

30.1.14

16b (הא בתלושה הא במחוברת) → 18a (הכל שוחטין ולעולם שוחטין)

1. כי ירחיב ה' אלהיך את גבולך כאשר דבר לך ואמרת אכלה בשר כי תאונה נפשך לאכל בשר בכל אות נפשך תאכל בשר: דברים יב, כ
 2. כי ירחק ממך המקום אשר יבחר ה' אלהיך לשום שמו שם וזבחת מבקרך ומצאנך אשר נתן ה' לך כאשר צויתך ואכלת בשעריך בכל אות נפשך: דברים יב, כא
 3. אך כאשר יאכל את הצבי ואת האיל פן תאכלנו הטמא והטהור יחדו יאכלנו: דברים יב, כב
 4. ושחט את בן הבקר לפני ה' והקריבו בני אהרן הפהנים את הדם וזרקו את הדם על המזבח סביב אשר פתח אהל מועד: ויקרא א, ה
 5. הצאן ובקר ישחט להם ומצא להם אם את כל דגי הים יאסף להם ומצא להם: במדבר יא, כב
 6. ובתים מלאים כל טוב אשר לא מלאת וברת חצובים אשר לא חצבת כרמים וזיתים אשר לא נטעת ואכלת ושבעת: דברים ו, יא
 7. ויאמר שאול פצו בעם ואמרתם להם הגישו אלי איש שורו ואיש שיהו ושחטתם בזה ואכלתם ולא תחטאו לה' לאכל אל הדם... שמ"א יד, לד

I Analysis of “general statements” in משנה – בכל שוחטין, לעולם שוחטין, בכל שוחטין, לעולם שוחטין

a לעולם understood as meaning “forever”

- i דבה. per ר"י, who reads v. 1 as permitting תאונה בשר; א"א with מקדש חורבן, ban returns – קמ"ל that it is forever
 - 1 Challenge (ר' יוסף): if so, should state לעולם שוחטין ואוכלין
 - (a) Furthermore: reason for original ban was to bring meat to מקדש; no reason to reinstitute ban after חורבן
 - ii מותר (שחיטה w/o) was מותר
 - 1 And: we might have thought that once exiled, the ban was lifted – קמ"ל that we continue to use שחיטה (only)
 - iii Observation: dispute ר"ע/ר"י –
 - 1 בשר תאונה (non-sanctified meat) was never banned
 - 2 בשר נחירה (non-slaughtered meat) was never permitted
 - (a) Arguments: for ר"י –
 - (i) V 4: assumes שחיטה in the desert (before arriving in א"י)
 - 1. Defense (for ר"ע): it was required for קדשים immediately
 - (ii) V 5: assumes שחיטה in the desert – for חולין
 - 1. Defense (for ר"ע): they would refer to their form of killing (נחירה) as “שחיטה”
 - (iii) כסוי חיה improperly from ועוף who killed a חיה: מצוות כסוי דם
 - 1. Explanation: if, per ר"ע, that was permitted form of killing → eating beforehand, should be חייב בכסוי
 - 2. Defense (for ר"ע): once it became prohibited (upon entry to א"י), it was fully “out”
 - (b) Arguments: for ר"ע's position
 - (i) V 3: compares בשר תאונה to צבי ואיל (which were always permitted as בשר תאונה)
 - 1. Defense (for ר"י): the original prohibition of בשר תאונה only applied to meat fit for a קרבן (not חיה)
 - iv Tangential question (ר' ירמיה): if (per ר"ע), they brought בשר נחירה into the Land, was it still מותר?
 - 1 Clarification: must be asking about status after 7 years of war
 - (a) Reason: during that time, even pig's shoulders were permitted, per v. 6
 - (b) Block: perhaps the question was referring to first 7 years; v. 6 only permitted enemies' spoils, not their own (freshly forbidden) food - - תיקו

II רבא's challenge to the interpretation of the משנה – and his reinterpretation:

- a Challenge: בכל cannot refer to נשחט (as we interpreted clauses #1 & #2; assumption – all clauses have common referent)
- b Therefore: all clauses refer to שוחט;
 - i הכל along with א:א, extends to כותי and משועמד
 - ii לעולם means day or night (or atop roof, on a boat)
 - iii בכל means any material, per our משנה (with attendant exclusions)
 - 1 Story: אבוא דשמואל would bend knives in different ways and send them to א"י to see what is a significant גגם
 - (a) Response: our משנה invalidates a saw → those type of “teeth” (which tear instead of cut) are invalid

