

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Presenting the Knife

Rav Huna said: A slaughterer who does not present his knife to a Sage (*to be examined*) is to be excommunicated.

Rava said: He is to be removed (*from his job*), and we announce publicly that his meat is non-kosher.

The *Gemora* notes that they do not disagree; for Rav Huna deals with a case where the knife, upon examination, was found to be free of flaws; whereas Rava was dealing with a case where it was found to possess flaws.

Ravina said that where the knife was found to be flawed, the meat is to be smeared with dung, so that it may not even be sold to gentiles.

There was a case of a slaughterer who did not present his knife for examination to Rava bar Chinana. Rava excommunicated him, removed him from his job and announced publicly that his meat was non-kosher. Mar Zutra and Rav Ashi happened to call on Rava, who said to them, “Would you Rabbis look into this case, for there are small children dependent on him (*and perhaps there are grounds to be lenient*)”? Rav Ashi examined the knife and found it satisfactory. He reinstated him as a slaughterer. Mar Zutra asked him: Are you not concerned for the honor of the Sage? Rav Ashi replied: We were only fulfilling his mission. (18a)

Tooth and Nail

Rabbah the son of Huna said: One may slaughter in the first instance with a detached tooth or a detached fingernail.

The *Gemora* asks: But have we not learned in a *Mishna* that one may slaughter using any implement, except a harvesting sickle, a saw, teeth (*of an animal*) or a fingernail, since these strangle (*but do not cut*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Regarding teeth there is no contradiction, for Rabbah’s ruling deals with a single tooth (*which, when sharp, can cut*), whereas our *Mishna* deals with two teeth (*and, on account of the space between the teeth, it cannot be used*). Regarding a fingernail there is no contradiction, for Rabbah’s ruling deals with a nail that is detached from the finger, whereas our *Mishna* deals with a nail that is attached to the finger (*and it is in accordance with Rebbe, who holds that one may not slaughter using something that is attached*). (18a)

Harvesting Sickle



By: CY Creations

[Notice how the nicks will only tear skin when the knife goes in one direction.]

If one slaughtered with a harvesting sickle, moving it forward only (*where due to the positioning of the teeth, it will not tear the simanim*), Beis Shammai rule that the slaughtering is invalid (*as a Rabbinic decree*), but Beis Hillel declare it valid. If the teeth of the sickle were smoothed out, it is regarded as an ordinary knife.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Even when Beis Hillel declared the slaughtering valid, they


did so only with respect of removing it from the *tumah* of *neveilah*, but it is still forbidden to be eaten.

Rav Ashi said: Proof to this is from the language which was taught in the *Mishna*: Beis Shammai rule that the slaughtering is invalid (as a *Rabbinic decree*), but Beis Hillel declare it valid. It does not read that Beis Shammai forbids it and Beis Hillel permits it.

The *Gemora* asks: But according to you, shouldn't the *Mishna* read: Beis Shammai rule that it is *tamei* and Beis Hillel declare it *tahor*? Rather, it must be that the expressions 'declare valid' and 'invalid' and 'permit' and 'forbid' are one and the same. (18a)

Hagramah – Slanting the Knife

[This is the *kaneh*; the trachea. It was sent to me by Rabbi Simon Wolf: <http://www.swdaf.com/>. We thank him profusely. The cricoids cartilage is the 'great ring.' The thyroid cartilage is the 'helmet.' The area between them is known as 'the slant of the helmet.' Notice the rings below them.]



If one slaughtered within the (*great*) ring (*of the trachea*) and left a hairbreadth of it along the entire circumference (*towards the head*), the *shechitah* is valid. [The *Mishna* is

referring to the cricoid cartilage – the great ring, which forms a complete ring around the trachea. This is in contrast to the other rings of the trachea which are incomplete; they are shaped like a horseshoe. This top ring of the trachea is regarded as the uppermost limit of the prescribed area within which the slaughtering may be performed. As long as he didn't cut above the great ring, it is valid. If, however, he completed the cutting of the trachea above this area, it is regarded as *hagramah*, and is ruled to be invalid.] Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says: if he only leaves a hairbreadth along the greater part of its circumference (even if he inclined the knife upward and cut above the great ring, the slaughtering is still valid; this is because he slaughtered the greater part of the trachea correctly).

