

30.6.3

86a (משנה ג) → 87a (ומכסי בחדא)

1. ואיש איש מבני ישראל ומן הגר הגר בתוכם אשר יצוד ציד חיה או עוף אשר יאכל וישפך את דמו ונסהו בעפר: ויקרא יז, יג
 2. כי נפש כל בשר דמו בנפשו הוא ואמר לבני ישראל דם כל בשר לא תאכלו כי נפש כל בשר דמו הוא כל אכליו יקרת: ויקרא יז, יד

I חט"ו status of שחיטה performed by משנה ג

- a If: they perform שחיטה under supervision, blood must be covered
 i But: if they perform שחיטה w/o supervision, no obligation to cover
 b אותו ואת בנו: if they slaughter under supervision, mother/offspring may not be slaughtered that day
 i But: if they perform שחיטה w/o supervision
 1 ד"מ permitted to slaughter afterwards
 2 חכמים prohibited to slaughter afterwards – however, they agree that if he does so, no מכות are incurred

II Analysis of dispute ר"מ/חכמים

- a Question: why do חכמים only consider שחיטת חט"ו w/o supervision to be meaningful in re: אותו ואת בנו?
 i Answer1: entire prohibition is a גזרה; if we insist on כסוי, people will assume their שחיטה is fully fine and will eat
 1 Challenge: if we disallow אר"ב, people will come to same errant conclusion
 2 Answer: not slaughtering proves nothing – might be that he isn't interested in eating meat today
 (a) Challenge: same could be said for דם כסוי, perhaps he's just cleaning up his yard
 (b) Block: if he slaughters over his dung pile, or if he asks us what to do –
 (i) Challenge: same could be asked about סיפא
 ii Rather: רבנן disagree in both cases and wait for ר"מ to finish his full ruling before expressing dissent
 1 Question: we understand רבנן (לחומרא) but why does ר"מ rule as he does? (leniently)
 2 Answer (ר' יוחנן): ר"מ considers שחיטת חט"ו (w/o supervision) to be full נבילה (→ מכות for eating)
 (a) Reason (ר' אמי): most of what they do is fouled
 (b) Question (ר' הונא בריה דר' לר"פ or inverse): why does ר' אמי have to rely on רוב for explanation
 (i) After all: ר"מ is חושש למיעוטה and if we add the חזקה (of an animal – חזקת איסור before proper שחיטה) – the רוב of "proper acts" (if we were to imagine it so) would be trumped
 1. Per: טמא-חכמים) טהור – if a baby is found near dough and is holding it - ר"מ finds it to be טהור
 a. Reason: minority of babies are טהורים and the עיסה has טהרה עיסה
 (c) Answer: just because he was willing to use חזקה+מיעוט for טהרה doesn't mean he would do so להיתר
 (i) Therefore: רוב needed to establish their שחיטה as clear-cut נבילה
 b Final ruling: one time, רבי ruled like ר"מ, another time like חכמים – but which was the later ruling (→ הלכה)?
 i Answer: per ר"א's message to גולה – his ruling per ר"מ was the later – and final – ruling

III שחיטות for multiple כסוי משנה ד

- a If: he slaughters many חיות or many עופות in one location – one כסוי for all
 b If: he slaughters חיה and עוף in one place
 i ד"ק one כסוי for all
 ii ד' יהודה first he covers the דם חיה (if he slaughtered it first) then he should slaughter and cover the עוף
 c ו. 1) each indicate the collective → one כסוי for all
 i ד' יהודה או עוף ד' יהודה divides them, requiring separate כסוי for each group
 ii Response: v. 2 (which follows v. 1) refers to דם as one, common feature → 1 כסוי for all
 1 Question: what are we to make of this response?
 2 Answer: they noted that או was needed (obligated for either חיה OR עוף, no need for both)
 (a) Response: ד' יהודה infers לחלק from "דמר" (in the singular)
 (b) Counter: דמו is understood as the collective-plural (just as חיה and עוף were understood) per v. 2
 d כסויים ברכה 1 is needed for both (even though separate כסויים are required) ד' חנינא
 i Challenge: why is this different than the story with תלמידי רב, who finished a meal, asked the servant to bring a cup for ברכת המזון and then decided to continue drinking – and were told that they couldn't drink until they said ברה"מ
 1 Answer: in that case, it is impossible to both drink and say ברה"מ simultaneously
 (a) But: in our case, he could cover with one hand and slaughter with the other
 (i) Explanation: therefore, שחיטה of the 2nd group doesn't constitute a הפסק from ברכה made over 1st group