

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף פ"ז

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by wrapping up the discussion of whether covering the blood of a first animal constitutes an interruption in the shechitah of a second animal. The Gemara distinguishes this from the case of Rav's talmidim, explaining that since one could technically slaughter with one hand and cover the blood with the other, doing so does not create a hefsek. From there, we move into a new Mishnah that outlines who is responsible for the mitzvah of kisuy hadam if the shochet fails to do it, and what happens if the blood is covered by the wind or becomes uncovered after being covered properly.

In the Gemara's discussion on this Mishnah, we learn the source for why any Jew who sees uncovered blood must cover it, and the requirement to cover the blood with one's hands rather than one's feet so as not to treat mitzvos with contempt. This leads into a famous discussion regarding the fine imposed by Rabban Gamliel on someone who snatched another's mitzvah of kisuy hadam, which leads the Gemara to analyze the value of a brachah and brings down a beautiful story involving Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and a heretic.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 87A

REFUTATION

הכי השתא!?

The Gemara rejects this comparison: **How can you compare these** two cases?!

EXPLANATION

התם משתא וברוכי בהדי הדדי לא אפשר,

There, in the case of Rav's talmidim, **drinking and reciting a blessing simultaneously is not possible**. Therefore, by asking for the cup of blessing, they clearly showed they were stopping their drinking.

EXPLANATION

הא אפשר דשחיט בחדא ומכסי בחדא.

But **here**, regarding the covering of the blood, **it is possible that he slaughters with one hand and covers** the blood of the first animal **with** the other **one**. Since they could have been done at the same time, covering the first blood is not considered an interruption of the slaughtering.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' שחט ולא כסה, וראהו אחר – חייב לכסות.

MISHNAH: If one slaughtered a wild animal or bird and did not cover the blood, and another person saw it uncovered, the second person is obligated to cover the blood.

MISHNAH

כסהו ונתגלה – פטור מלכסות.

If the shochet covered it and it was subsequently uncovered, he is exempt from covering it again.

MISHNAH

(כסהו) [כסתו] הרוח – חייב לכסות.

If the wind covered it with dirt, and then it became uncovered again, the shochet is obligated to cover it.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

גמ' תנו רבנן: "ושפה וכסה" – מי ששפה וכסה.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a braisa: The pasuk says, "And he shall pour out its blood and cover it with earth," which teaches that the one who poured it out, meaning the shochet, shall cover it.

QUESTION

שחט ולא כסה, וראהו אחר, מניין שחייב לכסות?

If he slaughtered and did not cover the blood, and another person saw it, from where do we know that the one who saw it is obligated to cover it?

ANSWER

שנאמר: "ואמר לבני ישראל" – אזהרה לכל בני ישראל.

As it is stated: "Therefore I said to the children of Israel," which is a warning to all the children of Israel to fulfill this mitzvah if the shochet fails to do so.

BRAISA

תנא אידך: "ושפה וכסה", במה ששפה – בו וכסה, שלא יכסנו ברגל, שלא יהיו מצות בזויות עליו.

It is taught in another braisa: The pasuk says, "And he shall pour out and cover," meaning with that which he poured out — with his hands — with it he shall cover, so that he should not cover it with his foot, so that mitzvos should not be contemptible to him.

BRAISA

תנא אידך: "ושפה וכסה", מי ששפה – הוא יכסנו.

It is taught in another braisa: "And he shall pour out and cover," meaning the one who poured it out, he has the first right to cover it.

STATEMENT

מעשה באחד ששחט, וקדם חבירו וכסה, וחייבו רבן גמליאל ליתן לו עשרה זהובים.

An incident occurred with one who slaughtered, and his friend preempted him and covered the blood, and Rabban Gamliel obligated him to give him ten gold coins as compensation for taking away his mitzvah.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: שכר מצוה או שכר ברכה?

