30.1.13

15b (משנה בו) $\rightarrow 16b$ (אמר רב פפא קינוח פי מכה קאמרינן)

- י. וַיִּשְׁלַח אַבְרָהָם אֶת יָדוֹ **וַיִּקָח אֶת הַמַּאֲכֶלֶת לְשְׁחֹט** אֶת בְּנוֹ: בראשית כב, י
- אַב הָאַבְדוּן אֶת כֶּל הַמְּקמוֹת אֲשֶׁר עָבְדוּ שָׁם הַגּוּיִם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּם יִרְשִׁים אֹתָם **אֶת אֱלֹהִיהָם עַל הָהָרִים** הַרְמִים וְעַל הַאָּבְעוֹת וְתַחַת כֶּל עֵץ רַעֲנָן: *דברים יב, ב*
- שחיטה acceptable/unfit cutting implements for שחיטה
 - a Acceptable (post facto): hand-scythe, flintstone, reed
 - b General rule: all may slaughter, at any time and with any implement (limitations on each of these)
 - c Unacceptable: harvest-scythe, saw, "teeth" or fingernail because they choke (instead of cutting)
 - i challenge: our משנה identifies צור וקנה as being valid תוספתא א:ה ;בדיעבד identifies מנה מנה identifies לכתחילה
 - 1 *note*: we understand why מגל יד would only be valid בדיעבד concern he may use the serrated side
 - 2 however: צור וקנה should be valid לכתחילה, per תוספתא
 - ii Answer: in our case, the flint or reed are תוספתא מחוברין was referring to uprooted items
 - 1 Per: dispute מחובר, is valid (תיי validates), anich is מחובר, anich is valid (מחובר, מחובר, anich is validates)
 - (a) And: ר"ח only validates בדיעבד, not ab initio
 - (b) Challenge: תוספתא א:ה allows (לכתחילה) that which is מחובר follows neither הבי חסי חר"ח חסים אום follows neither
 - (i) Answer: that follows ה"ח, who permits לכתחילה even לכתחילה
 - 1. And: the reason our משנה is oriented to בדיעבד is to demonstrate the polarity of רבי's position
 - 2. However: that leaves our משנה unattributed; ה"ז should allow רבי, לכתחילה should invalidate בדיעבד
 - (ii) Answer: our משנה follows רבי, who validates (בדיעבד) if it was uprooted and replanted (תלוש וחברו)
 - 1. Support (for distinction): ברייתא using a knife planted in a wheel, in the ground or in the wall
 - a. But: using a rock sticking out of a wall or a reed growing out of the ground פסולה
 - 2. Comment (on מוכני we have conflicting ברייתא disallowing מוכני (knife in wheel)
 - a. Resolution: valid when it is a potter's wheel; invalid if it is water wheel
 - b. *Resolution2*: both are waterwheels; valid when it is כה ראשון (i.e. as soon as he opens the sluice and lets the water out), invalid when יני (later, water is already flowing)
 - i. *Per: אר"פ*'s ruling that if someone ties another down, then opens a water-sluice that drowns him, he is liable, but if כח שני only מרמא and he is exempt
 - 2 א was sitting behind ה"ח in בי, בית מדרש 's invoked v.1 to prove that הלוש is required
 - (a) אברהם dismissed it as "nothing", interpreted verse as demonsrating אברהם's diligence
- II רבא s analysis of status of תלוש ולבסוף הברו) which was subsequently reattached/replanted (תלוש ולבסוף חברו
 - In re מחובר considered אסור, if one worships a house, it is now מחובר cannot be made אסור (per v. 2)
 - b In re ר"פ; מכשירין ד:ג it is a dispute (per ה"א s take on ה"ש; מכשירין ד:ג would disagree)
 - i fhe placed a bowl atop a wall to get washed (from rain/dew) water that splatters off is מכשיר לטומאה
 - 1 But: if he placed it there to protect wall from water not מכשיר
 - Implied contradiction: clause #1 \rightarrow if to get wall wet, not מכשיר; clause #2 \rightarrow to get wall wet, מכשיר
 - (a) Solution (ב' אלעזר): two clauses taught by different חכמים (a wall is הלוש ואח"כ הברו; status as תלוש disputed)
 - (i) Note: מכשיר resolves differently if the wall is a cave wall (מחובר מעיקרא) not מכשיר, built wall מכשיר
 - c Question (רבא): what is the status of תלוש ואח"כ חברו vis-à-vis שחיטה?
 - i Proposed proof: ברייתא (above) knife sticking out of wall is invalid (→ מחובר = תלוש ולבסוף חברו
 - 1 Rejection: that is referring to a cave-wall (proof parallel to reed growing out of ground always מחובר)
 - ii Proposed proof: if he sticks a knife into the wall and uses it for שחיטה valid (→ תלוש = תלוש ולבטוף חברו
 - 1 Rejection: a knife is significant, such that it doesn't lose its "identity" to the wall
 - iii Proposed proof: from same בריתא if he uses that which is מחובר לקרקע, valid (→ בריתא, valid (→ תלוש = תלוש
 - 1 Rejection: perhaps that is just explaining the exception the (unnegated) knife in the wall
 - 2 Tangent (to rule of sticking knife in wall): שמואל only valid if knife is above animal; else, we are חושש לדריסה
 - (a) Challenge: ברייתא teaches that both מחובר and are valid, whether animal is above or below
 - (b) Defense (מחובר): distributive statement: if מחובר, animal must be below
 - (c) Defense (2"7): liberal position allowed for birds (only), which are light and wouldn't put pressure
- III ברייתא listing five rules/limitations of use of reeds:
 - a May not: perform מילה, שחיטה (dangerous), cut meat (pieces of reed may get in), cleaning teeth (dangerous) or "wiping"
 - i שחיטה our משנה permits using a reed; that must be carex, which, when dried out, becomes hard and can cut
 - ii Cutting meat: י"ם would cut fish, where he could see if pieces got in; רבה בר ר' הונא would cut birds, which are soft
 - iii Wiping: must refer to cleaning a wound, "wiping", in any case, is banned due to it being flammable