30.1.2

3a (אביי אמר הכי קתני) $\rightarrow 4a$ (כיון דאחזוק אחזוק)

- I More proposals to decipher the משנה
 - a אביי ורבא: unstated subject of כותי is כותי
 - i ישראל if the ישראל is standing there;
 - 1 בדיעבד (phrase שחיטה valid; else not כותי will eat כזית from his own שחיטה valid; else not
 - 2 Exceptions: מש"ו even בדיעבד, concern that they will violate דריסה, הגרמה etc.
 - 3 Question: final בריעבד (if they slaughtered with ישראל watching valid) must refer to כותי
 - (a) Reason: if it referred to חש"ו, should say ואם שחטו
 - (b) Challenge: how can ישראל עומד ע"ג be the "last resort" that was his opening position קשיא
 - 4 Challenge (יוצא ונכנס: should be valid לכתחילה
 - (a) Support: not from ruling that if he left יוצא ונכנס guarding his wine-store and was יוצא ונכנס may drink
 - (i) Reason: that is presented as post facto המניח ("if he left him there")
 - (ii) Rather: from ruling that one guarding wine may watch it as יוצא ונכנס
 - ii לכתחילה הבא if the ישראל comes and goes at random intervals (יוצא ונכנס)
 - 1 ב*דיעבד*: if he came and found it already slaughtered if the כזית will eat כזית from שחיטה, valid; if not invalid
 - 2 Exceptions: חש"ו even דריסה, concern that they will violate דריסה, הגרמה etc.
 - 3 Question: final בדיעבד (if they slaughtered with ישראל watching valid) must refer to כותי (as above)
 - (a) Challenge: if he posits that יוצא ונכנס is permitted, why would ישראל עומד ע"ג be valid only קשיא?
 - b משומד is משומד (who eats בילות due to lust, not principle)
 - i Per: רבא we may eat from slaughter of ישראל משומד לתיאבון if we check the knife first and give it to him
 - ii But: if he didn't check first, may not allow him to do שחיטה
 - 1 בדיעבד: if he performed שחיטה without our checking knife if we check and it is good valid; if not invalid
 - 2 Exceptions: חש"ו even בדיעבד, concern that they will violate דריסה, הגרמה etc.
 - 3 Question: final בדיעבד (if they slaughtered with ישראל watching valid) must refer to משומד (as above)
 - (a) Challenge: if the knife was checked first he may give it to him לכתחילה; if not check it now!
 - (i) And if: the knife is no longer available, having a ישראל watch him is of no help perhaps it was a faulty knife קשיא
 - c שוחט with (known) experience הכל unstated subject in יהכל is expert and/or שוחט with (known)
 - i Version1: מומחה without known experience
 - 1 בדיעבד if we didn't test him first, ask him afterwards if he knows הלכות שחיטה valid; if not invalid
 - 2 Exceptions: דריסה, הגרמה even בדיעבד, concern that they will violate דריסה, הגרמה etc.
 - 3 Challenge: final בדיעבד must refer to untested מומחה (per above); he must be gone, else we could ask him
 - i Version2: הכל refers to experienced שוחט (we saw him slaughter 2-3 times without fainting)
 - 1 בדיעבד if he slaughtered and avers that he didn't faint, we believe him and permit
 - 2 Exceptions: דריסה, הגרמה even בדיעבד, concern that they will violate בדיסה, הגרמה etc.
 - 3 And: final בדיעבד must refer to someone who isn't available to ask
 - d Assessment: why each חכם rejected other solutions
 - i אביי, רבא ור' אשי rejected אביי, רבא ועלא due to problem with final בדיעבד
 - ii *Contra איקר* if we claim that our עיקר counter that that should be קישר, as קרשים are taught there
 - 1 And if: we claim that that is the ייקר, no reason to teach it here, as מקדשים על טהרת מדם חולין שנעשו על טהרת קדש are not
 - iii Contra רבינא: version 1- nearly anyone performing מומחה is a מומחה;
 - 1 And: version 2 we aren't concerned with fainting
 - iv אב" did not accept אביי, per his challenge (that נכנס ויוצא is sufficient)
 - v אביי did not accept רבא; in that case, no one touched the wine; here, he is touching the בית השחיטה
 - vi הרי אריות are כותים he holds that כותים are גרי אריות (non-Jews)
 - vii אביי. did not accept רבא he rejects משומד לתאבון s ruling that a משומד לתאבון's slaughter is valid
 - viii Question: why didn't רבא agree with his own ruling (כר' אשי)?
 - 1 Answer: he was only answering אביי on his own terms (within context of כותי); but he rejected it in toto

מסכת חולין

- II שחיטת כותי is permitted ברייתא is permitted
 - a If: ישראל is supervising permitted
 - b If: אס ישראל supervising, test to see if he'll eat a זית from the meat; if so valid; if not invalid
 - c Parallel: if he has a net of slaughtered birds in his hand, he tears off the head of one and gives it to him
 - *If*: he eats from it permitted; if not forbidden
 - d Application to above discussion: רבא and רבא inferred their positions about כותי from here:
 - (לכתחילה) invalid − נכנס ויוצא inferred from אביי is standing over him, valid → if he's only אביי invalid (לכתחילה)
 - ii הבא only requires "test" if he came and found it already slaughtered סיפא is valid זכנס ויוצא ∈
 - 1 אביי coming and finding it already שחוט is the same as נכנס ויוצא
 - עומד על גביו is tantamount to נכנס ויוצא : לבא
 - e Assessing the "parallel" case: if he has a net of birds...
 - i Challenge: why aren't we concerned that the one we gave him (only) was properly slaughtered?
 - 1 Answer: we hide the bird and just bring out the head
 - 2 Challenge: what if he put a סימן on the head of the one properly slaughtered bird?
 - (a) Answer: the ישראל mashes it to remove any identifying marks
 - ii Challenge: what if פחיטה don't accept שחיטה of birds as being commanded in תורה (not explicitly written)?
 - 1 Block: neither are the various invalidating acts of שחיטה (e.g. דריסה, החלדה) yet we trust them
 - 2 Rather: once they have taken on a ritual commitment, they take it on fully (in this case extending to birds)