A dilemma was raised before them: Are these ten gold coins the reward of the mitzvah itself, or are they the reward of the blessing that would have been recited over the mitzvah?

EXPLANATION

למאי נפקא מינה? לברכת המזון.

What is the practical difference of this question? It makes a difference for Birchas HaMazon, if someone stole the opportunity to lead the bentching.

EXPLANATION

אי אמרת שכר מצוה – אחת היא, ואי אמרת שכר ברכה – הויין ארבעים.

If you say the ten coins are the reward of the mitzvah, then Birchas HaMazon is one mitzvah, and the fine would be ten coins. But if you say it is the reward of the blessing, since there are four blessings in Birchas HaMazon, the fine would be forty gold coins.

QUESTION

מאי?

What is the halachic conclusion?

PROOF

תא שמע, דאמר ליה ההוא מינא לרבבי: מי שיצר הרים לא ברא רוח, ומי שברא רוח לא יצר הרים, דכתיב: "כי הנה יוצר הרים וברא רוח".

Come and hear a proof from the following story: As a certain heretic said to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: He who formed the mountains did not create the wind, and he who created the wind did not form the mountains, as it is written: "For behold, He Who forms the mountains and creates the wind," implying two separate creators.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: שוטה, שפיל לסיפיה דקרא – "ה' צבאות שמו".

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to him: Fool! Go down to the end of the pasuk, where it says: "Hashem, the God of Hosts, is His name," showing that one Creator did both.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה...: נקוט לי זימנא תלתא יומי ומחדרנא לה תיובתא.

The heretic said to him: Give me a time of three days, and I will return to you with a refutation.

STATEMENT

יְתִיב רַבִּי תָּלַת תַּעֲנִיתָא.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi sat and fasted **three fasts** so that the heretic would not succeed in finding a heretical answer.

STATEMENT

כִּי הָוָה קָא בָּעִי מִיבָרָא, אָמְרוּ לֵיהּ...: מִינָא קָאִי אַבְקָא.

When he was about to eat after his fasts, they said to him: A heretic is standing at the door.

STATEMENT

אָמַר: "וַיִּתְּנוּ בְּכַרוֹתַי רוֹשׁ וְגוֹי".

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said in distress, quoting the pasuk: "They put gall into my food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink."

STATEMENT

אָמַר לֵיהּ...: רַבִּי, מִבְּשֵׁר טוֹבוֹת אָנִי לָךְ, לֹא מָצָא תְּשׁוּבָה אוֹיְבְּךָ וְנָפַל מִן הַגֶּגֶז וּמָת.

The visitor said to him: Rabbi, I am a bringer of good tidings to you; your enemy did not find an answer, and he fell from the roof and died.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לוֹ: רְצוֹנְךָ שְׁתַּסְעוֹד אֶצְלִי? אָמַר לוֹ: הֵן.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to him: Is it your desire to dine with me? He said to him: Yes.

STATEMENT

לְאַחַר שֶׁאָכְלוּ וְשָׁתוּ, אָמַר לוֹ: כּוֹס שֶׁל בִּרְכָּה אַתָּה שׁוֹתָה אוֹ אֶרְבָּעִים זְהוּבִים אַתָּה נוֹטֵל?

After they ate and drank, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to him: Do you want to drink the cup of blessing, or do you want to take forty gold coins and let me recite the blessings?

STATEMENT

אָמַר לוֹ: כּוֹס שֶׁל בִּרְכָּה אָנִי שׁוֹתָה.

The guest said to him: I will drink the cup of blessing.

PROOF

יָצְתָה בַּת קוֹל וְאָמְרָה: כּוֹס שֶׁל בִּרְכָּה שָׁוֶה אֶרְבָּעִים זְהוּבִים.

A Heavenly Voice went forth and said: The cup of blessing is worth forty gold coins! This proves that each of the four blessings of Birchas HaMazon is worth ten gold coins.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק: עֲדִיין יִשְׁנָה לְאוֹתָהּ מִשְׁפָּחָה בֵּין גְּדוּלֵי רוּמִי, וְקוֹרְאִין אוֹתָהּ מִשְׁפָּחַת בֵּר לויָאנוֹס.

