

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF KUF NUN ZAYIN

Translated by: *Rabbi Avraham Rosenthal*  
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

**They may not chop wood** on Yom Tov for fuel purposes, **from beams** set aside for building. **And also not from an old beam** that broke on Yom Tov. Even though it is now meant for fuel, it is *muktzeh*, as it was not prepared for this when Yom Tov commenced. This is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, who requires preparation from before Shabbat.

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Yochanan, he taught that Mishnah in accordance with Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah**, and not as an unnamed Mishnah.

\*

The Gemara again raises a difficulty: **Come and hear** a proof from a Mishnah: **They may start** to supply themselves with fuel for cooking purposes from **a pile of straw** on Yom Tov, even if they had not yet taken from it for fuel. **But they may not** start to supply themselves **from wood in the storage** area behind the house, which he prepared for use only the fall, to heat the house.

At this point the Gemara understands that we are dealing with rotting straw, which is not fitting for animal consumption, rather for fuel. But wood in the storage area which is not meant for cooking is forbidden since it is not prepared. This is an unnamed Mishnah in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah. This poses a difficulty, as Rabbi Yochanan said the Halachah follows an unnamed Mishnah, so why does he rule like Rabbi Shimon?

The Gemara answers: **There**, regarding the wood of the storage area, we are speaking **about erez cedars and ashuach cedars**, which are various species whose wood is used for building purposes. **That they are muktzeh because of monetary loss**. If he uses them for fuel, he will be losing precious building wood. **Even Rabbi Shimon agrees** that this type of *muktzeh* applies, for the wood is considered as positively put aside for the sake of a special, non-Yom Tov use.

## PEREK 24 – 157A

\*

The Gemara again raises a difficulty: **Come and hear** a proof from a Mishnah: **They may not water or slaughter the pasture<sup>1</sup>** animals, who spend the nights in the fields, on Yom Tov. For it is forbidden to toil for their sustenance, since the obligation for their sustenance is not upon you. Thus, one may not give them to drink, due to unnecessary toil on Yom Tov.

Also, one may not slaughter them, as they are *muktzeh*. For they were not prepared from beforehand to eat on Yom Tov.

**But they water or slaughter the domestic** animals, as their sustenance is upon you. They are also permitted to be slaughtered, since they are not *muktzeh*. For they were meant for eating from before Yom Tov.

Also this unnamed Mishnah is like Rabbi Yehudah. Why did Rabbi Yochanan rule like Rabbi Shimon?

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Yochanan found another unnamed Mishnah** which is like Rabbi Shimon's view, and ruled in accordance with it.

For it was taught in a Mishnah: **Beit Shammai say: They may pick up from the table**, with their hands, **bones and shells**. Even though the bones are hard and not fitting even for dogs to eat, and shells from nuts are also not usable for anything, it is permissible to move them. For Beit Shammai does not apply the prohibition of *muktzeh* in this case.

**And Beit Hillel say:** They may not move them by hand, rather, they should **remove the entire table board**, which is not *muktzeh*—since it is a utensil—**and shake it out** to remove the bones and shells.

**And said Rav Nachman** regarding this: We do not rely on this Mishnah in the version that it was taught. For the opinions are reversed. **We only hold of the version that Beit Shammai** forbids picking up the bones and shells, since they apply *muktzeh* like **Rabbi**

## **PEREK 24 – 157A**

**Yehudah** does. **And Beit Hillel** permit, since they treat *muktzeh* more leniently **like Rabbi Shimon** does.

The words of Beit Hillel are judged as an unnamed Mishnah. For the words of Beit Shammai hold no weight in final Halachic rulings, as *all* later Sages are in accordance with Beit Hillel. Therefore, Rabbi Yochanan ruled in accordance with this “unnamed” Mishnah.

\*

Even **Rav Acha and Ravina differ in this** halachah.

**One said: In all** the laws of **Shabbat**, we have established that the **halachah follows Rabbi Shimon, except for** the law of *muktzeh* **due to disgust**, where Rabbi Shimon does not apply *muktzeh*, and we follow Rabbi Yehudah, who forbids it.

The Gemara asks: **And what is it**, *muktzeh* due to disgust?

