

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Slaughtering (cont.)

Abaye concludes his unsuccessful challenge to R' Yosef's defense of Levi the Elder's position that slaughtering occurs at the end of the severing process.

R' Idi bar Avin mounts another unsuccessful challenge to Levi the Elder's position.

### 2) Slaughtering in multiple places

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav maintains that incisions in multiple places constitute a valid slaughter but Shmuel disagrees.

It is noted that Reish Lakish agrees with Shmuel's position.

Two unsuccessful challenges to Shmuel's position are presented.

A related incident is recorded.

### 3) Burrowing

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav provides some guidelines for the invalid act of burrowing.

The novelty of one of these guidelines is explained.

The scholars from Rav's Yeshiva maintain that Rav was uncertain whether burrowing beneath the skin invalidates the slaughter.

The Gemara inquires about the parameters of Rav's position as cited by the scholars of Rav's yeshiva and the inquiry is left unresolved.

R' Pappa asks a related inquiry which is also left unresolved.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses different cases of slaughtering and issues rulings as to whether they are valid.

### 5) Severing in one motion

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*An animal which was shechted in several places along its neck*  
רב יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא שקל משופרי שופרי

There is a disagreement regarding an animal which was shechted in two or three places along its neck. After cutting the majority of the pipes in one place properly, another shechita was done slightly above or below the first one. Rav Yehuda says in the name of Rav that this is acceptable. However, when Rav Yehuda repeated this halacha in front of Shmuel, Shmuel said that it is unacceptable. According to Tosafos, Rashi explains that the case is where the entire shechita was repeated in several places, and Shmuel's issue is that the shechita must result in an exposed and revealed cut. When only one cut is normally made, the spot where the cut is made spreads apart and the opening is clearly noticeable. When several cuts are made, the spot of the shechita does not spread open fully at one spot.

Meiri explains that Rashi's opinion is that even if the majority of one of the pipes was not severed at one spot, but a majority is cut as a combination of several cuts, Rav rules that the shechita is kosher. This is also the way Magid Mishnah (to Hilchos Shechita 2:10) interprets Rav's halacha. According to this, Shmuel disagrees and holds that the majority of a pipe must be cut at one spot only, and we do not combine different cuts to arrive at a measurement of a majority. Rosh adds that Shmuel only disallows the shechita when the first cut was a minority of the pipe, and a majority cut at a second spot. However, if the first cut was a majority of the pipe, a second cut of a minority of the pipe at a second location is not a reason to rule it invalid.

The Gemara describes an incident of an animal which was shechted in this manner, and Rav Yitzchak b. Shmuel bar Marta took a beautiful piece from it and ate it. R' Zeira declared that his actions demonstrated that we rule according to Rav, and that this type of shechita is valid. Tiferes Yaakov asks why this testimony is described in terms of R' Yitzchak eating a beautiful piece, rather than just any piece. He explains that because Rav and Shmuel disagree whether such a shechita is valid or not, it apparently would have been better for R' Yitzchak not to eat from the questionable specimen, as long as any other meat was available. However, he apparently wished to eat a very special portion, and to get such a piece was normally quite expensive. This animal which was shechted in several places was not so desirable for sale, because of its halachic problem, so there was less demand for it. He was able to buy it inexpensively, and he was willing to do so, because he felt it was obvious and certain that the halacha followed the opinion of Rav.

Tiferes Yaakov also explains that perhaps R' Yitzchak wished to emphasize that there was no need to show reluctance in deference to the view of Shmuel. He took a nice piece to show that his actions were not hesitant, but rather willing and assertive. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is העמדה והערכה?

2. Why does Shmuel invalidate a slaughtering that occurred over two or three places?

3. Is a slaughter valid if the knife becomes hidden under the hide?

4. What is the correct size of a slaughtering knife?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Resurrecting the dead

שחט בה שנים או רוב שנים ועדיין היא מפרכסת וכו'

If one severed both pipes or the majority of both pipes but the animal convulses etc.

