

כל מְזוֹנוֹתָיו שֶׁל אָדָם קְצוּבִים לוֹ מֵרֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה וְעַד יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים, חוּץ מֵהוֹצָאת שַׁבָּתוֹת וְהוֹצָאת בְּנֵי לְתַלְמוּד תּוֹרָה. שָׂאֵם פָּתַח – פּוֹחֲתִין לוֹ, וְאִם הוֹסִיף – מוֹסִיפִין לוֹ.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָהוּ: מֵאֵי קָרָאָה – תִּקְעוּ בַּחֲדָשׁ שׁוֹפָר (בְּכֶסֶף) לְיוֹם חֲגֵגוֹ אִיזְהוּ חֵג שֶׁחֲדָשׁ מִתְכַּסֶּה בּוֹ – הוּא אֹמֵר זֶה רֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה, וְכַתִּיב (כִּי חֵק לְיִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא מִשְׁפָּט לֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב).

מֵאֵי מִשְׁמַע דְּהָאֵי "חֵק" לִישְׁנָא דְּמִזְוֵי הוּא – דְּכַתִּיב וְאָכְלוּ אֶת חֶקֶם אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָהֶם פֶּרֶעָה. מַר זוּטְרָא אָמַר מִהֶבְאָ: "הִטְרִיפְנִי לַחֵם חֶקִּי."

תֵּנְיָא, אָמְרוּ עֲלֵיו עַל שְׂמַאי הִזְקֵן כָּל יְמֵי הָיָה אוֹכֵל לְכַבּוֹד שַׁבָּת. מִצָּא בְּהֵמָה נָאָה אֹמֵר: זֶה לְשַׁבָּת. מִצָּא אַחֲרֵי נָאָה הַיְמִנָה – מִנִּיחַ אֶת הַשְּׂנֵיָה וְאוֹכֵל אֶת הָרֵאשׁוֹנָה.

אָבֵל הַלֵּל הִזְקֵן מִדָּה אַחֲרֵי הָיְתָה לוֹ, שְׁכָל מַעֲשָׂיו לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם. שְׂנַאֲמַר "בְּרוּךְ ה' יוֹם יוֹם". תֵּנְיָא נִמְי הָכִי: בֵּית שְׂמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מִחֲדָ שְׁבִיךְ לְשַׁבָּתִיךָ, וּבֵית הַלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: "בְּרוּךְ ה' יוֹם יוֹם."

אָמַר רַבִּי חֲמָא בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: הַנּוֹתֵן מִתְּנָה לְחֵבְרוֹ אִין צְרִיךְ לְהוֹדִיעוֹ, שְׂנַאֲמַר "וּמִשָּׁה לֹא יָדַע כִּי קָרַן עוֹר פָּנָיו."

A person's entire livelihood is allocated to him during the period from Rosh HaShana to Yom Kippur. During that time, as each individual is judged, it is decreed exactly how much money he will earn for all his expenditures of the coming year, **except for expenditures for Shabbatot,^N and expenditures for Festivals, and expenditures for the school fees of his sons' Torah study.** In these areas, no exact amount is determined at the beginning of the year; rather, **if he reduced the amount he spends for these purposes, his income is reduced** and he earns that much less money in that year, **and if he increased his expenditures in these areas, his income is increased** to ensure that he can cover the expense. Therefore, one may borrow for these purposes, since he is guaranteed to have enough income to cover whatever he spends for them.

Rabbi Abbahu said: What is the verse from which this dictum is derived? The source is: "Blow the *shofar* at the New Moon, at the concealed time for our Festival day" (Psalms 81:4). **On which Festival is the new moon concealed? You must say that it is Rosh HaShana,** which occurs on the first of the month, when the moon is not yet visible, while the moon is visible during the other Festivals, which occur in the middle of the month. **And it is written** in the next verse: "For it is a statute [*hok*] for Israel,^N a judgment of the God of Jacob" (Psalms 81:5).

The Gemara explains: From where may it be inferred that this word "statute [*hok*]" is a term relating to food? As it is written: "And they ate their allotment [*hukkam*], which Pharaoh gave them" (Genesis 47:22). Mar Zutra said: One can learn that *hok* is referring to food from here: "Feed me with my allotted [*hukki*] bread" (Proverbs 30:8).

It is taught in a *baraita*: They said about Shammai the Elder^p that all his days he would eat in honor of Shabbat. How so? If he found a choice animal, he would say: This is for Shabbat. If he subsequently found another one choicer than it, he would set aside the second for Shabbat and eat the first. He would eat the first to leave the better quality animal for Shabbat, which continually rendered his eating an act of honoring Shabbat.

However, Hillel the Elder had a different trait, that all his actions, including those on a weekday, were for the sake of Heaven, as it is stated: "Blessed be the Lord, day by day;ⁿ He bears our burden, our God who is our salvation; Selah" (Psalms 68:20), meaning that God gives a blessing for each and every day. That is also taught in a *baraita* in more general terms: Beit Shammai say: From the first day of the week, Sunday, start preparing already for your Shabbat. And Beit Hillel say: "Blessed be the Lord, day by day."

Ⓢ Apropos the statements about honoring Shabbat, the Gemara cites another statement on the same topic. Rabbi Hama, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: One who gives a gift to his friend need not inform him that he has given it to him, and he need not concern himself that the recipient might not realize who gave it to him. As it is stated: "And Moses did not know that the skin of his face was radiant" (Exodus 34:29); Moses received this gift unawares.

PERSONALITIES

Shammai the Elder – שְׂמַאי הִזְקֵן – Shammai, occasionally referred to as the Elder due to his esteemed position, was Hillel's partner in the Jewish leadership of his generation; he served as president of the court while Hillel, also called the Elder, was *Nasi* of the Sanhedrin. Hillel and Shammai, the last of the pairs of Sages, lived about one hundred years prior to the destruction of the Temple, at the beginning of Herod's reign.

Despite the fact that they founded two schools with opposing outlooks, Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai, which lasted for many years after their passing, they themselves disagreed about only three or

four issues. The difference between Hillel and Shammai themselves was mainly one of personality. Hillel related to himself and others in an easygoing manner, avoiding conflict whenever possible. Shammai, by contrast, took a more severe approach, attempting to scrutinize people's motivations and behavior. Nevertheless, it was the apparently strict Shammai who coined the phrase: Greet every person with a pleasant countenance (*Avot* 1:15).