The Gemara answers: An **old clay lamp**, for after it was used, it is disgusting.

**And the other one said: Even with** *muktzeh* **due to disgust, also the halachah is like Rabbi Shimon**, and it is not *muktzeh*. **Except for** *muktzeh* **due to a prohibition**, where we do not follow Rabbi Shimon, who permits it.

The Gemara asks: **And what is it**, *muktzeh* due to a prohibition?

The Gemara answers: **A lamp that they lit on** the eve of **that Shabbat**, because when Shabbat commenced, the lamp was still lit, thus it was forbidden to move it because of the prohibition of Extinguishing. And since it was *muktzeh* when Shabbat commenced, it remains *muktzeh* the entire day.

**But** *muktzeh* **due to a monetary loss, even Rabbi Shimon agrees** that it is forbidden to move it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lit. Desert

## **PEREK 24 – 157A**

**For it was taught** in a Mishnah: **All utensils may be taken on Shabbat, aside for a large saw.** Because a saw has teeth in order to cut wood and if he will use it for anything else, the teeth will break and be ruined.

Also they may not move the **spike of a plow**, because they do not use it for anything but plowing in order that it not be ruined. And anything that one puts aside so that he will not suffer a loss, it is forbidden to move it, according to all views.

### **MISHNAH**

A husband or a father may **annul** the **vows** of their wife or daughter **on Shabbat**.

**And** a sage **may be asked** to permit **vows** on Shabbat, regarding vows **whose** removal is **necessary for Shabbat**.

For example, if one vowed not to eat that day. He needs to remove that vow in order to fulfill the mitzvah of taking pleasure in Shabbat.

However, other vows may not be removed. For he can do it after Shabbat, and we do not toil on Shabbat unnecessarily.

**And they plug the window** on Shabbat. I.e. they insert the board that blocks the opening in the roof. We do not consider this as adding on to the building. This ruling is in accordance with the Rabbis, mentioned earlier in the tractate, who permitted plugging the window with a board that was prepared for this purpose from before Shabbat.

**And they may measure the** piece of **cloth** that touched impurity, in order to ascertain whether it is three by three fingerbreadths, in which case it is susceptible to receiving impurity.

## **PEREK 24 – 157A**

**And they may measure the *mikveh*<sup>2</sup>** to ascertain if it has forty *se'ah*<sup>3</sup> and therefore considered valid. Even though measuring is generally forbidden on Shabbat, due to a Rabbinic decree, these measurements are for mitzvot.

**And an incident** once took place **in the days of the father of Rabbi Tzadok and in the days of Abba Shaul the son of Botnit, that they plugged the window with a clay jug, and they tied a clay utensil with reed-grass to ascertain if the barrel had a width of a *tefach*.**<sup>4</sup> The Gemara will explain this.

**And from their words, we learned that they may plug** the window on Shabbat. **And** from the fact that they measured the barrel, we learned that **they may measure** on Shabbat, when the measuring is needed for the laws of impurity. **And** from the fact that they tied the clay utensil, we learn that **they may tie** on Shabbat with a temporary knot; i.e. such a knot is completely permitted.

## **GEMARA**

It was taught in the Mishnah: They may annul vows on Shabbat, and a sage may be asked to permit vows on Shabbat, concerning vows whose removal is necessary for Shabbat.

**They posed an inquiry:** For what law is the clause dealing with “vows which are necessary for Shabbat” needed? There are two ways of understanding it.

1) Perhaps we shall say **that annulment** of a vow is always permitted on Shabbat, **whether** it is **necessary** for Shabbat **and whether that** it is **not necessary** for Shabbat. This is because the Torah dictates that the father or the husband may only annul the vow on the day they hear of it. When they find out about the vow on Shabbat, they must annul

---

<sup>2</sup> Purifying pool

<sup>3</sup> 1 *Se'ah* = 2.2 gallons or 8.3 liters.

<sup>4</sup> 1 *tefach*: 3.1 in., 8 cm

## **PEREK 24 – 157A**

it that day (if they are displeased by the vow), for if they do not, they will no longer be able to.

