

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF KUF MEM ALEF

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

...that does drool.

And what was taught in the Baraita: “one may take fodder from an animal that has a bad mouth” refers to a donkey because it is not particular but eats anything, even thorns and thistles.

“And put it in front of an animal that has a good mouth” refers to a cow which is particular about what it eats, which is only straw and barley. The reason of the law is not related to the fact that the donkey eats thorns, but his mouth is called “bad” for that reason.

MISHNAH

Plain straw is *muktzeh* because its standard purpose is to be used as fuel. But if the owner thinks of it as food or litter, it is then not *muktzeh*. And also, if the animal laid on it the eve of Shabbat, even if the owner did not think of it specifically, it is not *muktzeh*.

One may not move straw that is on a bed, but which was not previously designated for sleeping on, with his hand to soften it for lying down. But he may move it with his body, for instance with his shoulders, which is not the usual way to move things, and which is therefore permitted.

PEREK 20– 141A

But if the straw was designated **for animal fodder, or alternatively, a pillow or a sheet was upon it** and one laid on it before nightfall, it is a utensil, and **he may move it with his hands.**

One may release a householder's garment-press. Two boards were fitted on four perforated poles and held by pegs which keep the garments pressed by the boards. This clause of the Mishnah speaks of the removal of the pegs to remove the garments for Shabbat. **But not tighten it** because since the garments will not be ready in time for Shabbat, it comes out that one is preparing on Shabbat for the week.

But laundrymen's press one may not touch it even to release it because it is very tight and it would look like the work of Destruction¹.

Rabbi Yehudah says: since the laundrymen's press is forbidden because of destruction, therefore **if it was a bit loosened on the eve of Shabbat, one can release it totally and remove it** and there is no prohibition of *muktzeh*.

GEMARA

Rav Nachman said: A radish which was hidden in the ground but did not take root because it was placed there only for keeping, and one comes to pull it out on Shabbat, its law depends on the way it was placed:

If the radish was placed in the ground with its wide head **above** and its narrow stalk **below**, in which case the hole is wide above and narrow below, **it is permitted** to pull it out because it does not displace any soil.

¹In Hebrew, *stirah*.

PEREK 20– 141A

But if it was placed in the ground with its head **below** and its stalk **above**, **it is forbidden** to pull it out, because when the wide head comes out towards the narrow top of the hole, it moves the soil which is *muktzeh*.

Ada bar Abba said, the scholars said: we learned not like Rav Nachman.

For we learned in our Mishnah: **One may not move straw upon a bed with his hand but he may move it with his body. But if the straw was for animal fodder, or a pillow or a sheet was upon it, he may move it with his hands.**

It implies that the Sages permitted to move something which is *muktzeh*, in certain way. The reason is **that indirect moving² is not called moving** and the Sages only forbade the usual way to move *muktzeh*. If so, when pulling out a radish, one moves the soil but not in the usual way. Thus it should be permitted, not like Rav Nachman said.

And the Gemara concludes: **It is indeed implied.**

The Gemara brings down other instances where Amoraim sometimes permit to perform works forbidden by the Torah even in the first place, when done in an unusual way.

Rav Yehudah said: to crush peppergrains one by one with a knife-handle is permitted because it is considered indirect crushing, while the usual way is to crush many at once.

But to crush in **twos is forbidden.**

Rava said: Since one is already altering the usual method, by crushing with the knife-handle, there is no need of further change, thus **even** crushing **many** is permitted.

²In Hebrew, *tiltul min hatzad*, lit., moving from the side.

PEREK 20– 141A

The Gemara collects here different Shabbat laws which are not so connected to the subject matter of our Mishnah.

Rav Yehudah said: He who swims i.e. bathes **in water should first dry himself and then come out** i.e. leave the edge of the water, because if he comes out without drying himself **he might come** to move his body **four ammot in a carmelit**³.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **If so**, if we worry about this, we should forbid bathing in rivers. **Because when one goes in** the water, **his force pushes also** the water **four ammot, and it is forbidden!**

The Gemara answers: **there is no Rabbinical decree on one's force** moving something **in a carmelit**.

Abaye said, others say Rav Yehudah said: One should wipe clay from his foot on the ground, but not on the wall.