Little is known about his personal life, but it appears that he was an architect or builder by trade, since he is portrayed on several occasions as standing with a builder's measuring rod in hand.

NOTES

Except for expenditures for *Shabbatot*, etc. – חוּץ מִהוֹצָאת שַׁבָּתוֹת וְכוּ': The Ritva notes that the same applies to all expenses related to mitzvot.

For it is a statute [*hok*] for Israel, etc. – כִּי חֵק – לְיִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא: Some explain *hok* literally as a statute, an unfathomable decree, since one's fortune and financial success do not depend on his merit; however, expenditures for mitzvot are like "a judgment of the God of Jacob," a logically understandable decision. This is because the allotment of money for mitzvot is granted to each person according to the amount that he spends on them (*Hatam Sofer*).

Blessed be the Lord day by day – בְּרוּךְ ה' יוֹם יוֹם: Rashi and many other commentators explain that Hillel trusted that God would provide food and other items for Shabbat when the time came, and therefore he did not concern himself about this during the week. Others explain that all of Hillel's actions, all through the week and with regard to all matters, were always undertaken in honor of Shabbat, so that he did not need to announce this explicitly (Rav Yitzhak Abuhav). The *Hatam Sofer* and many others hold that Hillel's philosophy was that the actions of one's entire life, not only those explicitly related to mitzvot, should be performed for the sake of Heaven; therefore, even on weekdays, he considered every activity as if it were for the sake of a mitzva.

Many early and later authorities write that it is most appropriate to act in accordance with Shammai's outlook. The Sages also praised this type of practice in several places, and many view it as an appropriate expression of deference to Shabbat (see Rashi and Ramban on Exodus 20:8). Hillel's custom, however, is viewed as suitable only for people of exceptional faith, whose trust in God is strong and whose actions are always undertaken solely for the sake of Heaven (see *Bigdei Yom Tov* and others).

NOTES

A good gift – מתנה טובה – There are those who explain that Shabbat is unique among the mitzvot in that its observance also includes physical pleasures. Shabbat is thereby not merely a mitzva that sanctifies the Jewish people, but also a valuable gift in all aspects, including material ones (*Simhat Yom Tov*).

Its reward is not likely to be revealed – מתן שכרה לא עבידא לאגלווי – The *Meiri* suggests a mystical interpretation: The reward for observing Shabbat consists of insights into the creation of the world, which is the inner essence of the mitzva of Shabbat. He adds that since the creation of the world is not something that can be proven by logic alone, the Gemara states that Shabbat was not given publicly but as a gift to the Jewish people alone.

The gentiles should not be punished for it – ללא לענשו גוים עלה – Early and later authorities discuss the meaning of this statement at great length. The Maharshah explains that gentiles can claim they did not accept the Torah because they were not informed that it includes a day of rest. The Maharsha suggests a different idea: The *halakha* is that it is prohibited for a gentile to observe Shabbat, as it was given to the Jewish people alone. If, however, Shabbat was not publicly revealed, why should it be considered a transgression for a gentile to observe it? Some explain that gentiles should not be punished for forcing Jews to work on Shabbat, as they can claim that the sacred day was not revealed to them (*Bigdei Yom Tov*).

Additional soul – נשמה יתירה – Rabbeinu Hananel writes: All were created in the world in order for their souls to enjoy the seventh day, as they are enhanced and augmented on Shabbat. Some write that the additional soul refers to the gift of an additional capacity for Torah study (*Shitta Mekubbetzet*). The *Meiri* maintains that the higher part of the soul, which deals with lofty matters, remains concealed throughout the week. On Shabbat, however, this aspect of the soul is able to shine through, and it is this additional soul that differentiates humans from other creatures.

LANGUAGE

Public [parhesya] – פרהסיא – From the Greek *παρρησία*, *parresia*, which means freedom of speech or a liberal regime. The Sages use it to describe an act performed in public, revealed to everyone.

מיתבי: "לדעת כי אני ה' מקדשכם", אמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא למשה: משה, מתנה טובה יש לי בבית גני ושבת שמה, ואני מבקש ליתנה לישראל, לך והודיע אותם. מכאן אמר רבן שמעון בן גמליאל: הנותן פת לתינוק צריך להודיע לאמו!

לא קשיא; הא במתנה דעבידא לאגלווי, הא במתנה דלא עבידא לאגלווי. שבת נמי מתנה דעבידא לאגלווי; מתן שכרה לא עבידא לאגלווי.

אמר רב, מכאן אמר רבן שמעון בן גמליאל: הנותן פת לתינוק צריך להודיע לאמו. מאי עביד ליה? שייף ליה משחא, ומלי ליה בוחלא. והאידנא דחיישינן לכשפים מאי? אמר רב פפא: שייף ליה מאותו המין.

אמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי שמעון בן יוחאי: כל מצות שנתן להם הקדוש ברוך הוא לישראל נתן להם בפרהסיא, חוץ משבת שנתן להם בצנעא, שנאמר "ביני וביני בני ישראל אות היא לעולם".

אי הכי לא לענשו גוים עלה?! שבת אודעי אודעינהו, מתן שכרה לא אודעינהו. ואי בעית אימא: מתן שכרה נמי אודעינהו, נשמה יתירה לא אודעינהו.

דאמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: נשמה יתירה נותן הקדוש ברוך הוא באדם ערב שבת, ולמוצאי שבת נוטלין אותה הימנו, שנאמר "שבת וינפש" כיון ששבת ווי אבדה נפש.

"עושה אדם תבשיל מערב יום טוב". אמר אביי: לא שנו אלא תבשיל, אבל פת לא.

The Gemara raises an objection to this. Isn't it written: "Nevertheless, you must keep My *Shabbatot*, for this is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations, that you may know that I am the Lord Who sanctifies you" (Exodus 31:13), which the Sages expounded as follows: **The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Moses: Moses, I have a good giftⁿ in My treasury, and its name is Shabbat, and I wish to give it to the Jewish people. Go and inform them of this intention of Mine. And from here Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: One who gives a gift of a piece of bread to a child must inform his mother** of his actions, so that the child's parents will be aware of the giver's fond feelings for them, thereby enhancing friendly relations and companionship among Jews. This appears to be in direct contradiction to Rabbi Hama's statement.

