

III.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER THREE

FOLIOS 36B-47B

3:1

- A. A double stove which [people] have heated with stubble or straw –
- B. they put cooked food on it.
- C. [But if they heated it] with peat or with wood, one may not put [anything] on it until he has swept it out,
- D. or until he has covered it with ashes.
- E. The House of Shammai say, “Hot water but not cooked food [may one put on it on the eve of the Sabbath].”
- F. And the House of Hillel say, “Hot water and cooked food.”
- G. The House of Shammai say, “[On the Sabbath] they take off [hot water placed thereon], but they do not put it back.”
- H. And the House of Hillel say, “Also: They put it back.”

- I.1** A. [But if they heated it with peat or with wood, one may not put [anything] on it until he has swept it out, or until he has covered it with ashes:] *The question was raised: Since the language used is, one may not put, does it mean, he may not put back, but it is permitted to keep it there, and that is the case even if the stove is not swept out or covered with ashes, in consequence of which the authority of the unassigned ruling must be Hananiah?*
- B. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Hananiah says, “Any food that is cooked to such an extent that it can have been eaten by Ben Derusai [that is, a third cooked] — it is permitted to keep it on the stove [on the Sabbath], even though it is not swept clear of cinders or sprinkled with ashes.”*

- C. *Or perhaps we have learned the Mishnah's rule only in respect to keeping the food there, but that is permitted only if the oven is swept or covered with ashes, and not otherwise. Then how much the more so would that be the rule as to putting it back!*
- D. *Come and take note of how matters are formulated in two clauses of our Mishnah paragraph:*
- E. **The House of Shammai say, "Hot water but not cooked food [may one put on it on the eve of the Sabbath]."**
- F. **And the House of Hillel say, "Hot water and cooked food."**
- G. **The House of Shammai say, "[On the Sabbath] they take off [hot water placed thereon], but they do not put it back."**
- H. **And the House of Hillel say, "Also: They put it back."**
- I. *Now, if you should say that the sense of our Mishnah rule pertains to keeping the food there, then there is no problem, for that is the sense of the formulation, **A double stove which [people] have heated with stubble or straw,** they keep a pot on it. If it was heated with **peat or with wood,** they keep a pot on it **until he has swept it out, or until he has covered it with ashes.** And what do they keep on it? **The House of Shammai say, "Hot water but not cooked food [may one put on it on the eve of the Sabbath]."** **And the House of Hillel say, "Hot water and cooked food."** *And just as they dispute concerning keeping a pot on the dish, so do they differ on putting it back, in which case, **The House of Shammai say, "[On the Sabbath] they take off [hot water placed thereon], but they do not put it back."** **And the House of Hillel say, "Also: They put it back."** But, by contrast, what our Mishnah tells us concerns putting the pot back, then this is how we shall have to read it: **A double stove which [people] have heated with stubble or straw,** they put a pot back on it. If it was heated with **peat or with wood,** they do not put a pot back on it **until he has swept it out, or until he has covered it with ashes.** And what do they put back on it? **The House of Shammai say, "Hot water but not cooked food [may one put on it on the eve of the Sabbath]."** **And the House of Hillel say, "Hot water and cooked food."** [Then comes the language: **The House of Shammai say, "[On the Sabbath] they take off [hot water placed thereon], but they do not put it back."** **And the House of Hillel say, "Also: They put it back"** — but what need do I have for this further formulation [since we've just said "but not a dish"]?**

- J. **[37A]** *In point of fact, I shall say to you that the way in which we are to understand our Mishnah rule is indeed, **putting the pot back**, but the formulation of the passage is flawed, and this is how it is to be read: **A double stove which [people] have heated with stubble or straw**, they put a pot back on it. If it was heated with **peat or with wood**, they do not put a pot back on it **until he has swept it out, or until he has covered it with ashes**. But they may leave a pot on it, even if he has not swept it out or covered it with ashes. And what do they put back on it? **The House of Shammai say, “Hot water but not cooked food [may one put on it on the eve of the Sabbath].” And the House of Hillel say, “Hot water and cooked food.”** And as to this question of replacing, of which I have spoken [that it is permissible to do so if the stove is swept out], that is not the position of both parties but the topic of a dispute between the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel, for **the House of Shammai say, “[On the Sabbath] they take off [hot water placed thereon], but they do not put it back.” And the House of Hillel say, “Also: They put it back.”***
- K. *Come and take note of what R. Helbo said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab said, “They have stated that rule only with respect to the top of the stove, but as to the space within it, it is forbidden.” Now, if you say that the sense of the statement of the Mishnah is, **to put the pot back**, then that is in line with the formulation before us, which distinguishes the top of the oven from the inside of it. But if you maintain that what is at issue in our Mishnah rule is keeping the pot there, then what difference is there between the inside of the oven and the top of it?*
- L. *But what makes you think that R. Helbo makes reference to the opening part of the Mishnah paragraph? In point of fact, he refers to the concluding part, namely: **And the House of Hillel say, “Also: They put it back.”** And said R. Helbo said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “They have stated that rule only with respect to the top of the stove, but as to the space within it, it is forbidden.”*
- M. *Come and take note: **Two double stoves that are paired, one of them having been swept out and had its ashes covered, and one of them not having been swept out and had its ashes covered — they keep something on the one that has been swept out and had its ashes covered, and they do not keep anything on the one that has not been swept out and has not had its ashes covered.***

- N. **And what is it that they keep on it?**
- O. **“The House of Shammai say, ‘The do not keep anything at all on it.’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘They keep on it hot water but not cooked food.’ If one removed the cooking pot, all concur that he should not put it back,” the words of R. Meir.**
- P. **R. Judah says, “The House of Shammai say, ‘Hot water but not cooked food.’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘Hot water and cooked food.’ If he removed it from the stove, the House of Shammai say, ‘He should not put it back.’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘He may put it back’ [T. Shab. 2:13A-K].”**
- Q. *Now, if you take the view that the sense of our Mishnah paragraph is, to keep the pot there, then there is no problem, for with whom does our Mishnah paragraph agree? It is R. Judah. But if you say that what we learn concerning putting the pot back, then who can be the authority of our Mishnah, since it is neither R. Judah nor R. Meir? If it were R. Meir, there would be a problem in respect to the House of Shammai on one count, and the House of Hillel on two. [Freedman: The House of Shammai in the Mishnah paragraph permit hot water to be kept there even if it is not swept or covered with ashes; here they permit nothing. In the Mishnah paragraph the House of Hillel permit hot water and a dish to be kept there even if the oven is not swept out, but here if it is swept out, hot water only may be kept there and nothing if it is not swept; in the Mishnah the House of Hillel say that the pot can be put back on an oven that is swept; here, all concur that it may not be put back.] If it were R. Judah, then there is a problem with the stove that is swept or covered over with ashes. [Freedman: Here nothing may be kept there, in the Mishnah either hot water alone or a dish also may be kept there according to the two Houses, respectively.]*
- R. *In point of fact, I shall tell you: What we have learned in our Mishnah paragraph concerns putting the pot back. And our Tannaite authority concurs with R. Judah in one matter and differs from him in another. He concurs with R. Judah in one point, that is, in regard to hot water and a dish, and removing and putting them back. But he differs from him in another, for while our Tannaite authority maintains that one may keep a pot there, and that is so even if the oven is not swept out nor covered with ashes, R. Judah takes the position that in the case of one that is swept out or covered with ashes, it is permitted to do so, but if not, it is not permitted to do so.*

- I.2** A. *The question was raised: [As to an oven that is not swept out or covered with ashes,] what is the law on leaning a pot against it? As to putting it inside or on top, it is forbidden, but leaning against it would be permitted, or perhaps there's no difference?*
- B. *Come and take note: **Two double stoves that are paired, one of them having been swept out and had its ashes covered, and one of them not having been swept out and had its ashes covered — they keep something on the one that has been swept out and had its ashes covered — and that is so even though heat reaches it from the other stove [and our problem is parallel, so one may do so].***
- C. *But maybe that case is exceptional, since it is at a higher level, the air affects it. [Freedman: The pot stands on the stove and is surrounded by air, which cools it, and therefore the heat from the other stove is disregarded; but leaning against an unswept stove without air interposing may still be forbidden.]*
- D. *Come and take note of what R. Safra said R. Hiyya said, “If one covered the stove with ashes, but it blazed up again, one may lean a pot against it, keep a pot on it, remove a pot from it and put it back.” This proves that even leaning a pot against the oven is permitted only when it is covered with ashes, not otherwise.*
- E. *But, according to your reading of matters, what about the language, remove a pot from it? Does that mean, only if it is covered with ashes, but not otherwise? [Since that is impossible,] you have to understand, the framer speaks of removing the pot on account of putting it back; so here, too, he speaks of leaning the pot on account of keeping it there. [Freedman: Yet covering it with ashes may not be required for leaning.]*
- F. *But how are the cases parallel? In that case, both taking the pot away and putting it back involve a single location, so there you may well say that the Tannaite framer of the passage has made reference to taking it because he wishes to speak of putting it back. But here, leaning the pot speaks of one location, while keeping the pot on the stove speaks of a different location!*
- G. *So what's the upshot?*
- H. *Come and take note: **A stove that is heated with peat or wood — one may lean a pot against it, but not keep it there unless the stove is swept out or covered with ashes. If the coals have merely died down, or well beaten flax is put on the oven, it is as though it is covered with ashes [T. Shab. 2:11]** [Freedman: thus for leaning it need not be swept out].*

- I.3** A. Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani said R. Oshayya, “If one covered up a stove with ashes but it blazed up again, one may keep on the stove hot water that had already been sufficiently heated, or a cooked dish that had already been sufficiently cooked.”
- B. **[37B]** *This proves that if something shrinks through cooking, but is improved thereby, it is permitted.*
- C. *That case is different, since he covered it with ashes.*
- D. *If so, what’s the point?*
- E. *It was necessary to make that statement to deal with the case of the fire’s blazing up again. What might you have supposed? Since the fire has blazed up, it reverts to its original state [and the dish may not be kept there]. So we are informed that that is not the case. [Freedman: By covering it with ashes, the cook showed he did not desire any further shrinkage.]*
- I.4** A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “If one covered the stove with ashes but it blazed up again, they may keep on the oven hot water that had been sufficiently heated or a cooked dish that had been sufficiently cooked, and even if they are broom coals” [that keep their heat longer than other coals and don’t go out so quickly (Freedman)].
- B. *This proves that if something shrinks through cooking, but is improved thereby, it is permitted.*
- C. *That case is different, since he covered it with ashes.*
- D. *If so, what’s the point?*
- E. *It was necessary to make that statement to deal with the case of the fire’s blazing up again.*
- F. *Yeah, I know, you just said so.*
- G. *It was necessary to make that statement to deal with broom coals.*
- I.5** A. Said R. Sheshet said R. Yohanan, “On a stove that one heated with peat or wood one may keep hot water that had not been sufficiently heated or a cooked dish that had not been sufficiently cooked. If one removed these things, one may not put them back until he sweeps the oven or covers it with ashes.”
- B. *He takes the view that for our Mishnah paragraph, we learn the reading, put back; but as to leaving a pot there, it is permitted to do so even if the oven is not swept out or covered with ashes.*

I.6 A. Said Raba, “We have learned for the Mishnah formulation both items, namely, with respect to keeping something on the stove, we have learned as a Tannaite statement: **They do not put bread into an oven at dusk, nor cakes on the coals, unless there is time for them to form a crust [even] on the top surface while it is still day [M. 1:10B-C].** It follows then that if there is time for them to form a crust, it is permitted to keep it there, even though the oven is not swept out.

