



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Notches (cont.)

The assertion that the Altar becomes disqualified if it is notched enough that a fingernail would get caught is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 2) Showing one's knife to the local rov

R' Huna states that a slaughterer who does not allow his knife to be examined by the local rov is banned.

Rava says that he is fired from his job and it is announced that his meat is not kosher.

The Gemara explains how R' Huna and Rava do not disagree with one another.

Ravina presents an even more stringent penalty for one who did not allow his knife to be examined and we then discover that it is flawed.

A related incident is recorded.

### 3) Slaughtering instruments

Rabbah bar Huna enumerates objects that could be used for slaughtering.

His rulings are unsuccessfully challenged.

**4) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses circumstances in which slaughtering with a sickle may be allowed.

### 5) Beis Hillel's position

R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan asserts that even according to Beis Hillel the slaughtering only prevents the animal from becoming a neveilah but does not make it permitted for consumption.

R' Ashi suggests proof for this understanding of Beis Hillel but it is rejected.

**6) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses slaughtering through the ring and the conditions necessary for the slaughter to be considered valid.

### 7) Slaughtering through the ring

Rav and Shmuel rule in accordance with R' Yosi the son of R' Yehudah's position. Furthermore, this ruling is limited to when the incision went through the great ring but not if the incision went through the other rings.

The statement that slaughtering through the other rings is invalid is challenged from a Beraisai.

R' Yosef resolves the contradiction.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

A related incident is recounted.

### 8) The upper limit for slaughtering

Amoraim discuss the upper limit for slaughtering.

The Gemara inquires whether R' Pappi meant that as he slaughters he touches the "chitei" or does he not touch the "chitei."

Other Amoraim maintain that one may slaughter even through the "chitei."

Another opinion asserts that one may not go through the "chitei." ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Presenting the knife to be inspected

האי שוחט דלא סר סכינא קמיה חכם

The Gemara stated (17b) that before a knife is used for shechita, it must be shown to an expert for inspection. On our daf, Rav Huna teaches that if a butcher performs shechita without first presenting his knife to an expert for inspection, that butcher deserves to be banned from the community.

Ritva notes that Rav Huna expresses his rule in terms of a butcher, and not in terms of an average person who shechts for his own personal needs, because the requirement to show a knife to an expert before starting only applies to someone who shechts regularly and who supplies others with meat. The need to present the knife for inspection is clearly not universal, as we find that the Gemara in Eiruvim (63a) says that a talmid chacham may inspect his own knife and do the shechita, and this is the ruling of Shiltei Gibborim.

Meiri also cites opinions that state that the rule to show the knife to an expert before commencing the shechita only applies to a butcher who supplies others with meat for sale, because he is subject to the temptation to sell meat although it might be questionable.

Rosh (#24) writes that the requirement to present the knife for inspection was only in effect as long as the butchers who sold the meat were the same ones who did the shechita. However, the custom throughout the Jewish community is that the butchers are no longer trusted to do the shechita, and people who are well-trained and experienced in shechita are assigned this job. The sages therefore have given up their honor and privilege of inspecting the knife in consideration of these people's proficiency. This is how the custom to show the knife has been lost, and even a private individual in his house does shechita without presenting his knife for inspection. Rosh concludes that this custom is not a correct one, particularly because checking a knife properly demands great care and considerable yir'as shamayim.

Ra'avya writes that a talmid chacham who wishes to do shechita may do so without showing his knife to anyone else. Rosh (Eiruvim 6, #2) considers whether the rule is that a talmid chacham is trusted only in regard to the inspection of a knife, because this is a function of the honor of the local Torah scholar who heads the community, and perhaps the Torah scholar will forego his honor for this talmid chacham. However, the talmid chacham is not allowed to rule in the presence of the head of the city in matters of what is permitted and what is prohibited (איסור והיתר). Or, perhaps the talmid chacham is trusted to make rulings on his own as well. Rosh concludes that he feels that we must be strict, and that although a talmid chacham does not have to show his knife to a greater scholar, he may not issue rulings in Torah laws in the presence of a scholar who is greater than he. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## A split תיומת

כמה פגימת המזבח

What is the size of the notch of the Altar that disqualifies it?

