

30.2.3

29a → 30b (תקו) → (רוב אחד בעוף)

1. וכי תזבחו זבח שלמים לה' לרצונכם תזבחהו: ויקרא יט, ה.
 2. רק בכל אות נפשך תזבח ואכלת בשר כבדפת ה' אלהיך אשר נתן לך בכל שעריך הטמא והטהור יאכלנו כצבאי וקאיל: דברים יב, טו.
 3. חץ שחוט לשונם מרמה דבר בפיו שלום את רעהו ידבר ובקרבו ישים 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 – 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 המולק ד' כהנא if 1st clause were קדשים, should say המולק
- (a) Challenge: if סיפא is קדשים, should say כשרה
- (b) Defense: סיפא last mentions בהמה, so it addresses שחיטה רישא; עוף first mentions רישא, should say המולק → QED
- 2 עולת העוף ד' שימי בר אשי if it were קדשים, it would have to list 2 (for עולת העוף)
- (a) Challenge: if סיפא is קדשים, should also list רוב שנים for עולת העוף
- (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 חולין רישא ד"פ since חולין רי"ר/ר"ב disagree about need for cutting veins – but in קדשים, must be cut (לכ"ע) for דם
- 4 בדיעבד 2 heads at once is only valid משנה ב' קדשים, from סיפא ד"א
- (a) And: that restriction only applies to קדשים, per יוסף ר' interpretation of v. 1 (read last word as תזבחהו)
- 5 קדשים, per his application of the סיפא to the validity of a תמיד whose שחיטה isn't fully completed
- (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 an עבודה done by another כהן
- (ii) Answer: סד"א that there is a פסול מד"ס if he doesn't complete it – קמ"ל from סיפא – סיפא even כשר – מד"ס
- 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 1 סימן was cut by גוי, or 1 סימן of עולת העוף 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 סימניו outside then finished inside
- b Challenge (ר' זירא): יוחנן ר' יוחנן ר' זירא: פרה ד:ד – those involved with פרה from beginning to end generate טומאת בגדים
- i Therefore: if it became פסול during שחיטה – at any point, not מטמא בגדים (of השוחט)
- ii And: if it became פסול during הזאת הדם – only the one involved after פסול is "spared" from טומאת בגדים
- iii Argument: if שחיטה is an ongoing process, should distinguish between פסול happening before or after
- 1 Defense (רבא): if שחיטה became פסול, that proves (retroactively) that the שחיטה was never good
- c Challenge (רבא): if שחיטה is only at end, פרה ד: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 (אב"י): יוחנן ר' יוחנן identified that ruling as being per רב"ש, but רב"ש rule that two may slaughter פרה 1
- 1 And: even for רב"ש, 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 (רב אב"י): if he slaughtered פסח during חוה"מ while owning חמץ (vis-à-vis על חמץ על חמץ) (לא תזבח על חמץ על חמץ)
- i לשמו exempt from violation (as לשמו שלא בזמנו is invalid)
- ii לשמו שלא לשמו liable – it is a valid שלמים
- 1 Implication: if he slaughtered פסח, 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 (אב"י): 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 שחיטה מפורעת – whether שחיטה must be a single cut
- a **דב**: if one slaughters in 2 or 3 places – valid
- b **שמואל** (when he heard this from **רב יהודה**): that isn't שחיטה מפורעת, which is 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** **שמה** **ידרוסו**
- (b) **Defense** (**ר' אבא**): there is such a version of the **משנה** – **על זה** – **אין חוששין שמה 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 – (ahead **ד** **משנה**) – 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 of **חלדה** since he is cutting in the usual direction of שחיטה – **קמ"ל**
- iv **Note**: in that report of **רב** (cited by **רב יהודה**), under the skin was valid
- 1 **But**: **בי רב** were not sure if it was valid
- v **Query**: according to **בי רב**, 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**