Rava said: what is the reason for not permitting it **on the wall?** Is it **because it looks like the work of Building**, it looks as if one is strengthening the wall that way? **This** is not the way to build, only **a peasant's building** is built that way.

Rather, Rava said: it is the opposite, **one should wipe** his foot **on the wall, but not on the ground**, because we worry that **perhaps** one will forget Shabbat **and come to level off holes**.

PEREK 20– 141A

It was said: Mar bar Ravina said: both of them are forbidden this one because of the work of Building and that one because of leveling holes.

Rav Papa said: both of them are permitted because we are not worried that it looks like the work of building, or that one may forget Shabbat and level holes. Even if one does it, but without intent, it is not problematic. For the Halachah is in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, that an unintentional action is permitted.

And the Gemara clarifies: **According to Mar bar Ravina, how does one wipe?**

And the Gemara says: **One wipes on a plank** which is on the ground.

Rava said: A man should not sit next to a post at the entrance of an alleyway which opens into a public domain, because **perhaps an object could roll away from him** into the public domain **and he might come to carry** because there is no clear distinction between the alleyway and the public domain.

And Rava said: A man should not properly settle a barrel to stand on the ground, perhaps he might come to level holes.

And Rava said: A man should not press a cloth stopper into the opening of a jar, perhaps he might come to squeeze because the stopper is wet.

³An area which cannot be classified either as public domain or as private domain,

PEREK 20– 141A

Rav Kahana said: Clay on a garment can be rubbed from inside the garment, **but not on the outside** which is the way of launderers. And even though the work of Laundering is only liable by Torah law when done with water, the Sages took a strict position and forbade rubbing off without water, because it looks like laundering. But they permitted when it is done from the inside because then it does not look like laundering.

They contradicted him, from the following source: **Clay on one's shoe can be scraped with the back of a knife, and that clay which is on his garment can be scraped with a nail**, and certainly with the back of a knife—**provided that he does not rub it.**

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **why not say** that this means **that he should not rub it at all?**

And the Gemara answers: **No**, it means that **one should not rub** on the outside, but **only inside**. And scraping with a nail is permitted even on the outside.

Rabbi Abahu said, Rabbi Elazar said, Rabbi Yannai said: One may scrape a new shoe, but not an old one...

Ammud Bet

...because one is then liable for the work of Scraping.

but in which it is Rabbinically forbidden to carry.

PEREK 20– 141B

And the Gemara clarifies: **With what does one scrape it** the new shoe?

Rabbi Abahu said: With the back of a knife but not with its blade. And an old shoe cannot be scraped even with the back of a knife.

One old man said to him: Take your teaching away from me, because Rabbi Chiya taught:

One may not scrape a new shoe nor an old one.

And it is forbidden to rub a shoe with oil because the leather softens up and this is the work of preparing hides. **And therefore one may not rub his foot with oil while the foot is in a shoe or in a sandal.**

But one may rub his foot with oil and then place it in a shoe or in a sandal without concern for the prohibition.

And likewise one may rub his entire body with oil and afterwards **roll himself on a leather cover, without concern** for the prohibition.

Rav Chisda said: it was only taught that it is permitted to rub one's foot with oil and then place it in a shoe, or to rub one's entire body with oil and then roll on a leather cover, **when one means to polish it. But if he means to prepare it, it is forbidden.**

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **If one means to prepare it, it is obvious** that it is forbidden!

Moreover the Gemara raises another difficulty: Even when one means **to polish it, who permits it?** This is surely forbidden Rabbinically ,because it looks like the work of preparing hides.

PEREK 20– 141B

Rather if it was said, this is what it meant to say:

Rav Chisda said: The Sages did not permit it at all, in a case where one means to prepare or to polish. But where one does not mean to do this, this is where it is permitted. Even so, **it was only taught** that he may on his foot **a quantity** of oil which is sufficient **to polish it. But** if he puts on his foot **a quantity** which is sufficient **to prepare it, this is forbidden.**

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: **A small man should not go out with a big shoe,** because it could fall off his foot and we worry that he might carry it four *ammot* in the public domain.

But he can go out with a large robe, which does not fall off him.

A woman should not go out with a torn shoe, perhaps she will take it off because of those mocking her and she might carry it in her hand in the public domain.

And so she may not perform *chalitzah*⁴ with it in the first place, because it is not an adequate shoe.

But if she performed *chalitzah* with it, it is valid.

