

30.2.3

29a → 30b (תיקו) → (רוב אחד בעוף)

1. וכי תזבח זבח שלמים לה' לרצונכם תזבחהו: ויקרא יט, ה.
2. רק בכל אות נפשו תזבח ואכלת בשר כבדפת ה' אלהיך אשר נתן לך בכל שעריך הטמא והטהור יאכלנו כצבי וכאיל: דברים יב, טו.
3. חץ שחוט לשונם מרמה דבר בפיו שלום את רעהו ידבר ובקרבו ישם ארבו: ירמיהו ט, ז.

I Analysis of end of משנה – repetition of rule that רוב is considered the whole סימן

a קדשים ד' חסדא solution – one is referring to חולין, the other to קדשים

i Justification: if we only learned חולין, we would think that קדשים, where the דם is needed (for זרה"ד – need full סימן

1 And: if we only learned קדשים, we would think that in re חולין, blood is not needed – part is enough – קמ"ל

ii identification: first passage refers to חולין and second (סיפא) to קדשים

1 כהנא if 1st clause were קדשים, should say המולק

(a) Challenge: if סיפא is קדשים, should say מליקתו כשרה

(b) Defense: עוף first mentions רישא, שחיטה first mentions סיפא, so it addresses המולק → QED

2 עולת העוף for רישא refers to אחד בעוף; if it were קדשים, it would have to list 2 (for עולת העוף)

(a) Challenge: if סיפא is קדשים, should also list רוב שנים

(b) Defense: רוב אחד means "majority of each one (needed)"; if חטאת – 1; if עולה – 2

(i) And: since it isn't one measure, they left the language equivocal

3 דם (לכו"ע) for קדשים, must be cut ר"י/רבנן; since חולין is רישא ד"פ

4 בדיעבד slaughtering 2 heads at once is only valid משנה ב' from קדשים is סיפא ד"א

(a) And: that restriction only applies to קדשים, per יוסף's interpretation of v. 1 (read last word as תזבחהו)

5 שחיטה תמיד whose שחיטה isn't fully completed קדשים, per סיפא to the validity of a תמיד

(a) Note: context is the 2nd כהן completing the שחיטה of the תמיד on יוה"כ, when the כה"ג must perform all עבודות

(i) Challenge: how could finishing be מעכב? – that would involve עבודה done by another כהן

(ii) Answer: כשר – סיפא from קמ"ל – מד"ס even כשר – סיפא that there is a פסול מד"ס if he doesn't complete it

II Dispute רשב"ל/ר"י regarding "point" of שחיטה – only at end (רשב"ל בשם לוי) or throughout process (ר' יוחנן)

a Scope of disagreement (רבא): they agree if סימן 1 was cut by גוי, or עולת העוף of סימן 1 was cut below – invalid

i Reason: an act of שחיטה/מליקה was done improperly

ii But: they disagree in case one סימן (of קרבן) was cut outside, and the other inside – whether liable for שחוט חוץ

iii Challenge: רב יוסף limited disagreement – and all agree in that case that he is liable

1 Reason: that is the full act done for עולת העוף (סימן 1)

iv Rather (רב יוסף): disagreement is if he cut <50% of סימנין outside then finished inside

b Challenge (רבא's position): יוחנן ר' זירא – פרה ד: – those involved with פרה from beginning to end generate בגדים

i Therefore: if it became פסול during שחיטה – at any point, not מטמא בגדים (of השוחט)

ii And: if it became פסול during הדם – only the one involved after פסול is "spared" from בגדים

iii Argument: if שחיטה is an ongoing process, should distinguish between פסול happening before or after

1 Defense (רבא): if the שחיטה became פסול, that proves (retroactively) that the שחיטה was never good

c Challenge (רבא's position): if שחיטה is only at end, פרה ד: should note that if פרה is slaughtered by two people, only last one should be טמא

i Block (רב יוסף): 2 may not slaughter פרה, per vv. 1-2

ii Defense (אביי): יוחנן identified that ruling as being per רבא, but רבנן rule that two may slaughter פרה

1 And: even for רבא, if שוחט changed scarves in the middle, only second should be טמא

2 Rather: משנה is only focused on impact of פסול פרה on טומאת בגדים, not on properly prepared פרה

d Challenge (רבא's position): if he slaughtered פסח during חוה"מ while owning חמץ (vis-à-vis חמץ על חמץ) (לא תזבח על חמץ)

i לשמו exempt from violation (as לשמו שלא בזמנו is invalid)

ii לשמו liable – it is a valid שלמים

1 Implication: if he slaughtered סתם, it'd be considered לשמו and he'd be exempt

2 Conclusion: פסח during the rest of the year (not יד) requires an active redesignation

(a) Rejection: perhaps in this case the owners were ט"מ, and this animal was still fit for "לשמו" on פסח שני

(b) Argument: if שחיטה is an ongoing process, it was already invalid at the beginning → exempt

(i) But: if שחיטה is only at end; once he slaughtered, should be invalid for פסח, then the שחיטה is valid for שלמים and he should be liable

(ii) Rejection (אביי): even though it was rejected as a פסח itself, it could have been redeemed for פסח דמי

1. And: that can even happen after שחיטה, while it is מפרכסת

III whether שחיטה must be a single cut

- a דב: if one slaughters in 2 or 3 places – valid
- b שחיטה מפורעת, which is required (when he heard this from יהודה רב): that isn't required
 - i Support: רשב"ל also requires שחיטה מפורעת per v. 3 (comparing שחיטה to an arrow)
 - ii Challenge (ר' אלעזר): חולין ב:ב – if two are holding a knife, even one above and the other below – valid שחיטה
 - 1 Defense (ר' ירמיה): that משנה is referring to two people holding one (double-handled) knife → שחיטה מפורעת
 - 2 Challenge (ר' אבא): rest of משנה – we aren't concerned that they will generate טריפה for each other's half
 - (a) But: if it is one knife – should be ידרוסו שמא חוששין
 - (b) Defense (ר' אבא): there is such a version of the משנה – אין חוששין שמא ידרוסו זה על זה
 - iii Challenge (ר' אבין): ruling that if he slaughters the קנה in one spot and the וושט in another – valid
 - 1 Defense (ר' אבין himself): case is where he slaughters like a quill – on a diagonal slant (still מפורעת)
- c Story: יצחק בר שמואל ate from an animal that was slaughtered (per רב) in several places
 - i Reaction (ר' זירא): this teaches us that ב:ב is referring to two people holding two knives

IV Tangential discussion re: חלדה

- a דב: if he stuck the knife in between סימנים and cut – invalid
 - i But: if he put it under the skin and cut – valid
 - ii Challenge: this is already taught – (משנה ד ahead) – if he put the knife under the 2nd סימן and cut – invalid
 - 1 Note: dispute ישבב ר"ע/ר' if it is a נבילה or טריפה (see ahead for discussion)
 - iii Defense: in that case, the knife was under the סימן; we may have thought that if it was above the סימן, not a problem קמ"ל – שחיטה in the usual direction of חלדה since he is cutting in the usual direction of חלדה
 - iv Note: in that report of רב (cited by יהודה רב), under the skin was valid
 - 1 But: בי רב were not sure if it was valid
 - v Query: according to רב בי, if he cut under a towel (on the animal's throat) or in tangled wool – is it חלדה? – תיקו
 - vi Query (ר' פ): if he did חלדה on a minority of the סימן (i.e. after רוב was cut) – is it חלדה? – תיקו