

דף יומי • חלין • דף פ"ה

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf continuing the shakla v'tarya regarding Rabbi Yosei's kal v'chomer. The Gemara is trying to find a source that a doubt is strong enough to obligate a mitzvah on Yom Tov, looking at the cases of shofar with a tumtum and circumcision. We see a beautiful discussion of how we refute these comparisons, including a d'rashah from Rabbi Elazar HaKappar Beribbi about the difference between circumcision and covering the blood, which Rabbi Chiyya praised as an unanswerable point that was indeed answered.

Then, we learn a new Mishnah that brings us straight into the core halachos of kisuy hadam. The Tanna Kamma, Rabbi Meir, and the Sages argue about whether an invalid shechita—like a treifah, or shechita for avodah zarah, or kodashim outside the Azarah—still requires covering the blood. This leads the Gemara into a major yeshivish sugya regarding the definition of shechita: do we say "shechita she'eina re'uya shemah shechita" (an unfit slaughter is still halachically considered a slaughter) or not?

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 85A

EXPLANATION

אֵלָא סָפֵק אִישׁ סָפֵק אִשָּׁה.

Rather, the case of shofar where there is a doubt is where we have a tumtum, who is a **doubt** whether he is a **man** or a **doubt** whether he is a **woman**. Since a tumtum is obligated in shofar because of this doubt, we can derive that a koy, which is also a doubt, requires covering on Yom Tov.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי לְטַעְמִיהָ, דָּאָמַר: אִשָּׁה וְדֹאִית נָמִי תִקְעָה.

And Rabbi Yosei is consistent **with his** standard line of **reasoning**, as he says: **A definite woman may also blow** the shofar on Rosh Hashanah as an optional mitzvah. Therefore, for Rabbi Yosei, there is no distinction between men and women regarding the permission to blow, so the obligation of a tumtum is not based on a mere doubt.

BRAISA

דִּתְנִינָא: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל סוֹמְכִין, וְלֹא בָנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל סוֹמְכוֹת.

As it is taught in a braisa: The pasuk says, 'Speak to **the sons of Israel**... and he shall lean.' This teaches that the sons of Israel **lean** on the head of a korban, **but the daughters of Israel do not lean**.

BRAISA

רַבִּי יוֹסִי וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמְרִים: נָשִׁים סוֹמְכוֹת רְשׁוֹת.

Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: Women may lean as an optional act, and it is not considered a violation of working with holy animals. The same applies to shofar; women may blow optionally, so a tumtum blowing is not a proof for resolving doubts.

OBJECTION

אמר רבינא: ולמאי דקאמרי רבנן נמי אית ליה פירכא,

Ravina said: And even according to what the Rabbis say—that women may not blow shofar, and thus a tumtum is only obligated because of doubt—there is also a refutation to the kal v'chomer from shofar to covering the blood of a koy on Yom Tov:

OBJECTION

מה לתקיעת שופר שפון ודא דוחה שבת במקדש, תאמר בכיסוי דליתיה כלל!

What is unique about the blowing of the shofar? That its definite obligation overrides Shabbos in the Beis HaMikdash! Will you say the same regarding covering the blood, which does not override Shabbos at all? Therefore, we cannot derive the laws of covering from shofar.

REFUTATION

השיב רבי אלעזר הקפר בריבי: מה למילה שפון אינה נוהגת בלילי ימים טובים.

Rabbi Elazar HaKappar Beribbi responded with a different refutation to Rabbi Yosei's kal v'chomer from circumcision: What is unique about circumcision? That it is not practiced on the nights of Yom Tov.

QUESTION

בלילי ימים טובים הוא דלא נהגא, בשאר לילי נהגא?

The Gemara asks: Is it only on the nights of Yom Tov that it is not practiced, but on other nights of the year it is practiced? Surely circumcision is never performed at night!

RESOLUTION

אלא, מה למילה – שפון אינה נוהגת בלילות כבימים – שנוהג בלילות כבימים!

Rather, this is what he meant: What is unique about circumcision? That it is not practiced at night as it is by day. Will you say the same regarding covering the blood, which is practiced at night just as it is by day? Therefore, covering is more frequent and cannot be compared to circumcision.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אבא: זה אחד מן הדברים שאמר רבי חייה אין עליהן תשובה, והשיב רבי אלעזר בריבי תשובה.

