30.2.12 41a (סיום הפרק) → 42a (משנה ט)

נ. בָּמַעשָׂה אַרֶץ מִצְרִיִם אַשֶּׁר יָשַׁבֹתֶּם בָּהּ לֹא תַעשוּ וּכִמַעשָׂה אָרֶץ כִּנַען אֲשֶׁר אַנִי מֶבִיא אָתֶכם שַׁמָּה לֹא תַעשוּ וּ**בְּחָלְתִיהָם לֹא תַלַכוּ:** ייִקרא יה, ג

- I משנה ט against שחיטה into certain places due to resemblance to idolatrous worship
 - a not allowed to: slaughter into the seas, rivers or vessels
 - i but: he may slaughter into a small container of water or over כלים on a boat (→ goes into sea, leaving boat clean)
 - 1 reason for prohibition: people shouldn't get the impression that he is worshipping the god of the sea etc.
 - (a) however: the waters in the permitted כלי must be dirty (per רובא); no impression of worship of reflection
 - b not allowed: in any case to slaughter directly into a pit
 - i but: he may dig a pit in his private area and let the blood flow into it
 - 1 however: he may not do so in public, as he seems to be following the מינים
 - ii challenge: גומא was utterly banned, then we allowed it in private!
 - 1 answer1 (אביי): utter ban was only in public
 - (a) challenge (רבא): since סיפא is in רישא, שוק must be even in his private property
 - 2 answer2 (דבא): permission is not to dig a pit, but to make pockmarks in his field and the blood runs into them
 - (a) and: even that is prohibited in the שוק, as it is the practice of מינים
 - (b) *supportive בּבּייתא*: if he was on a boat and there's nowhere on the boat to slaughter, he may put his hand overboard and slaughter, even though the דם goes on the hull; and he may not slaughter into a pit at all, but if he wants to keep his field clean, he may slaughter and allow the blood to flow into the pit
 - (i) however: he may not do so in public, as it follows custom of sectarians
 - 1. and if: he does so, we should investigate him.
- וו משנה י slaughtering with intent for a קרבן
 - a if: he slaughters לשם תודה or לשם פסח, or לשם אשם תלוי, or לשם זבחים (שלמים), or לשם כסח, or לשם פסח, all invalid
 - i dissent: ר"ש permits
 - ii and if: two were slaughtering together and one of them had one of these intents מסולה
 - b but if: he slaughters with intent for a חטאת or an בכור or מעשר ס בכור valid
 - c rule: if he intends that which is voluntarily given (נידר ונידב) invalid; if for something which is not כשר נידר ונידב
- III Analysis:
 - a אשם הלוי: follows אשם הלוי, who holds that a person may voluntarily bring (כריתות ו:ג) אשם הלוי
 - b נידר ונידב it has a set time
 - i solution (פסח: מסח can be designated all year
 - c limitation (ד' ינאי): this only applies to קרבן, we see that he doesn't intend a בעל מום, we see that he doesn't intend a
 - i dissent (ר' יוחען): even מום the מום may be covered up and he may intend a קרבן
 - d ר' יוחנן this only applies if he isn't liable for a חטאת; if so, he may intend this to be his חטאת
 - i challenge: he didn't say חטאתי
 - ii answer (אבהו): if he did say חטאתי, then it would be invalid (if he were חייב חטאת)
 - e המורה this is only true if he has no קרבן in his house; if he does, perhaps he is making a תמורה
 - i challenge: he didn't say תמורת זבחי
 - ii answer (תמורת זבחי: if he did say תמורת, then it would be invalid (if he had a מו in his house)
 - f (the rule): is there to include אולת נזיר (the rule): is there to include ימיר, we would think it's meaningless as he isn't a ימיר.
 - but: he may have taken a vow of נזירות discreetly
 - g עולת יולדת (the 2nd half of the rule): includes עולת יולדת (as being meaningless)
 - i \aleph'' 7. this is only true if he has no wife at home; if he does, perhaps it is for his wife
 - 1 challenge: he didn't say לשם עולת אשתי
 - 2 answer (ל" אבתו): if he did say לשם עולת אשתי, then it would be invalid (if he had a wife)
 - (a) *challenge*: this is obvious (that it would be considered if he said it that way)
 - (b) defense: we would think that had she given birth, there would be a קול →meaningless without the (קול
 - (i) therefore: it teaches that we suspect that she may have miscarried (and be liable for עולת יולדת)