

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

R' Yosef offers an alternative explanation of the Mishnah's statement, "We always slaughter."

2) Meat of the appetite

The Gemara identifies the point of dispute between R' Akiva and R' Yishmael recorded in an earlier-cited Baraisa.

Three unsuccessful challenges to R' Akiva's position are presented.

An unsuccessful challenge to R' Yishmael is presented.

R' Yirmiyah inquires about the status of pieces of meat brought into Eretz Yisroel that had been killed in the wilderness by piercing.

After clarifying the intent of the question the Gemara leaves the inquiry unresolved.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Rava questions the meaning of the last phrase of the Mishnah.

Since there is nothing left to be addressed by that phrase Rava offers an alternative explanation of all three phrases of the Mishnah.

4) The slaughtering knife

The Gemara relates that Shmuel made notches in knives to determine whether those notches made the blade invalid for use for slaughtering.

A related Baraisa is cited.

R' Elazar explains two of the cases mentioned in the Baraisa.

The logic behind the distinction between the two cases is analyzed.

Rava categorizes three different types of notches.

R' Ashi clarifies two points related to the middle category.

5) Examining the slaughtering knife

R' Chisda cites the Biblical source that one must examine the slaughtering knife.

The necessity for this exposition is challenged and according to the Gemara's conclusion it refers to the Rabbinic injunction to show the knife to a Torah scholar and the verse is a mere asmachta.

The method of examining the knife is discussed.

The Gemara records a discussion whether it is necessary to examine the slaughtering knife on all three sides.

6) Notches

R' Huna bar R' Ketina in the name of R' Shimon ben Lakish discusses three cases where notches are an important factor.

R' Chisda adds a fourth case and the Gemara explains why R' Shimon ben Lakish does not add that fourth case.

The Gemara concludes with the declaration that the notch must be large enough to disqualify the altar which is large enough that a fingernail would get caught passing over the notch. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Various conditions regarding a blade with a nick

אמר רבא ג' מידות בסכין

Rava taught that there are three conditions which are found regarding nicks in a knife which can invalidate a shechita. One is a knife which "collects the flesh." This is where the blade of the knife snags and retains the flesh as it is pulled across it. In this case, the knife should not be used for shechita, and if it is used, the shechita is ruled invalid, even after the fact.

The second is where the blade "catches." This is where the blade has a nick facing one direction. It runs smoothly when it cuts while being pulled in one direction, but from the other direction it would snag and pull at the skin and flesh as it cuts. In this case, if the knife is pulled but not pushed in the return direction, the shechita can be kosher. Nevertheless, this knife should not be used for shechita, even if it is used in the one direction which is kosher, because we are concerned that a person might use the knife to cut by both pulling and pushing. In this case, if the knife was already used to shecht, and it was used only in the one direction which was kosher, the shechita is kosher.

The third blade about which Rava spoke is where the blade had a nick in it, and the spot where there nick existed was sharpened and worn down to the point where the blade is not completely smooth. However, the area of the nick now has a concave curve, due to the part of the blade which was worn down by being sharpened. This knife may be used לכתחילה to shecht.

Rebeinu Yerucham notes that the novelty in the fourth case of Rava is that we might have thought that a blade which is now sharpened and repaired should not be used, because we might have to be concerned lest the knife be used before it is repaired fully. The point of Rava is that we do not have such a concern, and the knife may be used.

In Yoreh De'ah (18), Bach determines from the wording of Tur that we only allow a knife with one concave slope. However, if the blade has two or more smooth slopes to it, the blade may not be used לכתחילה. The wording of Rambam (Hilchos Shechita 1:17) is that "a blade which goes up and down like a snake" implies that even if the slope of the knife goes up and down several times it is kosher to be used. Kesef Mishneh, however, explains that Rambam is just describing one slope, and the analogy to a snake is that between its head and tail the body goes up and down. Bach concludes that one should be strict and that a knife whose blade rises and falls more than once should not be used. Taz and Shach express surprise with this ruling, and they feel that there is no basis for this limitation. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated

By the LeVee family

לע"נ ר' ארי' בן ר' ישראל הלוי ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating leftover Shabbos meat during the Nine Days

אברי בשר נחירה שהכניסו ישראל עמהן לארץ וכו'

Pieces of meat from animals that were pierced and brought into Eretz Yisroel etc.