And one may not go out with a new shoe.

⁴Lit., drawing off. The ceremony of taking off the shoe of the brother of a husband who has died childless, thus removing the obligation of Levirate marriage (see *Devarim* 25:5-9).

PEREK 20– 141B

And the Baraita explains: **About what new shoe did they say** that one may not go out? **About a woman's shoe.** She is particular not to walk with a shoe that does not fit her foot, and she might take it off and come to carry it.

Bar Kapara taught: It was only taught that a woman may not go out with a new shoe **if she did not go out with it when it was still day. But if she went out with it on the eve of Shabbat, it is permitted,** because she already knows that it fits her foot.

The Gemara quotes two contradicting Baraitot concerning shoes on Shabbat, and resolves them.

One Tanna taught: A shoe may be removed from its cast⁵ on Shabbat and one does not worry about moving *muktzeh*.

But it was taught in another Baraita: it may not be removed, because of *muktzeh*.

There is no difficulty.

This one the Baraita which forbids, is in accordance with **Rabbi Eliezer** who holds that the work on the shoe is not finished until it is removed from its cast, thus it is *muktzeh* because it is not yet called a utensil.

That one, the Baraita which permits, is in accordance with **the Rabbis** who hold that the work on the shoe is finished while still on its cast, thus it is called a utensil.

As it was taught in a Mishnah: **If a shoe is on its cast, Rabbi Eliezer declares it pure** because it is not finished **but the Sages declare it impure** i.e. fitting to contract impurity (see Tractate *Keilim* 26:4).

⁵A block of form shaped like a shoe , over which shoe uppers are shaped..

PEREK 20– 141B

The Gemara answered that for the Sages, the shoe is a utensil whose function is permitted, and that for Rabbi Eliezer the shoe is not a utensil. However, we have to inquire about the cast which is moved when the shoe is removed from it. It is a utensil whose function is forbidden, even though it is permitted to move it for its own sake⁶.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **It comes out well for Rava who said: It is permitted to move an object whose function is forbidden, whether it is for its own sake or for its place.** The cast may be moved because it is considered moving it for its place, and refraining from moving it holds back the use of the shoe.

But for Abaye who said: It is only permitted for its own sake, but not for its place, what can be said?

And the Gemara answers: **What is spoken of here? Of a loose cast** which does not need to be moved when the shoe is removed from it.

The Gemara brings support to Abaye, from a Baraita: **As it was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Yehudah says: If it the cast was loose, it is permitted.**

And the Gemara infers: **The reason** it is permitted is because **it the cast is loose, but if it is not loose, it is not permitted**, because of the moving of the cast which is a utensil whose function is forbidden.

And now the Gemara raises a difficulty: **It comes out well for Abaye who said: An object whose function is forbidden, is permitted when used for its own sake, but not for its place.** It is forbidden to move the cast for its place.

But for Rava who said: it is permitted whether it is for its own sake or for its place, what is the meaning of “loose”? It is permitted **even if it is not loose!**

⁶In Hebrew, *letzorech gufo*.

PEREK 20– 141B

And the Gemara answers: Rava understands the Baraita differently. In his view, the need for a loose shoe is because of the shoe itself. For **that Baraita of Rabbi Yehudah**, which distinguishes between where it is loose or not, is actually **in Rabbi Eliezer's name**, i.e. it follows the view of Rabbi Eliezer. And according to Rabbi Yehudah, Rabbi Eliezer agrees that a loose shoe is finished and is considered as taken off the cast. But if it is tight, it is still *muktzeh*.

And the Gemara brings support to Rava: **As it was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Yehudah says in Rabbi Eliezer's name: If it was loose, it is permitted.**

Hadran Alach Tolin

We Will Return to You, Perek Tolin

PEREK 21– 141B

Perek Noteil

MISHNAH

A man may pick up his son while he the son has a stone in his hand, and the father is not considered carrying the stone which is *muktzeh*. And the Mishnah speaks of a courtyard or of any place in which there is no prohibition of transferring an object four *ammot*.

Or, one may pick up a basket with a stone in it, as will be explained by the Gemara.

And impure terumah which is *muktzeh* because it is inedible **may be moved** in a basket **together with pure terumah or with chulin**⁷ which is also in the basket.

