

XVII.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

FOLIOS 122B-126B

17:1

- A. All utensils are handled on the Sabbath,
- B. and their [detached] doors along with them,
- C. even though they were detached on the Sabbath.
- D. For they are not equivalent to doors of a house,
- E. for the [latter] are not prepared [in advance of the Sabbath to be used].

17:2

- A. One handles (1), a hammer to split nuts,
- B. (2) an ax to chop off a fig,
- C. (3) a saw to cut through cheese,
- D. (4) a shovel to scoop up dried figs,
- E. (5) a winnowing shovel or (6) a fork to give something thereon to a child,
- F. (7) a spindle or (8) a shuttle staff to thrust into something,
- G. (9) a sewing needle to take out a thorn,
- H. (10) a sack maker's needle to open a door.

- I.1** A. All utensils are handled on the Sabbath...even though they were detached on the Sabbath: *And it goes without saying that they may be handled even though they were detached on a weekday.*

- B. But, to the contrary, on the Sabbath, they are prepared for use that day by reason of their genesis [Freedman: They were fit from the beginning of the Sabbath to be handled on the Sabbath, when they were part of the whole, so, if they became detached on the Sabbath, they remain fit for the entire Sabbath.]; but if they were detached on a weekday prior to the Sabbath, they are not prepared for use that day by reason of their genesis!
- C. *Said Abbaye, "This is the sense of the statement: **All utensils are handled on the Sabbath, and their [detached] doors along with them; even though they were detached** on a weekday they may be handled on the Sabbath."*

I.2 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **The door of a box, chest, or cabinet may be removed but not replaced; that of a hen coop may neither be removed nor replaced [T. *Shab. 14:11-J*].**

I.3 A. *Now there is no difficulty understanding the rule governing the hen coop. The framer takes the view that since the hen coop is attached to the ground, the prohibition of building applies to the ground and the prohibition of dismantling applies equally to the ground. [Freedman: It is like fitting or removing a house door, which constitutes building and demolishing.] But what does the framer of the rule suppose in connection with his rule on a box, chest, or cabinet? If he maintains that the prohibition of building applies to utensils, then surely the prohibition of dismantling them also does; and if there is no prohibition of dismantling, then there also should be no prohibition of building. [Freedman: Removing and refitting should be treated as equivalent.]*

B. *Said Abbaye, "In point of fact he takes the view that the prohibition of building applies to utensils, and so, too, does the prohibition of dismantling them. But the sense of his statement is, those that were removed may not be replaced." [Freedman: The doors if detached before the Sabbath may not be refitted.]*

C. *Said to him Raba, "There are two objections: First, he says that they may be removed, second, what is the meaning of the language, but not replaced?"*

D. *Rather, said Raba, "He takes the view that there is no prohibition of dismantling, and there also is no prohibition of building. But this is a precautionary decree, lest he fix it firmly" [for example, nailing it on, and that is a prohibited act of labor (Freedman)].*

- II.1** A. **One handles a hammer to split nuts, an ax to chop off a fig, a saw to cut through cheese, a shovel to scoop up dried figs:**
- B. Said R. Judah, "That is a nut hammer for splitting nuts, not a smith's hammer." *He takes the view that* as to something the ordinary work of which is forbidden, then even when required for itself, it is forbidden to handle such an object for a permitted purpose. [Freedman: Since the normal function of a smith's hammer is to do work forbidden on the Sabbath, it also may not be handled even for a permitted purpose.]
- C. *Said to him Rabbah, "Well, then, what about what comes next: a winnowing shovel or a fork to give something thereon to a child? Now are a winnowing shovel or a fork things that are designated for use with a child?"*
- D. Rather, said Rabbah, "That is a smith's hammer, in this case used for splitting nuts." *He takes the view that* [123A] as to something the ordinary work of which is forbidden, then even when required for itself, it is permitted to handle such an object for a permitted purpose.
- E. *Abbaye objected to Rabbah:* "As to a mortar, if it contains garlic, it may be handled, and if not, it may not be handled."
- F. *He said to him, "Well, then, who is the authority behind that ruling? It is R. Nehemiah, who takes the view, a utensil may be handled only for the purpose for which it is ordinarily used."*
- G. *He objected,* "Yet the Houses agree that if one has cut meat on a pestle, it may not be handled."
- H. *He considered replying to him that it accords with R. Nehemiah, but when he heard that Hinena bar Shelamayya said in the name of Rab, "All concur in regard to a dyer's pins, tubs, and beams, that, since one is meticulous about them, he appoints a special place for them," [he said,] "Here, too, one appoints a special place for the pestle" [and it may not be handled or moved from that place].*

- II.2** A. *It has been stated:*
- B. R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan [said], "A goldsmith's hammer is the subject of our Mishnah rule."
- C. R. Shemen bar Abba said, "A spice hammer."
- D. *He who takes the view that it is a spice hammer all the more so will maintain that that is the case of the goldsmith's hammer, but he who says it is a*

goldsmith's hammer will maintain that one is meticulous about a spice hammer [which may not be moved].

III.1 A. A spindle or a shuttle staff to thrust into something:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. An unripe fig that one hid in straw, or a cake that one hid in live coals, part of which got uncovered, may be handled [the straw or coals need not be handled]. And if not, it is forbidden to handle such a thing.
- D. R. Eleazar b. Taddai says, "They stick them onto a reed or a whorl and the straw or coals shake off on their own."
 - E. Said R. Nahman, "The decided law accords with R. Eleazar b. Taddai."