**And** specifically regarding the case of **asking** the sage, there it was taught that if it is **necessary** for Shabbat, one **can** ask about it on Shabbat. But if it is **not necessary** for Shabbat, he **cannot** ask about it on Shabbat, but he waits until Sunday.

**And for this** reason the Tanna **separated them from each other** and did not teach the cases of “annulling” and “asking” together. And the Tanna mentioned the stipulation of “necessary for Shabbat” only regarding “asking”, but not regarding “annulling”.

2) **Or perhaps** we shall say that for **annulment also**, the stipulation applies. If it is **necessary** for Shabbat, one **may** annul. But if it is **not necessary** for Shabbat, he may **not**.

**And** that **which he** the Tanna **separated them**, annulment and asking, **from each other**, and did not teach them together, is for the following reason: **because for annulment he does not require a court**, i.e., a sage. Rather, the husband or father annul by themselves. It is different regarding **asking**, for this **requires a court**.

The Gemara resolves the inquiry: **Come and hear** a proof from a Baraita: **For Zuti of the yeshivah of Rav Pappa taught** in a Baraita: **They may annul vows on Shabbat that are necessary for Shabbat**. We see that even for annulment, the stipulation applies: vows **that are necessary for Shabbat**, they **may**, but vows **that are not necessary for Shabbat**, they may **not** annul.

\*

**Another version: They posed an inquiry:** The stipulation that it should be “**necessary for Shabbat**”, **was it taught about both of them**, annulment and asking? **And** therefore a vow **that is not necessary**, they do **not** ask or annul on Shabbat. For even annulment can be done after Shabbat.

## **PEREK 24 – 157A**

**Consequently**, the verse of “on the day he heard” (*Bamidbar*<sup>5</sup> 30:6) which is written **regarding annulment of vows**, which tells us that the annulment must be on the day that the father or husband heard of the vow, it does not mean only on that day. Rather, the annulment may be performed for twenty-four hours<sup>6</sup> after the vow.

**Or perhaps** we shall understand it differently: **when it was taught** in the Mishnah the stipulation that it should be **necessary** for Shabbat, **it was only taught regarding asking** the sage.

But regarding annulling vows, even if they are not necessary for Shabbat, the annulment is permitted. For after Shabbat he can no longer annul, as it is no longer “the day he heard.”

**Consequently**, “the day he heard,” written **by annulment of vows**, is only that **entire day**, until evening, and not more.

The Gemara resolves the inquiry: **Come and hear** a proof from a Baraita: **For Rav Zuti of the yeshiva of Rav Pappi taught** in a Baraita: **They may annul vows on Shabbat which are necessary for Shabbat**. We learn from this: **What are necessary for Shabbat**, he **may** annul. **What are not necessary for Shabbat**, he may **not** annul. **Consequently**, one can perform **annulment of vows** the entire twenty-four hours. Therefore, if it is not necessary for Shabbat, he waits until after Shabbat and then annuls.

\*

**Said Rav Ashi: And note** that **we taught** the opposite in a Mishnah:

For it was taught in a Mishnah: **Annulments of vows** are **the entire day** that he heard the vow. **And there is in this matter a leniency and stringency**, since sometimes he has a long time to annul and sometimes a short amount of time. **How so?** If the wife **vowed on Friday night** and the husband heard the vow, he **annuls on Friday night and** the entire **day of Shabbat until dark**, since the day follows the night.

---

<sup>5</sup> Numbers

## **PEREK 24 – 157A**

If **she vowed as it got dark** (immediately before the end of Shabbat), **he annuls before it gets dark, because if he does not annul by then, after it gets dark he cannot annul.** Even though only a short amount of time passed from the time of the vow, it is no longer called “on the day he heard,” since it is not dependent on twenty-four hours, rather on the day—not like we inferred from the Baraita of Rav Zuti, that annulment of vows is for twenty-four hours.

The Gemara answers: **It is disagreement of Tannaim.**

**For it was taught** in a Baraita: **Annulment of vows are the entire day.**

**Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah and Rabbi Eliezer the son of Rabbi Shimon said:** Annulment of vows is the entire **twenty-four hours.**

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **And they may ask about vows** which are necessary for Shabbat.