B. “In regard to putting it back, we have learned in the Mishnah: **And the House of Hillel say, ‘Also: They put it back.’** So the House of Hillel permit it only if the oven is swept or covered with ashes, but not if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes.” [Freedman: So what need is there for Yohanan’s statement?]

C. So R. Sheshet has told us how a close reading of the Mishnah yields that very point. [Sheshet holds that the Mishnah rule refers to replacing the pot (Freedman).]

I.7 A. Said R. Samuel bar Judah said R. Yohanan, “On a stove that one heated with peat or wood one may keep a cooked dish that has been cooked sufficiently, or hot water that has been heated sufficiently, and that is so even if the thing shrinks and improves thereby.”

B. Said one of the rabbis to R. Samuel bar Judah, “But lo, both Rab and Samuel have said, ‘If it shrinks and is improved thereby, it is forbidden!’”

C. He said to him, “So don’t I know that said R. Joseph said R. Judah said Samuel, ‘If it shrinks and is improved thereby, it is forbidden’? When I made that statement to you, it was in accord with the authority of R. Yohanan that I said it to you [that it is permitted].”

D. Said R. Uqba of Mesene to R. Ashi, “You, who are located near Rab and Samuel, act in accord with Rab and Samuel. We shall act in accord with R. Yohanan.”

I.8 A. Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, “What is the law as to keeping a pot on the stove [if it is not swept out]?”

B. He said to him, “Lo, for R. Judah they keep it on the stove and he eats it.”

C. He said to him, “Except for R. Judah, for, since he would be in danger if he didn’t eat hot food, it is permitted for him even on the Sabbath, but what about the likes of thee and me?”

- D. *He said to him, "In Sura they keep it on the stove. Now R. Nahman bar Isaac is fastidious, and yet for him they keep it on the stove and he eats it."*

I.9 A. *Said R. Ashi, "I was standing in the presence of R. Huna, and they kept a fish pie on the stove for him and he ate it. But I don't know whether that was because he takes the view that if it shrinks but it is good for it, it is nonetheless permitted to eat it, or if it was because, since it contains flour pastes, it shrinks and that is bad for it."*

B. *Said R. Nahman, "If it shrinks and it is good for it, it is forbidden, if it shrinks and it is bad for it, it is permitted."*

C. *The governing principle is this: Whatever contains flour paste shrinks and it is bad for it, except for a turnip stew, which contains flour paste but shrinks and improves. And that is so only if it has meat. But if there is no meat, it shrinks and it is bad for it. And even if there is meat in it, this rule applies only if the meal is not intended for guests, but if it is intended for guests, it shrinks and it is bad for it [since it will be cut up in large chunks, and shrinking causes deterioration].*

D. *Date papa, pounded grain, and a dish of dates shrink and that is bad for them.*

- I.10** A. *They asked R. Hiyya bar Abba, [38A] "[Freedman: on the view forbidding the keeping of food on an unswept stove,] if one forgot a dish on the stove and cooked on the Sabbath, what is the rule?"*
- B. *He shut up and said nothing. The next day he went out and expounded for them, "One who cooks on the Sabbath — [if he does so] unintentionally, he may eat [the food he has prepared]; [but if he does so] intentionally, he may not eat [the food] [M. Ter. 2:3D-F]. And there is no difference."*
- C. *What is the meaning of, And there is no difference?*
- D. *Both Rabbah and R. Joseph said, "It is to make a lenient ruling, namely, if one cooked, he has deliberately carried out a deed, so he may not eat; but in this case that you raise for me, in which he has done no concrete deed, even if it was deliberate, he may eat the food."*
- E. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "It is to issue a prohibition, namely, it is in the case of cooking in particular, in which case someone is unlikely to practice deception, that, if one did so unintentionally, he may eat; but in this case, in which it is entirely likely that someone will practice deception, even if it is a case of inadvertence too, he may not eat the food."*

- F. *An objection was raised: “If someone forgot a pot on the stove and it cooked on the Sabbath, if this was inadvertent, he may eat the food; if this was deliberate, he may not eat the food. Under what conditions? In the case of hot water that was not sufficiently heated or a dish that was not sufficiently cooked. But as to hot water that was sufficiently heated or a cooked dish that was sufficiently cooked, whether this was inadvertent or deliberately, he may eat the food,” the words of R. Meir.*
- G. **R. Judah says, “In the case of hot water that was sufficiently heated, it is permitted, because it shrinks and it is bad for it; in the case of a cooked dish that was sufficiently cooked, it is forbidden, since it shrinks and that is good for it. And in the case of anything that has been boiled down and for which such treatment is an improvement, for instance, cabbage, beans, or boiled meat, it is prohibited; but in the case of anything that has been boiled down and for which such treatment is not good, it is permitted” [T. [Shab. 2:14A-N](#)].**
- H. *Now the Tannaite formulation in any event covers the matter of a dish that was not sufficiently cooked. Now that clearly poses no problem to R. Nahman bar Isaac: The passage before us speaks prior to the enactment of the precautionary decree, the formulation of R. Nahman’s view of R. Hiyya bar Abba’s statement is prior to the enactment of the precautionary measure. But from the perspective of Rabbah and R. Joseph, who explain the matter so as to yield a permissive ruling, if this was prior to the precautionary measure, there is a problem with the rule governing a deliberate action [it is supposed to be forbidden but he says it is permitted to eat that food], and if it was after the precautionary decree, then even the rule covering inadvertent cooking presents a problem.*
- I. *Yes, that’s a problem.*

I.11 A. *So what’s this precautionary ruling anyhow?*

B. Said R. Judah bar Samuel said R. Abba said R. Kahan said Rab, “In the beginning, they would say: ‘He who cooks on the Sabbath, if this was inadvertent, may eat the food; if this was deliberate, he may not eat the food; and the same rule applies to forgetting [food cooking on the stove].’ When a great many people began deliberately to leave food on the stove, saying, ‘we forgot,’ they went and imposed an extrajudicial penalty on the one who forgets food on the stove [saying that, too, may not be eaten].”

- I.12** A. *One statement of R. Meir's contradicts another statement of his, and one statement of R. Judah's contradicts another statement of his. [Freedman: Meir has forbidden a dish even if sufficiently cooked; here he permits it; Judah permits a dish sufficiently cooked; here he forbids it.]*
- B. *One statement of R. Meir's doesn't contradict another statement of his, the one statement pertains to the rule to begin with, the other, after the fact. [One may not leave a dish on the stove even if it was sufficiently cooked prior to the Sabbath; if he did so, it is permitted to eat the food.]*
- C. *One statement of R. Judah's doesn't contradict another statement of his: One statement refers to an oven that had been swept out or covered with ashes [in which case the dish is permitted], the other not.*

- I.13** A. *The question was raised: If one violated the law and left a dish on the stove, what is the rule? Did rabbis impose an extrajudicial penalty or is that not the case?*
- B. *Come and take note of what Samuel bar Nathan said R. Hanina said, "When R. Yosé went to Sepphoris, he found hot water that had been left on the stove on the Sabbath, and he didn't forbid it to them; he found eggs that had been overcooked and shrunk, and he forbade them to them." Now that obviously refers to the Sabbath day itself? [So there was no extrajudicial penalty.]*
- C. *No, it refers to the Sabbath to come [that he told them not to leave the eggs on the stove in the future].*

I.14 A. *It is to be inferred that when eggs are shrunk and go on shrinking, that is good for them.*

B. *True, for said R. Hama bar Hanina, "once I was a guest along with Rabbi in a certain place, and they brought us eggs shrunk to the size of crab apples, and we ate lots of them."*

- II.1** A. **And the House of Hillel say, "Also: They put it back":**
- B. *Said R. Sheshet, "From the perspective of him who says, [38B] 'They put it back,' that is so even on the Sabbath."*
- C. *And also R. Oshayya takes the view, "They put it back, that is so even on the Sabbath." For said R. Oshayya, "Once we were standing before R. Hiyya the Elder, and we brought up for him a kettle of hot water from the lower to the upper story, we mixed the cup for him, and then we put the water back, and he didn't say a word to us."*

- D. Said R. Zeriqa said R. Abba said R. Taddai, “That rule applies only if the pot of hot water is still in hand, but if he set it down on the ground, it is then forbidden to put it back on the stove.”
- E. *Said R. Ammi, “R. Taddai did this for himself, but this is what R. Hiyya said R. Yohanan said, ‘Even if he set the pot of hot water down on the ground, it is permitted to put it back on the stove.’”*

II.2 A. *There was a dispute on this matter between R. Dimi and R. Samuel bar Judah, both of them speaking in the name of R. Eleazar.*

- B. One of them said, “If the pot of water is still in hand, it is permitted to put it back on the stove; if it is on the ground, it is forbidden.”
- C. And the other said, “If he put the pot of water on the ground, it is also permitted to put it back on the stove.”
- D. *Said Hezekiah in the name of Abbaye, “As to your statement, ‘If it is still in hand, it is permitted to put it back on the stove,’ we have made that statement only in a case in which he intended to put it back on the stove, but if he didn’t intend to put it on the stove, it is forbidden to do so.” It follows that with reference to having put the pot of hot water down on the ground, even though one had the intention of putting the pot back on the stove, it is forbidden to do so.*

E. There are those who say: Said Hezekiah in the name of Abbaye, “As to your statement, ‘If it is still in hand, it is permitted to put it back on the stove,’ we have made that statement only in a case in which he did not intend to put it back on the stove, but if he did intend to put it on the stove, it is permitted to do so.” It follows that with reference to having the pot of hot water yet in hand, even though one had no intention of putting the pot back on the stove, it is permitted to do so.

- II.3** A. *R. Jeremiah raised this question: “If one hung the pot up on a staff, what is the law? If he put the pot on a bed, what is the law?”*
- B. *R. Ashi raised this question: “If one emptied the water from kettle to kettle, what is the law?”*
 - C. *So who knows.*

3:2

- A. An oven which [people] have heated with stubble or with straw — one should not put anything either into it or on top of it.
- B. A single stove which [people] have heated with stubble or with straw, lo, this is equivalent to a double stove.
- C. [If they heated it] with peat or with wood, lo, it is equivalent to an oven.

I.1

- A. An oven which [people] have heated:
- B. *R. Joseph considered explaining, "...into it or on top of it are meant literally, but as to leaning a pot against it, that is acceptable."*
- C. *Objected Abbayye, "A single stove which [people] have heated with stubble or with straw, lo, this is equivalent to a double stove. [If they heated it] with peat or with wood, lo, it is equivalent to an oven — and therefore forbidden. Lo, if it were like a double stove, it would be permitted. Now with what case do we deal here? Should we say that reference is made to the top? Then, again, under what circumstances? Should we say it is not swept out or covered with ashes? But would use of the top of a stove be permitted if the stove is not swept or covered with ashes? So it must mean leaning a pot against the stove, and yet the ruling is, [If they heated it] with peat or with wood, lo, it is equivalent to an oven — and therefore forbidden!"*
- D. *Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "Here we deal with a single stove that was swept out or covered with ashes, and an oven that is swept out or covered with ashes. Thus: Lo, it is equivalent to an oven means, even though it is swept or covered with ashes, use of the top is forbidden; but if it were comparable to a double stove, then if swept or covered with ashes, it would be acceptable [and permitted]."*

I.2

- A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Abbayye:*
- B. An oven that people heated with stubble or with straw — they do not lean a pot up against it, and it goes without saying, or on top of it, and, it goes without saying, inside of it, and, it goes without saying, if it was heated with peat or wood. If a single stove is heated with stubble or rakings, one may lean a pot against it, but not put a pot on top; if it was heated with peat or wood, one may not lean a pot against it.