Birkei Yosef¹ discusses the issue of eating meat during the Nine Days and mentions that there are authorities that allow one to eat meat that is leftover from Shabbos. He also relates that there are authorities that cite our Gemara as proof to that position. The Gemara discusses the permissibility of eating meat that was pierced (rather than slaughtered) in the wilderness and brought into Eretz Yisroel. Do we say once the meat was permitted in the wilderness before the obligation to slaughter, it remains permitted even after entering Eretz Yisroel when the obligation to slaughter animals that will be consumed begins, or not? Poskim write that regarding Rabbinic prohibitions one may adopt the lenient position that once something was permitted it remains permitted. Since the restriction against eating meat during the Nine Days is only a custom we should apply the principle and conclude that once the meat was permitted on Shabbos it remains permitted even during the Nine Days.

Birkei Yosef comments that although he disagrees with this position one who follows this ruling need not be rebuked. The reason this is not a definitive proof² is that the principle that once something was permitted it remains permitted is limited to a prohibited item that became permitted and did not become subject to any other prohibitions. As such, since the prohibi-

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Akiva and R' Yishmael?

2. What is נחירה?

3. What are the three types of notches in knives?

4. Is it necessary to examine three sides of a knife?

tion against eating meat begins after Shabbos and the meat was never prohibited on Shabbos, the principle does not apply. It is not a case of meat that was prohibited and then became permitted when Shabbos arrived; rather it is meat that becomes prohibited after Shabbos for the first time.

Teshuvos Chaim B'yad³ asserts that even those who do not eat meat that is leftover from Shabbos would agree that it is permitted to eat meat for melave malka since the time for eating melave malka still retains some of the sublime light of Shabbos. Sha'arei Teshuvah⁴ adds that the leniency only allows one to eat what is leftover from Shabbos but it is prohibited for one to intentionally cook extra for Shabbos with the intent to have leftovers to be eaten after Shabbos. ■

1. ברכי יוסף או"ח סי' תקנ"א סק"ו.
2. שו"ת חיים שאל ח"א סי' פ"ט.
3. שו"ת חיים ביד סי' קכ"ה אות ס"ו.
4. שערי תשובה סי' תקנ"א ס"ק י"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Logical Inconsistency

קתלי דחזירי

On today's daf we find that even pork was permitted during the seven-year conquest of Eretz Yisrael.

Rav Shabsi Yudelevitz recounted that on one plane trip he was seated next to a well-known Israeli zoologist. While the two spoke, the airline meal came and the professor began to partake of his bacon with obvious relish.

Rav Yudelovitz painfully remarked, "How could you eat that? Aren't you a Jew?"

The professor was nonplussed. "Why does what Moshe said four thousand years ago obligate me?"

Rav Yudelevitz was not impressed, however, with this answer. "Rasha! God said what is written in the Torah, and He is alive and well!"

The professor tried to mollify the offended rabbi. "Rebbi, don't get upset. If you can prove that God said what meat to eat, I will do teshuvah. But I must say that I had an argument with a certain rav for four hours and he failed to convince me of anything."

"Four hours? I only need about four minutes," was Rav Yudelevitz's confident reply.

The professor opened his eyes wide and said, "Four minutes? Really?"

"Yes. Just listen. The Torah tells us that there are only four species that have one sign of kashrus but not the other: they all either have split hooves or chew their cud, but not both. The Gemara in Chulin

60 wonders how Moshe could have possibly known this. It's not as though he was a hunter or zoologist! He never went hunting and how could any human at that time possibly know all the many species of animals, even on the savannah of Africa? So how would he dare say that there are only four such anomalies unless God told him so?"

The professor turned white.

But a moment later he said, "I will just finish eating and then I will do teshuvah..."

Rav Yudelevitz commented later about the incident. "What a pity. The professor simply cannot wean himself away from his tasty chazir. He is convinced of the truth but will just wait to finish eating. Sadly, by then it is already too late..."¹ ■

1. להגיד, פרשת שמני, ע' 307-305. ■