**They posed an inquiry:** That which they ask about these vows on Shabbat, is that specifically **when he had no time** to ask about them on Friday?

**Or perhaps, even if he had time** before Shabbat, he may ask on Shabbat since it is necessary for Shabbat.

The Gemara resolves this inquiry: **Come and hear** a proof from an incident that occurred: **that the Rabbis needed to deal with Rav Zutra the son of Rav Zira** who made a vow and needed to permit it because it was necessary on Shabbat. **And the Rabbis permitted for him his vow, and even though he had time** to ask about it before Shabbat.

\*\*\*

---

<sup>6</sup> Lit. From time to time, i.e., **from** a specific **time** on one day **to** the same **time** on the next day.



## **PEREK 24 – 157B**

It stated in the Mishnah: And an incident once occurred in the days of the father of Rabbi Tzadok and in the days of Abba Shaul ben Botnit, **that they plugged the window with a clay jug, and they tied the clay utensil with reed grass** to ascertain if the barrel is a *tefach* wide.

**Said Rabbi Yehudah in the name of Rav: There was a small path there, between two houses, and there was a corpse**, which is a source of **impurity**, on that path.

### **AMMUD BET**

**And a cracked barrel was placed on them**, i.e. the two houses. and the corpse was underneath the crack. However, it was not known whether the crack in the barrel was a *tefach* or not. And there was an open window in the wall of house facing the path.

The halachah is: if a corpse is underneath a roof, thus there is no way for the impurity to go up and out, the impurity spreads out to the houses sharing the roof, if there is a hole in the wall that joins the houses. (This is if the hole is at least the size of a fist). In our case, the barrel was over the corpse and was acting as a roof, preventing the impurity from going up and out. Therefore the impurity should enter the houses on the sides of the path, through the window in the wall, and render everything in the house impure.

**And** in order to prevent this, before the person died, **they plugged the window with a clay jug**, with the outside of jug facing the path. Since a clay utensil does not become impure via its outside, it acts as a barrier and prevents the impurity from entering.

After the person died, they wished to remove the jug from the window, but they were concerned that the impurity would enter the house. So they needed to measure the crack in the barrel to ascertain whether it was a *tefach*. For it was, the impurity would not spread to the sides, rather it would go up and out.

## **PEREK 24 – 157B**

Therefore, they took the clay utensil which was exactly one *tefach* by one *tefach*, **and they tied that clay utensil** to a long stick, **with reed grass**. They then raised the utensil to the crack to see if it would go in. That way it was possible **to ascertain if there is** in the crack **in the barrel** the measure of a *tefach*, and the impurity can exit through the crack and not enter the house, **or not**.

They tied it specifically with reed grass, since reed grass is usable for animal fodder. Thus it does not become nullified to the utensil and considered a permanent knot, since he will eventually remove it in order to feed his animal.

Alternatively, it is not a permanent knot because when it dries, it will disconnect by itself.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **And from their words we learned that they may plug, and they may measure and they may tie on Shabbat.**

**Ula happened to come to the house of the Exilarch on Shabbat. He saw Rabbah bar Rav Huna who was sitting in a tub of water and was measuring it**, i.e. the tub.

**He Ula said to him: When do the Rabbis say, “they may measure on Shabbat”?** They only said this regarding a **measurement of a mitzvah**, for example for the laws of impurity or for the validity of a *mikveh*. But this measuring **that is not** for a **mitzvah, who said** that it is permitted?

Rabbah bar Rav Huna **said to him: I do not need to measure this at all. I am merely busying myself** with an idle activity<sup>7</sup>, whereas the prohibition applies only to measuring that is necessary for some purpose.

---

<sup>7</sup> I.e. he had no need for the measuring of this particular barrel. But he measured it nevertheless, because he wished to develop expertise in knowing the exact volume of containers with rounded walls. For in the future, this would help him to determine whether a similarly shaped *mikveh* is valid. (*Ben Yehoyada*)

**PEREK 24 – 157B**

**Hadran Alach Mi Shehechshich**

**Uslika Lah Masechet Shabbat**

**We Will Return to You,**

**Perek Mi Shehechshich**

**And Tractate Shabbat is Completed**