- I.3** A. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, "As to the stove that is treated here, what is it like? Is it comparable to a double stove, then even if it is heated with stubble or straw, too, [use of it should be permitted, if it is swept out or covered with ashes], and if it is comparable to an oven, then it should not be permitted even if heated with stubble or raked out!"*
- B. *He said to him, "It produces more heat than a double stove but less than an oven."*
- I.4** A. *What is the definition of a stove and what is the definition of a double stove?*
- B. *Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, "A stove has space for one pot, a double stove for two pots."*
- C. *Said Abbaye, and some say, R. Jeremiah, "So, too, we have learned as a Tannaite statement [along the lines of this definition]: **A double stove which was divided lengthwise is [useless and therefore] insusceptible to uncleanness; and [that which is divided] breadth-wise is still useful and susceptible to uncleanness. A single stove which was divided, whether lengthwise or breadth-wise, is insusceptible [M. Kel. 7:3A-C].**"*

3:3

- A. **They do not put an egg beside a kettle [on the Sabbath] so that it will be cooked.**
- B. **And one should not crack it into [hot] wrappings.**
- C. **And R. Yosé permits.**
- D. **And one should not bury it in sand or in road dirt so that it will be roasted.**

3:4A-E

- A. **M'SH S: The people of Tiberias brought a pipe of cold water through a spring of hot water.**
- B. **Sages said to them, "If [this was done] on the Sabbath, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the Sabbath [itself]."**
- C. **"It is prohibited for use in washing and in drinking.**
- D. **"[If this was done] on the festival day, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the festival day.**
- E. **"It is prohibited for use in washing, but permitted for use in drinking."**

- I.1** A. **[They do not put an egg beside a kettle [on the Sabbath] so that it will be cooked:]** *The question was raised: If one roasted it, what is the rule?*

- B. Said R. Joseph, "If one roasted it, he is liable to a sin-offering."
- C. *Said Mar b. Rabina, "So, too, we have learned as a Tannaite rule: [39A] "Whatever is put into hot water on the eve of the Sabbath — they soak it [again] in hot water on the Sabbath. And whatever is not put into hot water on the eve of the Sabbath — they [only] rinse it in hot water on the Sabbath, except for pickled fish, small salted fish, and Spanish tunny fish, for rinsing them is the completion of their preparation [for eating] [M. Shab. 22:2]."*
- D. *That proves the point.*

II.1

- A. **And one should not crack it into [hot] wrappings. And R. Yosé permits:**
- B. *And as to that which we have learned in the Mishnah: They put a cooked dish in a cistern so that it may be preserved, and [a vessel containing] fresh water into foul water to keep it cool, and cold water into the sun to warm it up [M. Shab. 22:4A-C], may we say that this represents the position of R. Yosé but not of rabbis?*
- C. *Said R. Nahman, "If the dish is left in the sun, all parties concur that that would be permitted; if the dish is put into an object heated by fire, all parties concur that it would be forbidden [to keep people from roasting directly on fire]. Where there is a disagreement, it concerns an object heated by the sun [for example, a cloth]. One master holds that we forbid an object heated by the sun on account of one heated by fire, the other that we make no such precautionary decree."*

III.1

- A. **And one should not bury it in sand or in road dirt so that it will be roasted:**
- B. *Why shouldn't R. Yosé take a dissenting position here, too?*
- C. Rabbah said, "He would regard it as a precautionary decree, lest one come to bury it in hot ashes."
- D. R. Joseph said, "It is because he may move the dirt from its place [which may not be done on the Sabbath, and Yosé would concur]."
- E. *What would be a practical point of difference between these two explanations?*
- F. At issue would be crushed earth. [Here Joseph's reason is null and it would be permitted, since there would be no danger that he would have to scoop out more dirt; Rabbah's consideration pertains.]

- G. *An objection was raised: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "They roast an egg on a hot roof, but not on boiling lime." Now from the perspective of him who has said, "He would regard it as a precautionary decree, lest one come to bury it in hot ashes," there would be no reason to make such a decree. But from the perspective of him who has said that the operative consideration is that he may move the dirt from its place, shouldn't there be such a decree here?*
- H. *Ordinarily roofs don't have any dirt.*
- I. *Come and take note: M'SH S: The people of Tiberias brought a pipe of cold water through a spring of hot water. Sages said to them, "If [this was done] on the Sabbath, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the Sabbath [itself]. It is prohibited for use in washing and in drinking. [If this was done] on the festival day, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the festival day. It is prohibited for use in washing, but permitted for use in drinking." Now from the perspective of him who has said, "He would regard it as a precautionary decree, lest one come to bury it in hot ashes," that explains why it was forbidden to hide it in hot ashes; it is similar here to an act of burying the food to keep it warm. But from the perspective of him who has said that the operative consideration is that he may move the dirt from its place, what is there to say?*
- J. *But what makes you think that the story about Tiberias pertains to the latter clause of our paragraph? It pertains to the first part, namely: **And one should not crack it into [hot] wrappings. And R. Yosé permits.** And this is then the sense of what rabbis said to R. Yosé: Now there was this case of what the men of Tiberias did, and that involves an object heated by the sun, and yet rabbis forbade it. And he answered them, it was a fire-heated object, because the springs' waters pass by the entrance to Gehenna.*
- K. Said R. Hisda, **[39B]** "On the basis of the incident at Tiberias, *since rabbis forbade what they did there*, the practice of burying things in anything that adds heat fell into desuetude, and that is so even in connection with doing so while it is still day."
- L. Said Ulla, "The decided law accords with the men of Tiberias [and we may do what they did]."
- M. *Said to him R. Nahman, "The men of Tiberias long ago broke their pipe [and abandoned their practice, which is forbidden]."*

IV.1 A. M'SH S: The people of Tiberias brought a pipe of cold water through a spring of hot water. Sages said to them, "If [this was done] on the Sabbath, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the Sabbath [itself]. It is prohibited for use in washing and in drinking. [If this was done] on the festival day, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the festival day. It is prohibited for use in washing, but permitted for use in drinking":

- B. *[As to the prohibition of the water for use in washing,] to what is reference made here? Should I say that it is to washing the entire body? But is it forbidden to use in that connection only hot water heated on the Sabbath, though hot water heated on Friday would be permitted? But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: As to hot water heated on Friday, on the next day one may wash with it one's hands, face, and feet, but not his entire body. So it must refer to washing one's hands, face and feet. Then I point to the concluding clause: [If this was done] on the festival day, [the water] is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the festival day. It is prohibited for use in washing, but permitted for use in drinking. So are we going to have to conclude that the unattributed Mishnah rule accords with the position of the House of Shammai [which would be highly irregular]? For we have learned in the Mishnah: The House of Shammai say, "[On a festival day] a person may not heat water for his feet, unless it is also suitable for drinking." But the House of Hillel permit [M. Bes. 2:5A-C]!*
- C. *Said R. Iqa bar Hanania, "We deal with dousing the whole body, and it is in accord with the Tannaite authority of the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority: 'On the Sabbath they do not douse the whole body with either hot or cold water,' the words of R. Meir. R. Simeon permits. R. Judah says, 'It is forbidden to do so with hot water but permitted to do so with cold water' [T. Shab. 3:4A-C]."*
- D. *Said R. Hisda, "The dispute concerns use of a utensil, but if the water is on the ground [in a spring] all parties concur that it is permitted."*
- E. *But lo, there is the case of the men of Tiberias, and that water was on the ground, but rabbis forbade their using it! But if the statement was made, this is how it was made: "The dispute concerns what is on the ground, but if it is in a utensil, all parties concur that it is forbidden."*

IV.2 A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "The decided law is in accord with R. Judah."

B. *Said to him R. Joseph, "So did you hear this in so many words, or have you received this tradition on the basis of mere inference?"*

C. *What would be the inference?*

D. Said R. Tanhum said R. Yohanan said R. Yannai said Rabbi, "In any case in which you find two authorities at odds and one taking a mediating position, the decided law accords with the position of the one who takes the mediating position, except in the case of the catalogue of lenient rulings that pertain to rags [catalogued at B. Shab. 29A], in which case even though R. Eliezer takes the strict position and R. Joshua the lenient, with R. Aqiba mediating, the decided law does not accord with the mediating position. *The reason is, first, because R. Aqiba was a mere disciple. And, furthermore, lo, [40A] R. Aqiba retracted in favor of R. Joshua.*"

E. *So anyhow, what does it matter if it is by inference?*

F. *Maybe [Yohanan's rule] applies only to what is in the Mishnah, but not what is reported in a Tannaite formulation external to the Mishnah.*

G. *He said to him, "At any rate I heard it in so many words."*

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

B. As to hot water heated on Friday —

C. Rab said, "On the next day one may use it for washing his entire body, limb by limb."

D. Samuel said, "Sages have permitted washing with it only the face, hands, and feet."

E. *An objection was raised:* As to hot water heated on Friday, on the next day one may wash with it one's hands, face, and feet, but not his entire body. *Doesn't this refute Rab's position?*

F. Rab may say to you, "The sense is, not his entire body at one moment, but limb by limb."

G. *But lo, the language that is used is, one's hands, face, and feet!*

H. It means, along the lines of hands, face, and feet [that is, the various limbs].

I. *Come and take note:* They have permitting washing with water heated on Friday only one's hands, face, and feet.

- J. *Here, too, this means, along the lines of hands, face, and feet [that is, the various limbs].*
- K. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Samuel: As to hot water heated on Friday, on the next day one may wash with it one's hands, face, and feet, but not his entire body. And it goes without saying that the same is so of water that was heated on the festival day. [Freedman: One may certainly not wash his whole body therein on the festival.]*
- L. *Rabbah repeated as a Tannaite version this tradition of Rab in the following formulation: "As to hot water that was heated on Friday, on the next day," said Rab, "one may wash his entire body, but must leave out one limb."*
- M. *He raised by way of objection all of these refutations, and indeed there was a decisive refutation of his position.*

IV.4 A. *Said R. Joseph to Abbaye, "Did Rabbah act in line with Rab's ruling?"*

B. *He said to him, "I don't know."*

C. *What led him to raise the question? He obviously didn't act in accord with his position, for after all, Rab had been refuted!*

D. *He hadn't heard these refutations.*

E. *So if he hadn't heard those refutations, he surely did act in accord with his view. For said Abbaye, "At every point, the master [Rabbah] acted in accord with Rab, except for these three items, in which case he acted in accord with Samuel, specifically: Show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another; in a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may kindle one light from another light; and the law does accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another."*

F. *In accord with the strict rulings of Rab he acted, but in accord with the lenient rulings of Rab he didn't.*

IV.5 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A bath the holes of which one stopped up on the eve of the Sabbath [to preserve the steam] — at the end of the Sabbath one may wash therein forthwith. If he stopped up the openings on the eve of the festival, one may go in on the festival itself and sweat, then go out and take a bath in cold water.
- C. Said R. Judah, “There was the case of the bathhouse of Bené Beraq, where they stopped up the holes on Friday. On the next day R. Eleazar b. Azariah and R. Aqiba went in and sweat, came out and rinsed off in cold water. But the hot water thereof was covered over with boards. When the matter came before sages, they said, ‘Even if the hot water is not covered with boards [it is permitted].’ When transgressors became numerous, however, they went and prohibited the practice of taking schvitz baths on the Sabbath.”
- D. They may stroll through the baths of large cities and have no scruple [that one is suspect of going through in order to sweat] [T. [Shab. 3:3A-H](#)].