Rabbi Yehudah says: One may also remove the admixture⁸ of terumah in chulin **from the one hundred and one parts.**

The “admixture” is made of terumah and chulin. By Torah law, terumah is nullified – like all prohibited food – when mixed with a larger amount of ordinary food, and is then permitted to non-cohanim. But the Sages ordained that terumah would only be nullified if there is no more than one part of terumah in one hundred parts of chulin. And since terumah is not only a prohibition to non-cohanim but is also the cohen's personal property, one is obliged to take out from the admixture the amount of terumah which fell in it, and treat it as terumah (even when the terumah was nullified in one hundred parts). As long as the terumah is not taken out of the chulin, it is forbidden to eat from the admixture.

⁷Lit., mundane. Ordinary food as opposed to terumah.

⁸In Hebrew, *meduma*.

PEREK 21– 141B

According to the Sages, it is forbidden to take out that terumah on Shabbat, the same way it is forbidden to take terumah from *tevel*⁹ on Shabbat, because it looks like fixing. (Previously the produce was unusable, but now it is “fixed”.) But according to Rabbi Yehudah, it is permitted to take out the terumah, and the reason will be explained by the Gemara.

GEMARA

Rava said two halachot:

1. If one brought out a live child with a purse around his neck, he is liable for the work of transferring an object to a different domain, **for the purse**. And we do not say that the child brought out the purse, not the person who carried him. However, one is not liable for bringing out the child. This will be explained.

2. If one brought out a dead child with a purse around his neck, he is all together exempt.

And the Gemara discusses Rava’s first statement: “If one brought out **a live child with a purse around his neck, he is liable for the purse**”. This raises the question:

Let him be liable for bringing out the child as well!

And the Gemara answers: **Rava holds like Rabbi Nathan who said** that he who brings out slaughtered animals, beasts, or birds in the public domain, is liable. But if they are alive, he is exempt, because **a living person carries himself** and makes the burden lighter.

⁹ Produce from which terumah and maaser has not been removed

PEREK 21– 141B

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **Let the purse be nullified to the child**, because the purse is secondary to him. And he who brings it out should be exempt, since he is already exempt for the child.

Was it not taught in the Mishnah: If one brings out a **living person** from the private domain to the public domain **on a bed, he is exempt even for the bed**, because **the bed is secondary to him?**

And the Gemara answers: **A bed is nullified to a human being** because it is being used for the act of bringing out. But **a purse is not nullified to a child** because the purse does not play a role in the bringing out.

The Gemara proceeds to discuss Rava's second statement: “If one brought out **a dead child with a purse around his neck, he is all together exempt**”.

Even though the purse which is around the child's neck has no purpose in bringing him out, whoever is carrying him is not liable. For he does so with a heavy heart because of the child's death. The purse has no value to him because he intends to bury him with it. Therefore the purse is nullified to the child.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **Let him be liable** for bringing out **the child** himself!

And the Gemara answers: **Rava holds like Rabbi Shimon who said that one is exempt for any forbidden work which is not needed for its designated purpose**¹⁰. Bringing out a corpse is an example of this, because the purpose of the work is only to remove something that one does not want, i.e. the corpse. Here, one is not bringing out the object because one wants the object in the new location. Thus it is not called a thoughtful

¹⁰In Hebrew, *melachah she'einah tzrichah legufah*.

PEREK 21– 141B

work¹¹. This holds true although it is done in honor of the dead person (see above, daf 94b).

The Gemara now raises a difficulty with what Rava said:

It was taught in our Mishnah: **A man may pick up his son while he the son has a stone in his hand.** Since the Mishnah permits this case, it must be that we view the situation as follows: the son is holding the *muktzeh* stone, not the father. This contradicts Rava, who says that the bringing out of a purse around a child's neck is an act performed by the one who brings out the child (thus he who brought him out is liable).

The Gemara answers: **They say in the House of Rabbi Yannai:** Our Mishnah, which permits carrying the child with the stone, deals with a case **of a child who longs for his father.** There is a danger that he might become ill if his father does not pick him up. Thus the father is compelled to pick up the child together with the stone. And even though there is no danger for life¹², nevertheless the Sages here waived the prohibition of *muktzeh* due to the threat of illness.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **If so...**

¹¹In Hebrew, *melechet machshevet*.

¹²In Hebrew, *sakanat nefashot*.