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**; this case, where one need not inform the recipient, is referring to a gift that is likely to be revealed, such as Moses' shining face, which everyone would point out to him; that case, where one must inform the recipient, is referring to a gift that is not likely to be revealed in the natural course of events. The Gemara challenges: Isn't Shabbat also a gift that is likely to be revealed, as the Jews would eventually be instructed with regard to the time and nature of Shabbat? The Gemara answers: Nevertheless, its reward is not likely to be revealed.ⁿ Therefore, God told Moses to inform the Jews of the gift of Shabbat and its reward.

The Master said earlier that from here Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: **One who gives a piece of bread to a child must inform his mother.** The Gemara asks: **What does he do to him**; how does he inform the child's mother? **He rubs oil on him and paints his eyes blue**, so that when the child arrives home his mother will ask him who did this to him and he will reply that it was a person who also gave him a piece of bread. The Gemara comments: **And nowadays, when we are concerned about witchcraft**, i.e., that painting the child's eyes might have been performed as an act of sorcery, **what should one do?** **Rav Pappa said: He rubs on the child a little of that same type** of food that he put on the bread, such as butter or cheese, and this will cause the child's mother to notice that he received a present.

The Gemara cites a further statement with regard to the gift of Shabbat to the Jewish people. **Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: All the mitzvot that the Holy One, Blessed be He, gave to the Jewish people, He gave to them in public [parhesya]^l except for Shabbat, which he gave to them in private. As it is stated: "It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel forever"** (Exodus 31:17), meaning that in a sense, it is a secret between God and the Jewish people.

The Gemara challenges: **If it is so** that it was given in secret so that not everyone knew about it, **the gentiles should not be punished** for not wanting to accept it;ⁿ they are liable to receive punishment for refusing to accept the other mitzvot of the Torah. The Gemara answers: The Holy One, Blessed be He, **did inform them** of the concept of Shabbat, but He **did not inform them** of the reward for the fulfillment of the mitzva. **And if you wish, say instead that He also informed** the gentiles of its reward, but about the idea of the **additional soulⁿ** given to each person on Shabbat **He did not inform them.**

As Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: **The Holy One, Blessed be He, gives a person an additional soul on Shabbat eve, and at the conclusion of Shabbat removes it from him, as it is stated: "He ceased from work and was refreshed [vayinafash]"** (Exodus 31:17). Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish expounds the verse as follows: **Since he ceased from work**, and now Shabbat has concluded and his additional soul is removed from him, **woe [vai] for the additional soul [nefesh] that is lost.**

It was taught in the mishna that a **person may prepare a cooked dish on a Festival eve** and rely on it for Shabbat for the joining of cooked foods. **Abaye said: They taught** that the joining of cooked foods allows one to cook on a Festival for Shabbat **only** when it is made from a **cooked dish**; however, if it is composed of **bread alone, no**, this is not sufficient.

With bread – בְּנֶחְמָא: One may not establish a joining of cooked foods with bread alone. Furthermore, the dish used for this purpose must be something that accompanies bread, which excludes porridge and legumes, in accordance with the second version of Abaye's statement (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 527:4*).

Lentils that remain at the bottom of a pot – עֲדָשִׁים שְׁבִשְׁוֹלֵי קִדְרָה: One may rely on lentils at the bottom of a pot, or on the fat scraped off a knife, to establish an *eiruv*, provided they comprise an olive-bulk in total and customarily accompany bread. However, it is permitted to rely on these foods only after the fact (*Magen Avraham; Taz*), in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Hiyya and Rav Yitzhak, son of Rav Yehuda (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 527:6*).

Small salted fish – דָּגִים קֻטְנִים מְלוּחִים: Small salted fish are considered partially cooked and may be used as a dish for a joining of cooked foods, even if they were salted by a gentile (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 527:5*).

Fish with regard to cooked food of gentiles – דָּגִים לְעֵינֵן: If a gentile salted small fish, even if he later roasted them, they are not considered the cooked food of gentiles. However, if he fried them with flour, they are prohibited (*Shulḥan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 113:12*).

NOTES

One may rely on them for the joining of cooked foods – סוּמְךָ עֲלֵיהֶן מְשׁוּם עֲרוּבֵי תַבְשִׁילִין: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is likewise stated that one may rely upon lentils left in the bottom of a pot for this purpose. The *Meiri* explains that it was customary to eat lentils on Shabbat eve so as to leave room for the many delicacies prepared for Shabbat. The phrase: Rely on them, seems to indicate that it is permitted to act in this manner only after the fact. The early authorities discuss this issue at length, as it is not in keeping with the dignity of the mitzva to prepare an *eiruv* with leftovers alone (*Maḥatzit HaShekel*).

Small salted fish – דָּגִים קֻטְנִים מְלוּחִים: Rabbeinu Ḥananel explains that this is because these fish are not considered noteworthy food that would be served to a king, and the *halakha* is that such foods are not included in the decree prohibiting food cooked by gentiles. The early and later authorities (see Rif and others) discuss this issue at length (see *Sefat Emet*).

And even if a gentile roasted them – וְאִם צִלְאָן גּוֹי: This teaches us that while the preparation of this fish is wholly insignificant with regard to the *halakhot* governing the cooked food of gentiles, the fish is nevertheless considered cooked for the purpose of the joining of cooked foods (Ran; Rav Yitzhak Abuhav).

LANGUAGE

Fish fried with oil and flour [*kasa deharsena*] – כֶּסָּא דְהַרְסָנָא: *Kasa deharsena* was a popular dish in Babylonia prepared by frying small fish in flour and a little oil. The primary meaning of the phrase is: A fish dish. *Kasa* here means food, and is possibly related to the verb *kasas*, meaning chew or gnaw, or to the Aramaic term *kasna*, fodder. Some explain that *harsena* derives from the Greek ἀχάρνος, *akharnos*, a type of fish.