III.2 A. *Does that bear the implication that R. Nahman takes the view that carrying from the side [indirectly] is not classified as handling? But didn't R. Nahman say, "As to a radish, if it is right way up, it may be carried; if it is upside down, it may not be carried"?*

B. *R. Nahman reversed that ruling.*

IV.1 A. A sewing needle to take out a thorn:

- B. *Raba b. Rabbah sent word to R. Joseph: "May our lord teach us! As to a needle the eye or point of which one has removed, what is the law?"*
- C. *He replied to him, "You have learned it in the Mishnah: **a sewing needle to take out a thorn.** So what difference does it make to the thorn whether the needle has an eye or not?"*
- D. *He objected: "**As to a needle the eye or point of which one has removed, it is insusceptible to uncleanness [as a totally useless object] [M. Kel. 13:5]!"***
- E. *Said Abbaye, "So are you comparing a rule governing uncleanness with a rule governing the Sabbath? In the case of uncleanness, the operative criterion that we invoke is that we require a working utensil, but in regard to the Sabbath, we require something that is fit for some sort of purpose, and this, too, is fit for removing a thorn."*
- F. *Said Raba, "He who objected is right, since what is not a utensil in regard to receiving uncleanness also is no utensil when it comes to the Sabbath."*
- G. *An objection was raised: A needle, whether perforated or not, may be handled on the Sabbath, and we have made reference to a needle with an eye-hole only*

in the matter of uncleanness [Freedman: so there is a distinction in connection with uncleanness between various needles, too].

- H. *Explained Abbaye, "This is to be understood in line with the view of Raba as speaking of utensils that are not finished."* [Freedman: If it is not finished and has to have a hole punched in, it is not susceptible to uncleanness; but if it is finished without an eye, it is a utensil and susceptible to uncleanness, and there is no distinction between uncleanness affecting various needles; but as to the Sabbath, even the former may be handled, since one may decide to use it in its unfinished state, for example, as a toothpick; it is therefore classified as a utensil.]

IV.2 A. *As to making a baby vomit —*

B. *R. Nahman forbids doing so on the Sabbath.*

C. *R. Sheshet permits.*

D. *Said R. Nahman, "On what basis do I take that view? Because we have learned in the Mishnah: **And they do not induce [123B] vomiting [M. Shab. 22:6E].***

E. *And R. Sheshet?*

F. *There it is not the normal way, here it is the normal way.*

G. *Said R. Sheshet, "On what basis do I take that view? Because we have learned in the Mishnah: **a sewing needle to take out a thorn.**"*

H. *And R. Nahman?*

I. *There the thorn is located outside, here it is not located outside [but in the belly, and bringing it out by causing vomiting is not parallel to removing a thorn.]*

17:3

A. **A reed for olives, if it has a knot on its top, receives uncleanness.**

B. **And if not, it does not receive uncleanness.**

C. **One way or the other, it is handled on the Sabbath.**

I.1 A. *How come? This is a flat utensil made of wood, and such are not susceptible to uncleanness? Why so? Because we require what is comparable to a sack [Lev. 11:32, having a receptacle]!*

B. *It was taught on Tannaite authority in the name of R. Nehemiah, "When he turns the olives over, he reverses it and looks at it [at the oil*

that penetrates the reed, that is closed and so it is a cane that has a receptacle (Freedman)].

17:4A-B

- A. R. Yosé says, “All utensils are handled,
- B. “except for a large saw or plough-share.”

I.1 A. Said R. Nahman, “A fuller’s trough is in the category of the pin of a plough.”
B. Said Abbaye, “A cobbler’s knife and butcher’s chopper and carpenter’s adze are in the category of the pin of a plough.”

I.2 A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:
B. **At first they ruled: Three utensils may be moved about on the Sabbath: a fig cake knife, a pot soup ladle, and a small table knife. They went back and permitted, went back and permitted, went back and permitted [so adding to the list], until they reached the rule: All utensils are handled, except for a large saw or plough-share [T. Shab. 14:1A-B].**

I.3 A. *What is the meaning of they went back and permitted, went back and permitted, went back and permitted?*

B. Said Abbaye, “They permitted handling an article the function of which was for a permitted purpose, on condition that it was required for its own purpose [not because the place where it was situated was required]; then they went and permitting handling something that served a permitted purpose merely because the space where it was located was needed; and then they went and permitted handling something the usual use of which would be permitted on the Sabbath, so long as it was required for itself [for use in a form of labor that is permitted], but not merely because the space where it was located was needed. And still, these could be handled only with one hand, but not with two [so that an object, too, heavy for a single hand could not be handled], until, finally, they said, all utensils may be handled on the Sabbath, and even with two hands.”

C. Said to him Raba, “Since the language, permitted, is used in the Tannaite formulation, what difference does it make to me whether the utilization was for the purpose of a function performed by the object itself or for the purpose of clearing the space at which the object is situated?”