III detailing the “one-tooth” knife which may be valid

- a If: the knife has numerous פגימיות – invalid
- b But if: it has only one –
 - i If: it is אוגרת (sharp on both sides of the “tooth”) – invalid
 - ii But if: it is מסוכסכת (sharp on only one side, sloping on the other) – valid
 - 1 Challenge: אוגרת is invalid since one tooth weakens the סימן, the other one tears it
 - (a) But: the same will happen with אוגרת – the knife blade weakens, and the single “snag” tears it
 - 2 Defense: if the “snag” is at the head of the knife (doesn't draw it that far)
 - (a) Challenge: in any case, when he saws “fro”, it will tear
 - (b) Defense: only valid if he sawed “to” without “fro”

- c רבא's presentation: there are three types of knives:
- i **אוגרת**: invalid – even **בדיעבד**
 - ii **מסוכסכת**: valid **בדיעבד**, but shouldn't use it **לכתחילה**
 - iii **עולה ויורד** (*sloping curves*): valid **לכתחילה**
 - 1 **Challenge** (to **רב אשי**): he had taught, in רבא's name, that **מסוכסכת** was invalid
 - (a) **Defense**: it is invalid if he pulls to and fro (as per above); if only one direction – valid
 - 2 **Question** (to **רב אשי**): what if the knife is bumpy like a grain-beard
 - (a) **Answer**: that is perfectly acceptable **שחיטה**
- IV Source for **בדיקת סכין**
- a Source for obligation (**ר' חסדא**): v. 7
 - i **Challenge**: it's obvious that we need **בדיקה**, to make sure that the animal isn't rendered a **טריפה**
 - ii **Rather**: ר"ח's invoking v. 7 was to support **בדיקת חכם**
 - 1 **Challenge**: ר' יוחנן observed that **בדיקת חכם** is **דרבנן** (as a formality)
 - 2 **Answer**: v. 7 only serves as an **אסמכתא** for **בדיקת חכם**
 - b **Methods of בדיקה**:
 - i **א"י**: the sun (either by sunlight or to see if the shadow is unbroken)
 - ii **נהרדעא**: water – see if the blade causes a ripple
 - iii **ד' ששת**: the tip of his tongue
 - iv **ד' אחא בר יעקב**: by a hair
 - v **סורא**: it cuts meat, so it must be tested against meat (see if it tears any of the meat)
 - c **Range of בדיקה**:
 - i **ד"פ** must be tested against flesh, a fingernail and on both sides
 - 1 **Note**: confusion whether **ר' אשי** quoted רבא (or not) requiring sides being checked (or not)
 - 2 **Report**: רב כהנא required checking with flesh, fingernail and all sides of the knife (per ר' אשי's approval of a student checking that extensively)
 - 3 **Dissent**: רב יימר did not require sides; per שמואל's ruling (above) that a heated knife is valid, even though sides may burn **סימנים**, since the **בית השחיטה** widens out and sides do not touch **סימנים** → sides need not be checked
- V ר' קטינא's "list" of פגימות (reported by ר' רשב"ל):
- a **קרבן פסח**: bone (for violation of **עצם**)
 - b **זכור**: a piece of his ear – to render him **בעל מום** (and can be slaughtered and eaten by **כהן**)
 - c **מום**: for all **קדשים**
 - i **ד' חסדא**: adds פגימה of a knife
 - 1 **דשב"ל**: only listed פגימות in the area of **קדשים**
 - d **Amount**: same as **פגימת מזבח** – which is enough to catch a fingernail
 - i **Challenge**: dispute רשב"ל/ראב"י over פגימה – **טפח** or **כזית** (i.e. much more than fingernail-catching)
 - ii **Answer**: that dispute is re: **סיד** (but see ר' אריא's understanding); our ruling is in re the stones themselves
- VI Consequences of a שוחט not showing his knife to a **חכם**
- a **הונא ד' הונא**: he is excommunicated (for contempt of court)
 - b **דבא**: he is fired and his meat is pronounced to be **טריפה**
 - i **Resolution**: if the knife proves to be fit, only excommunicated; if not – fired etc.
 - 1 **Challenge**: if his knife is found to be unfit, we don't even allow him to sell meat to non-Jews
 - c **Story**: שוחט who wouldn't show his knife to רבא בר חיננא, he then put him in **חרם**, had him fired and his meat declared to be **טריפה**; he directed his students to look into the matter as the שוחט's young children depended on their father's livelihood, they found the knife to be fit and רב אשי pronounced his meat **כשר**; when asked how he had the right to forego the honor of "the elder", he answered that it was at his behest that he did so
- VII רבה בר הונא - 2 implements that may be used – a detached tooth/fang and a detached fingernail
- a **Challenge**: our משנה invalidates both שיניים (on a detached jaw) and צפורן
 - i **Resolution1**: one tooth is valid; if more than one - they "choke" (tear) and don't cut
 - ii **Resolution2**: a detached fingernail is valid; if still on the animal's paw (e.g.) invalid