

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara concludes proving that there is a difference between something that has always been attached to the ground and that which had been detached and then attached.

2) Slaughtering with a wheel

A contradiction between Baraisos is noted whether one may slaughter with a wheel.

Two resolutions to this contradiction are presented.

A statement of R' Pappa is cited that distinguishes between one's primary force and secondary force.

3) Slaughtering with something detached from the ground

Rebbi provided the source that slaughtering must be done with something detached from the ground.

Rav asked R' Chiya to further explain Rebbi's exposition.

4) Something detached and later attached

Rava teaches the halachos for things that were detached that later became attached in two contexts.

Rava notes a contradiction in the Mishnah he cited regarding susceptibility of seeds to tum'ah.

Two resolutions to this contradiction are presented.

Rava inquires about the status of something that was detached and then attached for use for slaughtering.

Three unsuccessful attempts to resolve this matter are presented and the matter is left unresolved.

5) A knife in the wall

R' Anan in the name of Shmuel qualifies the Baraisa's ruling about slaughtering with a knife that is embedded in a wall.

The distinction between whether the animal is above the knife or below the knife is challenged.

Two resolutions to this challenge are recorded.

6) Reeds

The Gemara presents five activities that may not be done with the stem of a reed.

Some of these rulings are challenged and consequently further explained.

7) Clarifying the Mishnah

A phrase of the Mishnah is explained.

Rabbah asserts that a phrase in the Mishnah indicates that it follows R' Yishmael who interprets a pasuk to mean that one may eat meat for the appetite.

R' Yosef challenges this interpretation for two reasons. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Learning halachos from the conduct of Avraham Avinu

קרא זריזותיה דאברהם קאמר

The Mishnah (15b) taught that shechita should be done with an implement which is detached from the ground, but it is kosher, after the fact, if it is done with a sharp rock or reed which is connected to the ground. The Gemara concludes that the Mishnah is the opinion of Rebbe. The Gemara also clarifies that although Rebbe permits a shechita which was done with an implement connected to the ground, this is only if the item was at one time detached, and later installed or placed into the ground. However, if the sharp stone, for example, had always been part of the ground, using this stone for shechita would not be valid according to Rebbe, even after the fact.

The Gemara tells the story of a lesson taught by Rebbe, where R' Chiya and Rav were present. Rebbe taught his lesson that shechita must be performed with a knife that is not connected to the ground, and he proved it from the verse which describes how Avraham "took the knife" in his hand in order to have it to perform the akeidah. Rav asked R' Chiya for a clarification of where this rule is indicated in the verse, to which R' Chiya responded that the verse was actually not a conclusive proof to Rebbe's rule. Although Avraham Avinu took a knife in his hand, this might have just been a conscientious move on his part, but had Avraham not prepared a knife, it could be that he might have been able to use a rock that he found at the spot of the akeidah.

We see from this Gemara that Avraham's handling of the akeidah can be the source to teach certain aspects of shechita, while other aspects of the akeidah are merely indications of Avraham's alacrity, but not necessarily halachic necessities.

Marat"z Chiyus cites Aruch, who writes that R' Chiya held that we cannot derive halachic conclusions from Avraham's conduct because the Torah and its mitzvos had not been commanded as of that time. We can, however, learn general tendencies and character traits from the actions and words of our patriarchs and ancestors, as R' Chiya himself states, "the verse is coming to teach the zeal of Avraham."

Tosafos (ד"ה מנין) notes that the Gemara in Zevachim (97b) learns from the verse of Avraham that when consecrated animals are slaughtered for an offering, the shechita must be done with a utensil, and not a rock or sharp reed. We also learn halachos regarding bris milah from Avraham's conduct. Maharat"z Chiyus answers that the Noachides had already been commanded regarding some types of offerings, so the episode of the akeidah which follows can be used to teach these laws. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Taking lulav and esrog that are still attached to the ground מנין לשחיטה שהוא בתלוש שנאמר "ויקח את המאכלת לשחט"

How do we know that slaughtering must be with something that is detached? For it is written, "And he took the knife to slaughter."

The Gemara searches for the source that one may not slaughter an animal with an instrument that is still attached to the ground. The source cited by the Gemara is the verse said in reference to Avrohom Avinu's preparation for the akeidah (Breishis 22:6) ויקח את המאכלת – and he took the knife. This clearly indicates that something that is attached to the ground may not be used for slaughtering. The understanding that the term ויקח refers to something that is detached from the ground has significance in other areas of halacha as well.

Tzelach¹ maintains that one may fulfill the mitzvah of taking the four species even if they are attached to the ground. Even though the Torah uses the term ולקחתם – and you should take them, it does not indicate that the species must be detached from the ground and it is possible that taking something attached to the ground is a fulfillment of the obligation to take an item in one's hands. Maharsham² in his work Orchos Chaim disagrees with this conclusion and cites many sources that indicate that grabbing hold of something that is attached to the ground is not considered "taking – לקיחה" as far as halachic definitions

REVIEW and Remember

1. Is slaughtering with a wheel valid?

2. What is the halachic meaning of the phrase?

3. Under what conditions may one slaughter an animal with a knife that is embedded in a wall?

4. When did בשר become permitted?

are concerned. One source he cites to prove his position correct is our Gemara's proof that slaughtering may not be done with an instrument that is attached to the ground based on the word ויקח – and he took. Consequently, since the verb used by the Torah in the context of taking the four species is also "ולקחתם – and you should take" it follows that the species must be detached from the ground. He further cites Pri Megadim who is uncertain whether one could fulfill the mitzvah of taking the four species if they are in a perforated pot which indicates that it is obvious that one may not fulfill the mitzvah if the species are still attached to the ground. ■

1. צליח שבת קלי"א.
2. אורחות חיים סי' תרנ"א ס"ק י"ז.
3. פמ"ג סי' תרנ"ג א"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Change of Habit

"ואמרת אוכלה בשר..."

On today's daf we find an opinion that eating meat for mere desire was forbidden in the desert, but all who desired to do so could eat meat after they entered Eretz Yisrael.

Rabbi Fish, the Rosh Kollel of Karmiel, told a wondrous story regarding the self-sacrifice of a certain Jew who had survived Communist Russia and lived to witness the fall of the regime. "After the iron curtain fell many rabbis went to the former Soviet Un-

ion to encourage our estranged brothers who had endured a religious holocaust there for seventy years. A certain rav went to Odessa to set up proper kashrus so that Jews could eat meat without violating the Torah. When he arrived, many Jews expressed their joy and appreciation of his efforts. Some had kept kosher despite the sacrifices involved even though this meant that they never ate meat.

"When everything was finally set up the rabbi noticed that a certain old man who was very careful in kashrus continued to subsist on fruit and vegetables just as he had done under the hated Russian regime. When he asked the man why he did not partake of the

kosher meat now freely available, he was astounded by his reply.

"The old man said, 'Russia is a very unstable country. Although communism has been put down for now, who knows what the future holds? It is quite possible that at some point kosher meat will once again be forbidden. If I accustom myself to eating meat and find myself unable to obtain kosher meat in the future, I will once again be challenged with the daunting test of stopping a habit. But if I continue my custom of several decades and avoid meat, this will be no challenge at all. I therefore prefer to continue to avoid it!'"¹ ■

1. על פי קול ברמה, ע' 234 ■