

VI.

BAVLI HULLIN CHAPTER SIX

FOLIOS 83B-89B

6:1

- A. [The requirement to] cover up the blood applies in the Land and abroad, (2) in the time of the Temple and not in the time of the Temple, (3) in the case of unconsecrated beasts, but not in the case of Holy Things.
- B. And it applies (4) to a wild beast and a bird, (5) to that which is captive and to that which is not captive.
- C. And it applies (6) to a koy, because it is a matter of doubt [whether it is wild or domesticated].
- D. And they do not slaughter it [a koy] on the festival. But if one has slaughtered it, they do not cover up its blood.

I.1 A. *On what basis does [the rule] not apply to Holy Things? Do you say it is on account of the view of R. Zira? For said R. Zira, “One who slaughters must put dust below and dust above [the blood]. For it says, ‘[Any man also of the people of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, who takes in hunting any beast or bird that may be eaten] shall pour out its blood and cover it in dust’ (Lev. 17:13). It does not say ‘with dust,’ but it does say, ‘in dust.’ This teaches us that the one who slaughters must put dust below and dust above [the blood].” And here [in the case of Holy Things] it is not possible [to cover it above and below with dust]. What are his options? If he puts [dust on the altar] and declares it null [he thereby violates the prohibition against] adding on to the structure [of*

the altar]. And it is written [that you cannot change the structures of the Temple], “And this he made clear by the writing from the hand of the Lord concerning it, all the work to be done according to the plan” (1Ch. 28:19). If he does not declare it null, then it [the dust underneath] will interpose [between the blood and the altar and invalidate the sacrifice].

- B. *Let it be the case then that below it is not possible [to cover the blood of a Holy Thing with dust]. But above it is possible to cover it with dust [in accord with the following]. Was it [the following] not taught on Tannaite authority? R. Jonathan b. Joseph says, “If one slaughtered a wild animal and afterward one slaughtered a beast, he is exempt from the obligation to cover the blood [of the wild animal since the blood of the beast covers it]. [If one slaughtered] a beast and afterward [one slaughtered] a wild animal, he is liable to cover the blood [of the wild animal even though the blood of the beast lies beneath it.” [Here too he should have to cover with dust above it even if he does not place dust below it.]*
- C. *And this accords with the principle of R. Zira. For said R. Zira, “For anything that is suitable for mixing, the absence of the act of mixing does not impede [the effectiveness of the mixture]. And for anything that is not suitable for mixing, the absence of the act of mixing does impede [the effectiveness of the mixture] [b. Men. 103b, b. B.B. 81b].” [In these cases it would have been suitable to put dust below the wild animal’s blood. For Holy Things it would not be suitable to put dust below because it would invalidate the sacrifice.]*
- D. *But why not let him scrape it [the blood off the altar, move it away], and cover it? And [in accord with this] was it not taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: **Blood that splashes and what is on the knife, one is liable to cover it up [M. 6:6 A-B]**? It seems logical to conclude that implies he may scrape it off and cover it. Here too let us scrape it off and cover it.*
- E. *If we are dealing with Holy Things brought upon the altar, that is indeed the case. In our case what are we dealing with? With Holy Things that are consecrated property of the Temple treasury [that may not be eaten by anyone until they are redeemed. Thus the act of slaughter accomplishes no change in the status of the animal as food and is invalid.]*
- F. **[84a]** *But why not let him redeem it and then cover the blood [since the act of slaughter would then be valid]?*
- G. *[You cannot do this because] you need to assess and appraise [the value of the animal by bringing it to a priest before you redeem it].*

- H. *And in accord with whose view is this? If you say that it is in accord with the view of R. Meir who said that all cases [of Holy Things] fall under the rule of having to be assessed and appraised, lo he said, "An act of slaughter that is improper, is a valid act of slaughter."* [He must cover the blood in any case.] *And if it is in accord with the view of R. Simeon who said [cf. b. 80a], "An act of slaughter that is improper, is not a valid act of slaughter," lo, he said that all cases do not fall under the rule of having to be assessed and appraised.*
- I. *Said R. Joseph, "It is in accord with the view of Rabbi. And he concurs with both Tannaite authorities.* With regard to an act of slaughter that is improper he holds in accord with the view of R. Simeon [that it is not a valid act of slaughter]. And with regard to the need to assess and appraise [before redeeming the animal] he holds in accord with the view of R. Meir [that all cases fall under the rule]."
- J. *And another possibility: The entire matter is in accord with the views of R. Simeon. This case is different [from the ordinary case] because Scripture said, "[He] shall pour out [its blood] and cover it [with dust]" (Lev. 17:13). [This subsumes under the rule] any [Holy Thing] that is lacking only pouring and covering. This excludes that which is lacking pouring, redeeming and covering.*
- K. *But now that you have reached this point in the argument, you should maintain even regarding Holy Things [i.e., birds] that are consecrated to the altar [that the rule applies only to] that which is lacking only pouring and covering. This excludes that which is lacking pouring, scraping and covering.*
- L. Mar bar R. Ashi said, "Scripture said, 'Any beast or bird' (*ibid.*). Just as a wild beast cannot be consecrated [to the altar], so too [we cannot refer here to] a bird that is consecrated to the altar." If [you wish to argue against this you may say] what is the case regarding wild animals? There are none of its kind that can be consecrated. So too regarding birds [we refer only to those] whose kind cannot be consecrated. This would exclude turtle doves and young pigeons whose kind can be consecrated.
- M. No [this is not a valid argument]. [Birds] must be like wild animals [in all respects with regard to the law for the logic of the argument to hold]. What is the case with regard to wild animals? You do not distinguish [between kinds that are and are not consecrated]. So too for birds you should not distinguish [between kinds that are and are not consecrated]. [In any case we deal here with unconsecrated birds (Rashi).]

- I.2** A. *Jacob the heretic said to Raba, “We have the principle that a wild animal is included under the rule for beasts with regard to the tokens [of cleanness] [cf. b. 71a]. It would make sense to maintain also that the beast is included under the rule for wild animals with regard to [the obligation] to cover [the blood].”*
- B. He said to him, “On your account Scripture stated, ‘[Only you shall not eat the blood]; you shall pour it out upon the earth like water’ (Deu. 12:16).” *What is the case regarding water? You do not have to cover it up. So too this [blood of a beast] you also do not have to cover it up.*
- C. *But on this basis we should infer that they may immerse in it [i.e., in a pool filled with blood to remove uncleanness]. Scripture stated, “Nevertheless a spring or a cistern holding water shall be clean; [but whatever touches their carcass shall be unclean]” (Lev. 11:36). These [pools of water] yes [do render objects clean through immersion]. Other kinds [of pools] do not.*
- D. *But it would make sense to maintain that this concern applies to exclude other kinds of liquids that are not compared to water. But blood, that is compared to water should be also [valid for immersion].*
- E. *[This is not the case because] two exclusions were written in the verse: a spring of water and a cistern of water.*
- F. *But it would make sense to say that both of these exclude other liquids [as valid]. One excludes water that streamed [into a pool] and one excludes water that was gathered to be held [in a pool].*
- G. *[This is not the case because] three exclusions were written in the verse: a spring of water, a cistern of water, and a holding of water.*
- I.3** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “[Any man also of the people of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them], who takes in hunting [any beast or bird that may be eaten shall pour out its blood and cover it with dust]” (Lev. 17:13).*
- B. I have only [the rule that he cover the blood] for those that he “takes in hunting.” What is the basis [for the rule] for those that are already taken and make themselves ready, such as geese and chickens?
- C. It comes to teach, “in hunting” implying any way [he takes them they are subject to the rule].
- D. If so what does it come to teach by stating “who takes”?