D. Rather, said Raba, “They permitted handling an object, the function of which is permitted on the Sabbath, whether it is for the purpose of using the object itself or for the purpose of clearing the space where it was located; and they then went and permitted moving the object from sun to shade; then they further went and permitted handling an object the ordinary function of which is for a forbidden type of labor only when it is required for itself or when the place where it is located is needed, but not handling it so as to move it from sun to shade. Yet it still might be moved by one person only, but not by two people, until they ruled, all utensils may be handled on the Sabbath, even by two people.”

E. *Objected Abbaye*, “[So how can you explain the following:] A mortar, if there is garlic in it, may be moved, and if not, it may not be moved.” [Freedman: Abbaye can explain that it may not be handled when only its place is required, since its normal function is forbidden, but how can Raba explain it?]

F. *“Here with what situation do we deal? The rule concerns moving it from sun to shade.”*

G. *He raised this objection*: “Yet the Houses agree that if one has cut meat on a pestle, it may not be handled.”

H. *“Here with what situation do we deal? The rule concerns moving it from sun to shade.”*

I.4 A. Said R. Hanina, “In the time of Nehemiah b. Hakaliah was this Mishnah teaching repeated for the first time [namely, **at first they ruled: Three utensils may be moved about on the Sabbath: a fig cake knife, a pot soup ladle, and a small table knife**], for it is written, ‘In those days I saw in Judah some treading winepresses on the Sabbath and bringing in sheaves’ (Neh. 13:15).”

I.5 A. Said R. Eleazar, “The law concerning handling on the Sabbath canes, staves, fastenings and a mortar were all repeated prior to the decree permitting all utensils.

B. “Canes — *as we have learned in the Mishnah: Neither the work of ordering of the reeds nor the work of their removal overrides the Sabbath [M. Men. 11:6E]*.

C. “Staves — *as we have learned in the Mishnah: And for whoever did not have space for hanging and flaying his carcass, there were*

thin smooth poles, and one would put one end on his shoulder and one on the shoulder of his fellow, and [thereon] hang and flay the carcass. R. Eliezer says, ‘On the fourteenth of Nisan which coincided with the Sabbath, he would put [124A] his hand on the shoulder of his fellow, and the hand of his fellow on his shoulder, and thereon suspend and flay the carcass’ [M. **Pes. 5:9C-F**].

D. “Fastenings — *as we have learned in the Mishnah*: And the door bolt, if it has on its top a fastener, R. Joshua says, ‘One draws it off this door and suspends it on another on the Sabbath.’ R. Tarfon says, ‘Lo it is like all utensils and may be carried in the courtyard’ [M. **Kel. 11:4I-K**].

E. “And a mortar — *as we just said*.”

F. *Said Rabbah, “How does this necessarily follow? Maybe I may in any event say to you: These were repeated as authoritative rules only after the enactment of the permission for handling all utensils.*

G. *“As to placing canes, what was the operative consideration? It was because of mouldiness [affecting the showbread], but in such a brief interval the bread wouldn’t become mouldy.*

H. *“As to the staves, it was possible in accord with the position of R. Eliezer.*

I. *“As to the fastening, the rule may accord with R. Yannai, for R. Yannai said, ‘We deal with a courtyard that has no symbolic union through a fictive boundary.’ So R. Joshua takes the view that the inside of the door [where the fastener is found] is located within, so one may carry a utensil belonging to the house through the courtyard; R. Tarfon maintains that the inside of the door is outside, so one carries a utensil of the courtyard in the courtyard.*

J. *“As for the mortar, the rule would accord with the position of R. Nehemiah.”*

17:4C-D

C. All utensils are handled in case of need and not in case of need.

D. R. Nehemiah says, “They are handled only in case of need.”

I.1 A. *What is the definition of, in case of need, and what is the definition of not in case of need?*

- B. Said Rabbah [better: Abbayye], “...**in case of need** means, an object the work of which is permitted on the Sabbath, and when it is required for its intrinsic purpose. ...**not in case of need** means, an object the work of which is permitted on the Sabbath, but handling it is required only so that one may make use of the space that it occupies. But as to an object, the work of which is forbidden on the Sabbath, one may handle it if one requires it for use of the object itself [for some subsidiary purpose that is legitimate on the Sabbath, but not when the location where the object is situated is needed. *And R. Nehemiah comes along to say*, even if it is an object, the ordinary purpose of which is permitted on the Sabbath, if it is for the necessity of using the object for its own purpose, it is permitted to move it, but if it is only to clear away the place where it is located, it may not be handled.”
- C. *Said to him Raba*, “*But do you really classify* handling an object so as to clear away the space it occupies as **not in case of need**?”
- D. Rather, said Raba, “...**in case of need** means, it is permitted to handle an object the work of which is permitted on the Sabbath, whether it is because of the need to use the object itself or because of the need for the space where the object is located; ...**not in case of need** means, even if it is to move the object from the sun to the shade. And as to an object the ordinary use of which is forbidden on the Sabbath, ...**in case of need** means, it is permitted to handle the object to use it for its ordinary purpose or because of need of the space where it is occupied; but if it is to move it from sun to shade, it is not permitted to move it. *Then R. Nehemiah comes along to say*, even if it is an object the work of which is permitted, and even if it is for the use of the object itself or for the space that it occupies, it is permitted to move the object, but if it is to move it from sun to shade, it is not permitted to move the object.”
- E. *In session*, R. Saфра, R. Aha bar Huna, and R. Huna bar Hanina stated to Rabbah [better: Abbayye], “*From the perspective of R. Nehemiah, as to plates, how come we handle them?*”
- F. *Said to them R. Saфра*, “*By analogy to a pot of shit.*”
- G. *Said Abbayye to Rabbah [better: Raba]* “*From the master’s viewpoint, from the perspective of R. Nehemiah, as to plates, how come we handle them?*”
- H. *He said to him*, “*Our colleague, R. Saфра, has already explained the matter: by analogy to a pot of shit.*”

I. *Objected Abbayye to Raba*, “As to a mortar, if it contains garlic, it may be handled, and if not, it may not be handled.”

