



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

Moving the Pipes for Melikah

Rabbi Chiya’s sons said that the commandment of do *melikah* is to move the pipes (*wind and food*) of the bird behind the spine, and then to sever them from the back with a fingernail. Some explain that they said this is also a *valid* method, while some say that they said that this is the *required* method.

The *Gemora* says that it is logical to say that is also a valid method, since the *Mishna* says that if one slaughters a regular bird from the back, it is invalid, but if one does *melikah* on a sacrifice bird from the back, it is valid. If the pipes are moved to the back, then slaughtering would also be valid, since it would sever the pipes first. Since the *Mishna* says that the method of *melikah* is invalid when done for slaughtering, this proves that the pipes are generally not first moved to the back.

Rabbi Yannai says that the *Mishna* disproves Rabbi Chiya’s sons’ statement. The *Mishna* says that the action that is valid for slaughtering is invalid for *melikah*, and vice versa. Rabbi Yannai assumes that the *Mishna* is teaching us that moving the pipes to the back, which is valid for slaughtering, is invalid for *melikah*.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah tries to deflect this, by saying that the *Mishna* is referring to a nail, which is valid for *melikah*, but not for slaughtering.

The *Gemora* rejects this, as the *Mishna* explicitly invalidates slaughtering with a nail (*or tooth*), so this rule is not needed to teach us this.

Rabbi Yirmiyah deflects the proof, saying the *Mishna* is referring to the process of slicing back and forth, which is valid for

slaughtering, but invalid for *melikah*, which must be done by cutting down into the neck.

The *Gemora* challenges this, as some say that *melikah* is valid when done by slicing back and forth, but the *Gemora* still accepts this explanation, as we can assume that the sons of Rabbi Chiya say that *melikah* is invalid when done by slicing.

Rav Kahana says the method of doing *melikah* is cutting down into the neck.

Rabbi Avin thought that he meant that this is the *only* way of doing *melikah*, but it is invalid if done in a slicing motion.

Rabbi Yirmiyah told him that Rav Kahana was saying that cutting down is *also* valid, but slicing, which is the act done for slaughtering, is certainly valid. (19b – 20a)

Melikah vs. Slaughtering

Rabbi Yirmiyah quotes Shmuel saying that anything that is valid for slaughtering a bird (*in the front*) is valid for *melikah* of the bird (*in the back*), implying that whatever is invalid for slaughtering a bird is invalid for *melikah*.

The *Gemora* says that he is not excluding *melikah* on dislodged pipes, as Rami bar Yechezkel taught that a bird whose pipes are dislodged still may be slaughtered.

Rav Pappa explains that he is excluding *melikah* on the head itself, as it is not opposite the neck, which is the valid place for slaughtering. Although the verse explicitly mandates that *melikah* be done “opposite the back of the head,” but not the head, Rav Pappa is referring to one who began the *melikah* in

the bottom half of the head, and then finished most of it on the neck. Just as Rav Huna quoted Rav Assi invalidating slaughtering which began in the wrong place, and then concluded in the right place, Shmuel is teaching that *melikah* which began in the head is invalid, even if concluded in the neck. (20a)

Dislodged Pipes

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi that Rami bar Yechezkel's statement that there is no rule that invalidates slaughtering of a bird whose pipes were dislodged follows the opinion that the Torah does not mandate slaughtering for a bird. However, the opinion that says that Torah mandates slaughtering of a bird would say that it follows the rules of animal slaughter, and it is therefore invalid if the pipes are dislodged.

Rav Ashi answered that on the contrary, if slaughtering a bird is Rabbinic, it was patterned after slaughtering an animal, and would follow its rules. If the Torah mandated slaughtering for a bird, it is possible Hashem established different rules for different types of slaughtering.

Ravina said that Ravin bar Kisai told him that Rami bar Yechezkel's statement refers only to *melikah*, but slaughtering is invalid if the pipes are dislodged.

The *Gemora* explains that this is inconsistent with Rabbi Yirmiyah's earlier statement in the name of Shmuel, since this would be a case where slaughtering would be invalid, but *melikah* would be valid. (20a – 20b)

Backbone and most of the flesh – dead or alive?

Ze'iri says that if the backbone and most of the meat on it were severed before the pipes, the animal is not just considered unviable, but already considered dead, and is therefore a *neveilah* – carcass, which may not be eaten.

Rav Chisda supports this from a *Mishna*, which says that if one did *melikah* with a knife (*i.e.*, slaughtering from the back), the

bird makes one who eats it impure, in the manner that a *neveilah* of a kosher bird does. If severing the backbone before the pipes is not a *neveilah*, but simply a *tereifah* – torn animal, severing the pipes should then be a form of slaughtering, which makes the resulting meat prohibited, but still pure. Since the *Mishna* classifies this bird an impure *neveilah*, it proves that slaughtering the backbone and then the pipes makes the animal a *neveilah*.