E. The Torah taught proper behavior. For a person should eat meat only after this kind of [extensive] preparation. [One should not eat meat often lest he become poor.] [Cf. T. [Arak. 4:28.](#)]

I.4 A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* “When the Lord your God enlarges your territory, [as he has promised you, and you say, ‘I will eat flesh,’ because you crave flesh, you may eat as much flesh as you desire]” (Deu. 12:20). The Torah taught proper behavior. A person should eat meat only when he craves it.

B. You might infer that a person may buy meat from the market place [any time he desires] and eat it. It comes to teach, “[If the place which the Lord your God will choose to put his name there is too far from you], then you may kill any of your herd or your flock, [which the Lord has given you, as I have commanded you; and you may eat within your towns as much as you desire]” (Deu. 12:21).

C. You might infer that he may kill all his herd and eat it or kill all his flock and eat it. It comes to teach, “Of your herd” — and not all your herd; “[Of] your flock” — and not all your flock. [Cf. T. [Arak. 4:26.](#)]

D. Based on this said R. Eleazar b. Azariah, “Whoever has a *maneh* should buy a *litra* of vegetables for his stew. If he has ten *manehs* he should buy a *litra* of fish for his stew. If he has fifty *manehs* he should buy a *litra* of meat for his stew. If he has one hundred *manehs* they should cook up a stew for him every day.” [Cf. T. [Arak. 4:27.](#)]

E. And for the others [who have less than a hundred] when should they [cook up a stew]? On every Sabbath eve.

F. Said Rab, “We must show concern for the words of an elder [i.e., for the view Eleazar and make do on a modest diet].”

G. Said R. Yohanan, “Abba [Rab] was from a healthy family [who could thrive on this diet]. But we [are not]. Whoever has a penny in his pocket should run and take it to the storekeeper [and not wait in accord with Eleazar’s teaching].”

H. Said R. Nahman, “But we [are not like that]. We borrow to eat.”

I.5 A. [On modesty and parsimony we have the following two verses in Proverbs: “The lambs will provide your clothing, and the goats the price of a field. There will be enough goats’ milk for your food, for the food of your household and maintenance for your maidens” (Pro. 27:26-27).] “The lambs will provide your clothing,” [means]

from the shearing of your lambs you should make your clothes. “And the goats the price of a field,” [means] a person in general may sell his field to buy goats. But he may not sell his goats to buy a field. “There will be enough goats’ milk” [means] it is enough if a person sustains himself through the milk of goats and lambs that are in his household. “For your food, for the food of your household” [means] your food should take precedence over the food for your household.

- B. “And maintenance for your maidens” — said Mar Zutra the son of R. Nahman, “Provide maintenance for your maidens. From this stipulation the Torah taught us proper behavior. For a person should not teach his child [to expect to have] meat and wine.”
- C. Said R. Yohanan, [84b] “A person who wishes to become wealthy should breed small animals.”
- D. Said R. Hisda, “What is the implication of that which is written, ‘The increase of your cattle’ (Deu. 7:13)? [It means that breeding cattle] increases the wealth of the owners.”
- E. *And said R. Yohanan, “It is better to drink a cup of magical potion than to drink a cup of warm water. And this concern applies to [water in] a metal vessel. But we do not have this concern regarding a clay vessel. And we say this only regarding a metal vessel that had no roots [of herbs and spices] in it. But if it had roots in it we do not have this concern. And we say this only where they put no roots in it and where they did not boil [the water first]. But where they did boil it we do not have this concern.”*
- F. And said R. Yohanan, “If a person’s father left him money and he wants to lose it, let him wear linen garments and use glass utensils and hire workers but not sit with them [to oversee them].”
- G. Let him wear linen garments [such as] *Roman linen*. And let him use glass utensils [such as] *white glassware*.
- H. And let him hire workers but not sit with them [such as] *those that work with oxen who can cause great loss [if not supervised properly]*.

I.6 A. R. Avira expounded, sometimes he said this in the name of R. Ammi and sometimes he said this in the name of R. Assi, “What is the

meaning of what is written, 'It is well with the man who deals generously and lends, who conducts his affairs with justice' (Psa. 112: 5)? A person should always eat and drink [on a standard] lower than his means. And he should dress and clothe himself in accord with his means. And he should respect his wife and children [on a standard that is] beyond his means. For they depend on him and he depends on the one who spoke and brought the world into being."

- I.7** A. R. Ayna expounded *at the gate of the house of the Exilarch*: "One who slaughters [a bird] on the Sabbath on behalf of a person who is ill is liable to cover [the blood with dust]."
- B. *Rabbah said to them, "Mute him!"*
- C. *He meant, "Take his Amora [public announcer] away from him."*
- D. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority [T. Hul. 6:1C-6:3, with some variations]:*
- E. **R. Yosé says, "As to a *koy*: they do not slaughter it on the festival, because it is a matter of doubt, but if they have slaughtered it, they do not cover up its blood" [M. Hul. 6:1C-D].**
- F. This is based on an argument *a fortiori*. [Said R. Yosé], "Now [consider that] for circumcision, in a case that is certain it overrides the Sabbath, [while] what is a matter of doubt... does not override the festival. [Then concerning] the covering up of the blood, [that in a case that is certain] does not override the Sabbath, logically in a matter of doubt [surely it] should not override the festival."
- G. They said to him, "The sounding of the shofar in the provinces [when the New Year falls on a Sabbath day] will prove [the contrary]... For even though when it is a matter of certainty, it does not override the Sabbath, [but] when it is a matter of doubt, it [still] does override the festival."
- H. Answered [R. Hiyya the son of] R. Eleazar Haqqappar Beribbi, "Now the distinctive reason that circumcision [in a matter of doubt] does not override the festival [is that when it is certainly required it does not override the nights of festivals]. But will you say so in the case of the covering up of the blood, [for when it is certainly required], it overrides the nights of festival. [Since when it is certainly required it overrides the nights of a festival, it is logical that when it is a matter of doubt it should override the festival.]"
- I. Said R. Abba, "This is one of the matters to which R. Hiyya did say there is no answer, and R. Eleazar Haqqappar Beribbi supplied the answer."

- J. *It was taught there [D] in any case: [Then concerning] the covering up of the blood, [that in a case that is certain] does not override the Sabbath*, what is the case of a matter of certainty regarding the covering up of the blood that does not override the Sabbath? Is it not the case of one who slaughters on the Sabbath on behalf of a person who is ill?
- K. *Bur perhaps this is where he violated the prohibition and slaughtered [on the Sabbath]. [No, this cannot be.] It must be a case that is comparable to the case of circumcision [on the Sabbath]. Just as for circumcision he is permitted [to perform the act] so too for the case of covering the blood it must be where he was permitted [to slaughter the animal. Accordingly, it must be that he did it for a person who was ill].*
- L. [Reverting now to E above]: **They said to him, “The sounding of the shofar in the provinces [when the New Year falls on a Sabbath day] will prove [the contrary]... For even though when it is a matter of certainty, it does not override the Sabbath, [but] when it is a matter of doubt, it [still] does override the festival.”**
- M. What is the case of a matter of doubt? *If we say there is a doubt about whether it is a weekday or a festival day, let us now consider the matter. If it overrides a day that is certainly a festival day, is there any question that it overrides a day about which there is a doubt whether it is a weekday or a festival day?*
- N. **[85a]** *Rather [the case must be] where there is a doubt whether [the person who blows the shofar] is a man or a woman. And R. Yosé is consistent with his view elsewhere. For he said that a person who is certainly a woman also may sound the shofar. [Accordingly there is not question about this case of doubt while the question remains about the law in a case of doubt for a koy.]*
- O. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority: The sons of Israel may lay their hands [on the sacrifice]. But the daughters of Israel may not lay their hands. [The verse is: “He shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him” (Lev. 1: 4).] R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, “Women are permitted to lay their hands [on the sacrifice].” [And for Yosé the principle may be extended to instruct us that women may sound the shofar.]*
- P. Said Rabina, “But according to what the rabbis said [that a woman cannot sound the shofar] there is another form of refutation [in this logical argument]. What is the case regarding the sounding of the shofar? Where it is certain [that it is the festival], it overrides the Sabbath in the Temple. What can you say regarding the

covering of the blood where there is no case at all [that overrides the Sabbath]?”
[The cases are therefore not comparable.]