Rav and Shmuel both say that the law is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah.

However, even Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah said this only with regard to the great ring, since it (*the cartilage*) surrounds the trachea completely, but with regard to the other rings, it is not valid. [Rashi explains: These rings do not completely surround the trachea but are connected by a thick strip of tissue. These rings, therefore, being incomplete, are not regarded as the trachea, and are not the proper place for slaughtering. Accordingly, Rav and Shmuel hold that the slaughtering can only be performed by cutting either in the top ring or between the other rings.]

The *Gemora* asks: He cannot cut through the other rings! Surely it has been taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says: If one slaughtered by cutting in the other rings, although they do not surround the entire trachea, yet since they surround the greater part of it, the slaughtering is valid! The *braisa* continues: Any slanted cut (*above the top ring*) invalidates the slaughtering (even if a majority of the trachea was cut in the correct place; this reflects the view of the *Tanna Kamma* of the *Mishna*). Rabbi Chanina ben Antignos testified that any slanted cut is

permitted (*as long as he does not cut beyond the slant of the thyroid cartilage*).

Rav Yosef answered that Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah said two things (*the cutting of the greater part of the top ring is sufficient, and the rings surrounding the majority of the trachea are regarded as the trachea*), but Rav and Shmuel agreed with only one of them (*the cutting of the greater part of the top ring is sufficient*), but not with the other (*for they maintain that the rings surrounding the majority of the trachea are not regarded as the trachea*).

The *Gemora* explains Rav and Shmuel's statement: The *halachah* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah with regard to the top ring, but the *halachah* is not in accordance with his view with regard to the other rings.

When Rabbi Zeira went up to *Eretz Yisroel*, he ate there from an animal which was slaughtered above the prescribed area according to Rav and Shmuel. The people there said to him: Are you not from the place of Rav and Shmuel? He replied: Who taught it (*that they ruled that a shechitah in the rings is not valid*)? Was it not Yosef ben Chiya? He taught from everyone (*even from unreliable sources*)! When Rav Yosef heard of this, he became annoyed and said: Do I teach from everyone? Indeed, I learned it from Rav Yehudah, who (*was extremely careful in his sources*) would report in his statements of tradition even the doubt as to a certain teaching. For Rav Yehudah said: Rabbi Yirmiyah ben Abba said, and I am in doubt whether he said it in the name of Rav or in the name of Shmuel: Three ordinary people may declare (*through examining for a blemish*) a firstborn permitted for use where there is no expert available!

The *Gemora* asks: But does Rabbi Zeira not accept the rule that when a person is in a place, he must adopt the stringencies of the place which he has left and also the stringencies of the place to which he went!?

Abaye answers: This rule applies only when one travels from place to place in *Bavel*, or from place to place in *Eretz Yisroel*, or from *Eretz Yisroel* to *Bavel*, but when one travels from *Bavel* to *Eretz Yisroel*, since we are subject to their authority, we must do like they do.

Rav Ashi said: You may even hold that the rule applies when one travels from *Bavel* to *Eretz Yisroel*, but only when such a person intends to return; Rabbi Zeira, however, had no intention of returning to *Bavel*.

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: The Rabbis who came from *Mechuza (in Bavel)* said in the name of Rav Nachman that an animal which was slaughtered above the prescribed area according to Rav and Shmuel is permitted. [*Evidently, in Bavel, they did not agree with Rav and Shmuel!?*]

Rav Yosef replied: Every river has its own course. [*Some places in Bavel did like Rav and Shmuel, and others did not.*]

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish held that if the trachea was cut at the point of the helmet (*above where it begins to slant*), the *shechitah* was valid. Rabbi Yochanan said: Too much! Indeed, too much! [*That is certainly a point which is not regarded as the place of the shechitah.*] (18a – 18b)