Rabbi Abba said: This is one of the matters about which Rabbi Chiyya said that there is no refutation for them, and yet Rabbi Elazar Beribbi responded and found a refutation.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' השוחט ונמצאת טריפה, והשוחט לעבודה זרה, והשוחט חולין בפנים וקדשים בחוץ, חיה ועוף הנסקלים – רבי מאיר מחייב, וחכמים פוטרם.

MISHNAH: One who slaughters a wild animal or a bird and it is found to be a treifah, or one who slaughters them for idol worship, or one who slaughters non-sacred animals inside the Azarah, or sacrificial birds outside the Azarah, or a wild animal or bird that are sentenced to be stoned—in all these cases of invalid slaughter, Rabbi Meir obligates one to cover the blood, and the Sages exempt him.

MISHNAH

השוחט ונתנבלה בידו, הנוחר והמעקר – פטור מלקפות.

One who slaughters and it becomes a carcass by his hand through an invalid act of slaughter, **or one who stabs** the animal, **or one who tears** the organs, **is exempt from covering** the blood, because these are not acts of slaughter at all.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן: ראה רבי דבריו של רבי מאיר באותו ואת בנו, ושנאו בלשון חכמים, ודרבי שמעון בכסוי הדם, ושנאו בלשון חכמים.

GEMARA: Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi saw the words of Rabbi Meir to be correct regarding the prohibition of slaughtering 'it and its offspring' on the same day—that an invalid slaughter is still considered a slaughter—and he taught it in the Mishnah there in the name of 'the Sages' to give it more weight. And he saw the words of Rabbi Shimon to be correct regarding covering the blood—that an invalid slaughter is not considered a slaughter—and he taught it here in the name of 'the Sages'.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא דרבי מאיר באותו ואת בנו?

The Gemara asks: What is the reason of Rabbi Meir regarding 'it and its offspring' that he considers an invalid slaughter to be a valid act of slaughter?

ANSWER

אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: גמר שחיטה שחיטה משחויטי חוץ.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: He derived it by a gezeirah shavah of the word 'slaughter' written by 'it and its offspring' from the word 'slaughter' written by sacrificial animals slaughtered outside the Beis HaMikdash.

EXPLANATION

מה התם – שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה, אף הכא נמי – שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה.

Just as there, by shechutei chutz, a slaughter that is not fit for eating is nevertheless called 'slaughter' to make him liable, so too here, by 'it and its offspring', a slaughter that is not fit is called 'slaughter' to make him liable.

QUESTION

ורבי שמעון, מאי טעמא?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Shimon, what is his reason** for holding that an unfit slaughter is not called a slaughter?

ANSWER

אמר רבי מני בר פטיש: גמר מ"טבוח טבח והכן", מה להלן שחיטה ראויה, אף כאן שחיטה ראויה.

Rabbi Mani bar Pattish said: He derived it from the pasuk, 'Slaughter the slaughtering and prepare.' Just as there, the slaughtering of Yosef's brothers was a fit slaughter for eating, so too here, the Torah only refers to a fit slaughter.

QUESTION

ורבי מאיר נמי, ליגמר מ"טבוח"?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Meir also, let him derive** the definition of slaughter from 'slaughter' in that pasuk!

ANSWER

דנין שחיטה משחיטה, ואין דנין שחיטה מטביחה.

The Gemara answers: **We derive** the word 'slaughter' (shechita) from the word 'slaughter' (shechita), **but we do not derive** 'slaughter' from 'slaughtering' (tevichah), which is a different root.

QUESTION

מה נפקא מינה? הא תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: "ושב הכהן" "ובא הכהן" – זו היא שיבה זו היא בואה.

The Gemara asks: **What difference does it make** if the roots are different? Behold, the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught:

The pasuk says 'And the Kohen shall return' and 'And the Kohen shall come'—and we derive them from each other because **this returning is the same as this coming**, even though the words are different!

ANSWER

הני מילי – היכא דליכא דדמי ליה, אכל איכא דדמי ליה – מדדמי ליה ולפינו.

