

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Accidental immersion (cont.)

Rava concludes his explanation of the dispute between R' Nosson and Rabanan and the novelty of this teaching is identified.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a disagreement concerning the duration of the pause that invalidates slaughtering.

### 3) Pausing

Rav clarifies Tanna Kamma's phrase כדאי שחיטה.

R' Kahana and R' Assi ask for a more precise definition and Rav claims that he cannot provide any further clarification.

According to Rav the allowable pause is the amount of time it takes to slaughter the creature that one is slaughtering whereas according to Shmuel it is always calculated by the amount of time it takes to slaughter a mammal.

Ravin in the name of R' Yochanan supports Shmuel's opinion and R' Chanina asserts that one has the amount of time it takes to bring another animal to slaughter.

R' Chanina's opinion is unsuccessfully challenged.

A fourth opinion is presented regarding the pause that invalidates a slaughter.

Rava issues a ruling on this topic and then poses a related question that is left unresolved.

R' Huna the son of R' Nosson inquired about pausing at the end of the slaughtering and the question is left unresolved.

The term כדאי ביקור used by R' Shimon is defined.

4) **MISHNAH:** After presenting many cases the Mishnah presents the parameters for determining whether an animal was rendered a tereifah or whether an animal was rendered a neveilah.

### 5) Clarifying R' Akiva's position

A contradiction between our Mishnah and another Mishnah regarding R' Akiva's position is noted.

Rava resolves the contradiction.

The resolution is unsuccessfully challenged although Rava was forced to revise his response in the middle of the discussion.

R' Shimon ben Lakish offers another resolution to the contradictory Mishnayos.

This resolution is rejected.

R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan resolves the contradiction.

### 6) Puncturing the lungs

Reish Lakish ruled that if one severed the trachea and then punctured the lungs before severing the esophagus the animal is kosher.

Rava asserts that if the animal's intestines were punctured in the same circumstance the animal would be a tereifah.

R' Zeira challenges this ruling and then begins an argument that R' Zeira retracted his opinion. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### A delay during the shechita—שהיה

נפלה סכין והגביהה, נפלו כליו והגביהן, השחיז את הסכין ועף, בא חבירו ושחט, אם שהה כדי שחיטה פסולה

The Mishnah discusses the rule of שהיה, a pause during the shechita, which may invalidate the shechita. The examples given in the Mishnah are where during the shechita, the knife slipped from the person's hand, and the person caught the knife and continued and completed the shechita. Another example is where a person sharpened a knife before doing the shechita, but this task made him weary. The person then fainted when doing the shechita, and someone else came and completed the act. In these cases, if the pause in the middle of the shechita was long enough "for shechita" (as defined in the Gemara), the shechita is invalid.

Prisha (Y.D. 23:#3) brings two reasons why a delay invalidates shechita. One reason is that the Torah states "ושחט," which suggests that there be one act of slaughtering an animal, not two. Furthermore, when the act of shechita is interrupted, the animal shudders due to the fear of being shechted. This causes the blood of the animal to be absorbed into the limbs of the animal, from where it can no longer be removed with the salting process.

Nevertheless, Simla Chadasha notes that all five disqualifications for shechita, including pausing, are halacha from Moshe at Sinai, and we do not question the reason for them. In fact, Tevu'as Shor writes that by analyzing the reasons for these disqualifications, we might come to err. For example, if we place credence on the explanation of the Prisha, someone might allow shechita done with a pause if they salt the meat well or roast it. Or, we might allow eating the intestines of the animal, which do not have an issue regarding blood. Rather, we should not speculate the reasons for these disqualifications.

Pri Megadim (S.D. #32) notes another error which might arise from attributing this disqualification to the blood being absorbed into the limbs. A k'zayis of neveilah and a k'zayis of this animal are both neveilah. If they both fall into fifty-nine portions of kosher meat, the mixture is not kosher. But, if we consider the pause to be an issue of the blood, the two k'zaisim would not combine, as different categories of prohibited items do not combine. We would mistakenly rule the mixture kosher. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated

