

30.1.12

14a (משנה א) → 15b (גזירה שמא ירבה בשבילו)

- I 4א משנה: if he slaughters on שבת or יום הכפורים – even though he is liable (for death), his שחיטה is still valid
- a דב per ר' הונא דב – it is prohibited for that day (i.e. may not be eaten on the שבת on which it was slaughtered)
- i And: the students attributed this to an adoption of יהודה רבי's opinion
- ii Question: which statement of ר"י associates with this ruling?
- 1 Answer1 (ר' אבא): re: הכנה (for eating on יו"ט); ר"י (contra חכמים) bans cutting up נבילה, which was not dead on יו"ט, to feed to dogs on יו"ט
- (a) Conclusion: since it wasn't מוכן for the dogs before יו"ט, cannot be fed to them on יו"ט (::our case)
- (b) Challenge (אב"י): in that case, it was fit for man, now changing to give to animals; in our case (שחיטה) it was fit for human consumption before שבת (waiting to be slaughtered for meat) and is the same now (שחוט)
- (c) Counter: that presumes that animals are destined for שחיטה while alive, but ר"י holds עומדת לגדל
- (i) Challenge: then how does ר"י allow any שחיטת בהמה on יו"ט?
- (ii) Answer: they are destined for שחיטה OR לגדל; once he slaughters, this retroactively determines status
1. Block: ר' יהודה does not allow for ברירה (retroactive determination)
2. Suggested source: his opposition (with ר"ש, ר' יוסי, ר"מ) to ר"מ's allowing drinking from a barrel of כותי wine and predetermining that whichever wine is left over at the end will serve as תרומה
- a. Block: the explicit reason there is a practical one – concern that the barrel will break before
3. Rather: per ר' אימי's teaching that ר' יהודה disallows עירוב with split (E/W) possibilities
- a. ד' יוחנן he only allows if the חכמים already arrived (but we didn't yet hear) – ברירה
4. Conclusion: ר' יהודה does not allow for ברירה → holds animals are לשחיטה → wouldn't forbid ביומו
- 2 Answer2 (ר' יוסף): re: שבת on שברי כלים;
- (a) חכמים: as long as the broken piece serves any function – may be moved
- (b) ד' יהודה: it must serve the same function as the base כלי
- (i) Implication: since it didn't have that other function set מע"ש, can't be used for it on שבת (::שחיטה)
- (c) Challenge (אב"י): in that case, it was כלי, and is now (vis-à-vis the original use) a שבר כלי → נולד (→ אסור)
- (i) But in our case: it was food, and is now "segmented" food (אוכלא דאיפרת)
- (ii) And: we know that ר' יהודה considers דאיפרת to be the same as the original food
1. Support: ר' יהודה permits juice that oozed out of table grapes to be drunk on שבת
2. Challenge: ר' יהודה - שמואל - agreed with חכמים if there was a basket of grapes (set for juicing)
- a. Reason: since they are set for juicing, he thinks about it (and may come to juice → we forbid the juice that comes out); similarly, since the animal is set for שחיטה, we ban (שמא ישחוט)
3. Block: רב, who is our subject, disagrees and hold that even זיתים וענבים are מותר
- 3 Answer3 (ר' ששת בריה דר' א): re: moving a lamp on שבת – ר' יהודה permits moving a new one, not a used one
- (a) Block: that tells us is that he bans מחמת מיאוס (ceramic oil-lamps are dirty after use), not מחמת איסור
- (b) Save: ר' יהודה also disallows moving a metal lamp if it was lit that שבת (only מחמת איסור – מיאוס)
- (i) Block: in that case, he purposefully "moved it away" from שבת use by lighting it, unlike our case
- 4 Answer4 (ר' אשי): re: תוספתא שבת ב: טו – cooking on שבת
- (a) במזיד – may eat; במזיד – may not eat
- (b) במזיד – may never eat; במזיד – may eat until מצ"ש
- (c) במזיד – no one may ever eat of it; במזיד – שבת; במזיד – שבת; במזיד – שבת; במזיד – שבת
- (i) Question: why not attribute רב's ban to ר"מ's position – in case the שחיטה was done במזיד?
1. Answer: our משנה juxtaposes שבת to יוה"כ, where כמזיד – שוגג – can't eat
2. Challenge: wording of משנה implies מזיד – "אע"פ שמתחייב בנפשו..."
- a. Answer: it means, even though if done intentionally, חייב מיתה, if done בשוגג – valid שחיטה
- (ii) Question: why not attribute רב's ban to יוחנן הסנדלר's position?
1. Answer: he distinguishes between the violator and others – even בשוגג – at מוצ"ש
- a. However: שחיטתו כשרה (in our משנה) implies that it is valid for all

- (d) *Related story*: a תנא presented ruling כר"מ before רב, who silenced him
- (i) *Question*: why silence him – just because רב holds like יהודה ר' – no silence of dissent
- (ii) *Besides which*: רב “really” held like ר"מ (at פרק, he ruled like יהודה ר' as public policy)
1. *Suggestion*: perhaps the תנא was speaking at the פרק
  2. *Rejection*: even if so, no one would act based on his report, they would follow the אמורא (broadcasting the החכם's views)
- (iii) *Solution* (רנב"י): תנא taught this in re: שחיטה – שאכל לא יאכל, במזיד לא יאכל, בשוגג בשבת בשוגג יאכל, במזיד לא יאכל
1. דב asked תנא if he was basing this on ר"מ's ruling about cooking and then רב distinguished:
    - a. *Cooking*: the food was edible (in some form) beforehand → may be eaten (מוכן)
    - b. *שחיטה*: food was not edible beforehand
  2. *Challenge*: our משנה, which is about שחיטה, was qualified by רב as not allowed to be eaten until after שבת, and we identified that position as following יהודה ר'
    - a. *Implication*: ר"מ would allow eating from שחיטה that day itself
    - b. *Answer*: ר"מ would allow it if there was a sick person in the house (for whom שחיטה on שבת would be permitted) on ע"ש
    - c. *Challenge*: if that is the case, why did יהודה ר' forbid?
      - i. *Answer*: the sick fellow recovered after שבת began
      - ii. *Therefore*: ר"מ, for whom the entire issue is one of מוקצה, would allow the meat to be eaten, as during השמשות (when all statuses for שבת are determined), he was ill; but ר' יהודה, who bans due to the מלאכה, would still ban, as he recovered before the שחיטה
  3. *Support* (for דב's distinction): רב's ruling that if someone slaughters for a חולה בשבת, others (who are healthy) may not eat from that meat; but if someone cooks for a חולה בשבת, all may eat the food
    - a. *Reason*: the uncooked food was edible beforehand; the live animal was inedible pre-שחיטה
    - b. ד"פ: sometimes the ruling will be flipped:
      - i. שחיטה could be permitted to all, if there was a חולה in the house (שחיטה was permitted)
      - ii. גישול could be prohibited, if he uprooted a vegetable (e.g.) to put into pot (not המוכן)
- (iv) *Final ruling* (ר' דימי מנהרדעא): if one does שחיטה בשבת for a sick person, בריא may eat from it – raw
1. *Reason*: impossible to serve the חולה without שחיטה → his שחיטה was intended for חולה
  2. *But*: if he cooks for a חולה בשבת, no healthy person may eat from it –
    - a. *Reason*: concern that he may add to the pot for the בריא