**S**hulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> explains that each leaf of a lulav contains two parts that attach together in the back. The place where they are attached is called the תיומת. In the event that the תיומת of a majority of the leaves are split a majority of its length, the lulav is invalid. Rema<sup>2</sup> adds that according to some Poskim the disqualification of the תיומת being split occurs when the תיומת of the upper middle leaf is split all the way to the spine of the lulav , (שדרה) and this is our custom. However, it is a beautification of the mitzvah to take a lulav whose upper middle leaf is not split at all since there are Poskim who are stringent when the upper middle leaf is split even a little. Mishnah Berurah<sup>3</sup> explains that the rationale behind the Poskim who are stringent is concern that the shaking of the lulav will cause the split to extend all the way to the spine of the lulav.

Taz<sup>4</sup> asserts that even according to the stringent opinion one need not be stringent unless the upper middle leaf is split the length of a tefach. It is not possible that the stringent position is stringent even when it is split only a slight amount. If the lulav would be invalid as a result of a split that would catch one's fingernail in the split why wasn't this case included

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the penalty for a slaughterer who does not show his knife to the local rabbinic authority?  
-----
2. What is Beis Hillel's position regarding an animal that was slaughtered with a harvesting sickle in a forward direction?  
-----
3. What did R' Zeira do that generated surprise?  
-----
4. What are the chitei?  
-----

amongst those things that become invalidated with the slightest nick? Once a slight split does not invalidate the lulav there is no logic to assume that it would invalidate a split any less than a tefach. Mishnah Berurah cites Taz's position about this matter but then references Chaye Adam who explains the rationale behind those who are stringent and invalidate the lulav if the תיומת is split even slightly. Therefore, he concludes that if another lulav is available one should recite the beracha on that lulav, but if necessary one could be lenient as long as the תיומת is not split a majority of its length. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' תרמ"ה סעי' ג'.
2. רמ"א שם.
3. מ"ב שם ס"ק י"ט.
4. ט"ז סק"ד.
5. מ"ב הנ"ל. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Proper Diction

"א"ל נהרא ונהרא ופשיטיה..."

**O**n today's daf we find that sometimes there is no absolute halacha of how to act. At times both opinions have equal halachic validity.

Much speculation has been offered as to whether the pronunciation of Sefardim is somehow more authentic than that of Ashkenazim. When someone asked Rav Yechiel Michel Twersky whether it is permitted—or perhaps even preferred—to change to Sefardic pronunciation, he asked Rav Moshe Feinstein, ז"ל. "It is certain that today we should not change our style of pronunciation since this is how our ancestors pro-

nounced their prayers for many long centuries.

"If there is a halachic difference, that is, if we hold that only one way counts as lashon hakodesh, we must certainly refrain from switching, since according to the Ashkenazic authorities it would be improper to use Sefardic pronunciation. It is better to follow Ashkenazic tradition since they were the majority of Jews throughout the generations. And even if we say that both ways are acceptable as lashon hakodesh as implied by the Rambam, it is still incumbent on us to use Ashkenazic diction.

"Presumably when our ancestors were in Eretz Yisrael everyone had the same basic style of diction. Nevertheless, either diction is considered lashon hakodesh since both are used by multitudes of people. We can prove this from the

halacha of chalitzah which must be said in lashon hakodesh. Even Ashkenazim have many ways to pronounce lashon hakodesh. If we say that only one style is genuine lashon hakodesh how can anyone do chalitzah? It is surely very difficult to say the words necessary in all dictions and this was never required by the poskim. Since we cannot know the exactly correct way to pronounce we see that any dialect that many Jews use is considered lashon hakodesh."

Rav Moshe concluded with a question. "We must not change since we have a tradition of the proper diction of l'shon hakodesh. Why reject the diction we received from our forefathers for a manner of pronunciation that contradicts our mesorah?"<sup>1</sup> ■

1. אג"מ, או"ח ח"ג, סי' ה' ■