



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Convulsing (cont.)

Shmuel disagrees with Rav's definition of a convulsing motion that indicates life.

R' Anan further explains Shmuel's position.

The novelty of this explanation is identified.

Rav's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Chisda identifies the moment during the slaughter at which the animal must convulse to indicate life.

R' Chisda suggests a proof to his position but it is rejected by Rava.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok identifies another moment during the slaughter at which the animal must convulse to indicate life.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok suggests a proof to his explanation.

This proof is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava presents a third opinion when the convulsing must occur during the slaughtering process to indicate life.

Rava cites a proof to his position.

Rava quotes a Baraisa that issues rulings about these matters.

The reason Rava was compelled to cite a Baraisa about this matter is explained.

2) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses whether the slaughter of an animal that belonged to an idolater is a valid slaughter.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the dispute among the three Tannaim of the Mishnah.

The Gemara begins an alternative explanation of the dispute in the Mishnah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are things that a dead animal does?
.....
2. At what point in the slaughtering process is it necessary for the animal to move to indicate that it was alive?
.....
3. How does an animal become an "orphan"?
.....
4. How does the Gemara explain the point of dispute between the Tannaim of the Mishnah?
.....

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ מורינו הרב שמשון בן ר' רפאל זצוק"ל

Distinctive INSIGHT

When is a newborn animal disqualified from being an offering?

שבעת ימים פרט למחוסר זמן

The Mishnah on 37b ruled that if an animal was deathly sick, performing shechita on it can result in allowing its meat to be eaten, provided that the animal died from the shechita. This can be ascertained if the animal moved and jerked at the point of shechita. Rava explains that this movement of the animal is a proper indication only if it takes place at the end of shechita.

Rava proves his contention based upon a Baraisa which analyzes the many phrases of Vayikra 22:27, each regarding the guidelines of animals which are disqualified from being brought for an offering. Among the phrases is that the animal must be "from the eighth day," which teaches us that an animal that is not yet past its seventh day is not eligible to be brought.

Rashi comments that we learn from here that even if its mother is alive, the newborn animal may not be brought until it is seven days old. Shitta Mikubetzes explains that Rashi is bothered by this insight, because it seems to be simply clarifying the literal meaning of the words, which say that the animal must be seven days old before it may be brought as an offering. Therefore, Rashi notes that the verse is illustrating a complete array of circumstances.

When an animal is born, several details must be monitored before it may be brought as an offering. The verse states that it must be "with its mother," and it must be "for seven days." The first point is that the animal must be born from a live mother, and not be "an orphan" from birth. If the newborn was taken from its dead mother, it was never "with its mother," and it may never be brought as an offering. Nevertheless, the mother does not still have to be living when the young animal is brought, because the Torah does not require that the mother live indefinitely. The mother does not even have to survive the entire first seven days of

Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Rabbi & Mrs. Yehoshua Starr
לע"נ ר' בנימין בן ר' זעליג ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Dr. & Mrs. Moshe Rubín
in memory of their parents
ר' חיים פיינול בן ר' נחמן ע"ה
מרת חוה בת ר' עמנואל ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Honoring a greater Torah scholar

אצטריכא ליה לאבא לאוזוי אוני

Does "Abba" require the animal to move its ear?

In the Gemara Shmuel refers to Rav as "Abba." Rashi¹ explains that the term "Abba" was a title of respect. Tosafos² in the name of Aruch writes that Rav's name was Abba and he was called Rav due to his importance, similar to the way that R' Yehudah HaNasi was referred to as Rebbi. The reason Shmuel referred to him as Abba was that they were colleagues. R' Yochanan also refers to Rav by his first name, Abba, since they were colleagues, but it is difficult to understand how R' Hamnuna could refer to him as Abba (Yoma 87a) when R' Hamnuna was his student.

Maharik³ discussed the issue of whether a Torah scholar of lesser stature must demonstrate respect to a Torah scholar of greater stature with the degree of respect that a student must demonstrate to his teacher. He proves that there is no such requirement from the fact that Shmuel, R' Kahana and R' Assi were not so great as Rav and nevertheless, they referred to him by his first name, Abba, and if they were obligated to honor him as a student must honor his teacher they would not have been permitted to refer to him by his first name. Gaon Chida⁴ questioned Maharik's proof from the fact that R' Hamnuna who was definitely a student of Rav also referred to him by his name Abba. This indicates that there must be another reason that he was referred to by his first name and it cannot be simply attributed to the fact that the others were not students. Shulchan Aruch⁵ rules that an outstanding Torah scholar has the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

the young animal's life. Rashi cites Toras Kohanim which says that "with its mother" can be satisfied with the mother living even a moment after the birth of her offspring. The specific point of Rashi here is that even if the mother has survived, we still require that the young animal be beyond its seventh day of life before it may be brought as an offering.

Tiferes Yaakov suggests that the verse may be teaching us a different insight. The Torah says that a newborn animal should remain with its mother for seven days before being taken for an offering. Yet, we might have thought that this is only true when the animal has its mother with whom to stay. But, if an animal is "an orphan," we might have thought that there is no reason to delay, and that this animal may be taken as an offering earlier than seven days. This, then, may be the lesson of the verse. No animal may be brought too young. It must be into its eighth day even if it is orphaned from its mother. ■

same status as one's primary Torah teacher (רבו מובהק) even if one was never his student. Rema⁶ explains that someone who is the gadol hador and is known in his generation as such, qualifies for this status. Shach⁷ adds that he must be a more advanced scholar than even the other scholars of the generation to fit into this category. If he is not, one is not obligated to honor him to this degree even if he is a greater scholar than one's self. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה לאבא
2. תוס' ד"ה אצטריכא
3. שו"ת מהרי"ק שרש קס"ט ד"ה ואשר כתבת וז"ל וכן
4. פתח ענים ברכות מ"ז ד"ה שוב ראיתי
5. שו"ע יו"ד סי' רמ"ד סע' י'
6. רמ"א שם
7. ש"ך שם סק"ב ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Shochet and the Rav

השוחט

A certain shochet felt that he was paid an unfair wage. When he approached the rabbi of his community and demanded a raise, the rav explained that he was paid the going rate and that the community could not afford to pay more. Hearing this, the shochet became upset. "How dare you refuse my reasonable request?"

To the shock of many in the community the shochet insulted the rav's honor.

Although he did not do so in a sharp manner, it was still completely unacceptable since he had denigrated the rav in public. When the Chazon Ish, zt"l, heard about this, he sent someone to this rav with his halachic opinion. "You are obligated to remove this shochet immediately. This is not merely a matter of your own honor. It is an instance where you are obligated to stand up to his inappropriate behavior to ensure that people take you seriously as rav of the city."

The rav did as he was told and deposed the shochet.

After some time elapsed, the rav was surprised to see that the Chazon Ish himself had come to visit the town—for the

first time ever. "What are you doing here?" asked the rav, obviously taken aback.

"The shochet you deposed has had long enough to think about his mistake. He received his due punishment and it is now time to reinstate him."

The rav protested, "But why did you come yourself? If you needed to speak to me, you could have sent me a messenger and I would have gladly saved you the trouble."

The Chazon Ish replied with typical simplicity. "Since the time has come to rectify this, it would be improper to tarry."¹ ■

1. מעשה איש ח"א ע' קמ"ט