J. *“Here with what situation do we deal? The rule concerns moving it from sun to shade.”*

K. He raised this objection: “Yet the Houses agree that if one has cut meat on a pestle, it may not be handled.”

L. *“Here with what situation do we deal? The rule concerns moving it from sun to shade.”*

M. *“But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **And they do not prop up a pot with a log, and so is the rule for a door** [M. Bes. 4:5F-G].* But lo, on a festival day, a log is an object that serves a permitted purpose, and that shows that a utensil that serves a permitted purpose may not be handled whether it is required for its own ordinary use or whether moving it is needed to free up the space that it occupies! *Therefore a utensil the function of which is for a permitted purpose may not be handled, whether it is needed for itself or for the space that it occupies.”*

N. *“There, what is the operative consideration? Since on the Sabbath it is forbidden to move an object the ordinary purpose of which cannot be carried out, there is a precautionary decree covering the festival on account of the Sabbath. And should you say that handling it on the Sabbath should be forbidden, lo, since an article the purpose of which is forbidden on the Sabbath may be handled when it is needed for its own use or when its place is needed, in fact, that is only where the object is to begin with classified as a utensil, not where it does not enter the classification of a utensil at all [and the log is no utensil].”*

O. *“But do we make such a decree at all? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **They let down produce [from a roof] through a hatchway on a festival, but not on the Sabbath** [M. Bes. 5:1A-B]?”*

P. *“But don’t we make such a precautionary decree? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **The sole difference between the festival and Sabbath is the preparation of food alone, [which is permitted on the festival but forbidden on the Sabbath** [M. Bes. 5:2J]?”*

Q. Said R. Joseph, “There is no real problem here; the one statement represents the position of R. Eliezer, the other, R. Joshua, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **‘A dam and its offspring which fell into a pit’ (Lev. 22:28) — R. Eliezer says, ‘One raises up the first with the intention of slaughtering it and does slaughter it, and, for the second, one provides food while it is in its present location, so that it not die.’** [Freedman: On the Sabbath no animal may be raised up; on a festival an animal may be raised up only to be slaughtered. In the case at hand, Eliezer applies to the second animal the usual rule for the Sabbath. Since it may not be slaughtered, it may not be raised up.] **R. Joshua says, ‘One raises up the first one with the intention of slaughtering it but does not slaughter it, and, practicing deception, one then raises up the second, [claiming he wishes to slaughter it instead]. If he wants one, he slaughters it. If he wants the other, he slaughters it’ [T. Y.T. 3:2].**”

R. On what grounds [can you claim that Eliezer holds that what is prohibited on the Sabbath is prohibited on the festival as well]? Perhaps R. Eliezer stated this view, only for a case [such as that at T. Y.T. 3:2] in which [it is possible to avoid monetary loss] by feeding [the animal in the pit]. But [it may be the case that], if it were impossible to feed [the animal so as to avoid monetary loss, that Eliezer would] not [hold the view attributed to him]. In the same way, perhaps R. Joshua holds [the position assigned to him] only in a case in which it is possible to use deception, [so as to make it seem that the second animal is being raised for a permitted purpose]. But here [in a different case], in which it is impossible to use deception [so as to make it seem that the action is permitted, Joshua would] not [permit performing on the festival day an action that is forbidden on the Sabbath].

S. Rather, said R. Pappa. “There is no contradiction. This is the opinion of the House of Shammai. This is the opinion of the House of Hillel. As we have learned in the Mishnah: **The House of Shammai say, [124B] ‘[On a festival day] they do not take out into public domain a minor, a lulab or a scroll of the Torah.’ And the House of Hillel permit’ [M. Bes. 1:5].**” [Avery-Peck, *Besah* to 37A: The assumption is that, just as the Shammaites prohibit carrying into public domain items not needed for the preparation of food, so they would

prohibit handling these things on a festival simply to prevent monetary loss. The Hillelites by contrast permit handling non-food items on a festival. They presumably permit carrying these things for purposes of avoiding monetary loss. But such handling is not permitted on the Sabbath.]

T. *But how so? [Perhaps] the House of Shammai forbids [this] only here, with regard to taking out [of one's house objects not associated with the preparation of food]. But they would not [forbid] handling [such objects within the house].*

U. *But is handling the object itself not forbidden on account of carrying out? [Carrying out involves handling, and handling is forbidden on account of carrying out.]*

I.2 A. *And furthermore, Rab, too, holds this view of Raba, for said Rab, "Moving a hoe so that it not be stolen is handling that is not necessary and it is forbidden." So the operative consideration is that it not be stolen, but if it were for use for some purpose that the object ordinarily can serve and that is permitted on the Sabbath, or if it were to clear away the place at which it is located, it would be permitted.*

B. *Well, now, is that so!? But as a matter of fact, R. Kahana visited the household of Rab, and he said, "Bring a log of wood for Kahana's seat." But that's something the function of which is for a forbidden purpose [for example, fuel], and it is something that ought to be handled only when needed for its own ordinary purpose and not merely because its place is needed!*

C. *This is the sense of his instructions to them: "Take the log away from Kahana's presence [so he can sit where it is located]." Or, they moved it from sun to shade.*

I.3 A. R. Mari bar Rahel had some pillows lying in the sun. He went to Raba and asked him, "What is the rule about handling these things?"

