



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

Rav Idi bar Avin raised the following objection (*on Levi the elder's opinion that the slaughtering is classified as a shechitah only upon the conclusion of the severing*) from the following *Mishna*: If a man slaughtered the *pesach* offering (*while having chametz in his possession*) during the festival (*in a case where he had lost the original animal and offered another on the fourteenth; he then found the initial one*) for its own sake, he has not violated the prohibition (*against offering the pesach sacrifice while having chametz in his possession; included in this prohibition is slaughtering any sacrifice during the festival; however, he only incurs liability if the sacrifice is valid, and in this case, it is invalid, for a pesach sacrifice can only be offered on the afternoon of the fourteenth*); if, however, he offered it not for its own sake (*he had intention for a shelamim*), he has violated the prohibition (*for a pesach sacrifice for the sake of a shelamim is a valid offering*). And we asked upon it as follows: The reason this is so is only because it was slaughtered not for its own sake, but if it were slaughtered without any specific intention, it follows that he would not be liable. But why is no liability incurred? Isn't the *pesach* sacrifice at any time of the year regarded as a *shelamim* (*automatically*)? This *Mishna* will prove the rule that for a *pesach* sacrifice to become valid as a *shelamim* at any other time of the year, its designation (*as a pesach*) must first be uprooted! And Rabbi Chiya bar Gamda said: It was suggested by the scholars of the assembly that the circumstances of the case were that the owners of this *pesach* sacrifice were rendered *tamei* through corpse *tumah*, so that they needed to postpone

the offering of the *pesach* sacrifice until the *Pesach Sheini* (*the fourteenth of Iyar is given as a 'second chance' to offer the sacrifice; this option was given to those individuals who were tamei through corpse tumah on the first Pesach*); therefore, this sacrifice, when slaughtered during the first *Pesach* without any specific designation, would remain for its own sake. Now, only in this particular case must the designation of the *pesach* sacrifice be uprooted (*before it is valid as a shelamim*), but in any other case, uprooting is not necessary.

The *Gemora* concludes its challenge: This is understandable if you were to say that the slaughtering is classified as a *shechitah* during the entire process of the slaughtering from beginning to end, for then the *pesach* sacrifice is rendered invalid at the beginning of the slaughtering (*and therefore no liability is incurred*); but if you say that the slaughtering is classified as a *shechitah* only upon the conclusion of the severing, then as soon as he commenced to slaughter it, it can no longer be intended to serve as the *pesach* sacrifice on *Pesach Sheini* (*for it cannot be retained until then*), and as he continues to slaughter, he should in fact be slaughtering a *shelamim* (so consequently, he should incur liability for slaughtering a valid *shelamim* on *Pesach* while in possession of *chametz*)!?

Abaye answered him: Granted that this animal can no longer serve as a *pesach* sacrifice, but its value as a *pesach* sacrifice has not been removed (*for after the initial cut, it*

can be redeemed like any other blemished animal, and its money can be used to purchase a replacement pesach sacrifice). And should you say that in order to redeem a consecrated animal, it requires a “standing and appraisal” (before the Kohen in order to be redeemed; and this animal, at its present condition, cannot stand on its legs), I can reply that we have learned in a *Mishna*: If one cut both pipes or the greater portion of both pipes, and the animal still jerks, it is nevertheless regarded as alive for all purposes (and can be redeemed).

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If one slaughtered in two or three places (first he severed the pipe a little bit, then, just below the initial cut, he severed a greater part of it, and then just below that, he cut a little bit again), the slaughtering is valid. But when I reported this ruling to Samuel, he said to me: We must have a slaughtering whose cut is discernible (a wide-open cut), and it is not so here.

The *Gemora* notes that Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish also maintains the opinion that the cut must be discernible, for Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: From where do we know that the *shechitah* must consist of a cut which is discernible? It is from the verse: *Their tongue is a sharpened arrow, it speaks deceit*.