IV.6 A. *What is the sense of* **When transgressors became numerous?**

B. *For* said R. Simeon b. Pazzi said R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Bar Qappara, “To begin with they would take a bath in hot water than had been heated on Friday. The bathkeepers began to heat the water on the Sabbath, claiming, ‘It was heated on Friday.’ So they forbade the use of hot water. But they permitted sweating. Nonetheless, they would bathe in the hot water but claim, all we were doing was sweating. So they forbade sweating. But they permitted the hot springs of Tiberias. Then they bathed in water heated by fire but claimed, we were bathing in the hot springs of Tiberias. So they forbade the hot springs of Tiberias but permitted cold water. When they realized that none of these prohibitions would stand up against popular practice, being unenforceable, they permitted the hot springs of Tiberias, but left as is the matter of sweating.”

IV.7 A. *Said Raba, “Someone who violates a rule made on the authority of rabbis — it is permitted to call him a sinner.”*

B. *In accord with what authority?*

C. [\[40B\]](#) *In accord with the foregoing Tannaite statement.*

IV.8 A. **They may stroll through the baths of large cities and have no scruple [that one is suspect of going through in order to sweat]:**

B. Said Raba, "That is in large cities in particular, but not in villages. How come? *Since they are tiny bathhouses, the heat in them is enormous [and will cause sweating].*"

IV.9 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A person may warm up at a big fire, go out and wash in cold water, on condition that he doesn't first rinse off in cold water and then warm himself at the fire, because if he does so, he also heats up the water that is on his body.

IV.10 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **One may warm a sheet and put it on his belly.**
C. **But he may not put a hot water bottle on his belly on the Sabbath [T. Shab. 3:7A-B].**
D. This is forbidden even on weekdays, since it's dangerous.

IV.11 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **One may bring a jug of water and put it near a bonfire, not to warm it up but to temper the cold.**
C. R. Judah says, "A woman may bring an oil cruse and put it by a bonfire, not so as to boil it but so as to make it lukewarm."
D. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "A woman may smear some oil on her hand, warm it at a fire, and massage her baby with it, and need not scruple" [T. Shab. 3:5].**

IV.12 A. *The question was raised: As to the initial Tannaite authority, what is his opinion on oil?*

B. *Rabbah and R. Joseph both say, "It is a permissive position."*

C. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "It is a restrictive position."*

D. *Rabbah and R. Joseph both say, "It is a permissive position": Oil, even if it is so hot that the hand draws back from it, is permitted [this is the last stage before it boils (Freedman)]. He takes the view that the initial authority maintains, oil is not subject to the prohibition of cooking; and R. Judah comes along to say, oil is subject to the prohibition of cooking, but warming it up slightly is not the same as cooking it. Then Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel comes along to say, Oil is subject to the prohibition of cooking, and warming it up slightly is the same as cooking it.*

E. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "It is a restrictive position": Oil, even if it is so cool that the hand does not draw back from it, is forbidden. He takes the view that oil is subject to the prohibition of cooking, and warming it up slightly constitutes cooking it. Then R. Judah comes along to say, warming it up slightly does not constitute cooking it. Then Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel comes along to say, warming it up slightly does constitute cooking it. But heating it up slightly constitutes cooking it.*

F. *Well, then, Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel repeats what the initial authority has said!*

G. *At issue between them is doing so in an unusual manner [which Simeon would permit, the initial Tannaite authority would forbid].*

IV.13 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "All the same are oil and water: If the hand shrinks back from touching it, it is forbidden to put them in front of a fire to reach that temperature, but if the hand doesn't, it is permitted."

B. *And how do we define the hand shrinks back from touching it?*

C. Said Rahba, "Any temperature sufficiently high to scald a baby's belly."

IV.14 A. Said R. Isaac bar Abedimi, "Once I followed after Rabbi into the bathhouse, and I wanted to place a cruse of oil for him in the bath [to heat it up for his use]. But he said to me, 'Take some water in a second utensil [into which boiling liquid has been poured, but not a utensil containing the liquid directly heated by the fire] and put the oil into that.'"

B. *There are three inferences to be drawn from that fact.*

C. *The inference is to be drawn:* Oil is subject to the prohibition of cooking.

D. *The inference is to be drawn:* The use of a second utensil [heated by a utensil heated by fire] is not classified as an act of cooking. [A secondary cause is not the same as a primary one.]

E. *The inference is to be drawn:* Heating up oil constitutes boiling it.

F. *But how could Rabbi have done this? Didn't Rabbah bar Hannah say R. Yohanan said, "In every place it is permitted to meditate [on Torah teachings] except for the bathhouse and the toilet"? And should you say that he used ordinary*

language [but not the language of Torah learning], didn't Abbaye say, "Secular matters may be stated in the holy language, but holy matters cannot be stated in secular language"?

G. A situation in which he kept him from committing a prohibited act is exceptional.

H. You may know that fact, for said R. Judah said Samuel, "There was the case of a disciple of R. Meir who followed him into the bathhouse and wanted to swill the ground for him, but he told him, 'They don't swill the ground.' He wanted to oil the ground for him, but he said to him, 'They don't oil the ground.'" That proves that keeping someone from transgression is an exceptional situation, and the same applies here.

IV.15 *A. Said Rabina, "From that story one may infer that one who cooks food in the hot water of Tiberias on the Sabbath is liable. For the case involving Rabbi took place after the decree [that forbade sweating in an artificially heated bath, so it must have been in the thermal bath at Tiberias (Freedman)], yet he said to him, 'Take some water in a second utensil [into which boiling liquid has been poured, but not a utensil containing the liquid directly heated by the fire] and put the oil into that.'"*

B. Well, is that so now? But didn't R. Hisda say, "He who cooks on the Sabbath in the hot water of Tiberias is exempt"?

C. But what is the meaning of "liable"? He meant, liable to a flogging for disobedience [of rabbis' decree].

IV.16 *A. Said R. Zira, "I personally saw R. Abbahu swimming in a bath, but I don't know whether or not he lifted up his feet [actually swimming, or merely bathing]."*

B. *It is obvious that he wasn't lifting up his feet, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A person should not swim in a swimming pool filled with water, and even if it is standing in a courtyard [where even if water is splashed for four cubits, it is in private domain].*

C. *No problem, the one speaks of a situation in which [41A] the pool has no rim, the other, in which it does.*

IV.17 A. *And said R. Zira, "I personally saw R. Abbahu put his hand near his 'face down there' [penis], but I don't know whether he touched or not."*

B. *It is obvious that he didn't touch, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer says, "Anyone who holds onto his penis when he urinates is as though he brought the flood upon the world."*

C. *Said Abbaye, "He classified the case within the category of a marauding troop, as we have learned in the Mishnah: **A band of gentile [raiders] which entered a town in peacetime — open jars are forbidden, closed ones, permitted. [If it was] wartime, these and those are permitted, because there is no time for making a libation [M. A.Z. 5:6A-D].** It follows that, since they are harried, they are not going to make a libation-offering. Here, too, since he is harried, one will not have inappropriate thoughts."*

D. *So here what sort of harassment is taken into account?*

E. *Concern for the river [into which he was pissing].*

F. *Is that so? But didn't R. Abba say R. Huna said Rab said, "Whoever puts his hand on his penis is as though he denied the covenant of our father, Abraham"?*

G. *No problem, the one refers to when he goes down into the river [and since he's facing the river, he doesn't have to put his hand over his penis (Freedman)], the other speaks to when he comes up from the river [at which time he covers himself].*

H. *That is along the lines of the practice of Raba, who would bend over; R. Zira would stand upright. As to the rabbis of the household of R. Ashi, when they went down, they stood upright; when they came up, they bent over.*

IV.18 A. R. Zira was avoiding R. Judah, for [the former] wanted to go up to the Land of Israel, while R. Judah held, "Whoever goes up from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive commandment, for it is said, 'They shall be brought to Babylonia and there they shall be until the day that I remember them, says the Lord' (Jer. 27:22)."

B. *He said, "I'll go and listen to a tradition of his, and then I'll go up." He came and found him standing at the bathhouse and saying to his servant, "Bring me soap, bring me a comb, open your mouths and breathe out the heat, and drink the bath water." He said, "If I had come only to hear this one thing, it would have been enough."*

C. *Well, now, there is no problem understanding his statements, Bring me soap, bring me a comb, for in them he tells us, secular matters may be*

expressed in the holy language [Hebrew]. *And as to his statements [in Aramaic], “open your mouths and breathe out the heat, and drink the bath water,” that would accord with Samuel, for said Samuel, “Heat expels heat.” But what’s the point of his statement: “And drink the bath water”?*

D. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:* If one eats but doesn’t drink, what he eats is blood, and that is the beginning of stomach trouble. Eating bread but not walking four cubits after eating [before going to sleep] — his food rots [in his belly], and that’s the beginning of halitosis. Someone who has to go to the toilet but eats is like an oven that was heated on top of its ashes [without clearing the old fuel], and that’s the beginning of body odor. If one bathes in hot water but doesn’t drink any, he is like an oven heated on the outside but not on the inside. If one bathes in hot water but doesn’t take a cold shower, he is like an iron but into the fire but not into cold water. If he bathes without putting on oil, he is like water poured over a barrel [but not into it].

3:4F-G

- F. A miliarum which is cleared of ashes — they drink from it on the Sabbath.
- G. An antikhi [boiler], even though it is clear of ashes — they do not drink from it.

- I.1** A. *What is the meaning of a miliarum which is cleared of ashes?*
B. *A Tannaite statement:* It has water inside and coals outside.

- II.1** A. *What is the meaning of an antikhi [boiler]?*
- B. *Rabbah said, "It is a utensil suspended between two fireplaces [of heated bricks]."*
- C. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "It is a utensil within a cauldron-like utensil."*
- D. *He who said, "It is a utensil suspended between two fireplaces [of heated bricks]," all the more so will apply the rule to the case of a utensil suspended between two fireplaces [of heated bricks], but he who said, "It is a utensil within a cauldron-like utensil," may say, but with respect to a utensil suspended between two fireplaces [of heated bricks], that is not the rule.*
- E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in line with the position of R. Nahman: As to an antikhi boiler, even though it was cleared of coals and covered with ashes, they do not drink from it, because the copper heats it [and adds to the heat, and that is forbidden (Freedman)].*

3:5A-C

- A. **A kettle [containing hot water] which one removed [from the stove] —**
- B. **One should not put cold water into it so that it [the cold water] may get warm.**
- C. **But one may put [enough cold water] into it or into a cup so that [the hot water] will cool off.**

- I.1** A. *What's the sense of this statement?*
- B. *Said R. Adda bar Matana, "This is the sense of the statement: **A kettle [containing hot water]** from which one removed hot water — **one should not put a little cold water into it so that it [the cold water] may get warm. But one may put a lot of cold water into it or into a cup so that the hot water will cool off.**"*
- C. **[41B]** *But by doing so, doesn't he harden the metal of the pot [Freedman: by pouring cold water into it while it is hot? This is itself forbidden on the Sabbath].*
- D. *This represents the position of R. Simeon, who has said, "If there is a result that is not intentional, the act is permitted [on the Sabbath]."*
- E. *Objected Abbaye, "But does the language before us in the Mishnah say, **A kettle [containing hot water]** from which one removed hot water? What it*

says is, **A kettle [containing hot water] which one removed [from the stove]!**”

- F. *Rather, said Abbaye, “This is the sense of the sentence: **A kettle [containing hot water] which one removed [from the stove]**, which contains hot water — **one should not put a little cold water into it so that it [the cold water] may get warm. But one may put a lot of cold water into it or into a cup so that the hot water will cool off.** But if water is poured out of a boiler, one may not pour any water at all into it, because this hardens it. *And it represents the position of R. Judah, who has said, ‘If there is a result that is not intentional, the act nonetheless is forbidden [on the Sabbath].’*”*

I.2

- A. Said Rab, “This rule permits only tempering the water, but if the intent is to harden the metal, the act is forbidden.”
- B. And Samuel said, “It is even permitted to do so in order to harden the metal.”
- C. *Yeah, well, if to begin with the intent is to harden the metal, can this possibly be permitted? Rather, if there was such a statement, this is what has to have been said:*
- D. Said Rab, “This rule permits only a case in which there is a sufficient quantity for tempering the water, but if there is enough to harden the metal, the act is forbidden.”
- E. And Samuel said, “It is even permitted to do so if there is enough **[42A]** to harden the metal.”