- Q. [Consider again the previous text at F]: **Answered [R. Hiyya the son of] R. Eleazar Haqqappar Beribbi, “Now the distinctive reason that circumcision [in a matter of doubt] does not override the festival [is that when it is certainly required it does not override the nights of festivals].**
- R. *Is it just on festival nights that circumcision is not practiced? Is it practiced on other nights?*
- S. [No.] *Rather [this is how you should state the matter]:* What is the case regarding circumcision? It is not practiced at night as it is during the day. What can you say about the covering of the blood? It is practiced at night just as it is during the day.
- T. [Repeating G]: **Said R. Abba, “This is one of the matters to which R. Hiyya did say there is no answer, and R. Eleazar Haqqappar Beribbi supplied the answer.”**

6:2

- A. (1) **He who slaughters [a wild beast or a bird] and it turns out to be terefah,**
- B. (2) **he who slaughters for the purpose of idolatry,**
- C. (3) **he who slaughters an unconsecrated [wild animal or bird] inside [the Temple] or consecrated ones outside [M. 5:1],**
- D. (4) **a wild beast and a bird which are to be stoned —**
- E. **R. Meir declared liable [for the covering up of the blood] [M. 5:3].**
- F. **And sages declare free [of the liability].**
- G. (1) **He who slaughters [a wild beast or a bird] and it is made carrion by his own deed,**
- H. (2) **he who pierces [the windpipe],**
- I. (3) **he who tears out [the windpipe],**
- J. **is free [of the obligation] to cover up [the blood].**
- I.1** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, “Rabbi concurred with the words of R. Meir regarding the prohibition against slaughtering it and its offspring on the same day. And he repeated it here attributing it to the sages. And [he concurred with the words] of R. Simeon regarding the obligation to cover the blood. And he repeated it here, attributing it to the sages.”
- B. *On what basis* did R. Meir [rule as he did] regarding the prohibition against slaughtering it and its offspring on the same day?

- C. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “He derived it from the common use of the word ‘slaughter’ [in our case and in the case of sacrifices that were] slaughtered outside [the Temple].” [The verses are: “If any man of the house of Israel kills (i.e., slaughters) an ox or a lamb or a goat in the camp, or kills (slaughters) it outside the camp” (Lev. 17: 3). And whether the mother is a cow or a ewe, you shall not kill (slaughter) both her and her young in one day” (Lev. 22:28).] What is the case there? We consider an improper act of slaughter to be a valid act of slaughter. So too here an improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter.
- D. And R. Simeon *on what basis* [did he dispute this view]?
- E. Said R. Mani bar Patish, “He derived it from the verse, [When Joseph saw Benjamin with them, he said to the steward of his house, ‘Bring the men into the house], and slaughter an animal and make ready, [for the men are to dine with me at noon’] (Gen. 43:16). What is the case there? It is a proper act of slaughter [that he instructed them to perform]. So too here it must be a proper slaughter [to be deemed a valid act].”
- F. *And why does R. Meir not derive [the same conclusion] from, “slaughter an animal”?*
- G. [He does not because he holds the view that] we may deduce a conclusion from the common use of the word ‘slaughter’ [*st*]. But we cannot deduce a conclusion from the use of ‘slaughter’ [*st*] based on the use of [a different root], ‘slaughter an animal’ [*tb*].
- H. *What difference does it make [that we have different terms here]? Lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority by the House of R. Ishmael: [The verse says], “And the priest shall come again [on the seventh day, and look; and if the disease has spread in the walls of the house] (Lev. 14:39)... Then the priest shall go [and look; and if the disease has spread in the house, it is a malignant leprosy in the house; it is unclean]” (Lev. 14:44). [The term] “come again” is common to [the term] “go” [as far as deducing conclusions regarding the rules].*
- I. [This objection based on the teaching of the house of R. Ishmael is not applicable to our circumstance.] *Their concern applies where there is no identical term* [to compare to in another verse for the purposes of making a deduction concerning the law]. *But where there is an identical term, we must derive any inference from the [verse with the] identical term.*
- J. *And why does R. Simeon not deduce a conclusion from the common use of the term in the verse concerning the slaughter of sacrifices outside the Temple?*
- K. *[He holds the view that] we deduce a conclusion from one [case of the slaughter of] an unconsecrated animal to another [such case]. But we do not deduce a*

conclusion from one [case of the slaughter of] an unconsecrated animal from a [case of the slaughter of] a consecrated animal.

- L. *But [does this not pose a difficulty then according to the view of] R. Meir?*
- M. *[He would answer], does not the prohibition against slaughtering it and its offspring on the same day apply to consecrated animals?*
- N. *This is the basis for what R. Hiyya said [in A], “Rabbi concurred with the words of R. Meir regarding the prohibition against slaughtering it and its offspring on the same day. And he repeated it here attributing it to the sages.”*
- O. *On what basis* did R. Meir [rule as he did] regarding the obligation to cover the blood?
- P. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “He derived it from the common use of the word ‘pour’ [in our case and in the case of sacrifices that were] slaughtered outside [the Temple].” [The verses are: “Any man also of the people of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, who takes in hunting any beast or bird that may be eaten shall pour out its blood and cover it with dust” (Lev. 17:13). “[... and does not bring it to the door of the tent of meeting, to offer it as a gift to the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord, bloodguilt shall be imputed to that man]; he has shed (poured) blood; [and that man shall be cut off from among his people]” (Lev. 17: 4).] What is the case there? We consider an improper act of slaughter to be a valid act of slaughter. So too here an improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter.
- Q. And [what will] R. Simeon [respond to this line of reasoning]? *It is written*, “That may be eaten.” [You cannot compare this to the case of a consecrated animal.]
- R. And [what will] R. Meir [respond to this]? This [phrase] *comes to exclude* an unclean bird [from the obligation]. [But you can make other comparisons.]
- S. And [what will] R. Simeon [respond to this]? *What is the basis for excluding an unclean bird? It is because it is not permitted for eating. A terefah-bird also is not permitted for eating [but according to Meir it is still subject to the obligation]. This is the basis for what R. Hiyya said [in A], “Rabbi concurred with the words of R. Simeon regarding the obligation to cover the blood. And he repeated it here, attributing it to the sages.”*
- I.2** A. Said R. Abba [85b], “Not for every matter did R. Meir say that an improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter. R. Meir would agree that it does not render [the animal] permitted for eating. And not for every purpose did R. Simeon say that an improper act of slaughter is not a valid act of slaughter. R. Simeon would agree that it renders [the animal] clean of the uncleanness of carrion.”