B. *He said to him, "It is permitted."*

C. *"But you should know that I have others [and don't need these]."*

D. *"They can be used for guests."*

E. *“But you should know that I have some for guests, too.”*

F. *“Well, what you’ve accomplished is to show that you concur with Rabbah [better: Abbayye]. So to everybody else it is permitted, but to you it is forbidden.”*

- I.4** A. Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, “Table brushes that are made of cloth may be handled on the Sabbath, but not those made of palm twigs.” [The latter are used for sweeping the floor, which is forbidden (Freedman).]
- B. R. Eleazar says, “Also those made of palm twigs.”

C. With what case do we deal? If we should say that it is for the purpose of doing something done with the object itself and for the purpose of access to the space that they occupy, then in such a case, can Rab say, “but not those made of palm twigs”? Surely Rab concurs with Raba [that that is permitted]! But it must be so as to move them from sun to shade [which no one would permit]. But in such a case, can R. Eleazar say, “even those made of palms”?

D. The point of the matter is, it does mean, from sun to shade, and say as follows: So did R. Eleazar rule.

17:5

- A. All utensils which are handled on the Sabbath — fragments deriving from them may be handled along with them,
- B. on condition that they perform some sort of useful work [even if it is not what they did when they were whole]:
- C. [So how large must these fragments be to be regarded as useful for some work, if not the work they originally did?] (1) fragments of a kneading trough — [must be sufficiently large on their own] to cover the mouth of a barrel,
- D. (2) glass fragments — [must be sufficiently large on their own] to cover the mouth of a flask.
- E. R. Judah says, “On condition that they perform the sort of work which they did [when they were whole]:
- F. (1) “fragments of a kneading trough — [must be sufficiently large on their own] to pour porridge into them, (2) glass fragments — [must be sufficiently large on their own] to pour oil into them.”

- I.1** A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The dispute pertains to a case in which the utensils were broken on the eve of the Sabbath, *for one authority maintains the theory that* the sherds may be handled only if they are fit for something that is along the lines of their own prior function but not for something that is along the lines of some different function altogether; *and the other takes the view*, even if it is fit for something that is along the lines of some different function altogether, it is permitted to handle them. But if they were broken on the Sabbath, all parties concur that, whatever the present use, they are permitted, since they are deemed ready for this purpose from prior to the advent of the Sabbath by reason of their genesis.” [Freedman: They were fit from the beginning of the Sabbath to be handled on the Sabbath, when they were part of the whole, so, if they became detached on the Sabbath, they remain fit for the entire Sabbath, but if they were detached on a weekday prior to the Sabbath, they are not prepared for use that day by reason of their genesis.]
- B. [Citing disputes given below, No. 2,] *objected R Zutrai*, “‘On a festival one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones.’ *Now when might these utensils have been broken? Should we say they were broken on the eve of the festival? Then all they are are pieces of wood [and why would it be forbidden to heat with them]? So it must be that they were broken on the festival, and yet it is taught*, On a festival one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones!’”
- C. *Rather, if any such statement was made, this is how it must have been made:* Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The dispute pertains to a case in which the utensils were broken on the Sabbath, *for one authority maintains the theory that* the sherds are classified as already available prior to the Sabbath; *and the other takes the view*, that they are in the classification of what has come into being on the Sabbath [and may not be used on the Sabbath]. But if they were broken on the eve of the Sabbath, all parties concur that they are permitted, since in that case they were available for the present purpose while it was still daylight on the prior day.”

- I.2** A. [With reference to the following set of disputes: “On a festival one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones” — the words of R. Judah. But R. Simeon permits. “On a festival one may make a fire with dates [being food, they may be handled for other purposes as well], but if they are eaten, one may not light a fire with their pits” — the words of R. Judah. But R. Simeon

permits. “On a festival one may make a fire with nuts, but if they are eaten, one must not make a fire with their shell” — the words of R. Judah. But R. Simeon permits, we proceed:] *One Tannaite rule states*, one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones, *while another Tannaite rule states*, just as one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils, so one may make a fire in an oven with broken ones. *And yet a third states*, just as one may not make a fire in an oven with whole utensils, so one may not make a fire in an oven with broken ones.

B. The one represents the view of R. Judah, the other, R. Simeon, the third, R. Nehemiah.

I.3 A. *Said R. Nahman, “Bricks left over from a building may be handled, since they are fit for seats. But if one sets them out in rows, then he has certainly designated them [for another building, not for seats].”*

I.4 A. Said R. Nahman said Samuel, “A little sherd may be handled in a courtyard, but not in neglected public domain.”