F. Is that to say, then, that Samuel concurs with the theory of R. Simeon? But didn’t Samuel say, “People may extinguish a lump of fiery metal in the street so that it will not do any harm to the public, but not a burning piece of wood”? Now if you take the view that he is in accord with R. Simeon, then he should permit extinguishing even a coal of burning wood.

G. In respect to a matter in which there is no intentionality he concurs with R. Simeon, but in respect to an act of labor which is not required for its own sake he concurs with R. Judah [and that is why he permits the unintentional putting out of fire on the altar but forbids unintentionally putting out a burning piece of wood (Freedman)].

H. Said Rabina, “Therefore if there is a thorn in the public domain, one may carry it away in stages of less than four cubits; *but if it is in the neglected portions of public domain, it is permitted to do so over even a great distance.*”

II.1 A. But one may put [enough cold water] into it or into a cup so that [the hot water] will cool off:

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. "One may put hot water into cold water, but not cold water into hot water," the words of the House of Shammai.

D. And the House of Hillel, "Whether it is hot water into cold or cold water into hot, it is permitted to do so. Under what circumstances? In the case of a cup of water for drinking [since one doesn't want to heat it up to a high degree]. But in the case of a bath, hot into cold is permitted, but not cold into hot."

E. And R. Simeon b. Menassayya forbids.

F. Said R. Nahman, "The decided law accords with R. Simeon b. Menassayya."

II.2 A. *R. Joseph considered stating, "As to a basin, it is in the category of a bath."*

B. *Said to him Abbayye, "R. Hiyya set forth a Tannaite rule: As to a basin, it is not in the category of a bath."*

II.3 A. *In the initial premise that it is in the category of a bath, and said R. Nahman, "The decided law accords with R. Simeon b. Menassayya," then, is there no washing whatsoever in hot water on the Sabbath? [Even if water is heated on Friday, cold water has to be added to temper the heat, and Simeon forbids doing so (Freedman/Rashi).]*

B. *But do you think that R. Simeon's statement pertains to the concluding clause? He speaks of the first clause, namely, And the House of Hillel permit, whether it is hot water into cold or cold water into hot. And R. Simeon b. Menassayya forbids pouring cold water into hot.*

C. *Then does R. Simeon b. Menassayya accord with the position of the House of Shammai?*

D. *This is the intent of his statement: The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel had no dispute on this matter.*

II.4 A. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "I saw Raba, that he wasn't meticulous about utensils [putting hot into cold water, cold into hot], because R. Hiyya set forth as a Tannaite rule: One may pour hot water into cold or cold into hot."*

B. Said R. Huna to R. Ashi, "But maybe that case is exceptional, because the utensil interposes" [the water being poured on the inner side of the utensil, and that cools it].

C. He said to him, "The language that is used is 'pour,' meaning, one may pour a jug of water into a basic water, whether hot into cold or cold into hot."

3:5D-G

- D. The pan or pot which one has taken off the stove while it is boiling —
- E. one may not put spices into it.
- F. [42B] But he may put [spices] into [hot food which is] in a plate or a dish.
- G. R. Judah says, "Into anything may one put [spices], except what has vinegar or fish brine [in it]."

I.1 A. The question was raised: Does R. Judah refer to the first clause [D-E], yielding a lenient ruling [Spices may not be put into the original utensil, right off the flame; Judah permits, except if it has vinegar or brine (Freedman)], or to the second clause [F], yielding a strict ruling [spices are permitted in a secondary utensil, no matter the contents; Judah excepts the specified items (Freedman)]?

B. Come and take note of what has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "Into all stew pots and boiling pots that are boiling, one may put spices, except into one that contains vinegar or brine" [he refers to the initial utensil].

I.2 A. R. Joseph considered stating, "Salt is in the category of spices: It boils in the initial utensil but not in the second one [that is, the utensil on the flame, not the one into which the broth is then poured]."

B. Said to him Abbaye, "R. Hiyya set forth the Tannaite rule: Salt is not in the category of spices, for it boils even in the second utensil."

C. And he differs from R. Nahman, for said R. Nahman, "Salt needs as much boiling as beefsteak."

D. There are those who say: R. Joseph considered stating, "Salt is in the category of spices: It boils in the initial utensil but not in the second one." Said to him Abbaye, "R. Hiyya set forth the Tannaite rule: Salt is not in the category of spices, for it doesn't boil even in the first utensil." And that is in line with what R. Nahman said, for said R. Nahman, "Salt needs as much boiling as beefsteak."

3:6A-D

- A. [On the Sabbath] they do not put a utensil under a lamp to catch the oil.
- B. But if one put it there while it is still day, it is permitted.
- C. But they do not use any of that oil [on the Sabbath],
- D. since it is not something which was prepared [before the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath].

- I.1** A. Said R. Hisda, “Even though they have said, ‘They do not put a utensil under chickens to collect the eggs,’ nonetheless, one may turn a utensil over an egg so that it not break.”
- B. *Said Rabbah, “What’s the operative consideration in the mind of R. Hisda? He takes the view that a chicken ordinarily drops her eggs on a compost heap but not on sloping ground. Sages permit [moving a utensil to care for something that itself may not be handled, as in this egg (Freedman)] in a predictable situation of saving something [for example, from being trampled on the compost heap], but they didn’t permit one to do so in an unusual situation [for example, from rolling down a slope (Freedman)].”*
- C. *Objected Abbayye, “But didn’t the sages permit saving something in an unusual situation? Hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: If one’s jug of wine in the status of produce that is untithed but is liable for tithing broke on his roof, he may bring a utensil and put it underneath the roof [he cannot handle the wine itself, which cannot be used; this situation is unusual; but sages permit saving the produce nonetheless]?”*
- D. *At issue here are new jugs, which do commonly burst.*
- E. *An objection was raised: They put a utensil under a lamp to catch the sparks [M. 3:6H].*
- F. *Sparks are also commonplace.*
- G. **[43A]** *An objection was raised: They may put a dish over a lamp so that the beams won’t catch fire.*
- H. *In low houses, fires of that sort are commonplace.*
- I. *An objection was raised: And so, if a beam was broken, they may hold it up with a bench or bed staves.*
- J. *That speaks of new planks, which routinely split.*

K. *An objection was raised:* On the Sabbath they may put a utensil under a leak in the roof.

L. *In new houses roof leaks are commonplace.*

M. *Said R. Joseph, "This is the operative consideration behind the ruling of R. Hisda:* It is because he deprives the utensil of its status as a utensil [that had been ready for use, thus revising the purpose for which that utensil is to serve for that Sabbath]."

N. *Objected Abbayye, "If one's jug of wine in the status of produce that is untithed but is liable for tithing broke on his roof, he may bring a utensil and put it underneath the roof."* [Freedman: On the Sabbath the produce may not be made fit for use through designating its dues; neither it nor the utensil that receives it may be handled; so that, too, loses its status as being generally fit; but the act is permitted.]

O. He said to him, "So far as the Sabbath is concerned, produce that is liable for tithing but not yet tithed is deemed ready for use on the Sabbath, for if someone violated the law and designated the tithes, it is regarded as properly prepared for use."

P. *An objection was raised: They put a utensil under a lamp to catch the sparks [M. 3:6H].*

Q. Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "Sparks are intangible."

R. And so, if a beam was broken, they may hold it up with a bench or bed staves.

S. *That means it is placed in a loose way [and not placed firmly], so if he wants, he can take it away.*

T. They put a utensil under drippings on the Sabbath.

U. That speaks of drippings that can be used.

V. They may turn over a basket before fledglings so that they can go up and down [to and from the hen coop]. [The utensil now no longer serves as it was supposed to prior to the Sabbath and ceases to fall into its designated category.]

W. *He takes the view that* it is still permitted to handle the basket.

X. *But it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* That is only when the fledglings are on it.

Y. *But it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* When the fledglings are not on it, it is forbidden.

Z. Said R. Abbahu, “This is what it means: If they were on it throughout twilight; *since in any case in which it was forbidden to handle the basket at twilight, it is forbidden to handle it throughout the Sabbath*” [but if the basket were put there on the Sabbath itself, it had been fit for handling at twilight, so it may be moved when birds aren’t on it (Freedman)].

AA. Said R. Isaac, “Just as they do not put a utensil under a chicken to receive its egg, so they don’t turn a utensil over the egg so that it won’t be broken.”

BB. *He takes the view that* it is still permitted to handle the basket only for the sake of something that itself may be handled on the Sabbath.

CC. *All the prior objects were addressed to him, and at each point he replied, it is a case in which its place was required [in which case a utensil may be moved, and when it is moved, it may be utilized for the stated purposes].*

DD. *Come and take note:* All the same are an egg born on the Sabbath and one born on a festival: They may not be handled, either for covering a utensil or for holding up the legs of a bed; but a utensil may be turned over it so that the egg won’t be broken.

EE. *Here, too, it is a case in which its place was required [in which case a utensil may be moved, and when it is moved, it may be utilized for the stated purposes].*

FF. *Come and hear:* They spread a mat over stones on the Sabbath.

GG. [This applies in the case of] rounded stones, *which are fit for a toilet.*

HH. *Come and hear:* They spread a mat over bricks on the Sabbath.

II. *[This refers to] bricks that were left over from building, which are fit for sitting on.*

JJ. *Come and hear:* They spread a mat over a beehive on the Sabbath.

KK. When it is sunny, [this is to protect the hive] from sun; when it is rainy, [it is to protect the hive] from rain.

LL. But [in either case] it is on the condition that the individual does not intend [the mat] to catch [the bees].

MM. Here with what situation do we deal? It is because of the edible honey it contains.