מאי שנא פת דלא? אילימא מידי דמלפת בעינן, ופת לא מלפתא – והא דייסא נמי, דלא מלפתא. דאמר רבי זורא: הני בבליאי טפשיאי דאכלי נהמא בנהמא. ואמר רב נחומי בר זכריה משמיה דאבוי: מערבין בדייסא אלא, מידי דלא שכיח בעינן, ופת שכיחא ודייסא לא שכיחא.

איכא דאמרי, אמר אבוי: לא שנו אלא תבשיל, אבל פת – לא. מאי טעמא? אילימא דמידי דלא שכיח בעינן ופת שכיחא, והא דייסא לא שכיחא. ואמר רב נחומי בר זכריה משמיה דאבוי: אין מערבין בדייסא אלא, מידי דמלפת בעינן, ופת לא מלפתא. ודייסא נמי לא מלפתא. דאמר רבי זורא: הני בבליאי טפשיאי דאכלי נהמא בנהמא.

תני רבי חייא: עדשים שבשולי קדרה סומך עליהן משום ערובי תבשילין. והני מילי דאית בהו כזית. אמר רב יצחק בריה דרב יהודה: שמנניית שעל גבי הספין גוררו וסומך עליו משום ערובי תבשילין. והני מילי – דאית בהו כזית.

אמר רב אסי אמר רב: דגים קטנים מלוחים אין בהם משום בשולי גוים. אמר רב יוסף: ואם צלאן גוי – סומך עליהם משום ערובי תבשילין, ואי עבד נהו גוי כסא דהרסנא אסור.

פשיטא! מהו דתימא:

The Gemara asks: **What is different about bread that makes it not fit for this purpose? If we say that we require something that accompanies bread, and bread does not accompany itself**, the following difficulty arises: **Porridge also does not accompany bread**, as Rabbi Zeira^p said: **Those foolish Babylonians eat bread with bread**, referring to their custom of eating bread with porridge. This shows that porridge is no better accompaniment to bread than bread itself, and yet Rav Neḥumi bar Zekharya said in the name of Abaye: **One may establish an *eiruv* with porridge. Rather, one must say as follows: We require something that is not routine**, so that it will be clear that one is setting it aside for the purpose of an *eiruv*, and bread is routine, whereas porridge is not routine.

Some say a different version of this discussion: **Abaye said: They taught that a joining of cooked foods allows one to cook on a Festival for Shabbat only when it is made from a cooked dish; however, if it is composed of bread, no, that is not sufficient.** The Gemara asks: **What is the reason for this? If we say that we require something that is not routine, and bread is routine**, the following difficulty arises: **Isn't porridge not particularly routine? And yet Rav Neḥumi bar Zekharya said in the name of Abaye: One may not establish an *eiruv* with porridge. Rather, one should say as follows: We require something that accompanies bread, and bread does not accompany itself, and porridge, too, does not accompany bread**, as Rabbi Zeira said: **Those foolish Babylonians eat bread with bread**, from which it is clear that like bread, porridge does not accompany bread and consequently cannot constitute an *eiruv*.^h

Rabbi Hiyya taught: With regard to lentils that remain at the bottom of a pot^h on the eve of a Festival, one may rely on them for the joining of cooked foods.ⁿ Although they were not prepared with this purpose in mind, they are nevertheless considered a cooked dish. **And this applies only if there is an olive-bulk of lentils in total.** Similarly, Rav Yitzhak, son of Rav Yehuda, said: With regard to fat of meat and the like that is on a knife, one may scrape it off the knife and rely on it for the joining of cooked foods; and this applies only if there is an olive-bulk of fat in total.

Rav Asi said that Rav said: **Small salted fish^{nh} that a gentile then cooked are not considered the cooked food of gentiles^h because cooking does not prepare them to be food any more than they already were, as they can be eaten in their salted state.** Rav Yosef said: **And even if a gentile roasted them,ⁿ a Jew may rely on them for the joining of cooked foods**, as they are not considered the cooked food of a gentile and are indeed already edible. However, **if the gentile made them into fish fried with oil and flour [*kasa deharsena*],^l it is prohibited to eat them.** In this case they are considered the cooked food of a gentile, since his actions have made them into noteworthy food.

The Gemara challenges: **It is obvious that this is the case; it need not be taught.** The Gemara answers: **The justification for teaching it is lest you say that**

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Zeira – רְבִי זְוֵרָא: Born in Babylonia, Rabbi Zeira, known in the Jerusalem Talmud as Rabbi Ze'aira, became one of the great third-generation *amora'im* of Eretz Yisrael. His father was a tax collector for the Persian government and was praised as one of the few who filled that position properly. When Rabbi Zeira ascended to Eretz Yisrael, he decided to identify completely with the Torah teachings of Eretz Yisrael. The Gemara relates that he fasted one hundred fasts in order to forget the traditions that he had received in Babylonia.

Rabbi Zeira was famous for his sharp intellect and incisive analysis of *halakhot*. He was also known as an extremely God-fearing man, and there are several stories that illustrate his distinction in that area. He did not even want to be ordained with the title Rabbi, due to his modesty. It was only after he was told that atonement for his sins comes with that ordination that he relented.

The Gemara relates that he fasted one hundred additional fasts so that the fire of Gehenna would not harm him, and he would test himself by entering a fiery furnace. On one occasion, his legs were scorched, and from then on he was called: The little man with the scorched legs. He was a contemporary of Rav Hisda, Rav Sheshet, and Rabba in Babylonia. In Eretz Yisrael he was counted among the disciples of Rabbi Yohanan and engaged in extensive halakhic discourse with them. Apparently, he was a flax merchant in Eretz Yisrael, and it is possible that he had occasion in the course of his business to return to Babylonia several times.

The text of the beginning of Rabbi Zeira's eulogy is preserved in the Talmud: The land of Shinar, Babylonia, conceived and gave birth; the land of splendor, Eretz Yisrael, raised her plaything. Woe unto her, said Rakkath, Tiberias, for she has lost her beloved vessel.

Rabbi Zeira had a son, Rabbi Ahava, who was a Sage in the following generation.