- B. Said the master, “[We learned], ‘Not for every matter did R. Meir say that an improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter. R. Meir would agree that it does not render [the animal] permitted for eating.’”
- C. *But this is obvious! Is an animal that is terefah permitted [to be eaten] on account of an act of slaughter?”*
- D. *No. It is necessary [to state the matter for clarification of the law in the case of] one who slaughtered a terefah-animal and found in it a live nine-month old foetus. You might have concluded that it makes sense to say that since R. Meir said, “An improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter,” that the slaughter of the mother will be effective [for the offspring] and it will not need its own act of slaughter. It makes the novel point [that, “It does not render the animal permitted for eating”].*
- E. *But is this a proper line of reasoning? Lo, did not R. Meir say, “A live birth from a [properly] slaughtered animal needs [its own act of] slaughter.” [It is surely obvious that his view would be that the offspring needs its own act of slaughter in the case of a live birth from an animal that was itself subjected to an improper act of slaughter.]*
- F. *No. It is necessary [to state the matter]. For Rabbi reasons in accord with the view of R. Meir and he reasons in accord with the view of the rabbis.*
- G. *He reasons in accord with the view of R. Meir who said, “An improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter.” And he reasons in accord with the view of the rabbis who said, “The act of slaughter of its mother renders it clean.” [Accordingly you might conclude] that the slaughter of the mother will be effective [for the offspring] and it will not need its own act of slaughter. It makes the novel point [that, “It does not render the animal permitted for eating”].*
- H. [Returning to Abba’s statement at A]: “And not for every purpose did R. Simeon say that an improper act of slaughter is not a valid act of slaughter. R. Simeon would agree that it renders [the animal] clean of the uncleanness of carrion.”
- I. *But this is obvious! For said R. Judah, said Rab, and some say that this was taught in a Tannaite teaching: Scripture stated, “And if from among any animal [of which you may eat] dies, he who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening” (Lev. 11:39); “From among” implies] some of the animals render unclean and some of the animals do not render unclean. And which is it [that does not render unclean]? It is a terefah-animal that was slaughtered (b. 74a, V.1 C).*

- J. *But it is necessary [to state the rule to exclude a case where] he slaughtered a terefah-animal and it was an unconsecrated animal [slaughtered] in the Temple court. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: He who slaughters a terefah-animal, and likewise he who slaughters [an apparently normal animal] and it is found to be a terefah, both of them unconsecrated animals [slaughtered] in the Temple court — R. Simeon permits them to derive from them benefit. And the sages prohibit. You might have concluded that it makes sense to say that since R. Simeon said they are permitted to derive from them benefit, it seems logical to conclude that this is not deemed an act of slaughter in any respect. It would make sense to maintain then that it [the slaughter] does not render it [the animal] clean from the uncleanness of carrion. It comes to make the novel point [that, “It renders the animal clean of the uncleanness of carrion”].*
- K. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye, “Does R. Simeon reason in accord with the view that [the slaughter of] an unconsecrated animal in the Temple court [is prohibited] on the authority of the Torah?”*
- L. *He said to him, “Yes. For it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **R. Simeon says, ‘Unconsecrated beasts that are slaughtered in the Temple courtyard are to be burned. And so: A wild animal that is slaughtered in the Temple courtyard’ [M. Tem. 7:4 F-G]. This makes perfect sense if you say that [it is prohibited] on the authority of the Torah. That is why we decree [a prohibition] for a wild animal incidental to [the prohibition] for a beast. But if you say that [it is prohibited] on the authority of the rabbis [to begin with, then we have the following situation]. A beast [that is not consecrated is prohibited to be slaughtered in the Temple court] on what basis? [We decree against it] lest perhaps [this will lead to confusion and] they come to eat Holy Things outside [the Temple]. This itself would be a decree [of the rabbis]. Would we then go and establish [another] decree to extend this [original] decree?” [We would not. Hence, according to Simeon, since we do make a decree it must be that he holds the view that the original prohibition is based on the authority of the Torah.]***

I.3 A. *Worms infested the flax of R. Hiyya. He came before Rabbi [for advice]. He said to him, “Take a bird and slaughter it over the vat of water [that the flax is soaking in]. For they will smell the blood and leave the flax.”*

- B. *Now how could act in accord with this advice? Lo, was it not taught on Tannaite authority: He who slaughters and needs to use the blood, he is liable to cover it. What must he do [to kill it in order to use the blood without covering it]? Either he stabs it or he rips out its organs [b. 27b].*
- C. *When R. Dimi came [from the Land of Israel] he said [to use the blood without having to cover it], “Go and render it terefah,” is what he [Rabbi] said to him [Hiyya].”*
- D. *When Rabin came [from Israel] he said, “Go and stab it,” is what he said to him.*
- E. *According to the authority [Dimi] who holds the view [that he told him], “Go and render it terefah,” why did he not tell him to, “Go and stab it?” And if you wish to maintain it is because he holds the view that, “The Torah did not prescribe the procedures of slaughtering for fowl” (b. 4a), [therefore] stabbing it is the same as slaughtering it [and he would be liable to cover the blood if he did this], but lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: Rabbi says, “As I have commanded you’ (Deu. 12:21) — this teaches us that Moses was commanded concerning [the requirement to slaughter by cutting] the gullet and the windpipe [and the requirement to slaughter] the majority of one organ for a bird and the majority of two organs for a beast” [b. 28a]. [Accordingly, this cannot be the explanation.]*
- F. **[86a]** *[The reason he told him to render it terefah is] he stated matters in the most efficient way. It was not efficient for him to say, “Go and stab it,” for that is not an act of slaughtering at all. But [in telling him], “Go and render it terefah,” it might have made sense to maintain that an improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter and it is necessary to cover the blood. It makes the novel point [that it is not necessary] in accord with R. Hiyya bar Abba.*
- G. *And the authority who holds the view [Rabin] that he told him, “Go and stab it,” why did he not tell him, “Go and render it terefah?” And if you wish to maintain that it is because he holds the view that and improper act of slaughter is a valid act of slaughter, but lo, said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, “Rabbi concurred with the words [of R. Meir regarding the prohibition against slaughtering it and its offspring on the same day. And he repeated it here attributing it to the sages. And he concurred with the words] of R. Simeon regarding the obligation to cover the blood. And he repeated it here, attributing it to the sages” [I.1 A, above]. [Accordingly, this cannot be the explanation.]*
- H. *[The reason he told him to stab it is] he stated matters in the most efficient way. It was not efficient for him to say, “Go and render it terefah,” because an improper act of slaughter is not a valid act of slaughter. But [in telling him], “Go and stab*

it,” it might have made sense to maintain [as at D above] that, “The Torah did not prescribe the procedures of slaughtering for fowl” (b. 4a), [therefore] stabbing it is the same as slaughtering it, and he should be liable to cover the blood. It comes to make the novel point [that there are procedures for the fowl], ‘As I have commanded you’ (Deu. 12:21).