Rabbi Yitzchak said: That family of the heretic still exists among the prominent families of Rome, and they call it the family of Bar Luyanus.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

כָּסָהּ וְנִתְגַּלָּה.

The Mishnah taught: If **he covered it and it was** subsequently **uncovered**, he is exempt from covering it again.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיהִי רַב אַחָא בְּרִיהַ דְּרַבָּא לְרַב אָשִׁי: מַאי שְׁנָא מִהִשְׁבַּת אֲבִידָהּ, דְּאָמַר מָר: "הָשֵׁב" – אֲפִילוּ מֵאָה פְּעָמִים.

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: How is this different from returning a lost object, where the Master said that the double wording of "You shall surely re turn" teaches that you must return it **even a hundred times**? Why is covering the blood not a repeating mitzvah?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיהִי: הֵתָם לֹא כְּתִיב מִיעוּטָא, הֵכָא כְּתִיב מִיעוּטָא "וְכָסָהּ".

Rav Ashi said to him: **There**, by a lost object, a limiting word is not written; but here, a limiting word is written: "And he shall cover it," meaning only once.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

כָּסָהּ הָרוּחַ.

The Mishnah taught: If **the wind covered it**, and then it became uncovered, he is obligated to cover it.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חַנָּה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שְׁחֹזַר וְנִתְגַּלָּה, אֲבָל לֹא חֹזַר וְנִתְגַּלָּה – פְּטוּר מִלְּכַסוֹת.

Rabbah bar bar Chana said that Rabbi Yochanan said: They only taught this where it became uncovered again; but if it did not become uncovered again, he is exempt from covering it.

QUESTION

וכי חזר ונתגלה מאי הוי? הא אידחי ליה!

The Gemara asks: **And even if it became uncovered again, what of it? It was already rejected** from the mitzvah when the wind covered it, so why should the obligation return?

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: זאת אומרת אין דיחוי אצל מצות.

Rav Pappa said: This says that there is no permanent rejection regarding mitzvos. Even if a mitzvah was temporarily set aside, the obligation returns once the obstacle is gone.

QUESTION

ומאי שנא מהא דתנא: השוחט ונבלע דם פקרקע – חייב לכסות.

The Gemara asks: **And how is this different from that which is taught in a braisa: One who slaughters and the blood is absorbed into the ground is still obligated to cover it?**

ANSWER

התם כשרשומו ניכר.

The Gemara answers: **There**, it is a case **where its trace is** still **visible** on top of the ground, so it was never truly covered.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני דם שנתערב במים, אם יש בו מראית דם – חייב לכסות.

MISHNAH: Blood that was mixed with water, if it has the appearance of blood, one is obligated to cover it.

MISHNAH

נתערב בייין – רואין אותו כאילו הוא מים.

If the blood **was mixed with wine**, we **view it as if it were water**, to see if it would have colored the water.

MISHNAH

נתערב בדם הבהמה

If the blood of the wild animal or bird **was mixed with the blood of a domestic animal**, which does not require covering...

עמוד ב' DAF 87B

MISHNAH

או בדם החיה – רואין אותו כאילו הן מים.

Or if the blood of a slaughtered bird was mixed **with the blood of a wild animal** that is exempt from covering, **we view it as though it**, the exempt blood, **were water**, and if there is enough bird's blood to color the mixture, one is obligated to cover it.

MISHNAH

רבי יהודה אומר: אין דם מבטל דם.

Rabbi Yehuda says: **Blood does not nullify blood**, and therefore even if the exempt blood is the majority, the obligation to cover remains.

MISHNAH

דם הניתז וישעל הספין – חייב לכסות.

With regard to **blood that spurts** during shechita onto the walls of the pit **and** the blood **that is on the knife**, one is obligated to **cover** it.