NN. *Said R. Uqba of Mesene to R. Ashi, “This makes sense for when it is sunny, [43B] at which time there is honey [in the hive]. But when it is rainy, [for example, in winter, at which time there is no honey in the hive], what can one say [to explain why one is permitted to cover the hive]?”*

OO. *It is necessary [to teach that the hive may be covered even when it is rainy] for the case of those two honeycombs [that the hive’s owner places in the hive during the winter, as food for the bees]. [Even in the winter the hive thus contains food so it may be covered.]*

PP. *[The honey in the hives in the winter is not set aside for human consumption.] But he has not designated those two honeycombs [for consumption on the Sabbath]! [They therefore are not in the status of food, and the hive should not be covered by reason of their presence.]*

QQ. *[This is a case in which] he had [at one point] considered [using] them [himself]. [These honeycombs therefore are in the status of food and, by reason of their presence, the hive may be covered.]*

RR. *Well, if he had not given thought to making use of them, what is the law?*

SS. *[In this case] it is forbidden [for him to cover the hive, even though it contains honey].*

TT. *[If so, then] rather than teach, “On the condition that he does not intend [the mat] to catch [the bees],” he should draw a distinction [within the rule for when it is rainy, cited at L] and should teach for its case: Under what condition does this pertain, [that one may cover the hive when it is rainy]? When he considered [i.e., designated, the honeycombs in the hive for his own use]. But if he did not consider them [for himself], it is forbidden [to cover the hive with a mat, since it contains no food that the person may eat on the Sabbath].*

UU. *Here is what the framer of the passage means to say [by phrasing matters as they stand]: Even though he has considered them [for his own use, he may cover them] so long as he does not intend [the mat for the purpose of] catching [bees].*

VV. *Which authority stands behind the rule? It cannot be R. Simeon, who rejects the conception of not using what has not been designated prior to the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath. It cannot be R. Judah, for so far as he is concerned, what matters if one doesn't intend to capture the bees, since he holds that an unintentional act is forbidden anyhow.* [Freedman: Since covering blocks the bees' exit, he does in fact capture them, even if he did not intend to.]

WW. *In point of fact, it represents the position of R. Judah, and what is the meaning of the phrase, on condition that one not intend to capture the bees? It means, he must not arrange it like a net, but must leave an opening so that the bees are not automatically caught?*

XX. [The following returns to the original question, Why should one be permitted to cover the hive when it is rainy, that is, in winter, when the hive does not contain honey. Ashi here explains that the Tannaite rule in fact does not permit covering the hive in winter — when it contains no honey — at all.] R. Ashi said, “*Does [this rule] teach, [One may cover a beehive on the Sabbath] in the sunny season [that is, summer] and in the rainy season [that is, winter]? [No! Rather, it teaches that one may cover it] ‘When it is sunny because of the sun and when it is rainy because of the rain.’ [The rule thus refers not to summer and winter, but to] the days of the months of Nissan and Tishré, [roughly March and September], when there is sun and rain and there is honey [in the hive].*”

YY. *[Reverting to BB,] said R. Sheshet to them, “Go and tell R. Isaac, ‘R. Huna has already set forth your ruling in Babylonia. For said R. Huna, “They may make a partition around a corpse for the sake of the living, but not for the sake of the dead.””*

ZZ. *What's the sense of that statement?*

AAA. *Said R. Samuel bar Judah, and so, too, did Shila Mari teach as a Tannaite statement:*

“If a corpse is lying in the sun, two men come and sit at its side. If they feel hot from the ground’s heat, each may bring a couch and sit on it. If they feel hot from overhead, they may bring an awning and spread it above them. Then each one sets up his couch, takes his leave and goes along, with the result that a screen for the corpse turns out to have been set up en passant.”

I.2

- A. *It has been stated:*
- B. A corpse lying in the sun —
- C. R. Judah said Samuel [said], “One may turn it over from one bier to the next [until it comes to shade].”
- D. R. Hanina bar Shelamayya said in the name of Rab, “One puts a loaf of bread or a child on it and carries it [on account of carrying those items, which it is permissible to carry.]”

E. Well, if there should be a loaf or a child available, all parties concur that it is permitted to do as Rab has said. Where there is a dispute, it is when these are not available. The one authority takes the view that moving by indirection [changing over from bier to bier] is classified as moving and so is forbidden, the other, that it is not classified as moving.

F. May we say that the same issue is subject to dispute among Tannaite authorities?

G. They do not save a corpse from a fire on the Sabbath.

H. Said R. Judah b. Laqish, “I have heard that they do save corpse from a fire on the Sabbath” [T. [Shab. 13:7F-G](#)].

I. Now how shall we imagine this case? If there is a loaf of bread or child at hand, then what stands behind the position of the initial Tannaite authority [since it is perfectly correct to save the corpse in that way]? But if there is no loaf of bread or child at hand, then what explains the position of R. Judah b. Laqish? So isn’t what is at issue the status of moving sideways, with one master taking the view that that is

classified as moving [therefore forbidden], the other that it is not classified as moving [therefore is permitted]?

J. Not at all. All concur that sideways moving is classified as moving. And this is the operative consideration behind the ruling of R. Judah b. Laqish: Since a person is distressed about the corpse, [44A] if you don't permit him to move it, he will turn out extinguishing the fire itself.

K. Said R. Judah b. Shila said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "The decided law in connection with the corpse is in accord with R. Judah b. Laqish."

- II.1** A. **But they do not use any of that oil [on the Sabbath], since it is not something which was prepared [before the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath]:**
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. The leftovers of the oil in the lamp is forbidden.
- D. R. Simeon permits it.

3:6E-F

- E. **They carry a new lamp, but not an old one.**
- F. **R. Simeon says, "On the Sabbath any sort of lamp do they carry, except for a lamp that actually is burning."**

- I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. "They carry a new lamp but not an old one," the words of R. Judah.
- C. **R. Meir says, "On the Sabbath any sort of lamp do they carry, except for a lamp one actually lit on that very Sabbath."**
- D. **R. Simeon says, "On the Sabbath any sort of lamp do they carry, except for a lamp that actually is burning."**
- E. "If he put it out, it is permitted to carry it."
- F. **But as to a cup, dish, or lantern which they extinguished — one should not move them from their place.**
- G. **And R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "One may take a supply of oil from a lamp that is going out and a lamp that is dripping, and even at the moment that the lamp is burning" [T. Shab. 3:13A-E, 3:14A].**

- I.2** A. *Said Abbaye, "R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon concurs with his father [Simeon] in one matter but differs from him in another. He concurs*

with his father [Simeon] in one matter, in that he does not accept the principle that what cannot be handled on the Sabbath also may not be touched on the Sabbath. But he differs from his father on another matter, for while his father holds that if the lamp has gone out, it is permitted, if not, it is not permitted, while he maintains that even if it is not out, one may do so."

- I.3** A. **But as to a cup, dish, or lantern which they extinguished — one should not move them from their place:**
B. *What distinguishes these objects?*
C. *Said Ulla, "This last clause carries forward the view of R. Judah."*
D. *Objected Mar Zutra to this proposition, "If so, what is the sense of But?!"*
E. *Rather, said Mar Zutra, "In point of fact that phrase belongs to R. Simeon, but R. Simeon permits handling only in the case of a small lamp, in which one is concentrating on it [Freedman: thinking that the oil won't last long and when it goes out I will use the lamp], but in the case of these, which are large, he is not thinking about them."*
F. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: The leftovers of the oil in the lamp is forbidden. R. Simeon permits it?*
G. *In that case the dish is comparable to a lamp, in this case, it is comparable to a cup.*

- I.4** A. *Said R. Zira, "A plain candlestick that one kindled on that very Sabbath — in the view of him who permits [Meir] is forbidden [Freedman: because it burned on that Sabbath, that is, the lamp was employed on that Sabbath for burning and one may not light a lamp on the Sabbath itself], in the view of him who forbids [Judah, speaking of an old lamp, which is repulsive] is permitted [Judah rejecting the prohibition of what is forbidden by reason of a decree]."*
B. *Does that then imply that R. Judah accepts the principle that something may be forbidden for use on the Sabbath on account of being repulsive, but rejects the principle that something may not be handled on the Sabbath because of a prohibition? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "All metal lamps may be handled, except for a lamp that was lit on that Sabbath"?*

C. Rather, if the statement was made, this is how it was formulated:
 Said R. Zira, “A plain candlestick that one kindled on that very Sabbath — all parties concur that it is forbidden. If it was not lit on that day, all parties concur, it is permitted.”

- I.5** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “A bed that was singled out for use for money may not be moved about on the Sabbath.” [Freedman: Mere designation renders it forbidden, even if money was not actually put on the bed.]
- B. *An objection was raised by R. Nahman bar Isaac, “**They carry a new lamp, but not an old one!** [44B] Now if a lamp, that was made for that very purpose, if not lit may be handled, a bed, which was not made for the purpose of holding money, all the more so should be available for handling [if money is not actually located thereon]!”*
- C. *Rather, if such a statement was made, this is how it has to have been made:*
 Said R. Judah said Rab, “A bed that was singled out for use for money — if one put money on it, it may not be moved about on the Sabbath. If one did not put money on it, it is permitted to move it about. If one did not single it out for use for money, if there is money on it, it is forbidden to move it about; if there is no money on it, it is permitted to move it about — but that is so only if there was no money on it at twilight.” [If there were money on it at twilight, it couldn’t be handled then, and what cannot be handled at twilight cannot be handled for the whole of the Sabbath (Freedman).]
- D. *Said Ulla, “Objected R. Eleazar: **Its [a chest’s] device [trundle] — when it may be slipped off, it is not connected to it, and is not measured with it, and is not afforded protection with it in the tent of the corpse, and they do not drag [the trundle] on the Sabbath when there are coins in it [the chest] [M. Kel. 18:2A-B].** Lo, if there is no money on it, it is permitted to be handled, and that is the case even though money may have been on it on the eve of the Sabbath.”*
- E. *That represents the position of R. Simeon, who rejects the law that that which may not be used on the Sabbath may not be handled thereon [Freedman: nonetheless, since money may not be handled for any purpose at all, he concedes that the trundle may not be rolled when there is actually money on it now]. But Rab concurs with R. Judah. [45A] And that stands to reason that Rab concurs with R. Judah. For Rab said, “Before the Sabbath they may leave a lamp on a palm tree on the Sabbath. [Freedman: The lamp will burn during the Sabbath; there is no fear that he will take and use it if it goes out, thus*

using what is attached to the soil; since it was forbidden for use at twilight, it is forbidden for use for the whole of the Sabbath.] But they may not leave a lamp on a palm tree on a festival day [Freedman: then one may remove it from the tree and replace it, using the tree itself, which is forbidden].” *Now if you maintain that Rab accords with R. Judah, that explains why he differentiates between the Sabbath and a festival day, but if you maintain that he concurs with Simeon, then what difference does it make to me whether it is a Sabbath or a festival day?*

- F. *But does Rab concur with R. Judah? And isn't it so that they asked Rab, "What is the law on carrying a Hanukkah lamp off from before Magi on the Sabbath," and he said to them, "Well and good." [Judah would not permit handling the lamp on the Sabbath.]*
- G. *A ruling made under emergency conditions is exceptional [and he would not ordinarily have permitted doing so]. For lo, said R. Kahana and R. Ashi to Rab, "Is that really the law?" He said to them, "Well, it's o.k. to rely on R. Simeon in an emergency."*

I.6

- A. *R. Simeon b. Laqish asked R. Yohanan, "As to wheat that one sowed in the soil or eggs under a chicken, what is the law [on taking them on the Sabbath for use, the wheat not having taken root, the egg not having addled]? When R. Simeon rejects the prohibition is a case in which on one's own action one has not rejected an object [here, when one sows wheat in the ground or puts an egg under the fowl, he has rejected it for the interim (Freedman)], but in a case in which one has rejected the object through one's own action, he will affirm that it is forbidden to handle such a [self-designated, repulsive] object on the Sabbath? Or maybe he makes no such distinction?"*
- B. *He said to him, "R. Simeon accepts the principle that what is not designated for use on the Sabbath is forbidden for handling on the Sabbath only in the case of oil in a lamp when the lamp is burning, since, at that point, the oil is both designated for carrying out the religious duty [of the Sabbath lamp] and it also is at that moment set apart because of a prohibition [putting out a lamp on the Sabbath, which one may not do; that prohibition renders the oil inaccessible while the lamp is burning (following Freedman's reading and explanation)]."*
- C. *Well, then, does he not hold that where something is singled out only to carry out a given religious duty, that alone would suffice to render handling that thing forbidden? And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: [If] one*

properly roofed over the Sukkah and beautified it with hangings and sheets and also hung up in it nuts, peaches, pomegranates, bunches of grapes, and wreaths of ears of corn, it is valid. [But] one should not eat of any of these, even on the last day of the festival. But if one made a stipulation concerning them that he would eat of them on the festival, it is entirely in accord with what he has stipulated [T.: permitted to do so] [T. Suk. 1:7G-I]? And how do you know that this represents the position of R. Simeon? Because R. Hiyya bar Joseph repeated before R. Yohanan the following Tannaite statement: **[On a festival day] they do not take pieces of wood from [the walls or roof of] a hut, but [they take wood] from that which is adjacent to it [M. Bes. 4:2A].** But R. Simeon permits. And they concur in regard to the Sukkah that was built for that festival in particular that it is forbidden to do so on the festival [should that hut collapse, its wood may not be used during the whole festival, having been designated to carry out the religious duty of a Sukkah for that festival]. But if he made a stipulation in that regard, it is entirely in accord with what he has stipulated. [So the foregoing concurs with Simeon.]