LANGUAGE

Spanish soft sea fish [*koleyas ha'ispenin*] – קוליים האספנין: This word derives from the Greek *κολίας*, *kolias*, meaning mackerel. Similarly, *ispenin* comes from the Greek *Ἰσπανία*, *hispania*, meaning Spain. *Koleyas ha'ispenin* therefore means: The Spanish *koleyas* fish.

BACKGROUND

Spanish soft sea fish [*koleyas ha'ispenin*] – קוליים האספנין: *Koleyas ha'ispenin* probably refers to the common mackerel, which can be found in many seas, although not in Eretz Yisrael. With its soft, thin skin, this fish may be eaten uncooked, either smoked or salted. The *ge'onim* identify this fish with the Hebrew *shavut*, also known as cod.



Common mackerel



Atlantic cod

NOTES

It does not have a maximum measure – אין לו שיעור למעלה – Later authorities discuss the meaning of this concept in this context. Some explain that it means there is no upper limit to the number of people who may rely on a single *eiruv* (*Penei Yehoshua*; *Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*). Others explain that there is no limit to the amount of food that may be prepared for Shabbat by relying on this *eiruv* (*Sefat Emet*).

The knowledge of the one for whom the *eiruv* is prepared – דעת מי שהניחו לו: Rav Aha inquired: Since there is a principle that one may perform an act to another's advantage without that person's knowledge and an *eiruv* is to the advantage of the one for whom it is set aside, why should his knowledge be necessary? One answer is that since each person is allocated less than an olive-bulk of the food in the *eiruv*, it cannot be considered an actual advantage (*Shitta Mekubbetzet*).

הַרְסָנָא עִקְרָא, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לָן: קְמָחָא עִקְרָא.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא: עֲרוּבֵי תַבְשִׁילִין צְרִיכִין בְּזוּתָא. אִיבַעְיָא לְהוּ: בְּזוּת אֶחָד לְכָלָא, אִו דְּלִמָּא בְּזוּת לְכָל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד? תָּא שְׁמַע: דְּאָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא אָמַר רַב: עֲרוּבֵי תַבְשִׁילִין צְרִיכִין בְּזוּתָא, בֵּין לְאֶחָד בֵּין לְמֵאָה.

תָּנַן: אֶכְלוּ אוּ שְׂאֵבַד – לֹא יִבְשַׁל עָלָיו בְּתַחֲלָה, שְׂיִיר מְמַנּוּ כָּל שְׂהוּא – סוּמְךָ עָלָיו לְשִׁבְתָּ. מָאי "כָּל שְׂהוּא"? לֹא אִף עַל גַּב דְּלִיכָא בְּזוּתָא! לֹא, דְּבָאִית בֵּיהּ בְּזוּתָא.

תָּא שְׁמַע: תַּבְשִׁיל – זֶה צְלִי, וְאֶמִּילוּ כְּבוֹשׁ, שְׁלוּק, וּמְבוּשָׁל, וְקוֹלִיִּים הָאֶסְפָּנִין שְׁנַתְּנָן עָלָיו חֲמִין מְעַרְבֵי יוֹם טוֹב, תַּחֲלָתוֹ וְסוּפּוֹ אִין לוֹ שְׂיַעוּר. מָאי לֹא אִין לוֹ שְׂיַעוּר כְּלָל? לֹא, אִין לוֹ שְׂיַעוּר לְמַעְלָה, אֲבָל יֵשׁ לוֹ שְׂיַעוּר לְמַטָּה.

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא אָמַר רַב: עֲרוּבֵי תַבְשִׁילִין צְרִיכִין דְּעַת. פְּשִׁיטָא, דְּעַת מְנִיחַ בְּעֵינָא, דְּעַת מִי שְׂהֵנְחוּ לוֹ בְּעֵינָא אוּ לֹא בְּעֵינָא?

the fish fat, which one is permitted to eat even if cooked by gentiles, is the essential element. Therefore, he teaches us that the flour is the essential element, and the gentile has created a new and significant dish, which is consequently prohibited.

Rabbi Abba said: A joining of cooked foods requires an olive-bulk of food. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Is it enough to have one olive-bulk for all of the household members who are relying on this *eiruv*, or perhaps must there be a separate olive-bulk for each and every one in the household? Come and hear that which Rabbi Abba said that Rav said: A joining of cooked foods requires an olive-bulk, whether it is cooked for a single person or for one hundred people.^h

The Gemara comments: We learned in the mishna: If one ate the joining of cooked foods that he prepared, or if it was lost, he may not rely on it and cook with the initial intent to cook for Shabbat; but if he left any part of the *eiruv*, he may rely on it to cook for Shabbat. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of: Any part of it? Doesn't it mean that it is valid although there is not an olive-bulk? The Gemara answers: No, the phrase: Any part of it, means that there is at least an olive-bulk left.

The Gemara attempts to bring another proof. Come and hear: The cooked dish that is required for a joining of cooked foods may be roasted, or even pickled, or well-boiled, or boiled in the regular manner, or may even be Spanish soft sea fish [*koleyas ha'ispenin*]^{lB} upon which one poured hot water on the eve of the Festival, rendering it cooked.^h With regard to its beginning and end, meaning its required size *ab initio* and after it has been reduced by being partially lost or partially eaten, the *eiruv* has no required measure. What, is it not that it has no required measure at all, not even a minimum one? The Gemara rejects this: No, it means it does not have a maximum measure,^N but it does have a minimum measure, namely an olive-bulk.

Rav Huna said that Rav said: A joining of cooked foods requires knowledge,^h meaning that one must be aware of the *eiruv* for it to be effective. The Gemara comments: It is obvious that we require the knowledge of the one who prepares the *eiruv*; the question is: Do we also require the knowledge of the one for whom the *eiruv* is prepared,^N or do we not require it?

HALAKHA

The amount of food required for a joining of cooked foods – שְׂיַעוּר תַּבְשִׁיל לְעִירוּב תַּבְשִׁילִין: The cooked dish of a joining of cooked foods must be at least an olive-bulk in volume, and this amount suffices for many people. One should use a whole loaf of bread and a significant portion of fish or meat *ab initio*, so as to glorify the mitzva. If there is a concern that the food might spoil, he may use a cooked egg (*Magen Avraham*, citing the *Shenei Luhot HaBerit*; *Be'er Heitev*; *Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 527:3*).