- I. *But how is it possible that worms infested his [Hiyya’s] flax [A, above]? Lo, did not Rabin bar Abba say, and some say that it was R. Abin bar Sheba, “When the residents of the diaspora came up [to Israel] the meteorites, earthquakes, winds and thunderstorms ceased. And their wine did not sour and their flax did not suffer an infestation. And the sages attributed this to [the merits of] R. Hiyya and his children” (b. Suk. 20a).*
- J. *Their merit helped protect the rest of the world. It did not work for them themselves!*
- K. *And this accords with what R. Judah said in the name of Rab. For said R. Judah, said Rab, “Every day a heavenly echo goes forth and says, ‘The entire world derives its sustenance on account of [the merit of] Hanina [b. Dosa] my son [cf. b. Ta’an. 24b-25a]. And for Hanina my son [the ascetic] it is enough if he has a qab of carob from one Sabbath even to the next.”*

6:3

- A. **A deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor who slaughtered, and others oversee them [M. 1:1] are liable to cover up [the blood].**
- B. **[If they did so] all by themselves, they are free of liability to cover up [the blood].**
- C. **And so with regard to the matter of, “It and its offspring:”**
- D. **[if] they have slaughtered and others oversee them, it is prohibited to slaughter [the offspring] after them.**
- E. **[If they did so] all by themselves,**
- F. **R. Meir permits [one] to slaughter [the offspring] after them.**
- G. **And sages prohibit.**
- H. **But they agree that if one has slaughtered [the offspring after the deaf-mute, imbecile, or minor has slaughtered the dam], he does not incur forty stripes.**
- I.1 A. *And for the rabbis what difference is there between the first rule [of the Mishnah], where they did not dispute, and the later rule [of the Mishnah], where they did dispute?*

- B. *In [respect to the ruling of] the first rule if we say that they are liable to cover the blood, people will say that their act of slaughter is fine and will come to eat from what they slaughtered.*
- C. *But from [the ruling] of the later rule I also [would conclude] that because the rabbis say that it is prohibited to slaughter [the second animal] after they [slaughtered the first], people will say that their act of slaughter is fine and will come to eat from what they slaughtered.*
- D. *[The cases are different.] In the [case presented in] later rule, people will say [he does not slaughter the second animal] because he does not need any more meat [and not because the act of slaughter for the first one was valid].*
- E. *But then in the [case presented in] the first rule, people will say that [he covers the blood] to clean up his yard [and not because he is liable to do so].*
- F. *[This may be true. But] if he slaughtered at a trash heap, will you be able to say this? Or if he sought a ruling [from a court as to whether he was liable to cover the blood and they ruled that he was liable] will you be able to say [that their act of slaughter in general is not fine]?*
- G. *But then according to your logic in the [case presented in] the last text, if he sought a ruling [and was told not to slaughter the second animal] will you be able to say [that their slaughter in general is not fine]?*
- H. *Rather it must be the case that the rabbis disputed the entire matter [both cases]. But they postponed until R. Meir had presented the whole matter and then they disputed his view.*
- I. *Now the view of the rabbis makes perfect sense because it presents a stringency [in a case of doubt]. But what is the basis for the view of R. Meir?*
- J. Said R. Jacob, said R. Yohanan, “R. Meir used to declare one who ate from what they slaughtered liable on account of [eating] carrion.”
- K. *What is the basis for this view?*
- L. Said R. Ammi. “It is because the majority of their actions are flawed.”
- M. Said R. Pappa to R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, and some say R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said to R. Pappa, “*Why specify that a majority [of their actions are flawed]? Even if a minority [are flawed] it also would be the case [that we should declare the animal carrion]. For lo, R. Meir shows concern for the minority [b. 6a]. Now you combine this minority [of cases] together with the presumption [that the animal is forbidden for eating until it is properly slaughtered], and you have undermined the majority [of cases where they would perform a proper act of slaughter].*”

- N. *For it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: A child [who is unclean] who is found at the side of the dough and the dough is in his hand — R. Meir declares clean. And sages declare unclean, for it is the way of the child to slap [dough] [M. Toh. 3:8 A-D]. And we say what is the basis for the view of R. Meir. He reasons that the majority of children slap and a minority do not slap. And the dough itself retains a presumption of cleanness. You combine [86b] the minority together with the presumption, and you have undermined the majority.*
- O. [Carrying this reasoning further]: If they said that it is clean in a case of doubt with regard to uncleanness, they should accordingly say that it is permitted in a case of doubt with regard to a prohibition. [Therefore in our case, Meir permits them to slaughter the second animal, even though he shows concern for a minority of cases, and they might have slaughtered it properly, since we say that the majority of their actions are flawed and the presumption is that the animal is forbidden until slaughtered (Rashi)].
- I.2** A. Rabbi taught in accord with the view of R. Meir. And Rabbi taught in accord with the view of sages. *Which of these was his last [and definitive ruling]?*
- B. *Come and take note: R. Abba the son of R. Hiyya bar Abba and R. Zira were standing in the market place of Caesarea near the door of the house of study. R. Ammi came out and found them there.*
- C. *He said to them, “Did I not instruct you that during the session of the house of study you should not stand outside lest there be those who need to know a tradition and there be trouble [because they cannot ascertain in your absence what is the tradition]?”*
- D. *R. Zira went in. R. Abba did not go in. They were sitting and asking [in the session], “Which of these was his last [and definitive ruling]?”*
- E. *Said to them R. Zira, “I did not know [that this question was under discussion]. I could have asked the elder [R. Abba]. Perhaps he heard from his father and his father heard from R. Yohanan [which one was the definitive ruling]. For R. Hiyya bar Abba used to review his learning before R. Yohanan every thirty days.”*
- F. *What was the outcome of the issue? Come and take note: R. Eleazar sent to the diaspora [to Babylonia], “Rabbi taught in accord with the view of R. Meir.”*
- G. *But lo, he also taught in accord with the rabbis. But it must be that you derive from this that this was his definitive ruling.*
- H. *We do derive this conclusion.*

6:4 A-D

- A. (1) [If] one has slaughtered a hundred wild beasts in one place, a single covering up of the blood [serves] for all of them.
- B. (2) [If one has slaughtered] a hundred birds in one place, a single covering up of the blood [serves] for all of them.
- C. (3) [If one has slaughtered] a wild beast and a bird in one place, a single covering up of the blood [serves] for all of them.
- D. R. Judah says, “[If] one has slaughtered a wild beast, he should cover up [its blood], and afterward let him slaughter the bird.”

- I.1 A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* [“Any man also of the people of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, who takes in hunting any beast or bird that may be eaten shall pour out its blood and cover it in dust” (Lev. 17:13).] “Any beast” means any number of beasts, whether many or few. “Any... bird” means any number of birds, whether many or few.
- B. Based on this they said, (1) [If] one has slaughtered a hundred wild beasts in one place, a single covering up of the blood [serves] for all of them. (2) [If one has slaughtered] a hundred birds in one place, a single covering up of the blood [serves] for all of them. (3) [If one has slaughtered] a wild beast and a bird in one place, a single covering up of the blood [serves] for all of them [M. 6:4 A-C].
- C. R. Judah says, “[If] one has slaughtered a wild beast, he should cover up [its blood], and afterward let him slaughter the bird.” [M. 6:4D]. As it is written, “Any beast or bird.”
- D. They said to him, “Lo, it is written, ‘For the life of every creature is the blood of it; [therefore I have said to the people of Israel, You shall not eat the blood of any creature, for the life of every creature is its blood; whoever eats it shall be cut off]’ (Lev. 17:14).”
- E. *What did they answer him?*
- F. *This is what the rabbis said to him, “This word ‘or’ [as in ‘Any beast or bird’] is needed to separate [beast from bird, i.e., that you do not need to slaughter both to be liable to cover the blood.]”*
- G. *And R. Judah [hold the view that] we derive that they separate [beast from bird] from the words ‘its blood’ in the verse.*
- H. *And the rabbis [hold the view that] the words ‘its blood’ mean all blood [is forbidden]. As it is written, “For the life of every creature is the blood of it.”*

