



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Kuf Zayin

MISHNA

- If a deer is in a house and one sits in the doorway to block its exit, but doesn't totally block the exit, and another person sits next to him thereby blocking the exit, the second person is chayuv for trapping.
- If the first person totally blocked the exit and a second person comes and sits next to this person, blocking the exit as well, only the first person is chayuv. Even if the first person walks away leaving only the second person to block the exit, only the first person is chayuv. This is like a deer that is trapped in a house (e.g. it is tied down) and then one goes and closes the door, he would not be chayuv because it was already trapped at the time of his action. [Even if the deer breaks out of the rope and it turns out that the only thing trapping him now is the door, still he is patur because at the time of the action, he did not effectuate a trapping.]

GEMARA

- **R' Abba in the name of R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, if a bird gets trapped in someone's clothing, he need not create an exit for it to escape. He can just stay the way he is until after Shabbos.
 - **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asks, the second case of the Mishna said that if he didn't actively trap the animal (i.e. the second person) is patur, which implies that it is not mutar!? **A:** The Mishna actually means it is patur and mutar. A proof to this is that the Mishna then says that this case is like one who closes his door on an already trapped animal. That is surely mutar, so this must be mutar as well.
 - Some say that **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** made a statement that our Mishna is a proof to **Rav**, because our Mishna's second case says that the second person is patur, and that must mean patur and mutar!
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, maybe the Mishna means patur but assur?! **A:** The Gemara says, the Mishna says that case is like one who closes his door on an already trapped animal. That is surely mutar, so this must be mutar as well.
- **Shmuel** says, whenever the halacha says that doing something on Shabbos is "patur", it means it is patur but assur, except for 3 cases which are patur and mutar: 1) our Mishna, 2) one who pops a hole into a puss-filled pimple with the intent that the current puss be removed, but not that it should remain open, is patur and mutar, 3) if one traps a snake to prevent himself from getting bitten, it is patur and mutar.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HA'OREG

PEREK SHMONAH SHERATZIM – PEREK ARBA'AH ASSAR

MISHNA

- One is chayuv for trapping or bruising any of the 8 sheratzim that are listed in the Torah (which give off tumah when they are dead). With regard to other "crawling animals" ("sh'katzim v'rimasim"), one who bruises them is patur (their skin is not considered "skin" because it is thin and doesn't permanently bruise). With regard to trapping them, one is chayuv for trapping them if doing so to use them for a purpose (not just to remove them from an area).
- One is patur for catching animals or birds in one's possession (and control), but he would be chayuv for bruising them.

GEMARA

- By saying that one is chayuv for bruising the 8 sheratzim, that means that they are considered to have a thick skin. **Shmuel** says, that would mean the Mishna only follows **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** who says that with regard to tumah, the skins of the 8 sheratzim are not considered flesh (they are thick) and are therefore not metameh like flesh. The **Rabanan** say that some of the sheratzim have thick skins and some don't **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of Rav** says, the **Rabanan** only argue regarding tumah, because an extra word in the pasuk tells us to treat the skins like flesh. But, for purposes of Shabbos, they agree that all 8 have thick skin and one who bruises any of them is therefore chayuv.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the **Rabanan** respond to **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** and say, for purposes of wounding only the 4 sheratzim listed in the Mishna in Chullin have skin separate from their flesh. Now, this can't be right, because the listed sheratzim are actually the ones that are thought NOT to have separate skins! **Abaye** explains that the Braisa means to say that the sheratzim NOT listed in the Mishna are the ones that have separate skins. We see that the **Rabanan** argue for purposes of Shabbos as well?! **A:** **Rava** said, that can't be right, because the words of the Braisa are "the sheratzim LISTED in the Mishna", not the ones NOT listed there! Rather, the Braisa means, the **Rabanan** say that the sheratzim listed in the Mishna do not have thick skins and the skins are therefore tamei like the flesh. But, with regard to Shabbos, all agree that all 8 sheratzim have thick skins.
 - **Q:** Based on **Rava's** approach, the **Rabanan** are saying "only 4 of them have skins that are tamei". If this is their response to **R' Yochanan ben Nuri**, it must be that they heard from him that all sheratzim have skins that are tamei. A Mishna says that **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** says all sheratzim do not have skins that can become tamei? **A:** **R' Ada bar Masna** says, the **Rabanan** responded that "the sheratzim listed by the Mishna do NOT have "skins", and therefore the skins that they do have are tamei like their flesh". This response would mean that they heard **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** say that all 8 sheratzim have skins that are not tamei like their flesh.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one who bruises the sheratzim which have "skin" for tumah purposes would be chayuv on Shabbos. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** says he is chayuv for bruising *any* of the 8. We see that they argue with regard to Shabbos as well!? **A:** The **T"K** of that Braisa is **R' Yehuda**, not the **Rabanan**. The Braisa should say "**R' Yochanan ben Nuri** and his disputants (the **Rabanan**) say that he is chayuv for bruising any of the 8".
- **Q: Levi asked Rebbi**, how do we know that a "bruise" means a permanent bruise? **A:** A pasuk compares a bruise to a black man to say that just like a black man is permanently black, so too a bruise is one of a permanent nature.