The Gemara teaches that if one slaughtered the two pipes of an animal but it convulses it is considered alive. Rambam<sup>1</sup> teaches that if a person's head was severed and he continues to convulse, he nevertheless transmits tum'ah via ohel. Rav Moshe Feinstein<sup>2</sup> explains that our Gemara discusses a case where the head was not severed altogether, it was just the pipes that were cut and for that reason the animal is still alive as long as it continues to convulse. Rambam was discussing a case of a person's head that was cut off altogether and in such a case he is categorized as dead even if he continues to convulse. As such even if there was a means to reattach the head to the body so that he should be able to live there is no mitzvah to do so and on Shabbos it would be prohibited to do since there is no mitzvah to resurrect the dead, only to heal the infirm.

Tosafos<sup>3</sup> questions why Eliyahu HaNavi was permitted to resuscitate a child by making physical contact with him. Since Eliyahu HaNavi was a kohen it should have been prohibited

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Shmuel identifies the source for the Mishnah's ruling that severing in one motion is invalid.

Tanna D'vei R' Yishmael identifies an alternative source and the Gemara explains why he cites two pesukim.

### 6) Burrowing

The Gemara begins to present an incident that revolves around the issue of burrowing. ■

for him to make physical contact with a corpse. He answers that since Eliyahu HaNavi knew that he could revive him it was permitted since it was an act of saving his life. Rav Feinstein explains that this answer does not refute his position. He asserts that the life Eliyahu was saving was not the child's since there is no mitzvah to resurrect the dead. Rather, Eliyahu was concerned that the grief over the loss of her child would kill his mother and in order to save her life he was permitted to resurrect the child. Sefer HoEmek Shealah<sup>4</sup> disagrees with this analysis and explains Tosafos according to the simple reading that Eliyahu HaNavi was allowed to touch the corpse of the child since he had the ability to resurrect him. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"א מהלי טומאת מת הטי"ו.

2. שו"ת אג"מ יו"ד ח"ב סי' קע"ד.

3. תוס' ב"מ קי"ד: ד"ה אמר.

4. העמק שאלה שאילתא קס"ז פ"ו: ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Two Shochtim Working Together

"שנים אוחזין בסכין ושוחטין..."

On today's daf we find that two shochtim can shecht together. Although this is unusual, there is an advantage for a shochet to shecht while another shochet is present.

One of the tasks of local rabbis is to ensure that the shochtim under their supervision are doing a reasonable job. In the city of Izmir and its environs, the rabbis decreed that no shochet should slaughter alone. At least a pair of shochtim should be together during shechitah and they should check for treifos together to avoid errors. In their guidelines, they declared that even one who shechts for a small hamlet—which did not maintain two shochtim—should do

his utmost to have a companion when he shechts as much as possible. If a shochet is travelling through the city—even if he is less experienced than the local shochet—he should be called in while the town shochet slaughters and checks the animal for treifos.

Such decrees must be flexible in consideration of the shochtim too. It was therefore enacted that the shochet who needs to slaughter should call any colleague in the area. But if the man fails to show, the shochet is permitted to do the job alone.<sup>1</sup>

Requiring the presence of two shochtim was not always enough to ensure that the animals were kosher, however. In Izmir, shochtim used to travel to an out-of-town slaughter house on motzei Shabbos to slaughter animals for the coming week. Although this was convenient it also complicated matters, especially during the winter. A driving rain and

punishing winds made shechitah very difficult. And even the most God-fearing of shochtim could not be certain that he did not slip up on the finer points of the laws. In addition, in inclement weather they could not do a thorough bedikah so essential for ensuring that the animal is not treif.

Rabbi Chaim Palagi, zt"l, recounts, "During Tamuz in the year תקצ"ו there was a plague in Izmir—may this trouble never return! Rabbi Dovid Sid, zt"l, an expert shochet in Izmir, was struck down tragically. Before he died he charged his mother (may she be blessed) and begged her to put a stop to their habitual shechitah on motzei Shabbos. "Please speak to my father-in-law and see that he decrees that this be stopped. There are many problems with this and I believe that this is why my time has come now..."<sup>2</sup> ■

1. רוח חיים, יו"ד, סי' א', אות ו'

2. משא חיים, מערכת ש, אות קט"ז ■