B. But R. Nahman speaking in his own name said, “Even in neglected public domain, but not in public domain.”

C. And Raba said, “Even in public domain.”

D. And Raba is consistent with principles expressed elsewhere, for Raba was walking along in the manor of Mahoza, and his shoes got dirty with clay; his attendant came, took a sherd, and wiped it off. The rabbis objected loudly. He said, “It’s not enough that they’re scarcely learned, but they even want to teach! If it were in a courtyard, wouldn’t it be fit for covering a utensil? Here, too, I have a valid purpose in using it.”

I.5 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “As to the bung of a barrel that was broken into pieces, it is permitted to handle it on the Sabbath.”

B. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. The bung that was broken into pieces — both it and its sherds it is permitted to handle on the Sabbath.

D. But one may not trim a fragment to cover a utensil or hold up the legs of a bed.

E. If one threw it away on a dung heap, it is forbidden [to be handled, since now it has ceased to be a utensil that the owner values and plans to use] [T. *Shab.* 14:2Cff.]

F. Objected R. Pappa, "But what about the following: If one throws away his robe, here, too, would it be forbidden [the owner having indicated he no longer values it]?"

G. Rather, said R. Pappa, [125A] "If he threw it away while it was still daylight on Friday, it is forbidden."

- I.6** A. Said Bar Hammeduri said Samuel, "Shreds of reeds that have been detached from a mat may be handled on the Sabbath."
B. *How come?*
C. *Said Raba, "Bar Hammeduri explained to me, as to the mat itself, what good is it? It is for covering the ground. These, too, are suitable for covering dirt."*

- I.7** A. Said R. Zira said Rab, "Remnants of silk of aprons may not be handled on the Sabbath."
B. Said Abbaye, "This makes reference to rags less than three fingerbreadths square, which are useless to either rich or poor."

- I.8** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
B. **The fragments of an old oven — lo, they are classified like all utensils that may be handled in a courtyard," the words of R. Meir.**
C. **R. Judah says, "They may not be handled."**
D. **Testified R. Yosé in the name of R. Eliezer b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its cover, that it does not require a handle [in order for it to be permitted to handle it on the Sabbath] [T. *Shab.* 14:3].**

- I.9** A. *What is at issue here?*
B. *Said Abbaye, "At issue is a case in which these fragments can do some useful work but not work in the nature of their prior work. R. Judah is consistent with his principles and R. Meir is consistent with his principles."*
C. *Objected Raba, "If so, instead of having their dispute concerning the fragments of an oven, let them have a dispute about the fragments of utensils in general!"*

D. *Rather, said Raba, “They dispute the status of the fragments of the following oven, of which we have learned in the Mishnah: [If] one placed it [the oven] over the mouth of the cistern, or over the mouth of the cellar, and placed there a stone — R. Judah says, ‘If one heats from below and it [the oven] becomes heated from above, it [the oven] is unclean.’ And sages say, ‘Since it was heated from any place, it is unclean’ [M. Kel. 5:6C-F].* [The oven is set over the walls of a pit, not on the ground; a stone is placed between the oven and pit as a wedge. Judah holds that if the walls correspond to those of the pit, then if a fire is made underneath the oven in the airspace of the pit, the oven is heated sufficiently to do its work, so it is classified as an oven and is susceptible to uncleanness, but if the fire is in the airspace of the oven, it is not classified as an oven and does not receive uncleanness (Freedman/Rashi.)] *And what is at stake? It is in the interpretation of this verse: ‘Whether oven or pot range, it shall be torn down; they are unclean and shall be unclean for you’ (Lev. 11:35). R. Judah holds that where an oven has not been torn down, it is susceptible to uncleanness, but where it is not torn down, it is insusceptible; and rabbis maintain that ‘and shall be unclean for you’ means, under all circumstances.”*

E. *But from the viewpoint of rabbis, too, isn’t the language “it shall be torn down” used?*

F. *That points in the opposite direction [a more stringent rule], namely: One might have argued, since it is attached to the ground, it is classified like the ground itself. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

G. *And the other party — isn’t the language “and shall be unclean for you” used?*

H. *That bears the sense imputed to it by what R. Judah said Samuel said, for said R. Judah said Samuel, “The dispute concerns the first heating of the oven, but at the second heating of it, even if it is suspended from a camel’s neck [the oven is susceptible to uncleanness, having been classified as an oven from the first point it was fired up].”*

I.10 A. *Said Ulla, “From the perspective of rabbis, as to the first firing of the oven, even if it is suspended from the camel’s neck, it is susceptible to uncleanness.”*

I.11 A. Objected R. Ashi to this proposition, “If so, then instead of having a dispute concerning the sherds of an oven, they should have a dispute concerning the oven itself. For, if from the perspective of R. Judah, the oven itself is not classified as a utensil, can there be any question of the status of the fragments?”

B. Rather, said R. Ashi, “In point of fact, the dispute is as we said to begin with. The controversy concerns a fragment that can serve as a baking tile [and therefore serves in a way along the lines of its original functioning, but not entirely so; here the baking takes place on top of the oven, rather than inside it]. R. Meir forms his statement in the framework of R. Judah’s opinion, along the following lines: In my opinion, even if it is able to do something like its original work, it is permitted to handle the object, but from your perspective, you have to agree with me here that, in a case such as this, it really is its own work. And R. Judah maintains that the cases still are not parallel, for in the normal setting the heat is from within, here the heat is from without; there it stands, here not.”