- I.2** A. Said R. Hanina, “R. Judah would agree that with regard to reciting a blessing [over the acts of slaughtering a beast and a bird, M. **6:4 D**], that he recites only one blessing [even though the act of covering the blood interposes].”
- B. *Said Rabina to R. Aha the son of Raba, and some say R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi, “How is this different from [the ruling of the students of Rab]?”*
- C. *For R. Brona and R. Hananel, students of Rab, were sitting at a dinner. R. Yeba the elder was standing near them. They said to him, “Let us recite the blessing [after the meal].”*
- D. *Then they said to him, “Let us have something to drink.”*
- E. *R. Yeba the elder said to them, “This is what Rab said, ‘As soon as one says, Let us recite the blessing, [the meal is over and] it is prohibited for him to drink wine [unless he recites another blessing before drinking].’”*
- F. *Here too, as soon as he gets involved in covering the blood, he is liable to recite another blessing [for his next act of slaughter].*
- G. *But are these cases comparable? There [regarding the meal] it is impossible for him to drink [more wine] and to recite the blessing [over the meal] at the same time. Here [in the case of slaughtering] it is possible for him to slaughter with one hand and to cover the blood with the other at the same time.*

6:4 E-G

- E. **[If] he slaughtered [a wild beast or a bird] and he did not cover up [its blood] and another person saw him, he [the other person] is liable to cover up [the blood].**
- F. **[If] he covered up [the blood] and it became uncovered, he is free of liability to cover it up [again].**
- G. **[If] the wind [blew dirt and] covered it up [and it became uncovered], he is liable to cover it up.**
- I.1** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “[He] shall pour out its blood and cover it with dust” (Lev. 17:13) [means] the one who pours it out should cover it. [If] he slaughtered [a wild beast or a bird] and he did not cover up [its blood] and another person saw him, on what basis is he [the other person] liable to cover up [the blood]? As it says, “Therefore I have said to the people of Israel” (Lev. 17:14). This is an admonition to all the people of Israel.*
- B. *Another Tannaite teaching: “[He] shall pour out its blood and cover it with dust” (Lev. 17:13) [means] with what he poured it out he should cover it. He*

should not cover it [by kicking dust on it] with his foot. For he should not subject the commandments to derision. [Cf. T. 6:10.]

- C. *Another Tannaite teaching: “[He] shall pour out its blood and cover it with dust” (Lev. 17:13) [means] the one who poured it out should be the one who covers it.*
- D. Once [*m’sh b*] a person slaughtered and his associate went ahead and covered the blood. And Rabban Gamaliel declared him [the associate] liable to give him [the person who slaughtered] ten gold coins.
- E. *They posed a question: Was this compensation for [depriving him of] performing a commandment or of reciting a blessing? In what case is there a practical difference [between these alternative explanations]? In [the case of one who goes ahead and deprives his associate of] reciting the blessing over the meal. If you say it is compensation for the performance of a commandment, then it is one [commandment that he deprived him of fulfilling]. But if you say that it is compensation for the recitation of a blessing, then here there are four [blessings that he deprived him of reciting]. Which is it?*
- F. *Come and take note: A certain Sadducee said to Rabbi, “The one who formed the mountains did not create the winds. And the one who created the winds did not form the mountains. For it is written, ‘For lo, he who forms the mountains, and creates the wind’ (Amo. 4:13).”*
- G. *He said to him, “Fool! Look at the end of the verse, ‘[For lo, he who forms the mountains, and creates the wind, and declares to man what is his thought; who makes the morning darkness, and treads on the heights of the earth] -- the Lord, the God of hosts, is his name!’ (Amo. 4:13).”*
- H. *He said to him, “Give me three days and I will return with a decisive refutation.”*
- I. *Rabbi sat and fasted for three days. When he was about to eat they said to him, “A Sadducee is at the gate.”*
- J. *He said, “They gave me poison for food” (Psa. 69:21).*
- K. *He said to him, “Rabbi, I bring you good tidings.*
- L. *He [the other one] could not find an answer and he threw himself off the roof and died.”*
- M. *He said to him, “Do you wish to dine with me?”*
- N. *He said to him, “Yes.”*

- O. After they ate and drank he [Rabbi] said to him, “Would you prefer to drink the cup [of wine over which you will recite] the blessings? Or would you rather have forty gold coins?”
- P. He said to him, “I would rather drink the cup over which one recites the blessings.”
- Q. A heavenly echo went forth and proclaimed, “The cup of wine over which one recites the blessings is worth forty gold coins.”
- R. Said R. Isaac, “They still consider that family [of the opponent of Rabbi] among the greatest in Rome. And they call it the family of Bar Lulianus.”

II.1 A. [If] he covered up [the blood] and it became uncovered, he is free of liability to cover it up [again] [M. 6:4 F]. *Said R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi, “Why is this different from the obligation to return a lost object?” For said the master, “You shall take them back to your brother” (Deu. 22: 1) [means] even a hundred times.*

B. *He said to him, “There, no exclusion is written in the verse. Here, an exclusion is written in the verse: ‘[And he shall] cover it with dust.’”*

III.1 A. [If] the wind [blew dirt and] covered it up [and it became uncovered], he is liable to cover it up [M. 6:4 G]. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Yohanan, “They taught this matter only where it again became uncovered. But where it did not again become uncovered, his is exempt from the obligation to cover it.”*

B. *But who cares if it again became uncovered? Lo, the [obligation] was already deferred [when the wind covered it].*

C. *Said R. Pappa, “This means that there is no deferral for the performance of commandments.”*

D. *And how is this different from what was taught on Tannaite authority: One who slaughters, and the blood is absorbed into the ground, he is liable to cover the blood?*

E. That is where the outline [of the blood] is visible.

6:5-6C

6:5

- A. **Blood that was mixed with water,**
- B. **if it has the appearance of blood,**
- C. **one is liable to cover it up.**
- D. **[If] it was mixed with wine, they regard it as if it were water.**

E. [If] it was mixed up with blood of a [domesticated] beast [87b] or with blood of a wild beast, they regard it as if it were water.

F. R. Judah says, “Blood does not annul blood.”

6:6

A. Blood that splashes and that is on the knife,

B. one is liable to cover it up.

C. Said R. Judah, “Under what circumstances? When there is there only that blood. But [if] there is there blood other than that, he is free [of the liability] to cover it up.”

I.1 A. *It was taught there in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: Blood that was mixed with water, if it [the mixture] has the appearance of blood, it is valid. [If] it was mixed with wine, they regard it as if it were water [and if the mixture is blood-color, it is valid]. [If] it [blood of Holy Things] was mixed with the blood of a beast or with the blood of a fowl [that were unconsecrated], they regard it as if it were water. R. Judah says, “Blood [under any circumstances] does not annul blood” [M. Zeb. 8:6].*

B. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, “They taught this rule [of M. 6:7 A-C] only where the water fell into the blood. But where the blood fell into the water, as each [drop falls in] it is annulled.”

C. Said R. Pappa, “To the matter of covering the blood, this rule does [of B] not apply. [We have a principle that] you do not defer commandments.”

D. Said R. Judah, said Samuel, “With any reddish [mixture of blood and water] they may attain atonement [through its use in the sacrificial rite], and they may render [foods] susceptible to uncleanness, and they are liable to cover it [after slaughtering an animal].”

