

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Burrowing

The Gemara finishes its analysis of the incident of slaughtering a bird with an arrow.

2) The slaughtering knife

R' Zeira asserts that the slaughtering knife must be longer than the neck of the animal that is being slaughtered.

The Gemara inquires whether R' Zeira meant it should be twice as long as the neck of the animal or only slightly longer than the neck of the animal.

The Gemara proves that it must be twice as long as the neck of the animal.

3) Small knives

R' Menashe identifies the type of scalpel referenced in the Mishnah.

R' Acha the son of R' Avya and R' Menashe discuss the use of different types of small instruments.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah teaches that a slaughter that was not done by human force is invalid.

5) Intent for slaughter

The Gemara infers from the Mishnah that intent is not necessary for a valid slaughter and then asks for the identity of the Tanna who subscribes to this position.

Rava asserts that it reflects the position of R' Nosson.

The Gemara explains why it was necessary for Rava to teach that two anonymous Mishnayos reflect the opinion of R' Nosson.

6) Accidental immersion

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav and R' Yochanan disagree whether accidental immersion permits a woman to her husband.

Rav's position is unsuccessfully challenged by Rava to R' Nachman.

The source that intent is not necessary for mundane matters is presented.

Rava unsuccessfully challenges R' Nachman's defense of Rav twice.

Abaye suggests a refutation of R' Yochanan's position that accidental immersion does not permit a woman to her husband to R' Yosef.

R' Yosef rejects Abaye's suggestion.

R' Shimi bar Ashi questions whether R' Yochanan was cited correctly since there seems to be a contradiction between two of his rulings.

The Gemara demonstrates that there is no contradiction.

Rava concludes the discussion by claiming that R' Nosson's argument is stronger than Rabanan's.

R' Pappa describes the circumstance in which a woman would accidentally immerse.

Rava begins another explanation of the dispute between R' Nosson and Rabanan. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Immersion in a wave

דתן גל שנתלש ובו ארבעים סאה ונפל על האדם ועל הכלים, טהורין

The Mishnah had taught the halacha that shechita is not valid if it occurs without a person performing it. For example, someone happens to drop a knife, and as it was falling it caused shechita of an animal. The Gemara continues the discussion and deals with the halacha that shechita is kosher when done by a person whether he has full intent for the act or not.

The Gemara then discusses another issue related to having intent, and that is that when one immerses in a mikveh for non-consecrated purposes (chullin), it is not necessary that the one immersing have any special intent that his status will be changing.

This is learned from a Mishnah in Mikva'os (5:6): A wave of forty se'ah of water became detached from the ocean and flew onto the shore and on top of an impure person and utensils. The Mishnah rules that as a result of being immersed in this wave, the person and the utensils are now pure. We assume, notes the Gemara, that just as the utensils in this illustration do not have any intent to become immersed, so too we are dealing with a person who had not special intentions for immersion.

The Gemara refutes this proof, however, because it could be that intent is critical. The case could be where the person on the shore was anticipating that a wave might come ashore and crash down on him to purify him, and the utensils would also be pure in a case where their owner placed them near the shore and was expecting that a wave would fall on them and purify them.

The rule is that rainwater which is collected for a mikveh purifies that which is immersed in it when the waters are forty

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How long must a knife be to allowed to slaughter with a single stroke?

2. What is the point of dispute between Rav (cited by R' Yehudah) and R' Yochanan?

3. How is it possible to immerse in the air, even though it is not valid?

4. How is it possible for one to immerse accidentally?

HALACHAH Highlight

Should a person daven if he cannot properly concentrate?

דלמא ביושב ומצפה עסקינן אימתי יתלש הגל

Perhaps we refer to where he sits and anticipates when the wave will become detached

Teshivas Torah L'Shmah¹ was asked whether a person who would not be able to concentrate while davening should daven. Seemingly, if he will not be able to concentrate he should be exempt since sefarim write that davening without concentration is comparable to a body without a soul. Accordingly, if he is unable to concentrate he should not daven. He responded that one who is distracted and consequently incapable of davening with proper concentration should nevertheless daven since we do not push aside the mitzvah just because of his difficulty. He then adds that someone who does not know the inner meaning or kabbalistic intent that is supposed to accompany a mitzvah is not exempt from that mitzvah. A person is expected to do what he can and even without that additional intent the mitzvah is considered fulfilled without any defect whatsoever.