- D. *What we mean to say was*, parallel to the oil in the lamp; since it was singled out to carry out its religious duty, it was also singled out in respect to the prohibition affecting it. [The former consideration suffices.] So, too, it has been stated: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “So far as R. Simeon is concerned, the principle that on the Sabbath one may not touch what one may not use applies only to a case parallel to one involving oil in a burning lamp: Since the oil has been singled out to carry out that religious duty, it has been singled out also to be subject to the prohibition applying to it.”

- I.7** A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “So far as R. Simeon is concerned, the principle that on the Sabbath one may not touch what one may not use applies only to drying figs and grapes.” [Freedman: When they are spread out to dry, they cease to be fit for food until fully dried; hence they are certainly rejected as food, and even Simeon admits the prohibition here.]
- B. *Nothing else? But what about what has been taught on Tannaite authority:* [If prior to a festival] one was eating grapes, had some left over, and brought them up to the roof to make from them raisins, or [if he was eating] figs, left some over, and brought them up to the roof to make from them dried figs — he may not eat of them [on the festival] unless he designates them [for festival use] while it is still daylight, before the start of the holy day. And thus you find [is the law] for peaches, quinces and all other types of fruit? *Now who can be*

the authority behind this rule? Should I say it is R. Judah? But if in a situation in which by one's own action one has not rejected use of something, the thing nonetheless is forbidden for use on the Sabbath, in a case in which by one's own action, one has done so, all the more so will he concur! So isn't it R. Simeon's position [in which case he invokes the stated principle in more than the instance specified above].

- C. *In point of fact it stands for R. Judah's view, but it was necessary to specify that that is the case even when one was actually eating the fruit. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that, since one was going along and eating the fruit, it was not necessary that he designate the produce for eating on the Sabbath. So we are informed that, since he has brought up the residue to the roof, he has given up regarding the produce as useful [and so it is subject to the same prohibition].*

I.8

- A. *R. Simeon bar Rabbi asked Rabbi, [45B] "According to R. Simeon, what [is the law whether or not on a festival day one may eat] burst figs?"*
- B. *[And, indicating that Rabbi does not require prior designation, Rabbi] said to [Simeon b. Rabbi], "R. Simeon requires that food be set aside for festival use only in the case of dried figs and raisins." [These foods were edible but now have been set aside for drying. The owner himself purposely imposed upon them the status of a non-edible. If he wishes to make them available for festival use, accordingly, prior to the holy day, he must indicate his intention to eat them. But in most other cases, Simeon does not require designation of food for festival use. The assumption is that Rabbi reports this perspective because it is his own opinion, not simply that of Simeon.]*
- C. *But doesn't Rabbi accept the principle that what may not be used on the Sabbath may not be handled? Haven't we learned in the Mishnah: **They do not give drink to field animals or slaughter them [on a festival day, since they are not deemed set aside as food]. But they give drink to and slaughter household animals, [which are deemed set aside for festival use] [M. Bes. 5:7D-E].** And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: **What are the field animals and what are the household animals? Field animals are those that go out to pasture at Passover and come back in the first quarter, [that is, in the rainy season]. And what are the household animals? Those that go out and pasture outside the Sabbath boundary but come back and spend the night within the Sabbath boundary. Rabbi says, "Both of these [types of animals], are household animals. Rather,***

what are field animals? Those that go out and graze in [the distant] pastures and do not return to town either in the sunny season or the rainy season” [T. Y.T. 4:11]?

- D. [The apparent contradiction between Rabbi’s opinion at F, in which he requires prior designation, and his understanding of Simeon’s position, I, which states that in most cases no designation is required, is resolved.] *If you wish I can say that these [field animals], too, are comparable to dried figs and raisins, [such that even Rabbi holds that they require prior designation if they are to be used on a festival day].* [Like the figs and raisins, the animals should automatically be ready and available as food. But they have been removed from the person’s home, such that they no longer are deemed ready for consumption. They are a special case in which designation is required.] *And if you wish I can reason that [Rabbi] made his statement, according to the opinion of R. Simeon, even though this is not his own [view].* [Unlike Simeon, whose opinion he reports, Rabbi always requires food to be set aside for use on a festival day]. *And if you wish I can explain that [Rabbi does not require prior designation, as indicated, but that he] reported the law according to the view of rabbis, thus: “In my opinion food to be used on a holy day need not be set aside prior to the start of that day. But even you, [who require prior setting aside], should agree with me that [animals that] go out to pasture at Passover and come back in the first quarter are household animals!” But the rabbis said to him, “No! These are field animals!”*

- I.9** A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “They said: The law accords with R. Simeon.”
- B. *But did R. Yohanan make any such statement? And lo, a certain elder of Qirvayya, and some say, from Sirvayya, addressed this question to him: “What is the law on handling a fowl nest on the Sabbath?” And he said to him, “Is it made for anything other than chickens?” [It is designated for what may not be handled on the Sabbath and therefore is forbidden; Simeon would not take that view in that case.]*
- C. *Here with what situation do we deal? It is a case in which the nest contains a dead bird [which even in Simeon’s view may not be handled].*
- D. *Well, now, that poses no problem to Mar bar Amemar in the name of Raba, who has said, “R. Simeon concedes that if living creatures die, they may not be handled on the Sabbath [even cut up as food for dogs].” [Freedman: If they were in good health at twilight, so that one*

gave no thought to them, they cannot be used for the stated purpose on the Sabbath; but if the animal was dying at twilight and died after nightfall, on the Sabbath, Simeon would concur that it can be chopped up and fed to dogs, because the owner can have given thought to using the carcass for that purpose.] *But from the perspective of Mar b. R. Joseph in the name of Raba, who said, “R. Simeon differed even in the case of living creatures that die, holding that they may be handled on the Sabbath [even cut up as food for dogs],” what is there to say?*

E. Here with what situation do we deal? It is a hen coop that contains an egg [laid that day; even Simeon admits that what is newly created on the Sabbath may not be handled].

F. But didn’t R. Nahman say, “Anyone who permits [for use on the festival day] that which has not been set aside [for use on that day] also permits [for use on the festival] an object that [physically] comes into being [on that day], and anyone who prohibits [for use on the festival day] that which has not been set aside [for use on that day] also prohibits [for use on the festival] an object that [physically] comes into being [on that day]”?

G. It is a case in which there is the egg of a fledgling [on which the chicken is sitting; that is entirely unfit; no one thinks the nest may be handled (Freedman)].

- I.10** A. *When R. Isaac bar Joseph came, he said, “R. Yohanan said, ‘The decided law is in accord with R. Judah.’ And R. Joshua b. Levi said, ‘The decided law is in accord with R. Simeon.’”*
- B. *Said R. Joseph, “That is in line with what Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan said, ‘They have said, “The decided law is in accord with R. Simeon.””*
- C. *“They have said...” — but didn’t R. Yohanan take that position for himself?*
- D. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, “And don’t you think that R. Yohanan concurs with R. Judah’s position? Isn’t it the fact that R. Abba and R. Assi visited the household of R. Abba of Haifa, and a candelabrum fell on R. Assi’s robe, but he didn’t take it off? How come? Surely it is because R. Assi was R. Yohanan’s disciple, and R. Yohanan took the position of R. Judah, who affirmed the principle that what cannot be used on the Sabbath also cannot be handled on that day!”*

- E. *He said to him, “Do you speak of a candelabrum? The case of a candelabrum is exceptional, for said R. Aha bar Hanina said R. Assi, ‘R. Simeon b. Laqish gave instructions in Sidon: “A candelabrum that can be lifted with a single hand may be moved, but one that needs two hands may not.”’ And R. Yohanan said, ‘So far as a lamp is concerned, we have in hand only the position of R. Simeon; as to a candelabrum, whether it can be lifted by one hand or by two, it may not be moved.’ How come? Rabbah and R. Joseph both say, ‘Since a person assigns a place for it [on the Sabbath], it is designated for that place in particular and is not to be moved elsewhere.’”*
- F. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, “But what about a bridal couch, for which one designates a particular place, and yet said Samuel in the name of R. Hiyya, ‘On the Sabbath a bridal couch [46A] may one set up and dismantle.’”*
- G. *Rather, said Abbayye, “It refers to a candelabrum that can be dismantled, having movable joints” [Freedman: it may not be handled lest it fall to pieces and be put together again, which is tantamount to making a utensil].*
- H. *If so, how come R. Simeon b. Laqish permits moving it?*
- I. *What is the meaning of “removable joints”? It means, similar to joints, in that, it has grooves. [Freedman: It is all fastened in one place, but because it has grooves, it looks as though it were jointed for dismantling.]*
- J. *Therefore, if it had real joints, whether it was large or small, it may not be handled; if it was large and had grooves, it also may not be handled because of a large one made of joints. Where there is a difference of opinion it concerns a little one that had grooves. The one authority maintains that we make a precautionary decree against handling it, and the other maintains we do not make a precautionary decree.*
- K. *Well, did R. Yohanan make any such statement? But didn’t R. Yohanan say, “The decided law accords with the unattributed Mishnah rule”? And we have learned in the Mishnah: **Its [a chest’s] device [trundle] — when it maybe slipped off, it is not connected to it, and is not measured with it, and is not afforded protection with it in the tent of the corpse, and they do not drag [the trundle] on the Sabbath when there are coins in it [the chest] [M. Kel. 18:2A-B].** Lo, if there is no money on it, it is permitted to be handled, and that is the case even though money may have been on it on the eve of the Sabbath [and that imposes the prohibition of touching what may not be used on the Sabbath].*

- L. Said R. Zira, “Let our Mishnah paragraph pertain to one that had no money on it during all of twilight, so as not to contradict R. Yohanan’s position.”

I.11 A. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Once Rabbi went to Diospera and he gave instruction in the matter of the candelabrum in accord with the position of R. Simeon on a lamp” [the former: a branched candlestick, the latter, a single lamp].