לעילוי נשמת

הרב חיים מאיר אלטער מרדכי ניימן ז"ל בן ר' משה צבי ז"ל תנצב"ה

Rabbi Hyman M. Naiman, z'l

הנוצח ע"י המשפחה שיחיו

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Dr. and Mrs. Koenigsberg

In memory of his parents

ר' דוב בן ר' יוסף, ע"ה, ומרת שיינדל בת ר' לייבש דוד, ע"ה

# HALACHA Highlight

## Severing a finger while slaughtering

כדי שיגביהנה וירביצנה וישחור

The amount of time it takes to lift it, lay it down and slaughter

Teshuvos Panim Meiros<sup>1</sup> was asked a fascinating question. It happened once that someone was slaughtering a bird while his friend was holding it. As he was slaughtering the bird he ended up severing the finger of his friend who was holding the bird. The question that arose was whether the slaughtering of the chicken should be invalid due to the disqualification of pausing. Seemingly, while the knife was going through his friend's finger he was not severing the bird's neck and the slaughter should be declared invalid. He answered that he did not think that this constituted an act of pausing since it is possible that the slaughterer severed the bird's esophagus and his friend's finger in the same motion. Proof to this possibility is found in our Gemara. The Gemara teaches that while slaughtering the parah adumah the slaughterer may not be involved in another activity. Nevertheless, the Gemara teaches that if the slaughterer severed a gourd from the ground while he slaughtered the parah adumah the slaughter remains valid. It is assumed that he did not lose focus on the mitzvah of slaughtering the parah adumah since the cutting of the gourd happened without intent. This clearly illustrates that as long as one remains engaged in his primary activity if secondary acts are performed it does not diminish from a person's intent.

Panim Meiros then notes that although our Gemara

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon ?
2. Explain the principle: נתת דבריך לשיעורין.
3. Why would the Tannaim not change a Mishnah even though the author changed his opinion ?
4. How does Rava qualify Reish Lakish's ruling ?

defines the disqualification of pausing as being the amount of time necessary to lift the animal, lay it down and slaughter it. Rema<sup>2</sup> rules that any pause whatsoever invalidates the slaughter. Accordingly, perhaps according to Rema's stringent ruling we should invalidate this slaughter since cutting through a finger constitutes a minimal pause. He dismissed this based on a ruling of Terumas HaDeshen<sup>3</sup>. Terumas HaDeshen discusses the halacha if the slaughtering knife cuts something flexible while slaughtering and rules that one must be concerned that while cutting the flexible item the knife paused. It is clear, however, that cutting something stiff does not cause a pause and since a finger is stiff, it would not cause even a minimal pause while slaughtering. ■

<sup>1</sup> שו"ת פנים מאירות ח"ב סי' מ"ב ומובא בפת"ש יו"ד סי' כ"ג סק"ה.  
<sup>2</sup> רמ"א יו"ד סי' כ"ג סעי' ב'.  
<sup>3</sup> שו"ת תרומת הדשן סי' קפ"ה. ■

# STORIES off the Daf

## A Rav's Obligation

"אלו טריפות..."

Today's daf discusses the laws of shechitah and treifos.

The Chofetz Chaim, ז"ל, took great care to fulfill all mitzvos in the best possible manner. When there was a vacancy among the shochem and bodkim of Radin, the Chofetz Chaim worked to ensure that the best candidate would take the place. After some inquiries it became known that in one of the outlying towns near Kovno there was a certain shochem and bodek who was exceptionally skilled

in his job. He had vast experience and was considered an expert.

The Chofetz Chaim worked through all possible channels to persuade this man to accept the vacancy in Radin. After many efforts, the Chofetz Chaim finally succeeded and this man was slated to move to Radin.

On the day that the shochem arrived in Radin, the Chofetz Chaim went a long distance out of the town to greet him. When the shochem arrived, the Chofetz Chaim was seen to cry tears of pure joy. With a face shining with happiness usually found in people who have won a fortune, he approached the shochem and embraced him for all to see.<sup>1</sup>

Although the Chofetz Chaim held himself to the high standard of numerous

stringencies so that he could fulfill mitzvos in the best possible manner, he was equally sensitive to not imposing such stringencies on others. When he would speak to a student of the yeshiva who had been accepted as rav of a community, the Chofetz Chaim's advice was quite telling. "Try your utmost to find a valid reason to be lenient in every halachic question that reaches you. When a rav errs and permits an animal that is really treif, he has sinned **בין אדם למקום** for which Yom Kippur atones. But one who declares an animal that is kosher treif sins **בין אדם לחבירו** for which Yom Kippur cannot atone!"<sup>2</sup> ■

<sup>1</sup> ארחות צדיק, בקונטרס שערי ציון י"ב, ע"מ.  
<sup>2</sup> "הנאמן" תשי"ג. ■