The Gemara answers: **This applies only where there is no word that is identical to it; but where there is a word that is identical to it, we derive it from the one that is identical to it.**

QUESTION

ורבי שמעון נמי ליגמר משחויטי חוץ?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Shimon also, let him derive** the law from sacrificial animals slaughtered outside the Temple, where the word 'slaughter' is identical!

ANSWER

דנין חולין מחולין, ואין דנין חולין מקדשים.

The Gemara answers: **We derive** the laws of **non-sacred** animals (chullin) from **non-sacred** animals, **but we do not derive non-sacred animals from sacrificial animals** (kodashim).

QUESTION

ורבי מאיר: אטו אותו ואת בנו בקדשים מי לא נהיג?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Meir**, how does he respond to this? **Is that to say that** 'it and its offspring' does not apply to **sacrificial** animals? It certainly does, so it is not considered deriving chullin from kodashim.

STATEMENT

הִיִּינוּ דִקְאָמְרִי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: רָאָה רַבִּי דְבָרָיו שֶׁל רַבִּי מֵאִיר בְּאוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ, וּשְׁנָאוֹ בְּלִשׁוֹן חֲכָמִים.

The Gemara notes: This is indeed what Rabbi Chiyya said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi saw the words of Rabbi Meir to be correct regarding 'it and its offspring', and he taught it in the name of 'the Sages'.

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי מֵאִיר בְּכֶסוּי הַדָּם?

The Gemara asks: What is the reason of Rabbi Meir regarding covering the blood, that he requires covering even for an unfit slaughter?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ: גָּמַר שְׁפִיכָה שְׁפִיכָה מִשְׁחוּטֵי חוּץ, מָה לְהֵלֵן – שְׁחִיטָה שְׂאִינָה רְאוּיָה שָׁמָּה שְׁחִיטָה, אֲףִי כָאֵן – שְׁחִיטָה שְׂאִינָה רְאוּיָה שָׁמָּה שְׁחִיטָה.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: He derived it by a gezeirah shavah of the word 'pouring' written by covering the blood from the word 'pouring' written by sacrificial animals slaughtered outside the Temple. Just as there, a slaughter that is not fit is called 'slaughter', so too here, a slaughter that is not fit is called 'slaughter'.

OBJECTION

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן: "וְאֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל" כְּתִיב,

And Rabbi Shimon argues: It is written regarding covering the blood, 'which may be eaten,' which implies that only an animal fit for eating requires covering.

ANSWER

וְרַבִּי מֵאִיר: הֵהוּא לְמַעוּטֵי עוֹף טָמֵא הוּא דְאֵתָא,

And Rabbi Meir responds: That phrase comes to exclude a non-kosher bird, which can never be eaten, but not a kosher bird that became a treifah.

OBJECTION

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן: עוֹף טָמֵא מַאי טַעְמָא – דְּלֹא פִּרְ אֲכִילָהּ הוּא, טְרֵפָה נִמִּי – לֹא פִּרְ אֲכִילָהּ הוּא.

And Rabbi Shimon argues: What is the reason that a non-kosher bird is excluded? Because it is not fit for eating. A treifah is also not fit for eating, so it should also be excluded.

STATEMENT

וְהִיִּינוּ דֹאֲמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא: רָאָה רַבִּי דְבָרָיו שֶׁל רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בְּכֶסוּי הַדָּם, וּשְׁנָאוֹ בְּלִשׁוֹן חֲכָמִים.

And this is indeed what Rabbi Chiyya said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi saw the words of Rabbi Shimon to be correct regarding covering the blood, and he taught it in the name of 'the Sages'.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא:

Rabbi Abba said:

STATEMENT

לא לכל אמר רבי מאיר שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה:

Not for all halachic matters did Rabbi Meir say that an act of slaughter that is not fit to permit the animal for eating is considered an act of slaughter;

STATEMENT

מודה רבי מאיר שאין מתירתה באכילה;

for Rabbi Meir concedes that such a slaughter does not permit it for eating if the animal is a tereifa;

STATEMENT

ולא לכל אמר רבי שמעון שחיטה שאינה ראויה לא שמה שחיטה:

and not for all halachic matters did Rabbi Shimon say that an act of slaughter that is not fit is not considered an act of slaughter;

STATEMENT

מודה רבי שמעון שמטהרתה מידי נבלה.

for Rabbi Shimon concedes that the slaughter of a tereifa purifies it from the impurity of a carcass.