B. *They asked him, “Is the sense, in the matter of the candelabrum in accord with the position of R. Simeon on a lamp, that he gave a lenient ruling, or perhaps the sense is, he gave instruction in respect to a candelabrum so as to prohibit handling it, and in accord with R. Simeon in regard to a lamp so as to permit handling it?”*

C. *The question stands.*

I.12 A. *R. Malkio visited the household of R. Simlai and moved the lamp [that had gone out (Freedman)]. R. Simlai objected.*

B. *R. Yosé the Galilean visited the locale of R. Yosé b. R. Hanina. He moved a lamp that had gone out, and R. Yosé bar Hanina objected.*

C. *When R. Abbahu came to the locale of R. Joshua b. Levi, he would carry a candle [on the Sabbath, since Joshua thought it was all right to do so under certain circumstances], and when he came to the locale of R. Yohanan, he didn’t carry a candle.*

D. *Well, what’s what? If he concurs with R. Judah, then let him act in accord with R. Judah! If he concurs with R. Simeon, then let him act in accord with R. Simeon!*

E. *In point of fact he concurs with R. Simeon, but it was because of the respect owing to R. Yohanan that he did not act in such a way.*

I.13 A. *Said R. Judah, “As to an oil lamp, it is permitted to handle it; as to a naphtha lamp, it is forbidden to handle it.”*

B. *Both Rabbah and R. Joseph say, “As to one of naphtha, it is also permitted to handle it.”*

I.14 A. *R. Avayya visited the household of Raba. His boots were muddy with clay, but he sat down on a bed before Raba. Raba took offense. Raba wanted to irritate him. He said to him, “How come both*

Rabbah and R. Joseph say, 'As to one of naphtha, it is also permitted to handle it'?"

B. He said to him, "It is because it is suitable for covering a utensil."

C. "Then all the chips in the courtyard should be permitted to be handled, since they are suitable for covering a utensil."

D. He said to him, "But the former is classified as a utensil, but the latter in no way are classified as a utensil! Hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: [46B] Chains, earrings and nose rings are all articles of clothing, which may be worn on the Sabbath in a courtyard? And said Ulla, "How come? Because they are classified as utensils. Here, too, since it is classified as a utensil, it may be handled."

E. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Blessed is the All-Merciful, that Raba did not humiliate R. Avayya."

- I.15** A. *For [his teacher] Rabbah, Abbaye contrasted [Tannaite rules, as follows:] "It has been taught on Tannaite authority: The leftovers of the oil in the lamp is forbidden. R. Simeon permits it. Therefore R. Simeon rejects the principle that what is not suitable for use on the Sabbath also may not be touched. But it also has been taught on Tannaite authority: **R. Simeon says, 'Any [firstling] the blemish of which has not been discerned while it is still day [before the festival] — this is not [deemed to be] in the category of that which is ready [for festival use]' [M. Bes. 3:4C].** [Therefore he accepts the principle that what is not available for use prior to the holy day, for example, by sunset, may not be handled on the holy day itself.]"*
- B. *But how are the cases parallel? In the one case, someone sits there and looks forward to when the lamp will go out [to save the oil]. But here does someone sit there and look forward to when the beast will be blemished? [He does want that to happen, but he doesn't expect it, but he does have reason to expect the lamp to go out (Freedman).] Rather, he says, who can tell me that it ever will receive a blemish? And even if you say that it will, who can tell me that it will be a permanent blemish [such as that which will release the animal for slaughter]? And even if you say it will be permanent, who can say that a disciple of a sage will take up the case? [So it is hardly parallel.]*
- C. *Objected R. Ammi bar Hama, "They abrogate vows on the Sabbath. And on the Sabbath they receive applications for the nullification of vows concerning matters which are required for the Sabbath [M. Shab. 24:5A-B]. But why should this be the case? Rather, why not say, 'Who can say that*

her husband will take up her case?’” [Freedman: When a woman forswears benefit from anything, she rejects it for herself, and it falls into the category of what cannot be used; even if her husband annuls her vow, she could not have anticipated his doing so; so it should remain prohibited for handling on the Sabbath by reason of its having been prohibited for use.]

- D. *The answer there accords with what R. Phineas said in the name of Raba, for said R. Phineas in the name of Raba, “Whoever takes a vow does so with the stipulation of her husband’s concurrence.”*
- E. *Come and take note: **And on the Sabbath they receive applications for the nullification of vows concerning matters which are required for the Sabbath [M. Shab. 24:5A-B].** But why should this be the case? Rather, why not say, “Who can say that a sage will take up the case?”*
- F. *In that case, if a sage won’t take up the case, a court of three common persons will do; but here, who can say that a sage will take up the case?*

- I.16** A. *Abbaye raised the following question to R. Joseph, “Did R. Simeon say, ‘If the lamp went out, it may be handled’? Then, only if it went out may it be handled, but not if it went out. Why not? Because we take the precaution, lest, through his handling it, it might go out [and the Torah forbids putting out a fire]. But, by contrast, we have heard as a tradition for R. Simeon, who has said, ‘If it is something that one does not wish to have happen, it is permitted.’ For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon says, ‘On the Sabbath, one may drag a bed, chair, or bench, so long as he does not intend thereby to make a groove in the dirt.’”*
- B. *[He said to him,] “In any case in which one intends for that to happen, there is a prohibition deriving from the Torah, but in any case in which one does not intend that to happen, R. Simeon makes a decree prohibiting such a thing by reason of the authority of rabbis. But if there is only a rabbinical prohibition, then even if it is intentional, R. Simeon to begin with permits the action.”*
- C. *Objected Rabbah, “**Clothes dealers sell [garments of diverse kinds] in their usual manner provided that they do not intend, in a hot sun, [for the garments to protect them] from the hot sun, or in the rain, [for the garments to protect them] from the rain. And the more scrupulous ones tie [the garments of diverse kinds] on a stick [M. Kil. 9:5].** Now here is a case in which the prohibition of an intentional action is based on the law of*

the Torah — and yet if the action is not intended, to begin with R. Simeon permits that action!”

- D. *Rather, said Raba, [47A] “Set aside the lamp, oil, and wicks, since they are turned into the foundation for an act that is forbidden.” [The flame is forbidden; while the lamp is lit, everything is subsidiary to the flame; under such conditions, Simeon concurs that what cannot be used cannot be handled (Freedman).]*

- I.17** A. *Said R. Zira said R. Assi said R. Yohanan said R. Hanina said R. Romanus, “Rabbi permitted me to handle a pan with the ashes in it.” [Freedman: Ashes cannot be used so shouldn’t be handled, but it is assumed that he was permitted to move the ashes on account of the pan, a utensil.]*
- B. *Said R. Zira to R. Assi, “Did R. Yohanan make such a statement? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: **A man takes up [handles] his child, with a stone in [the child’s] hand, or a basket with a stone in it [M. Shab. 21:1A-B]**? And said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, ‘We deal here with a basket full of produce.’ So the operative consideration is that there is produce, but if there were no produce, it would not have been permitted to do so.”*
- C. *“He was astounded for a moment” (Dan. 4:16). Then he said, “Here, too, it is a case in which the pan has some grains of spice.”*
- D. *Said Abbaye, “So did the household of Rabbi value grains of spice? And should you propose, well, they’re fit for the poor, hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: The garments of the poor are judged by what is relative to the situation of a poor person, [who will value a very small piece of cloth], and the garments of the rich are judged by what is relative to the situation of a rich person [who will value only a larger piece of cloth but regard a small piece as worthless]. But we do not assess the garments of the poor by appeal to the value placed on them by the rich.”*
- E. *Rather, said Abbaye, “It is comparable to a chamber pot. [One may empty a chamber pot, and so, too, a pan and ashes.]”*
- F. *Said Raba, “There are two pertinent answers to this: First of all, a chamber pot is nauseating, but this isn’t nauseating; furthermore, a chamber pot is out in the open, but this is covered. [The analogy fails.]”*
- G. *Rather, said Raba, “When we were at the household of R. Nahman, we would handle a brazier on account of the ashes in it [if the ashes were needed to*

cover something; these were relied upon for that purpose from prior to the Sabbath (Freedman)], *even if broken pieces of wood were lying on it.*”

- H. *An objection was raised:* But [Judah and Simeon] concur that if the lamp had fragments of a wick, it may not be handled. [The same would pertain to pieces of wood on a brazier; the lamp contains oil, as the brazier contains ashes (Freedman).]
- I. *Said Abbaye, “We have learned this rule for Galilee”* [where oil is abundant and the residue would not be valued; so the lamp with the fragments of wick may not be handled on account of its oil (Freedman)].

- I.18** A. *Levi bar Samuel came across R. Abba and R. Huna bar Hiyya, who were standing at the doorway of the household of R. Huna. He said to them, “What is the law as to reassembling a weaver’s frame on the Sabbath?”*
- B. *They said to him, “It’s quite o.k.”*
 - C. *He came before R. Judah. He said, “Both Rab and Samuel say, ‘He who reassembles a weaver’s frame on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering.’”*
 - D. *An objection was raised: **He who puts back the branch of a candelabrum on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering. As to the joint of a whitewasher’s pole, one may not reinsert it, but if he did so, he is exempt from a sin-offering, although the act is forbidden [cf. T. Shab. 13:5].*** R. Simai says, “For a circular horn he is liable, for a straight one, he is exempt.” [Freedman: The difficulty is presented by the branch of the candelabrum, which is on the same principle as the weaver’s frame.]

E. *They made their ruling in line with the Tannaite authority of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:* The sockets of a bed, legs of a bed, archer’s tablets may not be reinserted; if one did so, he is exempt from penalty, [47B] though it is forbidden to do so. And they are not to be tightly fixed, but if one did tightly fix them, he is liable to a sin-offering. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “If it is loose, it is permitted.” [[Freedman: If it is so constructed that it need be only loosely joined, it is permitted even to begin with; Abba and Huna likewise refer to branches that set lightly in their sockets.]

- I.19** A. *At the household of R. Hama was a folding bed, which they would set up on festivals. Said one of the rabbis to Raba, “What’s your view? Do you think this is an offhand construction [not done in a professional way, and therefore, because it is loosely fitted, it is not classified as building and*

that is why it is permitted to do this]? Then even though it is not prohibited by the Torah under such circumstances, surely it is forbidden by rabbis!"

B. *He said to him, "I concur with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, who has said, If it is loose, it is permitted."*

3:6H-I

H. They put a utensil under a lamp to catch the sparks.

I. But [on the Sabbath] one may not put water into it, because he thereby puts out [the sparks].

I.1 A. *But by doing so, one nullifies the utensil's status as a useful object ready for work [by putting it under the lamp in this way]!*

B. Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "Sparks are not tangible."

II.1 A. **But [on the Sabbath] one may not put water into it, because he thereby puts out [the sparks]:**

B. *May we say that what we have here taught without attribution accords with the view of R. Yosé, who has said, "What indirectly brings about extinguishing fire is forbidden"?*

C. *But do you really think so? While I may well say that R. Yosé made that ruling with respect to the Sabbath, does he hold that view also for the eve of the Sabbath? And should you say, well, here, too, it refers to the eve of the Sabbath, hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: They put a utensil under a lamp to catch the sparks on the Sabbath, and it goes without saying, on the eve of the Sabbath, but on the eve of the Sabbath one may not put in water because it puts out the sparks, and it goes without saying, on the Sabbath?*

D. *Rather, said R. Ashi, "You may even say that this represents the position of rabbis. The present case is exceptional, since by one's action he brings near what extinguishes the flame." [Freedman: By pouring water into the utensil, and therefore as a preventing measure it is forbidden eve on the eve of the Sabbath.]*