2.10.4

93b (משנה ו) → 94b (דאפיק חצי זית ממת גדול)

- I. משנה exemption for carrying an incidental "טפל" and מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה
 - a. שפל if he carries out less than כלי of food in a כלי, he is exempt for all including כלי since כלי is secondary
 - i. And: if he carries out a living person in a bed, he is exempt for the bed as well as the 'n
 - b. מלאכה שא"ע לגופה if he carries out a corpse or כזית of מת ס נבלה דם פרץ liable
 - i. exempts, as this is מלאכה שא"צ לגופה (i.e. he doesn't want the מthere, just not here)
- II. Related בבייתא if someone carries out כלי of food, he is liable for food but exempt for כלי
 - a. But if: he needed the כלי in any case (in the new location), he is also liable for כלי
 - i. Implication and application: if someone eats 2 סזיתים of under one העלם he brings (!) חטאות he brings 2 חטאות
 - ii. Defense (מיר ששת): in this case he was שוגג vis-à-vis the food but מזיד regarding the חיובים (2 different מיר)
 - 1. Challenge (אף על הכלי" ברייתא implies the same אין על הכלי" ברייתא
 - iii. Rather (ד' אשי): he was שוגג about both but found out in between
 - iv. Note: this dispute ר"ש/ר"א) replicates the dispute הי יוחנן/ר"ל if ידיעות מחלקות (above 71b)
- III. Discussion of exemption for carrying out a live person
 - a. Suggestion: our משנה follows ר' נתן against רבנן
 - i. Per: חוטפתא שבת טייז: if someone carries out animals, alive or dead, he is מייב (חייב animals reconstruction).
 - 1. Reason: the live one carries itself ("חי נושא את עצמר")
 - ii. Block (רבא): even רבנן would agree here; they only disagree re: animals, who fall and need help to walk
 - iii. Challenge (א"מ א:: :(ראב"א): ב בתירה ע"ז א: (לאכה מה"ת (task of horse doesn't involve) עכו"ם מלאכה מה"ת
 - 1. And: ר' נתן commented that בן בתירה and ר' יוחנן held the same position
 - 2. But if: דבון agree that carrying a person is not מלאכה מה"ת, why did ר' יוחנן single out ר' יוחנן stance?
 - a. Defense (ירי יוחנן 'r's referent was a horse that specializes in carrying birds (not people)
 - b. *clarification*: there is a horse that carries hawks (e.g.) to trap other birds
 - iv. הייב agrees that if the animal is tied down, one is חייב for carrying it
 - 1. *Challenge (ראב"מ לאב"ו*): Parthians are considered tied down (with their armor), yet בן בתירה permits selling them horses, and ר' נתן::בן בתירה aligned ר' נתן::בן בתירה
 - 2. Defense: they remain on the horses due to their own haughtiness, per story with horseman who ran
- IV. Discussion about מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה (end of משנה carrying the corpse outside)
 - a. ב' יוחנן ורבש"ל even exempts if he was taking the מת out for burial
 - b. ר"ש . מבא agrees to liability in case he takes a shovel out for digging or a מ"ת for readings
 - i. Challenge: this is obvious else, what would he define as מלאכה הצריכה לגופה?
 - ii. Defense: we might have thought that he requires למ"ל (the object) and מלאכה taking it out) לגופו taking it out) קמ"ל
 - c. Story: רגב"י permitted moving a מת out to a רמלית (even though מת only exempted, not permitting רגב"י)
 - i. Defense: even ר' יהודה would permit here; since הוצאה to a מד"ס is כבוד הבריות, which is waived for כבוד הבריות
- V. Side-door נגעים ז:ד סוגיא if someone pulls out hairs of צרעת or burns a מכוה (to make it נגעים, he violates ל"ת, he violates
 - a. מימרא. if he pulls out 1 of 2 hairs, he is liable (as only 1 is not טמא); but 1 of 3...
 - i. ינחמן liable, since he has furthered his goal and if another falls out, he is טהור
 - ii. ד' ששת exempt, since right now he is still טמא
 - 1. Proof: from our משנה is liable, implying that ½ כזית is exempt
 - a. But: ברייתא rules that ½ כזית is liable
 - b. Proposed resolution: liable if he took ½ גזית from single כזית (erased שיעור); exempt ½ נית 1.5 from 1.5
 - 2. ביית both of those cases are חייב; exemption is in case he takes ל ביית from a large מת
 - a. Reason: his actions accomplished nothing vis-à-vis the מת and he took out less than כשיעור