MISHNAH

אמר רבי יהודה: אימתי? בזמן שאין שם דם אלא הוא, אבל יש שם דם שלא הוא – פטור מלכסות.

Rabbi Yehuda said: **When** is this the halacha? **At a time when there is no** other blood there except that spurted blood; **but** if **there is** other blood there **that is not that** spurted blood, which was already covered in the pit, then he is **exempt from covering** the blood on the wall or the knife.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' תנן ה'תם: דם שנתערב במים, אם יש בו מראית דם – כ'שר.

GEMARA: **We learned** in a Mishnah **there** in Maseches Zevachim: With regard to **blood** of a korban **that was mixed with water**, if it has the appearance of blood, it is **fit** for sprinkling on the Mizbeach.

GEMARA

נתערב ב'ין – רואין אותו כאילו הוא מים.

If the blood **was mixed with red wine**, we **view it as though it were water**, and if that amount of water would not ruin the appearance of the blood, it is fit.

GEMARA

נתערב בדם בהמה או בדם החיה – רואין אותו כאילו הוא מים.

If the kodashim blood **was mixed with the blood of a chullin domesticated animal** or with the blood of a chullin wild animal, we **view it as though it were water**.

GEMARA

רבי יהודה אומר: אין דם מבטל דם.

Rabbi Yehuda says: **Blood does not nullify blood**, and it is fit in any case.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן: לא שנו אלא שנפלו מים לתוך דם, אבל נפל דם לתוך מים – ראשון ראשון בטל.

Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: They only taught this halacha that it is fit if it has the appearance of blood where the water fell into the blood; but if the blood fell into the water, the first drop and then the next first drop is nullified in the water as it falls, and the mixture is permanently disqualified.

STATEMENT

אמר רב פפא: ולענין כסוי אינו כן, אין דחוי אצל מצות.

Rav Pappa said: But with regard to the matter of covering the blood, it is not so; even if the blood fell into water, it is not nullified, because there is no permanent rejection by mitzvos that are not kodashim, and once there is enough blood to color the water, the obligation returns.

STATEMENT

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: כל מראה אדמומית – מכפרין, ומכשירין, וחיבין בכסוי.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Any mixture of blood and water that retains a reddish appearance, they effect atonement if sprinkled on the Mizbeach, and they render food susceptible to tumah, and they are obligated in covering.

QUESTION

מאי קמשמע לן? מכפרין – תנינא, חיבין בכסוי – תנינא!

The Gemara asks: What is he teaching us? That they effect atonement, we already learned this in the Mishnah in Zevachim! That they are obligated in covering, we already learned this in our Mishnah!

ANSWER

מכשירין איצטריקא ליה.

The Gemara answers: It was necessary for him to teach that they render food susceptible to tumah.

OBJECTION

מכשירין נמי, אי דם – אכשורי מכשר, אי מֵא – אכשורי מכשירי!

The Gemara objects: Regarding rendering susceptible also, why do we need a ruling? If the mixture is considered blood, it renders susceptible as blood, and if it is considered water, it renders susceptible as water! Either way, the food becomes susceptible!

RESOLUTION

לא צריקא, שתמדו במי גשמים.

The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary for a case where he mixed it with rainwater.

OBJECTION

מי גשמים נמי, כיון דשקיל ורמי, אחשבינהו.

The Gemara asks: Regarding rainwater also, since he took the water and poured it into the blood, he has given it importance, and rainwater that is handled with intent renders food susceptible!

RESOLUTION

לֹא צָרִיכָא, שְׁנֵתְּמָדוּ מֵאֲלֵיהֶן.

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** for a case **where they became mixed on their own**, without human action.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי אָסִי מִנְהַרְבִּיל אוֹמֵר: בְּצֵלֶּלֶתָא דְדָמָא.