STATEMENT

אמר מר: לא לכל אמר רבי מאיר שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה, מודה רבי מאיר שאין מתירתה באכילה.

The Master said above: Not for all halachic matters did Rabbi Meir say that an act of slaughter that is not fit is considered an act of slaughter, for Rabbi Meir concedes that such a slaughter does not permit it for eating.

QUESTION

פשיטא! טרפה בשחיטה מי מישתריא?

The Gemara asks: Isn't this obvious? Can a tereifa become permitted through slaughter? The Torah explicitly forbids eating a tereifa!

ANSWER

לא צריכא, לשוחט את הטרפה ומצא בה בן תשעה חי;

The Gemara answers: No, this statement of Rabbi Abba is necessary for a case of one who slaughters a tereifa animal and found inside it a living nine-month-old fetus;

EXPLANATION

סלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל דאמר רבי מאיר: שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה, תהני ליה שחיטת אמו ולא ליבעי שחיטה, קמשמע לן.

for it might enter your mind to say: Since Rabbi Meir said that an act of slaughter that is not fit is considered an act of slaughter, then the slaughter of its mother should be effective for it, the fetus, and it should not require its own slaughter after birth. Therefore, Rabbi Abba comes to teach us that since the mother's slaughter does not permit her own meat, it cannot permit the fetus either.

OBJECTION

ותסבירא? והאמר רבי מאיר: בן פקועה טעון שחיטה!

The Gemara asks: **And can you understand** it this way? **But doesn't Rabbi Meir say** that a **ben pekua**, a live fetus removed from a slaughtered mother, **requires slaughter** on its own? Rabbi Meir holds that the mother's slaughter never permits the fetus, even when she is a kosher animal!

ANSWER

לא צריכא, דרבי סבר לה כרבי מאיר וסבר לה כרבנן.

The Gemara answers: **No**, Rabbi Abba's statement **is necessary** because **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds like Rabbi Meir** in one aspect **and holds like the Rabbis** in another aspect.

EXPLANATION

סבר לה כרבי מאיר, דאמר: שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה,

He **holds like Rabbi Meir**, who said that an act of slaughter that is not fit is considered an act of slaughter regarding the prohibition of slaughtering an animal and its offspring on the same day;

EXPLANATION

וסבר לה כרבנן, דאמרי: שחיטת אמו מטהרתו.

and yet he **holds like the Rabbis**, who say that the slaughter of its mother permits it, the fetus, so that a **ben pekua** does not require its own slaughter.

EXPLANATION

כיון דאמור רבנן שחיטת אמו מטהרתו, תהני ליה שחיטת אמו ולא ליבעי שחיטה, קא משמע לן.

So, since the Rabbis said that the slaughter of its mother permits it, you might think that even in the case of a tereifa, the slaughter of its mother should be effective for it and it should not require its own slaughter. Therefore, Rabbi Abba comes to teach us that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi concedes that the slaughter of a tereifa mother cannot permit the fetus.

STATEMENT

ולא לכל אמר רבי שמעון שחיטה שאינה ראויה לא שמה שחיטה, מודה רבי שמעון שמתהרתה מידי נבלה.

The Gemara turns to the second statement: **And not for all halachic matters did Rabbi Shimon say** that an act of slaughter that is not fit is not considered an act of slaughter, for **Rabbi Shimon concedes** that the slaughter of a tereifa purifies it from the impurity of a carcass.

QUESTION

פשיטא! דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב, ואמרי לה במתניתא תנא:

The Gemara asks: Isn't this obvious? For Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, and some say it was taught in a Braisa:

PROOF

”וְכִי יָמוּת מִן הַבְּהֵמָה”, מְקַצֵּת בְּהֵמָה מְטֵמְאָה וּמְקַצֵּת בְּהֵמָה אֵינָה מְטֵמְאָה, וְאִי זֶה – טְרֵפָה שֶׁשְּׁחָטָהּ.