I.12 A. Testified R. Yosé in the name of R. Eliezer b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its cover, that it does not require a handle [in order for it to be permitted to handle it on the Sabbath] —

B. Said Rabina, “In accord with which authority these days do we handle oven lids of Mehassaya, which don’t have handles? It is in accord with R. Eliezer b. Jacob.”

17:6

- A. A stone in a gourd shell [used for weighting it] —
- B. if they draw water in it and it does not fall out,
- C. they draw water with it [the gourd shell].
- D. And if not, they do not draw water with it.
- E. [125B] A branch tied to a pitcher — they draw water with it on the Sabbath.

17:7

- A. The window shutter [stopper of a skylight] —
- B. R. Eliezer says, “When it is tied on and suspended, they shut [the window] with it.
- C. “And if not, they do not shut [the window] with it.”
- D. And sages say, “One way or the other, they shut the window with it.”

- I.1**
- A. [A stone in a gourd shell used for weighting it — if they draw water in it and it does not fall out, they draw water with it [the gourd shell]: *There we have learned in the Mishnah: A stone which is over the mouth of a jar — one tilts [the jar] on its side and [the stone] falls off. [If the jar was among other jars, one lifts the jar up and turns it on its side, so that the stone] falls off [M. Shab. 21:2A-C].*
 - B. [In the latter connection,] said Rabbah said R. Ammi said R. Yohanan, “They have repeated that rule only in the case of one who forgets, but if one puts it there [prior to the Sabbath], it then serves as the foundation for an article that may not be handled.”
 - C. And R. Joseph said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “They have repeated that rule only in the case of one who forgets, but if one puts it there [prior to the Sabbath], it serves as a covering of a barrel [and it may be handled and moved, and one doesn’t have to tilt the barrel].”
 - D. *Said Rabbah, “We may challenge our tradition by reference to the following: A stone in a gourd shell used for weighting it — if they draw water in it and it does not fall out, they draw water with it [the gourd shell]. But that is not the case, for since it is firmly attached, it may serve as a wall of the utensil.”*
 - E. *Said R. Joseph, “And we may challenge our tradition by reference to the following: And if not, they do not draw water with it. But that is not analogous, for there, since he didn’t fasten it tightly, he treated it as null.”* [Freedman: Since the pumpkin is not fit for drawing water, for the stone will fall out, it is null; but here, it is enough for his purpose to place the stone on the barrel, which therefore becomes part of the barrel.]

I.2 A. *What is at issue between them?*

B. *The one authority holds that we require an act of labor [if we wish to assign the stone to the barrel, and merely putting it there is not an*

act of labor such that changes the character of things], and the other authority maintains that we do not require such an act of labor.

C. And they are both consistent with views expressed elsewhere. For when R. Dimi came, he said R. Hanina [said], and some say, he said R. Zira said R. Hanina said, “Once Rabbi went somewhere and found a course of stones, and he said to his disciples, ‘Go and express an intentionality concerning them so that we may sit on them tomorrow,’ but Rabbi didn’t require them to do a concrete deed in that regard [for example, making them into comfortable seats for use on the Sabbath by some specific action].’ But R. Yohanan said, ‘Rabbi did require them to do a concrete deed in that regard.’”

D. So what did he say to them?

E. R. Ammi said, “‘Go, arrange them in order,’ is what he said to them.”

F. R. Assi said, “‘Go, scrape them [clean],’ is what he said to them.”

I.3 A. *It has been stated:*

B. R. Yosé b. Saul said, “It was a pile of beams.”

C. And R. Yohanan b. Saul said, “It was a ship’s sounding pole” [Freedman].

D. He who says the latter all the more so would maintain that the former would be used for a seat; but he who says it was the former would hold that, as to a sounding pole, one would be careful about it [and not use it for some other purpose, so it may not be handled.]

II.1 A. **A branch tied to a pitcher — they draw water with it on the Sabbath:**

B. *Only if it is tied on, but not if it is not tied on? Then may we say that our Mishnah paragraph does not accord with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. As to dry branches of a palm tree that one cut down for fuel, but then changed his mind and decided to use them as a chair, he has to tie them together [before the Sabbath, to make them into a kind of chair; otherwise they are fuel and may not be handled on the Sabbath; a change of mind without an action is null (Freedman)].

D. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “He doesn’t have to tie them into a bundle.”

- E. *Said R. Sheshet, "You may even hold that it is in accord with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel. Here with what situation do we deal? It is a branch attached to its generative stock." [It is attached to the vine, so it is not tied to the pitcher prior to the Sabbath; it is part of the vine and may not be handled at all (Freedman).]*
- F. *If so, then he is making use of what is attached to the soil [even if it were tied prior to the Sabbath]!*
- G. *It is below three handbreadths from the ground and so may be handled.*
- H. *R. Ashi said, "You may even say it was detached, but it is a precautionary measure, lest he shorten the branch to size [on the Sabbath, if it is not fastened prior, and to that Simeon b. Gamaliel may concede]."*

III.1 A. **The window shutter [stopper of a skylight] — R. Eliezer says, "When it is tied on and suspended, they shut [the window] with it. And if not, they do not shut [the window] with it":**

