



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The status of an animal (cont.)

R' Ashi concludes his proof that matters of danger are treated more stringently than matters of prohibition.

2) Water left uncovered

A Mishnah is quoted that discusses the restriction against drinking water that was left uncovered overnight.

The last statement of the Mishnah is clarified.

3) Slaughtering knife

R' Huna and R' Chisda disagree about the status of an animal that was slaughtered and the knife was examined and found to have a nick.

The rationale behind each opinion is explained.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Huna's position that the slaughter is invalid.

This proof is rejected.

R' Chisda's defense of his position is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara rules that halacha follows R' Huna's stringent opinion when the knife was not used to break bones after the slaughter and it follows R' Chisda's lenient opinion when the knife was used to break bones after slaughtering.

One of these rulings is further explained.

A related incident is cited and explained.

It is reported that R' Kahana required examination of the knife between the slaughter of each animal.

The Gemara discusses whether this ruling could be reconciled with both the position of R' Huna and the position of R' Chisda.

4) Chazakah

The Gemara searches for the source for the principle of chazakah.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How long does a liquid have to be left uncovered to become prohibited?

2. What is the status of an uncertain slaughtering?

3. What is the Gemara's final ruling in the dispute between R' Huna and R' Chisda?

4. Why is it necessary to have one's slaughtering knife examined by the Torah scholar of the community?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Checking the knife and trusting an individual's testimony
עד אחד נאמן באיסורין

The knife designated to be used for shechita must be examined before being used. Rav Huna holds that even if a knife is checked, if we find it to be nicked after the shechita is complete, we assume that the skin of the animal might have damaged the knife, and it was invalid immediately as the shechita was beginning. The first shechita which takes place is suspected of being a neveilah. Rav Chisda holds that if a knife was checked, but was detected with a nick after having done shechita, we may assume that it was not the skin of the animal which damaged the knife, but rather a bone of the back of the neck which damaged it. Therefore, the animal which was slaughtered is kosher, because the shechita was completed while the knife was still intact, and the nick happened after the shechita was finished. If more than one animal was shechted with the knife, although the first one is deemed kosher, the kashrus of any subsequent shechita would be doubtful, because the knife might have been damaged at the end of the first shechita.

The Gemara reports that Rav Kahana required that a knife for shechita be checked between each and every usage. The Gemara clarifies that this ruling might have been made based upon Rav Huna's approach, and the reason to check the knife is to determine that the animal just shechted is not kosher. The knife would be assumed to have become nicked as it began to cut the skin of the animal just shechted. Yet, the Gemara notes that this is not necessarily Rav Kahana's position. It might be that he agrees with Rav Chisda, and the reason to check the knife is in order to confirm that the next animal will be a kosher shechita. If we find a new nick in the knife, we could assume that the damage occurred after the previous animal's shechita was completed, and the knife was damaged by the bone at the back of its neck. Yet, if the inspection of the knife is in anticipation of verifying that the next animal will be kosher, the Gemara points out that the knife should have to be shown to an expert, as the Gemara states later (17b).

The Gemara responds that a single witness is trusted in areas of Torah ritual law (איסורים), and the need to show the knife to an expert is established for the honor of the expert himself.

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Uncovered liquids in a refrigerator

ג' משקין אסורין משום גלוי

Three liquids are prohibited if left exposed

The Gemara teaches that one may not drink certain liquids that are left uncovered out of concern that a snake drank some of the liquid and left behind some venom. This halacha is codified in Shulchan Aruch¹. Poskim discuss whether it is prohibited to drink a liquid that was left uncovered but it was stored in a closet or a refrigerator in a manner that it is not possible for a snake to get in. Is it prohibited to drink the liquid since the utensil was left uncovered or perhaps since the utensil was resting in a place that snakes could not reach the liquid is permitted?

Sefer Shemiras Haguf V'hanefesh² relates that Chazon Ish maintained a stringent position regarding liquids left uncovered and was stringent even in cases of doubt. However, when a liquid was left uncovered in a refrigerator he was lenient because in his opinion a container that is in a refrigerator is comparable to being covered. One explanation for his lenient position is that the cold of the refrigerator deters the snake from entering. Another possible explanation is that it is not possible for a snake to enter the refrigerator. According to this explanation if the container was in a closet into which a snake cannot enter he would also maintain that the liquid is permitted.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Rashi reports that the source for the halacha that testimony of a single person is accepted is that the Torah allows each person to slaughter his own offering, and the kohen relies upon the owner as he continues the remaining procedures of the offering, including eating from its meat. It must be that the kohen is allowed to trust every individual.

Rashi in Gittin (2b) gives a different reason for this halacha. The Torah allows Jews to offer food to one another. It must be that we may trust each other in this regard. ■

Dayan Weiss³ was asked whether liquid left in an uncovered utensil but placed beneath a table so that less than three tefachim separate the top of the utensil and the bottom of the table is permitted. Generally, when two objects are within three tefachim of one another the principle of lavud considers that they are attached. As such, in this case lavud should treat the utensil as if it is covered and the liquid should be permitted. He answered that when it comes to matters that depend upon what actually occurred (מצאיאות) the principle of lavud does not apply. Therefore, since the concern is whether a snake has the ability to access the liquid the concern exists even if the principle of lavud means that the utensil is considered covered. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' קט"ז סעי' א'.
2. ספר שמירת הגוף והנפש סי' מ"ד.
3. שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ט סי' פ"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Private Rebuke

בית אפל אין פותחין בו חלונות לראות את נגעו

A certain mechanech found out that two boys were indulging in the same negative behavior. Although he publicly rebuked one boy, the other boy was drawn aside and rebuked in private. The boy who was publicly rebuked felt that this was unfair. After all, he hadn't done anything worse than his friend, so why was only he bawled out in public?

When he confronted his mechanech with this inconsistency, the teacher explained himself very clearly and well. "You acted in an overt manner, telling

everyone about your misdemeanors. The other boy acted in the same inappropriate manner but he kept his sin to himself. It is therefore appropriate that you be publicly admonished to warn others that this behavior is wrong and will not be tolerated. Since his actions were not known to his fellow students, I was able to rebuke him privately, which is certainly preferable if possible."

When the boy admitted that this sounded sensible, the mechanech explained where he had first learned about this distinction. "I heard this from the Damesek Eliezer of Vizhnitz, zt"l, who based it on the Gemara in Chulin 10. There we find the case of a kohen who goes to see a house which may be afflicted with tsara'as but is dark. Although one might have assumed that he is re-

quired to open the windows if this will help him determine if the blemish is impure, the Gemara tells us not to do so. The rebbe explained the lesson from this. Although one who sins in public should be rebuked publicly, as long as the house is dark—as long as the sinner conceals his flaw—he should be rebuked privately." ■

1. ליקוטי בתר ליקוטי, ח' ט"ו, ע' ר"י"ח

(Overview...continued from page 1)

R' Shmuel bar Nachmani in the name of R' Yonason offers a source for this principle.

R' Acha bar Yaakov rejects this source but Abaye refutes R' Acha bar Yaakov's challenge.

Further discussion regarding the source for chazakah is recorded. ■