30.7.11

וזה לפי מחשבתו וזה לפי מחשבתו) → 102b (אמר ר' יהודה)

- ז. וַיַּקָם יַעָלָב מָבָּאָר שַׁבַע וַיְּשָׁאוֹ **בְּנִי יִשְּרָאֵל** אָת יַעַלָב אָבִיהֶם וֹאָת טַפָּם וְאָת נְשֶׁיהֶם בַּעַנְלוֹת אָשֶׁר שַּׁלֶח פְּרְעֹה לְשֶׁאת אֹתוֹ: *בראשית מו, ה* 
  - 2. רַק חֲזַק לְבַלְתִּי אֲכֹל הַדָּם כִּי הַדָּם הוּא הַנְּפֵש ֹ וְלֹא תֹאכֵל הַנְּפֵשׁ עִם הַבַּשַּׁר: דברים יב, כג
- ַכִּי יְרָחַק מִמְּד הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר ה' אֱלֹהֶיד לָשׁוֹם שְׁמוֹ שֶׁם **וְזָבֹחָת מִבְקרד וּמִצאוָד** אֲשֶׁר נָתַוֹ ה' לְדְּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתַד וְאָכַלְתַ בַּשְׁעָרֶידְּ בְּכֹּל אַנַת נַפְשֶׁךּ: *דברים יב, כא*
- Analyis of dispute ר"י/רבנן regarding application of טמאה to טמאה
  - *response*: it doesn't state בנ"י and they weren't called that until הר סיני and they weren't called that until
    - Rather: it was given at סיני but written in בראשית to explain the reason for the ban
  - Defense (רבא): v. 1 refers to סיני before בני ישראל
    - Block: that was after this event
      - Challenge: then let גה"ג become prohibited at that point
      - Block: חורה was not given in pieces; it was either forbidden when it happened or at סיני
- "Side-door סוגיא" parameters of אבר מן החי
  - טמאה ור' אלעזר applies to טמאה as well as ה' יהודה ור' אלעזר, to
  - טהורים only applies to טהורים
    - אבר מן החי as toth are based on respective reads of v. 2, understanding אבר מן החי as אבר מן החי
    - ii דם::נפש ד"י ור"א → any animal whose דם is forbidden, its limbs are forbidden (מן החי
    - iii בשר::נפש דבנן any animal whose flesh is permitted, its limbs are forbidden (מן החי)
      - Question: why would היוהדה require this פסוק he should allow אבר מן החי to be added to איסור מאה as it is איסור חמור, since it applies to בני נח (as per our argument re גה"ג)
      - Answer: indeed; the verse was only needed for א"ז's position
        - (a) Corroboration: ברייתא citing dispute lists only ה"מים as הכמים s disputant using this verse
        - (b) Note: ר"מ cites ברייתא cites בריית opinion only applies to בהמה טהורה (not חיה nor עוף)
          - (i) בקר וצאן s reason v. 3 only lists בקר וצאן (and "sets up" v. 2)
      - Comment (בי): dispute only applies to בני נה ;ישראל are forbidden from אבר מן החי of all animals
        - (a) Support: ישראל which mentions that only טהורה/טהורים are forbidden to ישראל
          - (i) If טהורה: follows ר"מ
          - (ii) If טהורים: follows רבנן
        - (b) Support (ברייתא הוא from an אמה"ח if someone eats אמה"ח אמה from an אנוף טמא and שחיטה doesn't "fix" it
          - (i) Note: this must refer to ישראל; obviously it wouldn't מטהר the bird for a ישראל
          - (ii) Note: סיפא ר' מני בר פטיש) is referring to בן-נח to סיפא ; ישראל to סיפא
  - אמה"ח . רב is the operative verb
    - מכות of אמר"ח: above-mentioned ברייתא if he eats מלות of אמר"ח acin of מכות ח
      - But: if ממה"ח is defined as עוף טמא for eating מכות for eating עוף טמא 1
      - Defense: case is where the כזית has a sum of כזית, including inedibles (e.g. bones), but less than ס of meat
    - Challenge2 (from 27's ruling): if he eats
      - 1 שהוד bird: while alive violates at any amount; afterwards (נבלה) requires כזית
      - טמא bird: in any case, violates at any amount
      - Defense: again, he ate a full כזית with a כזית of total substance, of which אבר was meat
    - Challenge3: if he took a טהורה) which has less than כזית and ate it (note: if he killed it all agree בכזית
      - exempt זכי.
      - דאב"ש: liable
        - (a) Argument: if he is liable for one limb, certainly he is liable for eating entire bird
          - (i) Analysis: they disagree if we regard the bird as אברים while alive, but they agree that no מזית needed
          - (ii) Answer: in this case (as above), there is a אבר of אבר, but not of meat
          - (iii) Challenge: how could there be a bird which has כזית of meat, yet each בזית has כזית total?
            - 1. Answer: could be קלניתא
            - 2. Challenge: טמא), no need for כזית; but if אלניתא), no need for כזית
            - 3. Rather: it is a טהור bird which is similar, in weight, to קלניתא
        - (b) תנאים if each of these חנאים holds that subjective intent redefines food
          - (i) אברים אברים if he thinks of eating animal while alive, becomes אברים אברים and he is liable
          - (ii) ארים. if he thinks of eating this bird only after שחיטה, becomes non-אברים and he is exempt
            - 1. אב": how could different people eat same bird and have different liabilities?
            - 2. Answer (דבא): status of each defined by his intent