Rabbi Elozar asked from the following *Mishna*: If two people hold a knife and slaughtered, even if one cut higher up (towards the head) and the other cut lower down (away from the head), the *shechitah* is valid. Now, why is this so? There is not a discernible cut here!?

Rabbi Yirmiyah said to him: Our *Mishna* refers to a case where two people are holding one knife (at an angle).

Rabbi Abba said to him: If so, let us consider that which a *Tanna* taught regarding this *Mishna*: And we are not

concerned that one will render the animal a *tereifah* on account of the other. Now, it is understandable if you say that it is referring to the case of two knives and two people (each holding a knife), for then you might have thought that we should be concerned lest they come to rely one upon the other, and this one will not cut the required greater portion of the pipes, and the other one will not cut the required greater portion of the pipes; we are therefore taught that there is no concern for this. But if you say that it is referring to the case of two people holding one knife, then why did the *Tanna* state that there is no concern that one will render the animal *tereifah* on account of the other? He should rather have stated that there is no concern that one will cause the other to press the knife (into the neck, for they are each holding the knife on opposite ends; and that would have invalidated the *shechitah*)?

Rabbi Avin said to him: The correct version of the teaching was that there is no concern that one will cause the other to press into the neck.

Rabbi Avin asked from the following *braisa*: If one cut the esophagus low down (close to the chest) and the trachea high up, or the esophagus high up and the trachea low down, the *shechitah* is valid. Now, why is this so? There is not a discernible cut here!?

He raised the objection and answered it himself, as follows: The cutting, in this instance, was slanting, like the writing of a pen (and henceforth, the cut is discernible).

There was an ox that was cut in two or three places, and Rav Nachman bar Shmuel bar Marsa came and obtained some of the choicest meat from this animal. Rabbi Zeira said to him: You have now (through your actions) taught us, our master, that our *Mishna* refers even to the case of two knives and two people.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If one burrowed the knife between the two pipes and cut them (by first cutting the lower pipe under cover of the upper one, and then withdrawing the knife and cutting the upper one), the *shechitah* is invalid (*for burrowing the knife before the shechitah is one of the five disqualifications to shechitah*). If he burrowed it underneath the skin (*and then severed the pipes*), the *shechitah* is valid.

The *Gemora* notes the novelty of this teaching (*for in fact, there is a Mishna that teaches this disqualification*): If we would have only learned that *Mishna*, I might have argued that only there is the *shechitah* invalid because (*after the burrowing*) he cut the pipes from below upwards, which is not the usual way of *shechitah*, but where he cut the pipes from above downwards, which is the usual way of *shechitah*, I might have said that the *shechitah* is permissible; he therefore teaches us that it is not valid.

The *Gemora* notes that although Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav that if he burrowed the knife underneath the skin the *shechitah* is valid, in the Academy of Rav it was taught that Rav did not know if the *shechitah* was valid or not in a case when the slaughterer burrowed underneath the skin.

They inquired: According to the view of the Academy of Rav that underneath the skin was a matter of doubt, what would be the law if one burrowed the knife underneath a cloth (*tied around the animal's neck before slaughtering*)? What would be the law if he burrowed underneath the entangled wool? The *Gemora* leaves these questions unresolved.

Rav Pappa inquired: What is the law if he burrowed the knife while he was cutting the lesser portions of the pipes

(*after he had already slaughtered the greater part*)? The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.

If one slaughtered two animals simultaneously (*with the same knife*), the *shechitah* is valid. If two people held the knife and slaughtered, even if one cut higher up and the other cut lower down, the *shechitah* is valid. If he chopped off the head with one stroke, the *shechitah* is invalid (*for he pressed down in the neck*). If, while cutting, he cut through the neck with one stroke, the *shechitah* is valid, provided the knife extended the width of a neck. If, while cutting, he cut through two heads with one stroke, the *shechitah* is valid, provided the knife extended the width of a neck. These provisions apply only to the case where the slaughterer moved the knife forward and not backward, or backward and not forward; but if he moved the knife to and fro, however small it was, even if it was a scalpel, the *shechitah* is valid.

## 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*).