He cites as proof the comments of Maharach Or Zarua² who points to our Gemara as proof that anticipation alone qualifies as intent. The Gemara relates that if a person is sitting and notices a wave approaching and he thinks to himself, "When is the wave going to detach and fall on these utensils," his intent is sufficient so that when the wave arrives the utensils are t'horim. This demonstrates that intent alone is sufficient and additional more esoteric thoughts are not necessary. Additionally, if one woman had intent that the immersion of a

(Insight...continued from page 1)

se'ah collected in one place, and when they are stationary (not flowing). The waters of a spring can be used to purify even if they are flowing, and they need not have forty se'ah in one place, as long as the item being purified is totally immersed.

The waters of the ocean are a matter of disagreement in the Mishnah (ibid. 5:4). R' Meir's opinion is that the waters of seas and oceans have the same law as a mikveh, so that they are effective only if we gather forty se'ah of water and if the water is stationary and not flowing. R' Yehuda holds that inland seas and lakes have the rule of a spring. Thus, they purify even without forty se'ah in one spot, but the oceans of the globe have the law of a mikveh. R' Yose holds that all oceans and seas have the law of a spring.

The waters of the wave described in the Mishnah purify even while in motion, so we see that they have the status of a spring. This wave which breaks away and inundates a person or utensils follows the opinion of R' Yose. Accordingly, it is really not necessary that the wave have a volume of forty se'ah, but the Mishnah mentions this because this is generally the amount needed for a person to be covered. ■

second woman should be effective to make her tehorah it is effective and the second woman is tehorah. Accordingly, Torah L'shmah writes that intent and concentration for davening is the same thing. If another person's intent is effective for immersion certainly God's intent for a person's tefila should be effective. Even though the individual does not know how to properly focus his thoughts on davening, God will supplement what is lacking. ■

1. שו"ת תורה לשמה סי' י"ז.

2. שו"ת מהר"ח אור זרוע סי' ל"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Length of the Knife

"מלא הצואר חוץ לצואר..."

Rav Chaim Palagi, zt"l, warned that every rav is responsible for the shechitah in his city. "Every rav must do his utmost to supervise those who perform shechitah and bedikah in his city. He should ask unexpected questions to be certain that they have not forgotten the halachos. That way they will not unknowingly feed the community non-kosher meat."¹

The Rema writes that the length of two necks found on today's daf is the preferred size even for a chalaf used to shecht

one animal. He explains that this length is equivalent to fourteen fingers and points out an interesting remez to this from the verse regarding shechitah. "The verse states, 'ושחטתם בזה'." The word בזה has a numerical value of fourteen."²

The Vilna Gaon points out that the measurement of fourteen fingers is actually from a midrash in Parshas Kedoshim and Naso. "Moshe showed them a knife that is fourteen fingers wide, the numerical value of בזה."³

In Brisk, the rav once asked one of the city's shochemim the remez for the proper length of a chalaf. The shochet did not remember but insisted that this was not essential. But the rav of Brisk disagreed. "You are removed from your post for the

next thirty days. During this time you must make a thorough review of the halachos..."⁴

Someone wondered why the rav was so harsh. "After all, why is the remez important? Isn't the main thing remembering the actual halachos?"

The Tevuos Shor, zt"l, disagreed. "If he does not recall an explicit Rema—whatever he says anywhere—this shows that his learning was insufficient. It is only right that he review the halachos since they are no longer fresh in his mind."⁵ ■

1. שו"ת חיים ביד, יו"ד, ס' ה'

2. רמ"א יו"ד, ס' י', סעי' ח'

3. מדרש רבה, קדושים, כ"ה, ח', ונשא, י', א'

4. שו"ת בית הלל, מובא בבאר היטב, יו"ד, שם

5. תבואות שור, ס' א' ■