U'SHI'AR SHEKATZIM...

- It seems that bruising other sheratzim is patur, but killing them would be chayuv. **R' Yirmiya** says, this follows **R' Eliezer** who says that killing lice on Shabbos is like killing a camel. (The **Rabanan** argue and say that killing lice is patur).
 - **Q:** **R' Yosef** asks, the **Rabanan** argue regarding lice because they don't reproduce, however they would agree that one would be chayuv for killing sheratzim, which do reproduce?!
 - The **Rabanan** and **R' Eliezer** learn the issur of killing from the Mishkan, where they killed rams for their skins. **R' Eliezer** says, one is chayuv for taking any life, just like they took the lives of the rams. The **Rabanan** say, just like rams reproduce, so too one is only chayuv for killing something that reproduces.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asks, we learned that Hashem sustains "from the horns of "re'eimim" to the eggs of lice". We see that lice reproduce?! **A:** That refers to a species called "Eggs of Lice".
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** says one is chayuv for trapping (and presumably killing) a flea (which reproduces) and **R' Yehoshua** says he is patur. We see they argue regarding something that reproduces as well?! **A:** **R' Ashi** said, they are only arguing regarding trapping (**R' Yehoshua** says it is not typical to catch a flea

and he is therefore patur) but all would agree that he would be chayuv if he were to kill it.

HATZADAN L'TZORECH CHAYUV...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, this follows **R' Shimon** who says melacha not done for its primary purpose is patur. Therefore, trapping it to remove it (but not to actually use it) will be patur.
 - Some say that **Rav** said this on the case of one who pops a hole into a puss-filled pimple with the intent that the current puss be removed, but not that it should remain open, he is patur. **Rav** says this follows **R' Shimon** who says melacha not done for its primary purpose is patur.
 - Some say that **Rav** said this on the case of one traps a snake to prevent himself from getting bitten, he is patur. **Rav** says this follows **R' Shimon** who says melacha not done for its primary purpose is patur.
- **Shmuel** says, if one takes a fish out of the sea and it gets a dry spot the size of a "selah", he is chayuv for killing the fish. **R' Yose bar Avin** adds, this is when the dry spot is between its fins. **R' Ashi** explains, it does not need to be totally dry. Even if it becomes sticky so that the sticky film sticks to his finger after he touches it, he is chayuv.
- **Shmuel** says, if one sticks his hand into a pregnant animal and detaches the embryo, he is chayuv. **Rava** explains, he is chayuv because he uprooted something from the place of its growth.
 - **Abaye** says, one who detaches mold from a pitcher is chayuv for this as well. This is different than a plant in a flower pot without a hole (for which one is not chayuv for ripping it out) because this is the usual place for the growth of mold.