E. *What novel point does this make? That they may attain atonement was taught elsewhere on Tannaite authority. That they are liable to cover it was taught elsewhere on Tannaite authority.*

F. *We need [to stipulate the rule to teach] that they may render [foods] susceptible [with this mixture].*

G. *But it also [was taught on Tannaite authority that both liquids render susceptible]. [Accordingly] if it is deemed blood it surely renders susceptible. And if it is deemed water it surely renders susceptible.*

- H. *No [this is not a valid line of reasoning]. We need to [stipulate it explicitly for a case where] he mixed it with rain water. [That renders susceptible only if subject to active intention that it be put on the foods.] But rainwater also will render susceptible because when he takes it and pours it [into the blood] he has demonstrated his intention [to use it].*
- I. *No [this is not a valid line of reasoning]. [We may be dealing with a case where the mixture occurred by itself [i.e., the rain water fell into the blood]. [We need then to stipulate the rule, as E says, for this case.]*
 - J. *R. Assi of Nehar Bil says, “[This rule applies] to the clear liquid of the blood itself. [If it has the appearance of blood it can render foods susceptible to uncleanness.]”*
 - K. *R. Jeremiah of Difti said, “[One who drinks such liquid] is subject to the punishment of extirpation. And that is only where there is an olive’s bulk of [congealed] blood [in with the clear liquid of the blood itself].”*

- I.2** A. *In a Tannaite tradition it was taught:* [A mixture of water with blood from a corpse] renders unclean in a tent as long as there is a quarter-log [of blood in the mixture].
- B. *It was taught there on Tannaite authority:* **Every liquid substance that exudes from a corpse is clean except for its blood. [And blood] as long as it is reddish in appearance, it renders objects unclean [that are together with it] in a tent [cf. T. Ahilot 4:9; T. Mak. 3:15].**
- C. *But is it the case that,* Every liquid substance from a corpse is clean [except for its blood]? *They raised a contradiction:* **The liquids [that exude from] the *tebul-yom* are like the liquids that he touches: [88a] these and those are not susceptible to uncleanness. All other sources of uncleanness, whether minor or major — the liquids that exude from them are like liquids that he touches: these and those are in the first remove of uncleanness, except for the liquid that [itself] is a Father of Uncleanness [M. Tebul Yom 2:1].**
- D. *What is meant by minor, and what is meant by major? Is it not the case that minor [means] a dead creeping thing and a zab, and that major [means] a corpse? No. Minor [means] a dead creeping thing, and major [means] a zab. [And liquid from a corpse is not included in the rule.]*

E. *What is the difference with regard to the law between the zab for whom the rabbis issued a decree [regarding the liquids that issue from him], and a corpse for which the rabbis did not issue a decree? For a zab, because people do not avoid contact with him, the rabbis issued a decree. For a corpse, because people do avoid contact with it, the rabbis did not issue a decree.*

II.1 A. Blood that splashes and that is on the knife, [one is liable to cover it up] [M. 6:6 A-B].

B. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “And cover it with dust” (Lev. 17:13) — this teaches us that, **Blood that splashes and that is on the knife, one is liable to cover it up. Said R. Judah, “Under what circumstances? When there is there only that blood. But [if] there is there blood other than that, he is free [of the liability] to cover it up.”***

C. *Another Tannaite teaching: “And cover it with dust” (Lev. 17:13) — this teaches us that he is liable to cover up all of its blood. Based on this they said, Blood that spurts and that is on the sides [of the neck where it is slaughtered], one is liable to cover it up.*

D. *Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “Under what circumstances? Where he did not cover the life-blood [that spurts out at the time of slaughter]. But where he did cover the life-blood, he is exempt from the obligation to cover [this other blood].”*

E. *Concerning what interpretation of law do they dispute? The rabbis reason that [when the Torah says], “its blood” it means every bit. And Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel reasons that “its blood” means the special blood [that spurts out at the time of slaughter].*

6:7

A. With what do they cover up [the blood], and with what do they not cover up the blood?

B. They cover up the blood (1) with fine dung and (2) with fine sand and (3) with lime and (4) with [pieces of] potsherd and (5) with brick and (6) with the plug of a jar [both (5,6)] of which one has crushed.

C. But they do not cover up the blood either (1) with coarse dung or (2) with coarse sand or (3) with a brick or (4) with the plug of a jar neither [(3,4)] of which one has crushed.

D. And one should not turn a utensil over on it.

E. A general principle did Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel state: “With something in which one grows plants, they cover it up, and with something in which one does not grow plants, they do not cover it up.”

I.1 A. *What is the definition of “fine sand”?*

B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Yohanan, “Any [sand] that the potter does not have to crush up [before using it].”

C. *And there is a version that teaches this regarding the last text of the Mishnah [C]:* **But they do not cover up the blood either (1) with coarse dung or (2) with coarse sand.** *What is the definition of “coarse sand”?* Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Yohanan, “Any [sand] that the potter does have to crush up [before using it].”

D. *What is the difference between the versions? The difference between them is where he doesn’t really have to [crush it up] because it crumbles on its own. [According to the first version they may use it. According to the second, they may not (Rashi).]*

I.2 A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* “And cover it [with dust]” (Lev. 17:13) — you might infer that he may cover it with stones or that he may overturn a vessel on it. It comes to teach us, “With dust.” I only have [derived from this that he may cover it] with dust. What is the source that includes [in the rule that he may cover it with, **(1) with fine dung and (2) with fine sand** and with crushings of stones, and crushings of shards, and fine scrapings of flax, **[88b]** and fine sawdust, **and (3) with lime and (4) with [pieces of] potsherd and (5) with brick and (6) with the plug of a jar [both (5,6)] of which one has crushed?** It comes to teach, “And cover it.”

B. You might infer that I include even, **(1) with coarse dung or (2) with coarse sand** or with crushings of metal vessels, or **(3) with a brick or (4) with the plug of a jar neither [(3,4)] of which one has crushed**, or with flour or bran or coarse bran. It comes to teach, “With dust.”

C. And why would you see fit to include these and exclude those? After Scripture included some with its usage and excluded others with its usage I see fit to include all those [substances] that are a kind of “dust.” And I see fit to exclude all those [substances] that are not a kind of “dust.”

D. *It makes sense to maintain as follows:* “And cover it” is a general rule; “With dust” is a specification. Where there is a general rule and a specification we only have in the general rule what is found in the specification. *What is [a kind of] “dust” is [included]. Any other substance is not [included].*

E. Said R. Mari, “Because we have here a general rule that must be qualified by a specification [your conclusion is not warranted]. For the principle is that any general rule that must be qualified by a specification is not subject to [the ordinary method of] interpretation of a general rule and a specification.”

I.3 A. R. Nahman bar R. Hisda expounded, “They may cover [the blood] only with a substance in which you may plant and things will grow.”

B. *Said Raba, “What a boorish thing to say!”*

C. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac to Raba, “What is so boorish about that? I said it and I said it based on this Tannaite teaching: If one was travelling in the wilderness and had no dust to cover it — he should scrape a gold denar and cover it [with the scrapings]. [The desert sand is not valid.] If one was travelling on a ship and had no dust to cover it — he should burn his cloak and cover it [with the ashes].”*

D. *Now we do find that ashes are called “dust.”* [Cf. Num. 19:17, “For the unclean they shall take some ashes (the word is ‘dust’) of the burnt sin offering, and running water shall be added in a vessel.”]

E. *But what is the source of the assertion that [scrapings of] a gold denar [are called dust]?*

F. Said R. Zira, “[It is based on the verse], ‘[Its stones are the place of sapphires], and it has dust of gold’ (Job. 28: 6).”

I.4 A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “They may cover [the blood] only with dust,” the words of the House of Shammai.*

B. And the House of Hillel say, “We find ashes that are called dust. As it says, ‘For the unclean they shall take some ashes (the word is ‘dust’) of the burnt sin-offering, and running water shall be added in a vessel’ (Num. 19:17).”