What is considered a cooked dish – אִיזְדוּ תַבְשִׁיל: The cooked dish used for a joining of cooked foods need not be actually cooked, but may also be roasted, well boiled, or smoked. Fish that are eaten after being rinsed with hot water are considered cooked. Similarly, one may rely upon cooked fruit (*Rema*). The food may even be pickled or salted, provided

that this process makes the food edible (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 527:5*).

A joining of cooked foods requires knowledge – עֲרוּבֵי תַבְשִׁילִין צְרִיכִין דְּעַת: One who sets aside a joining of cooked foods for another person must be aware at the time that he is doing so, but the other person need only be informed of the *eiruv* at some point before he starts to cook for Shabbat on the Festival. Some say that since everyone nowadays recites the fixed formula: Through this *eiruv* it shall be permissible for us to bake, cook... for us and for all the Jews who dwell in this city, it is not even necessary to inform a person for whom the *eiruv* is set aside (*Taz*). Others maintain that another person must acquire it on his behalf (*Shakh*), and this is indeed the custom in certain places, where the *eiruv* is set aside and acquired by another person, who acquires it for anyone who wishes to rely on it (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 527:9*).

Neharde'a – נְהַרְדְּעָא: Neharde'a was a city on the Euphrates and was one of the oldest Jewish communities in Babylonia. According to tradition, Jews lived in Neharde'a as early as the First Temple period in the sixth century BCE, beginning with the exile of King Jehoiachin of Judea. Neharde'a was one of the most important Jewish communities in Babylonia. It was a center of Torah learning from an early period and its yeshiva was the oldest in Babylonia. Many of the greatest *tanna'im* visited Neharde'a, among them Rabbi Akiva, who intercalated the calendar there (*Yevamot* 122b). In Rav's time, the first half of the third century CE, the yeshiva of Neharde'a was headed by Rav Sheila, and after him by Shmuel. Since the city lay near the border between the Roman and the Persian Empires, it frequently suffered from the wars between the two, and Pappa ben Nazer Odonathus, king of Tadmor, destroyed it completely in 259 CE. Later, however, Jews resettled there, and many Torah scholars remained in Neharde'a even after its yeshiva relocated to Mehoza and Pumbedita.

Tiberias – טִבְרְיָא: Tiberias is a town on the shore of the Sea of Galilee founded by Herod Antipas, c. 18 CE. It was apparently founded on the site of earlier settlements, and according to some opinions in the Talmud (*Megilla* 6a) this was the site of the biblical city of Rakkath.

Originally, Tiberias was a town of mixed Jewish and gentile population. The Jewish population was not distinguished for its Torah scholarship. However, after the destruction of the Temple, important Torah scholars, including ben Azzai and Rabbi Meir, lived there. Its golden age came when the Sanhedrin moved there, c. 235 CE, and it became the seat of the Great Council, presided over by Rabbi Yehuda Nesia I. Rabbi Yoḥanan succeeded him as the leading spiritual figure in Tiberias and headed the yeshiva there. Tiberias then became the Torah center of Eretz Yisrael. Most of the disciples of Rabbi Yoḥanan, particularly those who emigrated from Babylonia, lived and studied there, including Reish Lakish, Rabbi Elazar ben Pedat, Rabbi Ami, Rabbi Yirmeya, and Rabbi Yona. Apparently, most of the Jerusalem Talmud was redacted there.

Even after the amoraic period, Tiberias remained a significant creative religious center, and many of the works of aggadic midrash were composed there, as were numerous liturgical poems. During the post-amoraic era, the inhabitants of Tiberias were renowned as experts in Hebrew grammar. Indeed, the system of Hebrew vocalization used today is called Tiberian vocalization because it was formulated and established there.

HALAKHA

Joining of Shabbat boundaries and of courtyards on a Festival – עִירוּבֵי תְּחוּמִים וְחֻצוֹת בְּיוֹם טוֹב: One may not prepare a joining of courtyards or a joining of Shabbat boundaries on a Festival that occurs on a Friday, in accordance with the opinion of Rav, as the *halakha* is ruled in accordance with his opinion in his disputes with Shmuel with regard to prohibitions. When, however, the second day of a Festival observed in the Diaspora occurs on a Friday, it is permitted to join courtyards conditionally but not to join Shabbat boundaries, in accordance with the opinion of Rava (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 528:2).

תָּא שְׁמַע: דְּאָבוּה דְּשְׂמוּאֵל מְעָרַב אַבּוּלָה נְהַרְדְּעָא, רַבִּי אָמִי וְרַבִּי אֲסִי מְעָרְבוּ אַבּוּלָהוּ טְבְרְיָא. מְכַרְזוּ רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב בַּר אִידִי: מִי שְׂלָא הֵנִיחַ עֲרוּבֵי תְּבִשְׁלִין – יָבֵא וְיִסְמֹךְ עַל שְׂלִי. וְעַד כְּמָה? אָמַר רַב נְחוּמִי בַּר זְכַרְיָה מְשַׁמֵּיָה דְּאָבֵי: עַד תְּחוּם שַׁבָּת.

הָהוּא סְמִיָּא דְּהוּה מְסַדֵּר מִתְּנִיתָא קַמֵּיהּ דְּמַר שְׂמוּאֵל, חֲזוּיָה דְּהוּה עֲצִיב: אָמַר לֵיהּ: אַמְאֵי עֲצִיבְתָּ? אָמַר לֵיהּ: דְּלֹא אוֹתִיבֵי עֲרוּבֵי תְּבִשְׁלִין. אָמַר לֵיהּ: סְמוּךְ אֲדִידִי לְשַׁנְה חֲזוּיָה דְּהוּה עֲצִיב, אָמַר לֵיהּ: אַמְאֵי עֲצִיבְתָּ? אָמַר לֵיהּ: דְּלֹא אוֹתִיבֵי עֲרוּבֵי תְּבִשְׁלִין. אָמַר לֵיהּ: פּוֹשְׁעַ אַתָּ, לְכוּלִי עֲלֵמָא – שְׂרִי לְדִידִךְ – אָסוּר.