The *Gemora* rejects this proof, as *melikah* done with a knife is not a valid slaughtering of the pipes.

Rav Huna explains that it is invalid, since the knife is hidden by the backbone, making it *chaladah* – burrowing.

Rava explains that it is invalid, since it cuts by pressing, making it *derisah* – pressing.

The *Gemora* explains that Rav Huna did not cite the issue of *derisah*, since he says that *melikah* may be done with a slicing motion, which is not pressing. Rava did not cite the issue of *chaladah*, as the knife is not truly hidden, but just covered above and below by the sides of the backbone.

Rava says that his true challenge on Ze'iri's statement is from *melikah* itself. If we consider a severed backbone and flesh to be dead, the act of severing the pipes in *melikah* is simply cutting dead meat, and not any form of slaughtering.

Abaye challenged this, since the same logic could be used to challenge the process of *melikah* on an *olah* bird, which must sever both pipes. Once the first pipe is severed, is the second severing not simply cutting dead meat?

Rava answered that severing the second pipe is not a slaughtering, but simply to fulfill the commandment of separating the head from the body.

The *Gemora* asks why the *Kohen* need not also cut the skin, if the goal is separation, and the *Gemora* answers that only parts



of the bird that are necessary for general slaughter (*i.e.*, the pipes) are considered an attachment.

The *Gemora* challenges this answer, as the Sages say that only most of each pipe must be cut for slaughtering, while both whole pipes must be severed for an *olah* bird.

The *Gemora* modifies the answer, saying that only parts of the bird that are involved in slaughtering (*i.e.*, the pipes) are considered an attachment.

Rava answers his challenge by explaining that *melikah* is done by severing the backbone, but not most of the flesh next to it. This prevents it from being considered dead, making the following severing of the pipes an act of *melikah*.

When Rabbi Zeira went to *Eretz Yisroel*, he found Rabbi Ami teaching the statement of Ze'iri, and he asked him how *melikah* can be done, as the pipes are being severed after the animal is dead. He thought for a moment, and then answered that only a minority of the flesh around the backbone is severed, leaving the bird alive.

The *Gemora* concludes with a supporting *braisa*, which states that the act of *melikah* on a *chata* is to first sever the backbone, but not most of the flesh around it, then severing one of the pipes, and then severing most of the flesh around the backbone. (20b – 21a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Chaladah

The *Gemora* discusses doing *melikah* with a knife, and says that it is not a valid slaughtering. Rava and Rav Huna offer different reasons that it is invalid. Rav Huna says it is *chaladah* – *burrowing*, while Rava says it is *derisah* – *pressing*, as *melikah* is not done by slicing. The *Gemora* explains that Rava does not consider this *chaladah*, as the knife is not truly hidden.

Rashi explains that Rav Huna considers it burrowing, since the backbone hides the blade of the knife.

Tosfos (20b mipnai) explains that Rashi understands the case to be a narrow knife, since a wide knife would still be visible. Furthermore, the backbone does not separate as much as the pipes themselves do, hiding the blade between the two sides of the backbone. Tosfos explains that Rav Huna considers such a slaughtering burrowing, since it is going in the opposite direction from normal, while Rava says burrowing is limited to a case where the knife is hidden, e.g., when the knife was inserted inside the throat, and then the pipes severed.

Slaughtering a Bird?

The *Gemora* discusses whether dislodging a bird's pipes is an issue, and debates whether it is an issue according to those who say that the Torah does not mandate slaughtering a bird.

Tosfos (20a lo) explains that even according to this opinion, a bird can become a *neveilah* – *carcass*. Even this opinion agrees that the Torah mandates that the bird be killed by severing the pipes, but the Torah does not mandate how the pipes be severed. Therefore, if a bird was killed without severing the pipes, it is a *neveilah*.

Rashi (27b) adds the case of the bird dying, which would make it a *neveilah* according to all opinions.

DAILY MASHAL

How a Shochet Is Tested

Our *Gemora* recounts how slaughterers were tested: "In Eretz Israel they test it (the knife) with the sun. In Nehardea they test it with water. Rav Sheishes tested it with the tip of his tongue." G-d-fearing *shochatim* in previous generations would say "In Eretz Israel they test it with the sun" – *i.e.*, they tested *shochatim* by the virtue of charity – "Charity like sunlight". "In Nehardea they tested him with water" – *i.e.*, if a *shochet* purifies himself properly. "Rav Sheishes tested him with the tip of his tongue" – if he guards his tongue (*Toras HaShechitah*).