B. *And [how do we interpret this in accord with the view of] the House of Shammai? [They would say that ashes might be called] “the dust of the burnt sin-offering” but they would not be called ordinary dust.*

I.5 A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: Add to them [that may be used to cover the blood] soot, stibium, and dust from chiselling [Rashi: from the grindstone]. And some say, “Even orpiment.”*

**Abraham answered, Behold, I have taken upon myself to speak
to the Lord, I who am but dust and ashes**

- I.6** A. Said Raba, “As a reward for what Abraham our forefather said, ‘[Abraham answered, Behold, I have taken upon myself to speak to the Lord], I who am but dust and ashes’ (Gen. 18:27), his descendants merited two commandments, the ashes of the Red Heifer and the dust given to the *sotah*-woman.”
- B. *And why do we not include with them [that on his merit they were given the commandment] to cover the blood with dust? For that there it is valid [to eat the animal even if he does not cover the blood. Accordingly] there is a commandment [to cover it]. But there is no benefit [directly derived from the action].*
- C. Said Raba, “As a reward for what Abraham our forefather said, **[89a]** ‘That I would not take a thread or a sandal-thong or anything that is yours, lest you should say, I have made Abram rich’ (Gen. 14:23), his descendants merited two commandments, the thread of blue [of the fringes on a garment] and the thong of the *tefillin*.”
- D. *Now it makes perfect sense [that there is merit in the commandment to wear] the thong of the tefillin. It is written, “And all the peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of the Lord; and they shall be afraid of you” (Deu. 28:10). And it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer the great says, “These [promises] refer to the tefillin for the head.” [The peoples will see from the tefillin that you are called by the name of the Lord.]*
- E. *But why [do we ascribe merit] to the thread of blue? For it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Meir says, “How different is blue from among all the colors. For blue is the color of the sea. And the sea is the same color as the firmament. And the firmament is the same color as the sapphire stone. And the sapphire stone is the same color as the throne of glory.”*
- F. *As it is written, “And they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heaven for clearness” (Exod. 24:10). And it is written, “And above the firmament over their heads there was the likeness of a throne, in appearance like sapphire; and seated above the likeness of a throne was a likeness as it were of a human form” (Eze. 1:26).*
- I.7** A. Said R. Abba, “How severe is the sin of a theft of something that is consumed. For even the completely righteous cannot return it. As it says, ‘I will take nothing but what the young men have eaten, [and the share of the men who went with me; let Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre take their share]’ (Gen. 14:24).”

- B. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, “Everywhere you find the words of R. Eliezer the son of R. Yosé the Galilean, make your ear like a funnel [to receive them].”
- C. [He said], “It was not because you were more in number than any other people that the Lord set his love upon you and chose you, for you were the fewest of all peoples” (Deu. 7: 7). Said the Holy One Blessed be He to Israel, “I adore you. For even at the time that I bestow upon you greatness, you humble yourselves before me.
- D. “I bestowed greatness upon Abraham and he said before me, ‘I am but dust and ashes’ (Gen. 18:27). [I bestowed greatness upon] Moses and Aaron and they said, ‘What are we? Your murmurings are not against us but against the Lord’ (Exod. 16: 8). [I bestowed greatness upon] David and he said, ‘But I am a worm, and no man’ (Psa. 22: 6).
- E. “But the idolaters are not [humble] like this. I bestowed greatness upon Nimrod and he said, ‘Come let us build ourselves a city, and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves...’ (Gen. 11: 4). [I bestowed greatness upon] Pharaoh and he said, ‘Who is the Lord?’ (Exo. 5: 2). [I bestowed greatness upon] Sennacherib and he said, ‘Who among all the gods of the countries have delivered their countries out of my hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?’ (2Ki. 18:35). [I bestowed greatness upon] Nebuchadnezzar and he said, ‘I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will make myself like the Most High’ (Isa. 14:14). [I bestowed greatness upon] Hiram king of Tyre and he said, ‘I am a god, I sit in the seat of the gods, in the heart of the seas’ (Eze. 28: 2).”

- I.8** A. Said Raba, and some say said R. Yohanan, “What is said concerning Moses and Aaron is greater than what is said concerning Abraham said. For concerning Abraham *it was written*, ‘I am but dust and ashes.’ But concerning Moses and Aaron *it was written*, ‘What are we?’”
- B. And said Raba, and some say R. Yohanan, “The world continues to exist because of [the merit of that humble utterance of] Moses and Aaron. *It is written there*, ‘What are we?’ *And it is written here*, ‘He stretches out the north over the void, and hangs the earth upon nothing’ (Job. 26: 7).” [The pericope makes a play on the words.]
- C. Said R. Ila, “The world continues to exist because of [the merit of] a person who controls himself (*bwl m*) in a time of contention. As it says,

‘[He] hangs the earth upon nothing (*blymh*)’ (Job. 26: 7).” [Another play on the words.]

- D. R. Abbahu said, “The world continues to exist because of [the merit of] a person who completely abases himself. As it says, ‘And underneath are the everlasting arms’ (Deu. 32:27).” [Those who make themselves low, support the world (Cashdan).]
- E. Said R. Isaac, “*Why is it written*, ‘Did you indeed decree what is right, you gods [or: in silence]? Did you judge the sons of men uprightly?’ (Psa. 58: 1). What should a person’s vocation be in this world? He should make himself mute. You might infer that do so even with regard to the words of the Torah. it comes to teach, ‘Decree what is right’ [or: speak righteousness, i.e. Torah]. You might infer that he then will become haughty. It comes to teach, ‘Judge the sons of men uprightly’ [or: evenly, i.e., with moderation].”

I.9 A. Said R. Zira, “They may cover the blood with the dust of a condemned city (cf. Deu. 13).”

B. *But why may he do this? It is prohibited to derive benefit from [the city, so Deu. 13:18].*

C. *Said Zeiri, “It was only necessary to state this on account of the dust of the earth. As it is written, ‘You shall gather all its spoil into the midst of its open square, and burn the city and all its spoil with fire’ (Deu. 13:16). This refers to whatever needs only to be gathered and burned. It excludes whatever needs to be uprooted, gathered and burned.” [Accordingly, one may use the dust of the earth of the city.]*

D. *But Raba said, “Fulfilling the commandments does not give one any benefits.” [Accordingly, to fulfill the commandment of covering the blood, one may use the dust from the city.]*

E. *Rabina sat and he stated this tradition. R. Rahumi raised an objection to Rabina. A shofar that was used for idolatry, he should not sound it [on the new year to fulfill the commandment]. Is it the case that if he sounded it, he did not fulfill the commandment? No, if he sounded it, he did fulfill the commandment. A lulab that was used for idolatry, he should not take it [on Sukkot]. Is it the case that if he took it, he did not fulfill the commandment. No, if he took it, he did fulfill the commandment. But lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: If he sounded it, he did not fulfill the commandment. If he took it, he did not fulfill the commandment.*

F. Said R. Ashi, “*Are these cases [i.e., shofar and lulab of idolatry, and dust from a condemned city] comparable? There [in the cases of lulab and shofar] [89b] we*

need a measurable object [to fulfill the commandment]. And we have a principle that using it for idolatry [figuratively] 'shatters it into particles.' [With regard to the law, it is considered as if it does not fulfill the minimum size requirements for fulfilling the commandments.] Here [with regard to dust for covering the blood] the more it is shattered into particles, the better it is to use for covering [the blood]."