תַּנּוּ רַבְנֵי: יוֹם טוֹב שְׂחָל לְהֵיטֵב בְּעָרַב שַׁבָּת – אִין מְעָרְבִין לֹא עֲרוּבֵי תְּחוּמִין, וְלֹא עֲרוּבֵי חֻצוֹת.

רַבִּי אוֹמַר: מְעָרְבִין עֲרוּבֵי חֻצוֹת, אָבָל לֹא עֲרוּבֵי תְּחוּמִין. מִפְּנֵי שְׂאֵתָה אוֹסְרוּ בְּדָבָר הָאֶסוּר לוֹ, וְאֵי אַתָּה אוֹסְרוּ בְּדָבָר הַמּוֹתֵר לוֹ.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear a proof from the following testimonies: Shmuel's father^N would prepare an *eiruv* for the entire city of Neharde'a,^B and Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi would prepare an *eiruv* for the entire city of Tiberias.^B Similarly, Rabbi Ya'akov bar Idi would announce: Anyone who did not prepare a joining of cooked foods for himself should come and rely on mine.** The Gemara asks: **And up to how much may one rely on it, i.e., how far may one be from such an *eiruv* and still rely upon it? Rav Neḥumi bar Zekharya said in the name of Abaye: One may be as far away as the Shabbat limit.^N**

The Gemara relates: With regard to **the blind person who would present *mishnayot* before Mar Shmuel, the latter observed that he was sad. Mar Shmuel said to him: Why are you sad? He said to him: Because I did not prepare a joining of cooked foods before the Festival. Mar Shmuel said to him: Then rely on mine. In the following year, he once again observed that he was sad. He said to him: Why are you sad? He said to him: Because I did not prepare a joining of cooked foods. Mar Shmuel said to him: If so, you are consistently negligent^N in this regard. Therefore, for the entire world, i.e., anyone else but you, it is permitted to rely on my *eiruv* if they forgot to prepare one, but for you it is prohibited to do so, as I did not intend to include such negligent people as yourself in my *eiruv*.**

The Sages taught: If a Festival occurs on Shabbat eve, one may not prepare an *eiruv* on that day, neither a joining of Shabbat boundaries [*eiruv tehumin*] nor a joining of courtyards [*eiruv hatzerot*], for Shabbat. If one did not prepare these before the Festival, he may not do so on the Festival itself.^N

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: On a Festival that occurs on a Friday, one may prepare an *eiruv* for a joining of courtyards, but not for a joining of Shabbat boundaries. His reasoning is as follows: There is a distinction between the two types of *eiruv* because you may prohibit him from a matter that is prohibited to him, e.g., venturing beyond the Shabbat limit, which is prohibited on a Festival as well as Shabbat, but you may not prohibit him from a matter that is permitted to him, e.g., carrying from one domain to another, which is permitted on a Festival. Therefore, on a Festival, one may not prepare a joining of Shabbat boundaries in order to render it permitted to venture beyond the boundary on the Shabbat following the Festival. However, one may prepare a joining of courtyards on the Festival in order to render it permitted to carry from one domain to another on the Shabbat following the Festival.^H

NOTES

Shmuel's father, etc. – אָבוּה דְּשְׂמוּאֵל וכו': Some early authorities explain that the proof stems from Rabbi Ya'akov bar Idi's actions; the fact that he found it necessary to make an announcement shows that the beneficiaries must be informed (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). Others suggest that since Shmuel's father, Rabbi Ami, and Rabbi Asi could not have informed all the inhabitants of the locale on the eve of the Festival, they must have made an announcement in the synagogue on the Festival itself (Rid), as all agree that people must be aware of the *eiruv* before they begin preparing food for Shabbat on the Festival (*Meiri*).

As far away as the Shabbat limit – עַד תְּחוּם שַׁבָּת: Some early authorities infer from this that one who arrived in a town from outside the Shabbat limit by means of a joining of boundaries [*eiruv tehumin*] may not rely on the joining of cooked foods for the town, as the one preparing it did not have him in mind (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

You are consistently negligent – פּוֹשְׁעַ אַתָּ: Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi explains the incident as follows: The blind person came from outside the Shabbat limit and was therefore not included in Shmuel's *eiruv*, as when Shmuel prepared the joining of cooked foods he had in mind only the people in his locale, but Shmuel invited the man to dine with him. However, most early authorities reject this explanation.

The Ran and the *Meiri* state that the fact that the blind man was upset over his failure to prepare an *eiruv* shows that he did not intend to be included in Shmuel's *eiruv*. Since it is impossible for one to act in another person's interest if that person does not want him to, the *eiruv* was ineffective for the blind man the following year. Others maintain, similar to the Ran, that since the blind man was unwilling to rely on the Sages' ruling that one may be included in the *eiruv* of another, Shmuel told him that he did not intend to include people such as him in his *eiruv*; alternatively, Shmuel could have said that as he knew that the blind man was negligent and remiss in his observance of mitzvot, he did not intend to include him (*Rishon LeTziyyon*). Yet others explain that the repeat occurrence of his failure to prepare an *eiruv* is proof of his careless and negligent attitude (Maharam Schiff; *HaBoneh*).

The prohibition against preparing a joining of courtyards – אִיסוּר עִירוּב חֻצוֹת: Some hold that this prohibition is due to the fact that preparing such an *eiruv* is a kind of preparation from the Festival to Shabbat (*Tosafot* on tractate *Eiruvin*). Rashi explains that it is prohibited because it appears similar to repairing, which is a prohibited labor on a Festival. Others say that a joining of courtyards is a type of transfer of ownership, which may not be performed on a Festival (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

NOTES

Not as you teach it – לֹא כְּשִׂאתֶם שׁוֹנִין: In the Jerusalem Talmud a slight variation of this exchange is recorded: Rabbi Elazar was unsure of the version here and ruled that one should therefore be stringent due to uncertainty. Another view is also cited there to the effect that a joining of cooked foods may also be used for the purpose of establishing a joining of courtyards.

PERSONALITIES

Rav Tahlifa bar Avdimi – רַב תַּחְלִיפָא בַר אַבְדִּימִי: Rav Tahlifa bar Avdimi, or bar Avimi according to some versions, was a second-generation Babylonian amora. Nothing is known about his personality, but since all of his statements are cited in the name of Shmuel, it is clear that he was a significant disciple of the latter. It is therefore no surprise that he followed his teacher's halakhic rulings in practice as well.