Rabbi Assi of Neharbil says: Shmuel's statement was referring **to the clear plasma of blood** that has a reddish hue.

STATEMENT

רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה מִדִּפְתִּי אָמַר: עָנוּשׁ כֶּרֶת, וְהוּא דְאִיכָא כְּזַיִּס.

Rabbi Yirmeya of Difti said: One who consumes this plasma is **punishable by kares**, and that is specifically **where there is a kezayis** of actual blood within the plasma.

BRAISA

בְּמִתְנִיתָא תָנָא: מְטֻמָּאִים בְּאֵהָל, וְהוּא דְאִיכָא רְבִיעִית.

It was taught in a Braisa: Plasma from a corpse **imparts tumah in a tent**, and that is specifically **where there is a revi's** of actual blood within it.

BRAISA

תָּנן הֵתָם: כָּל מַשְׁקָה הַמֵּת טְהוֹרִין, חוּץ מִדָּמוֹ, וְכָל מַרְאֵה אֲדָמוּמִית שָׁבוּ מְטֻמָּאִין בְּאֵהָל.

We learned in a Mishnah there: All liquids of a corpse are **tahor** from imparting the severe tumah of a corpse, **except for its blood**; and any reddish appearance in its liquids **imparts tumah in a tent**.

QUESTION

וּמַשְׁקָה הַמֵּת טְהוֹרִין? וְרַמְינָהּ: מַשְׁקָה טָבוֹל יוֹם, מַשְׁקִין הַיּוֹצֵאִין מִמֶּנּוּ כְּמַשְׁקִין שְׁנוּגֵעַ בָּהֶן.

The Gemara asks: **And are the liquids of a corpse tahor? But I will point out a contradiction:** We learned in a Mishnah, with regard to **the liquid of a tevil yom**, liquids that issue from him are like liquids that he touches, which are tamei; and the same should apply to a corpse!

SUMMARY

The Gemara establishes that the shochet has the primary right to perform kisuy hadam, and if someone else steals the mitzvah, they must pay a fine of ten gold coins. Through a story involving Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and a guest who chose the cup of blessing over a cash reward, a Heavenly Voice confirms that each of the four brachos of Birchas HaMazon is worth ten gold coins. Additionally, the Gemara clarifies that while returning a lost object must be done repeatedly, the Torah's phrasing limits the obligation of kisuy hadam to a single act once it has been properly covered. Finally, we learn that if the wind covers the blood and it becomes uncovered again, the shochet is still obligated to cover it, demonstrating the principle that there is no permanent rejection (dechuya) when it comes to mitzvos.

The Gemara brings down a beautiful and powerful story about Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who offered his guest a choice: either take forty gold coins, or take the zechus of reciting the Birchah HaMazon over the cup of blessing. The guest chose the blessing, and a Bas Kol came out and declared that the cup of blessing is indeed worth forty gold coins. From here, the Gemara learns that every single one of the four berachos of Birchah HaMazon is worth ten gold coins.

Think about this for a moment, my friends. We bentch every single day, sometimes multiple times a day. It is so easy to let the words slip by as a habit, a quick routine we rush through to get back to our day. But Chazal are revealing to us the true value of what we are holding. Every single berachah we utter is a precious gem, valued by Heaven at a fortune of gold. When we say Birchah HaMazon, we are literally collecting wealth!

This is not just about bentching; it is about how we look at all our mitzvos. The Torah tells us regarding the mitzvah of kisuy hadam that we must cover the blood with our hands and not with our feet, so that "mitzvos should not be contemptible to him." When we do a mitzvah with excitement, with care, and with a sense of its immense value, we show Hashem how much we cherish His Torah.

Today, when you sit down to bentch after eating bread, do not just rush through the words. Pause for three seconds before you begin. Remind yourself of the Bas Kol's declaration: each of these four berachos is worth ten gold coins. Say the words slowly, out loud, and with real joy, appreciating the immense spiritual wealth you are gathering with every single word.