salting meat in order to extract the blood from it. Rishonim disagree whether the requirement to salt meat requires putting salt on both sides of the meat or not. Tur,¹ in the name of his father, writes that preferably one should salt well both sides of the meat but **בדיעבד**, if one only salted one side, it is sufficient. Similarly, it is preferable if fowl is salted on the inside and outside, but **בדיעבד** it is sufficient if it is salted only on the outside. This is the position adopted by Shulchan Aruch.² Rokeach³ amongst others maintains that even **בדיעבד** one may not eat meat that was not salted on both sides. Rema⁴ writes that the custom is to be stringent about these matters unless it is a circumstance of need and the meat was already cooked.

Rashba⁵ writes that one should not conclude from our

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the status of blood that is cooked?

2. What is derived from the word תמלח?

3. Where are the three places that salt is stored?

4. From where is sacrificial salt funded?

Gemara's discussion that it is essential to salt meat on both sides. He proves this correct with the following argument. If one has a thick piece of meat and salts it on both sides, the salt has the capacity to extract all the blood, even the blood at the very center of the meat. How then is it possible for one to think that a thin slice of meat would not be kosher if one did not salt both sides? It must be, concludes Rashba, that when Abaye states that one must salt the meat on both sides it was expressing the preferred practice since salting both sides will certainly extract all the blood, however, it is not essential. ■

1. טור יו"ד סי' ס"ט.
2. שו"ע שם סעי' ד'.
3. רוקח סי' תט"ו.
4. רמ"א שם.
5. שו"ת הרשב"א ח"א סי' רס"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Poisoned Worldview

"לאכול אכילת קדשים..."

Today's daf discusses the kohein's consumption of sacrifices.

Money sometimes makes a person hold very strange notions. It doesn't seem to matter how outlandish or wrongheaded the person is when he has money. As the famous saying goes, "בעל המאה בעל הדעה" — meaning, "Money talks."

The story is told of a certain wealthy man who refused to donate a penny to Yeshivas Volozhin unless it

was given directly to the Rosh Yeshiva himself. "I will only consent to give my money to Rav Chaim Volozhiner himself. That way I know that every penny is going to benefit the Yeshiva. I am not willing to pay a penny for the upkeep of meshulachim..."

But when he finally went to Rav Chaim Volozhiner, he was shocked that the Rosh Yeshiva refused to accept his donation. "You may be surprised to learn that the custom you have taken upon yourself to only give money to the head of an institution you wish to support is a non-Jewish custom. There is a reason why non-Jews who give money to support their churches will not give it through a messenger. They

cannot understand how one can give to Hashem while humans benefit from it as well.

"This explains why a non-Jew can only bring a korban olah, which is completely consumed on the altar. A shelamim which may be eaten by others is not something within his worldview. He cannot understand how regular humans can eat a sacrifice without lowering it and making it unacceptable."

Rav Chaim concluded, "And this is why I will not take your money—I do not wish to accept donations tainted by such a non-Jewish attitude!"¹ ■

1. פרדס יוסף, ויקרא, א' ד'.