אֶתְמַר, רַב אָמַר: הֲלֵכָה כְּתַנָּא קָמָא, וְשִׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי.

אֵיבַעֲיָא לְהוּ: הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי לְקוּלָא אוֹ לְחוּמְרָא? פְּשִׁיטָא דְלְקוּלָא קָאמַר. מְשׁוּם דְשִׁלַּח רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר לְגוּלָה: לֹא כְּשִׂאתֶם שׁוֹנִין בְּבַבְלָא: רַבִּי מַתִּיר וְחַכְמִים אוֹסְרִין, אֶלְא: רַבִּי אוֹסֵר וְחַכְמִים מְתִירִין. מַאי?

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּרַב תַּחְלִיפָא בַר אַבְדִּימִי עָבַד עוֹבְדָא כּוֹתִיבָה דְשִׁמוּאֵל. וְאָמַר רַב: תַּחֲלַת הוֹרָאָה דְהָאֵי צוּרְבָא מְרַבְּנָן לְקוּלָא. אֵי אָמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא לְקוּלָא קָאמַר – הֵינֵי קְלָקוּלָא. אֶלְא אֵי אָמַרְתָּ לְחוּמְרָא – מַאי קְלָקוּלָא אֵיבָא?

כִּינּוּן דְמְקַלְקְלֵי בְּהַ רַבִּים

It was stated that the amora'im disagreed as to the conclusive ruling. Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the first tanna, who said that it is prohibited to prepare both types of eiruv, and Shmuel said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and it is permitted to prepare a joining of courtyards on a Festival.

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Is stating that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi a leniency or a stringency? The Gemara wonders at this query: It is obvious that he stated it as a leniency. The Gemara explains: The question was asked because Rabbi Elazar sent a message from Eretz Yisrael to the Diaspora: This baraita is not as you teach it^N in Babylonia, that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permits one to prepare a joining of courtyards on a Festival and the Rabbis prohibit it. Rather, the opinions should be reversed, so that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi prohibits it and the Rabbis permit it. Therefore, the question arose: What is the conclusive ruling for this halakha? Is it lenient or stringent?

The Gemara attempts to cite a proof: Come and hear that Rav Tahlifa bar Avdimi^P performed an action in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel, who ruled that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and Rav said in anger about this: The first public ruling of this young Torah scholar is bringing about corruption of the halakha. The Gemara analyzes this statement: Granted, if you say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said it as a leniency, this explains the corruption of the halakha involved, as Rav was angered by a young scholar who relied on his own judgment to issue a lenient ruling on a disputed issue. However, if you say that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi meant it as a stringency, what corruption of the halakha is there in the young scholar's ruling?

The Gemara answers: Since it corrupts the behavior of the masses, as, if they refrain from preparing a joining of courtyards on the Festival although it is permitted to do so, they might mistakenly carry from one domain to another on Shabbat,

Perek II Daf 17 Amud a

NOTES

The halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi to prohibit – הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי וְלֹאֶסוּר: The question is raised: Why is it necessary to state that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi; why not simply issue a ruling that it is prohibited? Some answer that the Gemara wishes to teach that the reason for the prohibition cannot be due to preparation, as Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi does not prohibit that, so there must be a different reason for the prohibition (Hatam Sofer).

מתפלל – תפילת שבת ויום טוב – שְׁמֹנֶה: Why does the Gemara cite this halakha with regard to prayer in the middle of a discussion of a joining of cooked foods? Some answer that it is because in this case, too, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi (Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya).

HALAKHA

Shabbat and Festival prayers – תפילת שבת ויום טוב: On a Festival that occurs on Shabbat, one recites seven blessings during each Amida prayer, mentioning both Shabbat and the Festival in the middle blessing. The middle blessing is that of a Festival prayer into which references to Shabbat are added. The blessing concludes with the formula: Who sanctifies Shabbat, the Jewish people, and the seasons, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 487:1).

הֵינֵי קְלָקוּלָא. אָמַר רַבָּא אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי וְלֹאֶסוּר.

תְּנִי רַבְנָן: יוֹם טוֹב שְׁחַל לְהִיטָא בְּשַׁבָּת. בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מִתְפַּלֵּל שְׁמֹנֶה [וְאוֹמֵר] שֵׁל שַׁבָּת בְּפָנֵי עֲצֻמָּה וְשֵׁל יוֹם טוֹב בְּפָנֵי עֲצֻמָּה. וּבֵית הֵלֵל אוֹמְרִים: מִתְפַּלֵּל שְׁבַע, מִתְחִיל בְּשֵׁל שַׁבָּת וּמְסִיִּים בְּשֵׁל שַׁבָּת, וְאוֹמֵר קְדוּשַׁת הַיּוֹם בְּאֶמְצַע. רַבִּי אוֹמֵר: אֶף חוֹתֶם בָּהּ "מְקַדֵּשׁ הַשַּׁבָּת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַזְּמַנִּים".

this is the corruption that might result from a ruling that renders it prohibited to prepare an eiruv the day before. Therefore, this cannot serve as proof of the conclusive ruling. Rava said that Rav Huna said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi to prohibit^N one from preparing either type of eiruv. One may not prepare an eiruv either for courtyards or for boundaries, as the halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Elazar's version of the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

The Sages taught the following baraita: In the case of a Festival that occurs on Shabbat, Beit Shammai say: One must recite an Amida prayer that includes eight blessings,^N inserting two additional blessings between the standard opening three and concluding three. As for the two middle blessings, one recites one for Shabbat as an independent blessing and a second for the Festival as an independent blessing. And Beit Hillel say: One must pray an Amida comprising only seven blessings, i.e., the three opening ones, the three concluding ones, and one in between. One begins the middle blessing with Shabbat and concludes it with Shabbat, and he recites a passage referring to the sanctity of the day of the Festival in the middle. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: He even concludes this blessing with mention of both Shabbat and the Festival, saying: Who sanctifies Shabbat, the Jewish people, and the seasons.^H