Introduction to פרק ארבעה-עשר – שמונה שרצים

This ברק continues the topic of צידה – focusing on trapping of rodents – and includes a discussion of חבלה (as a subset of שוחט); then includes a major tangent (occupying the bulk of the מפרק) about חז"ל; רפואה banned חד"ל (if not for פקוח נפש out of concern that someone will grind powders to prepare them.

2.14.1 107a (משנה א) → 108a (קאלוס)

- I. משנה א: trapping and wounding/killing rodents
 - a. The 8 rodents (in v1): if someone traps or wounds them is liable
 - i. Implication: their skin must be considered distinct from flesh (→liable for חבלה)
 - 1. שמונה שרצים this follows (חולין ט:ב) ר' יוחנן בן נורי שרצים who rules that עור have עור
 - 2. בנו could even be עור, they only disagree re טומאה, per v. 2 (which extends אינור to יומאה, :flesh)
 - a. But: regarding חבלה בשבח, they agree
 - b. Challenge (ברייתא): חבלה of one of שמונה שרצים is liable per ריב"נ
 - i. בשר (after correction by עוב: אביי is only distinct from בשר for those not listed by חרמים
 - ii. Challenge (רבא): statement in ברייתא is "למה שמנו חכמים"
 - iii. Rather (עור :(רבא) is only מטמא like flesh for those animals listed by חכמים (ibid)
 - 1. Implication: מטמא holds that all skin even those not listed is מטמא
 - 2. Clarification (עור אדא בר מתנא): regarding טומאה, there is only עור for those listed by
 - c. Challenge (ברייתא): wounding one of the שמונה שרצים is liable for all rodents that have skin
 - i. Definition of permanent הבורה. if the blood gathers (under the skin) even if didn't leave body
 - ii. מרצים have skin
 - iii. Answer: that הודה si הודה איי, who distinguishes rodents based on feel, not verse-categories
 - 1. But: שבת who disagree with ריב"נ about מומאה agree about שבת (as above)
 - 2. Note: ברייתא should (and does) read "according to ריב"נ and his opposing "חכמים
 - iv. Observation (לוי לרבי): source for חבורה being permanent v. 3
 - b. Other rodents: wounding carries liability
 - i. *Trapping*: if he needs them liable; if not exempt
 - 1. Follows (ב"): מפיס מורסא (מ") מפיס מורסא (מ") לגופה ר"ש, or on מפיס מורסא, or on מפיס מורסא, or on מפיס מורסא, מרכב לגופה
 - ii. Implication: killing them is liable
 - 1. Authority: must be אליעזר, who rules that even killing a louse on שבת is like killing a camel (→חייב), who rules that even killing a louse on חייב
 - 2. Counter (ירב יוסד) only disagree with א"ז about louse, which spontaneously regenerates (sic)'
 - a. But: regarding other rodents, they would agree that killing it on שבת carries liability
 - b. And: both inferred it from rams that were slaughtered to use their skins for משכן
 - i. κ'' 7. just as rams have loss of life so anything which has loss of life
 - ii. *חכמים* just as rams reproduce, so all types which reproduce (not lice)
 - 1. Challenge (אב"): lice also reproduce, per אגדה that God "feeds...to eggs of lice"
 - 2. Answer (ביצי (רב יוסף): the type is called "ביצי כנים", but they don't really have eggs
 - 3. Challenge: fleas reproduce yet ר' אליעזר and ר' יהושע disagree about liability for trapping them (ר"א מחייב)
 - a. Block: can't counter צידה to killing; י only disagrees about צידה since it isn't the type that is נצוד
 - c. Wild animals and birds in his domain: if he traps them exempt; if he wounds them liable

II. Related discussions

- a. שמואל if someone pulls fish out of the water liable when the fish is dry as a rock
 - i. *ד' יוסי בר אבין*. that is only if it is dried up between the fins
 - ii. ד' אשי. need not be completely dry; even if it still exudes liquid
- b. שמואל if he sticks his hand into the womb of an animal and dislodges a foetus liable
 - i. איז just as יששת explained pulling hops off of bushes is liable for עוקר דבר מגידולו

מסכת שבת

- ii. אב" if someone pulls a mushroom off of the handle of a pitcher (on which it grew) liable (עוקר דבר מגידולו)
 - 1. Challenge (ד' אושעיא): only liable for תולש from an "unsealed" planter if sealed, exempt
 - 2. Defense: in that case, it isn't growing from that earth (when sealed); here, it is growing on the rim
- c. מהורים that are טהורים (permitsed to be eaten) חיה ועוף that are טהורים (permitted to be eaten)
 - i. קנייסף this teaches that birds are considered to have עור but we know this from our חובל בהן חייב) חובל בהן חייב) משנה
 - ii. משנה it teaches more than that; from משנה, we would think that since it has many holes, can't be used
 - 1. Therefore: teaches as per א"י if the ink can write over the hole, it is valid (for סת"ם
 - 2. Challenge (עור איזי): v. 4 is used to extend עור to be considered עור \rightarrow it isn't generally considered עור
 - a. Answer (אב"): it is considered תורה extended to allow it as a part of an offering
 - 3. Alternate version: אבי י זיהא 'r saw v. 4 as support for אבי if it weren't קרבן, no need for קרבן t allow it as
 - a. Block (אביי): could be לאו עור, but since it has holes, it is nonetheless rejected from קמ"ל מזבח
- d. Question posed to דנב"י. may fish skin be used for תפילין?
 - i. Answer: אליהו אליהו could come and testify that the smell is finally gone (i.e. may not be used due to stench)
- e. Questions: posed to בבל upon his "announced" arrival in בבל (by קרנא, at behest of שמואל), at behest of
 - i. Question: what is the source that תפילין may only be written on עור בהמה טהורה
 - 1. Answer: v. 5 מן המותר בפיך
 - ii. Question: how do we know that blood is red?
 - 1. Answer: v. 6
- iii. Question: how do we know that מילה is done at "that place"?
 - 1. Answer: v. 7 just as that ערלה (of fruit) is at place which reproduces...
 - a. Challenge: perhaps it is his heart, per v. 8? or his ears, per v. 9?
 - 2. Answer: in those case, ערלה is modified (אזנם, לבבכם); v. 7 uses unmodified ערלה
 - 3. Note: this was debated by י מקום משנושה פרי ' יאשיה תנאים " inferred from v. 10 זכר inferred from v. 10 זכר
- III. מבילות וטריפות may be written on the skin of בהמה וחיה that are שהורים even תפילין (ברייתא of those types
 - a. And: the פרשיות are bound with their hairs and the תפילין are stitched with their sinews
 - i. Note: this is הלכה למשה מסיני that they be bound with their hair and stitched with their sinews
 - b. But: they may not be written on the skin of בהמה וחיה which are טמאים and certainly not on their נבלות וטרפות
 - i. Nor: may they be bound with their hair or stitched with their sinews
 - ii. Note: this was answer given by ב המה טהורה we write on ביתסי we write on בהמה טהורה only per v. 5
 - 1. Challenge: then we should not be permitted to write it on נבלה וטריפה
 - 2. Answer: used parable of 2 executed men; 1 executed by king directly is more "praiseworthy"
 - a. However: we may still not eat it per v. 11