

**Shabbos Daf Tzaddik Daled**

ES HACHAI B'MITAH, PATUR AHF AHL HAMITAH

- **Q:** A Braisa says that if one carries a live or dead animal out on Shabbos he is chayuv. **R' Nosson** says he is only chayuv for carrying a dead animal, not a live one, because a live animal "carries itself". Should we say that our Mishna follows only **R' Nosson** (which is a minority view) and not the **Rabanan**? **A: Rava** said, our Mishna may follow the **Rabanan**. The **Rabanan** only argue regarding a live animal, since when it is carried it fights and makes itself "heavy", trying to escape the grip of the one who carries it. The **Rabanan** would agree that a live person "carries himself" and one would therefore not be chayuv for carrying a live person out on Shabbos.
  - **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked **Rava**, how can you say the **Rabanan** agree regarding a live person? A Mishna prohibits the sale of certain animals to goyim because that may lead to renting and lending animals to goyim over Shabbos, with the goy performing melacha with the animal on Shabbos, which is prohibited. **Ben Beseirah** allows the sale of a horse, because a horse carries people, which if done on Shabbos is not prohibited D'Oraisa because a "live person carries himself", so we don't have to be goizer in that case. **R' Yochanan** explained, that **Ben Beseirah** and **R' Nosson** say the same principle (that a live person carries himself). If **Rava** is correct that the **Rabanan** agree that a live person carries himself, why does **R' Yochanan** limit **Ben Beseirah** to agreeing only with **R' Nosson**?! **A: R' Yochanan** was referring to a horse that was designated to carry birds, in which case the **Rabanan** would not agree. We find that bird hunters would use a horse to carry the birds that helped them catch other birds.
  - **R' Yochanan** said, **R' Nosson** would agree that a live person or animal that is tied up is not considered to be able to "carry itself".
    - **Q: R' Adda bar Masna** asked **Abaye**, the Persians ride their horses in a way that they are basically tied up, and yet **R' Yochanan** said that **Ben Beseira** and **R' Nosson** say the same thing that the person on the horse "carries himself"?! **A:** The Persian is not truly tied up. He could move and run if he wanted to (like we find a story with a Persian officer who ran 3 "parsah" on foot to escape the king). He just chooses not to, and therefore they are not considered to be tied up.

ES HAMEIS B'MITAH CHAYUV, V'CHEIN KIZAYIS MIN HAMEIS...

- **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** say, **R' Shimon** said one is patur for carrying out a meis even if he carried him out to bury him. Although there is a purpose in doing so, it is still considered to be a "melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufah" because it is not needed for the person doing the melacha. **Rava** said, **R' Shimon** would agree that one who takes out a shovel to dig with or a sefer Torah to read from is chayuv.
  - **Q:** Obviously he would be chayuv in this case, since he took it out for his own use!?! **A:** One would think that **R' Shimon** would only say one is chayuv when there is a purpose for the person doing the melacha and a purpose for the item of the melacha – i.e. if one takes out a shovel to fix it and to dig with it, or if one takes out a sefer Torah to fix it and to read from it. **Rava** tells us that as long as there is a use for the one performing the melacha, **R' Shimon** would say he is chayuv.
  - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** allowed a meis to be taken out to a karmelis. **R' Yochanan, the brother of Mar the son of Ravana** asked, even **R' Shimon** said one is patur for carrying out a meis, but he didn't allow it l'chatchila, so why did you allow it? He answered, I only allowed the meis to be taken out into a karmelis, not a reshus harabim. Even **R' Yehuda** would allow this l'chatchila for the purpose of human dignity.
- If "tzara'as" has 2 white hairs growing out of it, it is a sign that it is tamei. A Mishna says, if one pulled out one of the 2 white hairs, thereby rendering it not tamei, he is chayuv malkus for being "oiver" a lav. If there are 3 white hairs and he pulls out one, **R' Nachman** says he is chayuv

(because he has just brought himself one step closer to rendering the tzara'as not tamei) and **R' Sheishes** says he is patur (because he has done nothing to change the tumah status right now).

- **R' Sheishes** proves his point from a contradiction regarding carrying a piece of a meis. Our Mishna said that one is chayuv for carrying out a kezayis of a meis. It is mashma that he would not be chayuv for half of a kezayis. A Braisa says that one is chayuv for carrying out even a half of a kezayis of a meis. It must be that the Braisa is talking about where he took a half of a kezayis from a piece that was a kezayis. He therefore changed the status to make it unable to give off tumah and that's why he is chayuv. The Mishna must be talking about where there was a kezayis and a half. When he takes the half of a kezayis, he left over a full kezayis and he is therefore patur. This is similar to the case of 2 white hairs and 3 white hairs.
  - **R' Nachman** would say in both these cases (where he takes a half kezayis from either a full kezayis or from a kezayis and a half) he would chayuv for taking out a half of a kezayis. When the Mishna is mashma that he is patur it is referring to where he took a half of a kezayis from a large meis. In that case, his half of a kezayis doesn't bring him even close to losing the tamei status, and that's why he is patur. However, taking one hair of 3 is significant.

#### MISHNA

- If one removes his nails with his other nails, or with his teeth, or he rips out hair of his head, of his mustache, or of his beard, or a woman who braids her hair, or paints her eyes, or combs her hair, **R' Eliezer** says they are chayuv and the **Chachomim** say these acts are assur D'Rabanan.

#### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** says, the machlokes is removing the nails by hand. However, all would agree that one who removes nails with a utensil would be chayuv.
  - **Q:** This is obvious – that's what the Mishna says!? **A:** One could say that the **Rabanan** say he is patur when using a keili as well, and they argue regarding removing with the hands to inform us how strict **R' Eliezer** is.
- **R' Elazar** says, the machlokes is one who removes his own fingernails. However, all would agree that one who takes off someone else's nails with his hands is patur.
  - **Q:** This is obvious – the Mishna says "his" nails?! **A:** One would think that **R' Eliezer** says he would be chayuv in this case as well, and the Mishna says "his" fingernails to teach that even in that case the **Rabanan** say he is patur.

#### V'CHEIN S'ARO...

- A Braisa says, if one removes a scissors' full of hair he is chayuv. **R' Yehuda** explains this to mean 2 hairs. This is the same amount that would make one chayuv for tearing out hair in mourning.
  - A Braisa says the **Chachomim** agree with the amount of 2 hairs, but **R' Eliezer** says one is chayuv for even one hair. The **Chachomim** agree that plucking one white hair from among the black hairs is enough to make someone chayuv. Doing so is even prohibited during the week (because it is "dressing" like a woman).
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, if a nail or cuticle is mostly detached, it may be removed by hand but one is chayuv a chatas for removing it with a utensil.
  - **Q:** How can it be mutar l'chatchila if done by hand and chayuv a chatas if done with a keili? It should be assur D'Rabanan if done by hand!? **A:** The Braisa should say, if it is mostly detached, it is mutar to detach by hand and assur to do by utensil. If it is not mostly detached, it is assur to do by hand and if done with a keili, he is chayuv a chatas.
  - **R' Yehuda** says, the halacha follows **R' Shimon ben Elazar**. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that is only if it detached from the top down. That is typically associated with pain, and because of that pain, one may remove the detached piece with his hands.