- B. **Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "All concur that to begin with, on a festival, one may not make a temporary shelter, and it goes without saying, or on the Sabbath. They differ in the matter of adding on to a building, R. Eliezer says, 'They do not add to a building on the festival, and it goes without saying, or on the Sabbath' And Sages say, 'They do add to a building on the Sabbath, and, it goes without saying, on the festival.' [T. Suk. 1:8E-F]."**

IV.1 A. **And sages say, "One way or the other, they shut the window with it":**

- B. *What is the sense of one way or the other?*
- C. **Said R. Abba said R. Kahana, [126A] "One way or the other — whether it is tied on or not tied on, but that is the case only if it was prepared in advance for this purpose, prior to the advent of the Sabbath."**
- D. *Said to him R. Jeremiah, "But why shouldn't the master say, 'whether it is suspended or not, but that is the case only if it was prepared in advance for this purpose, prior to the advent of the Sabbath'? For said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, 'As is the dispute here, so is the dispute with reference to a bolt that is dragged. For we have learned in the Mishnah: A bolt which is dragged on the ground — they lock the doors with it in the Temple but not in the provinces. And one which rests on the ground [not fastened] both here and there is prohibited. R. Judah says, 'The one which rests on the ground is permitted in the Temple, and the one which is dragged on*

the ground [is permitted] in the provinces' M. **Erub. 10:11**]. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- E. "What is the definition of one that is dragged on the ground, with which we may lock a door in the Temple but not in the provinces? It is one that is fastened to a door and suspended, with one end reaching the ground.
- F. "R. Judah says, 'One such as this even in the provinces is permitted. But what is the definition of one that is forbidden in the provinces? It is any that is neither tied on nor suspended, which one removes and puts in a corner.'
- G. "*And said R. Joshua bar Abba in the name of Ulla, 'Who is the Tannaite authority behind the rule concerning a dragging bolt? [Who requires it both be fastened and suspended?] It is R. Eleazar, [but R. Judah concurs with rabbis; all agree then that it must be tied on (Freedman)].*"
- H. *He said to him, "I make my statement in accord with the version of the following Tannaite authority, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A reed that a householder set up with which to open and lock a door, if it was tied on and suspended from the door, they open and shut the door with it, and if not, they do not open and shut the door with it. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, 'If it is set up for this purpose, then even though it is not tied on and even though it is not suspended, it is permitted to make use of it' [T. **Shab. 14:3F-H**]."*
 - I. Said R. Judah bar Shilat said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "The decided law accords with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel."
 - J. *But did R. Yohanan make any such statement? For haven't we learned in the Mishnah: All utensil covers [126B] which have handles are handled on the Sabbath, and on this said R. Judah bar Shila said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, 'And that is the case if it is classified as a utensil [Freedman: The lids themselves must be fit for use as utensils, but how can a cane be classified as a utensil?]'? And should you say, here, too, it means, where it is classified as a utensil [for example, as a stirrer], does R. Simeon b. Gamaliel invoke the governing criterion that it have the character of a utensil? And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: As to dry branches of a palm tree that one cut down for fuel, but then changed his mind and decided to use them as a chair, he has to tie them together [before the Sabbath, to make them into a kind of chair; otherwise they are fuel and may not be handled on the Sabbath; a change of mind without an*

action is null (Freedman)]. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “He doesn’t have to tie them into a bundle.”

K. R. Yohanan concurs with him on one point but differs with him on another.

- IV.2** A. *Expounded R. Isaac Nappaha at the date of the exilarch: “The decided law accords with R. Eliezer.”*
- B. *Objected R. Amram, “ [In the time of the father of R. Sadoq and of Abba Saul b. Botnit, they stopped up the light hole with a pitcher and tied a pot with reed grass to a stick to know whether or not there was in the roofing an opening of a handbreadth square.] And from their deed we learned that they stop up, measure, and tie up on the Sabbath [M. **Shab. 24:5E**]!”* [Here we have a cloth that is not fastened or suspended, yet that may be used to close a skylight (Freedman).]
- C. *Said to him Abbaye, “So what are you thinking? Since it is repeated as an unassigned [therefore consensual] Tannaite rule? But the Mishnah rule concerning a dragging bolt also is unassigned to a named authority [and that is where Eliezer’s opinion is set forth]!”*
- D. *“The fact that at the other passage a specific precedent is invoked is weightier.”*

17:8

- A. **All utensil covers which have handles are handled on the Sabbath.**
- B. **Said R. Yosé, “Under what circumstances? In the case of lids over openings in the ground.**
- C. **“But as to lids of utensils, one way or the other [without or with handles], they are moved about on the Sabbath.”**

- I.1** A. **[All utensil covers which have handles are handled on the Sabbath:]** Said R. Judah bar Shila said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “But that is the case only if they are still classified as utensils.”

B. For all parties concur that as to covers of buildings in the ground, if they have a handle, they may be handled, but if not, they may not be handled; as to covers of utensils, all parties concur that even if they have no handle, they may be handled on the Sabbath. Where is the disagreement? It concerns utensils that are attached to the ground. The one master takes the view that we make a precautionary decree against handling them [Freedman: lest they be confused with

the lid of ground buildings], *and the other party holds we make no such precautionary decree.*

C. Another version: Where they differ it concerns the cover of an oven, for the one authority invokes the analogy of the cover of a building in the ground, and the other authority invokes the analogy of a cover of a utensil.