The verse says, “**And if there dies of the animals**,” which implies that only **a part of** the category of **animals transmits impurity** when dead, **and a part of** the category of **animals does not transmit impurity**. And which one is this? This is a **tereifa that one slaughtered**, which is excluded from carcass impurity. This is a Torah law, so why does Rabbi Shimon need to concede it?

ANSWER

לֹא צָרִיכָא, לְשׁוּחֵט אֶת הַטְּרֵפָה וְהִיא חוּלִין בְּעֶזְרָה.

The Gemara answers: **No**, Rabbi Abba’s statement is **necessary** for one **who slaughters a tereifa animal**, and it is **non-sacred**, chullin, **in the Temple courtyard**.

PROOF

דִּתְנִינָא: הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַטְּרֵפָה, וְכֵן הַשּׁוֹחֵט וְנִמְצְאָת טְרֵיפָה, זֶה וְזֶה חוּלִין בְּעֶזְרָה – רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן מַתִּיר בְּהִנָּאָה, וְחֻכְמִים אוֹסְרִין.

As it was taught in a Braisa: One who slaughters a known tereifa, and likewise one who slaughters an animal and it was found to be a tereifa, and both this and that are **non-sacred** animals slaughtered in the Temple courtyard—Rabbi Shimon permits deriving **benefit** from them, and the Sages forbid it.

EXPLANATION

סָלָקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אֲמִינָא, הוּאִיל וְאָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן: מוֹתֵר בְּהִנָּאָה, אֲלֵמָא לֹא שְׁחִיטָה הִיא כָּלֵל, אִימָא: מִיַּדִּי נִבְלָה נִמִּי לֹא מִטְהֵרָה, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן.

Therefore, it might enter your mind to say: Since Rabbi Shimon said that it is **permitted** to derive **benefit** from it, **consequently**, this is **not** considered an act of **slaughter at all** to make it forbidden as chullin in the Azarah; say then that it **does not purify** the animal from carcass impurity **either**. Therefore, Rabbi Abba comes to teach us that it is still considered a slaughter to save it from tumas nevelah.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה רַב פָּפָא לְאַבֵּי: וְסָבַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן חוּלִין בְּעֶזְרָה דְּאוֹרֵייתָא הִיא?

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: And does Rabbi Shimon hold that the prohibition of **non-sacred** animals slaughtered in the Temple courtyard is from the Torah?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיה: אֵין, וְהִתְנִן רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמַר: חוּלִין שֶׁנִּשְׁחָטוּ בְּעֶזְרָה יִשְׂרְפוּ בָּאֵשׁ, וְכֵן חִיָּה שֶׁנִּשְׁחָטָה בְּעֶזְרָה.

Abaye said to him: Yes, and did we not learn in a Mishnah that Rabbi Shimon says: **Non-sacred** domesticated animals that were slaughtered in the Temple courtyard must be burned in fire, and likewise a wild beast, a chayah, that was slaughtered in the Temple courtyard must be burned?

EXPLANATION

אי אמרת בשלמא דאורייתא – היינו דגזרינן חיה אטו בהמה.

Granted, if you say that the prohibition of a domesticated animal is from the Torah, that is why we decree a prohibition on a wild beast on account of a domesticated animal, to prevent confusion.

EXPLANATION

אָלאַ אי אמרת דרבנן, בהמה מאי טעמא? דילמא אתי למיכל קדשים בחוץ, היא גופה גזרה, ואנן ניקום ונגזור גזירה לגזירה?

But if you say that the prohibition of a domesticated animal is only Rabbinic, what is the reason for the Rabbinic decree on a domesticated animal? Lest one come to eat sacrificial meat outside the Temple. If so, the prohibition on a domesticated animal is itself a decree, and would we stand and make a decree on a wild beast upon a decree? We do not make a double decree! Thus, the prohibition of chullin in the Azarah must be mid'Oraisa according to Rabbi Shimon.

STATEMENT

רבי חייא נפל ליה יאניבא בכיתניה, אתא לקמיה דרבי, אמר ליה: שקול עופא ושחוט על בוכיתא דמיא, דמורח דמא ושביק ליה.

The Gemara relates: Rabbi Chiyah had worms infest his flax. He came before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi to ask for a remedy. Rabbi said to him: Take a bird and slaughter it over the pool of water where the flax is soaking, so that the worms will smell the blood and leave it.

