

30.1.10

12a (לרצונכם תזבחוהו לדעתכם זבחו) → 13a (א"ר נחמן אמר רב ראה אחד ששחט)

1. ושחט את בן הבקר לפני ה' והקריבו בני אהרן הפהגים את הדם וזרקו את הדם על המזבח סביב אֶשֶׁר פָּתַח אֵהָל מוֹעֵד: ויקרא א, ה
 2. וכי תזבחו זבח שלמים לה' לרצונכם תזבחוהו: ויקרא יט, ה

- I רב's ruling in case of overseeing a שחיטה (reported by ר"נ): if we saw someone perform a full שחיטה – valid
- a background: if he knows the laws, no need to oversee; if he does not know the laws, he must obviously be watched
- b answer1: we don't know if he is familiar with the laws
- i challenge: why don't we employ the principle of רוב (most שוחטין are familiar)?
- 1 Support: ברייתא – if he finds a slaughtered bird in the שוק, or instructs his agent to slaughter – assume validity
- c Answer2: we know that he is not familiar with the laws, but saw him cut one סימן properly – למ"ל we need to see both
- d Tangent: ר"נ asked ר' דימי בר יוסף why we assume שחוט (above), if we don't make the same assumption about תרומה תרומה – if we assume שליחותו, should be valid; if not, שחיטה should be invalid
- i Answer: we do not assume שליחותו, but here, another may have heard the directive and slaughtered
- 1 However: if the same happened in re תרומה, no one may separate תרומה without permission of the owner
- e Revisit: perhaps the assumption that רוב מצויין אצל שחיטה is subject to dispute:
- i ברייתא: if his animals were lost and he found them slaughtered
- 1 דבי יהודה: forbids eating them
- 2 ד' חנינא בנו של ריה"ג: permits
- (a) we rule (נראין) like יהודה if they were found in a dung-heap (discarded); like ר"ח if found in the house
- (i) Implication: the שחיטה's positions are polar → they disagree about רוב מצויין
1. Rejection (רנב"י): all hold if found in public אשפה – invalid; in house – valid
- a. Disagreement: if found in house-אשפה; whether a person will throw a נבילה in his house-אשפה
- (ii) Revisiting דבי "dung-heap" must be of house (all agree, per רנב"י, re: public dung-heap – נבלה)
1. And: "house" must mean – אשפה שבבית, (all agree, per רנב"י, re: house itself – שחטה)
2. Contradiction in דבי's ruling: is found in אשפה שבבית a נבילה or שחטה?
3. Resolution: he means that ר"ח agrees (נראין לר"ח) if found in public dung-heap, and vice-versa
- II Revisiting חש"ו in our משנה – 'tho the clause is בדיעבד, the reason given is לכתחילה (שמה ילקלו), not (שמה ילקלו)
- a Application (דבא): teaching that we don't give them (even) חולין for slaughtering לכתחילה, even with supervision
- III Revisiting last clause in 1א: any of them (those invalid לכתחילה) who slaughtered under supervision – כשרים
- a Observation: תנא holds that we require no intent for שחיטה (could even be done by חש"ו)
- i דבא: this follows נתן ר' if someone threw a knife which ricocheted and slaughtered – ר"נ validates (contra חכמים)
- ii Ruling (דבא): per ר"נ, provided it sawed back and forth, as required (הולכה והובאה)
- b חש"ו's question (according to ר' חייא בר אבא version 1): is the intent of קטנים reckoned מחשבה?
- i Challenge (ר' אמי): why not ask whether their actions are meaningful?
- ii Because: explicit ruling that their actions are meaningful (כלים יז:טו); but ibid states מחשבה אין להם מחשבה
- iii Answer (ר' חייא): he was asking about intent which can be discerned from the action
- 1 For example: if a קטן dragged an animal from דרום into צפון for שחיטה, does this prove intent for עולה?
- (a) Or: shall we posit that he moved it there for convenience?
- 2 Challenge: ר' יוחנן already ruled in such a case, re: מכשירין ו:א (כני יתן putting fruit on roof doesn't establish intent)
- (a) ד' יוחנן: if the קטן turned the fruit over (and then it rained on them) – it is בכי יתן (=considered intent)
- 3 Answer: he was asking whether the intent ascribed to the קטן is מד"ס (לחומרא) or מה"ת (even לקולא)
- c חש"ו's question (according to ר' חייא version 2): is the action of קטן considered מעשה?
- i Challenge (ר' אמי): why not ask whether a קטן's intent is meaningful?
- ii Because: explicit ruling that his intent is not meaningful (כלים יז:טו); but ibid states מעשה יש להם מעשה
- iii Answer (ר' חייא): he was asking whether the validity of their actions is מד"ס or מה"ת
- d Resolution (to both): their actions are fully meaningful (מה"ת), their intent has no impact (even מד"ס)
- i And: intent discernable via action (מחשבה ניכרת מתוך מעשה) – is valid מד"ס but not מה"ת
- e שמואל (asked הונא): how do we know that מתעסק בקדשים is invalid?
- i Answer: v. 1 shows the requirement לכתחילה
- ii Response: how do know that it is מעכב?
- 1 Answer: v. 2 – לדעתכם means לרצונכם – must have intent for שחיטה