QUESTION

היכי עביד הכי? והתנא: השוחט וצריך לדם – חייב לכסות. כיצד יעשה? או נוחרו, או עוקרו.

The Gemara asks: How could he do this? But wasn't it taught in a Braisa: One who slaughters and needs the blood for some purpose is still obligated to cover the blood. What should he do to avoid the obligation of covering? Either he stabs it, or he tears its organs, which is not a halachic slaughter and does not require covering the blood. Why did Rabbi tell him to slaughter it?

ANSWER

כי אתא רב דימי אמר: "צא טרוף" אמר ליה, כי אתא רבין אמר: "צא נחור" אמר ליה.

The Gemara answers: When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael, he said that Rabbi actually said to him: "Go, tear the organs of the bird." And when Ravin came, he said that Rabbi said to him: "Go, stab the bird."

QUESTION

למאן דאמר "צא טרוף", מאי טעמא לא אמר "צא נחור"?

The Gemara asks: According to the one who said that Rabbi told him, "Go, tear," what is the reason he did not say, "Go, stab"?

OBJECTION

וכי תימא, קסבר אין שחיטה לעוף מן התורה, ונחירתו זו היא שחיטתו, והתנא: רבי אומר: "פאשר צויתך" – מלמד שנצטוו משה על הושט ועל הקנה, ועל רוב אהד בעוף, ועל רוב שנים בבהמה.

And if you say that Rabbi holds that there is no requirement of ritual slaughter for a bird from the Torah, and therefore stabbing it is its actual slaughter, which would require covering the blood—but wasn't it taught in a Braisa: Rabbi says: "As I have commanded you" teaches that Moshe was commanded regarding the gullet and the windpipe, and

regarding cutting the majority of one of them for a bird, and regarding cutting the majority of two of them for an animal. Thus, Rabbi holds that slaughtering a bird is a Torah law, so stabbing is not a slaughter!

SUMMARY

The daf begins by wrapping up the discussion on Rabbi Yosei's kal v'chomer, bringing refutations from shofar (which overrides Shabbos in the Mikdash) and circumcision (which is not practiced at night). We then move to the Mishnah where Rabbi Meir and the Sages dispute whether invalid slaughters require kisuy hadam, while agreeing that a complete non-shechita (like stabbing or tearing) is exempt. In the Gemara, Rabbi Yochanan explains how Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi structured the Mishnayos of "oto v'es b'no" and "kisuy hadam" based on which opinion he saw as more correct in each case. Finally, the Gemara analyzes the source for Rabbi Meir's view that an unfit slaughter is called a shechita, deriving it via a gezeirah shavah from shechutei chutz, while Rabbi Shimon derives his opposing view from Yosef's brothers' slaughtering in Mitzrayim.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, we see a fascinating phenomenon in the way Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi compiled the Mishnah. Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba tells us that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi saw the truth in Rabbi Meir's view regarding one halachah, and the truth in Rabbi Shimon's view regarding another. Even though they held opposing, systematic views on whether an unfit slaughter is halachically considered a "slaughter," Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi did not feel bound to blindly accept one entire system over the other. He looked at each case on its own merits, recognized the truth in both, and established the halachah accordingly.

This is a profound lesson in how we look at people and situations in our own lives. The yetzer hara loves to make us think in absolute, black-and-white terms. If we disagree with someone on one issue, or if we see a flaw in them, we are tempted to write off their entire way of thinking. We think, "If he is wrong about this, he must be wrong about everything." But the Torah way is to seek the truth wherever it is. We must have the greatness of mind to say, "In this area, his approach is correct and beautiful, even if in another area I follow a different path."

When you learn to look at the world this way, your entire relationship with other Yidden changes. You stop putting people in rigid boxes. You begin to appreciate the unique spark of truth that every single person possesses, realizing that no single person has a monopoly on every correct perspective, and no one is entirely devoid of wisdom.

Today, when you find yourself disagreeing with a family member, a coworker, or a chavrusa, consciously separate the issue from the person. Find one point where they are actually right, or one area where you truly respect their approach, and validate it. Train yourself to see the truth in parts, just as Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi did.