

NOTES

Not as you teach it – לֹא כְּשֶׁאַתֶּם 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.

אִתְּמַר, רַב אִמְרֵי: הֲלֵכָה כְּתַנָּא קַמָּא, וְשִׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי.

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.

אֵיבְעִינָא לְהוֹ: הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי לְקוּלָא אוֹ לְחוּמְרָא? פְּשִׁיטָא דְלְקוּלָא קְאָמַר. מְשׁוּם דְשִׁלַּח רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר לְגוּלָה: לֹא כְּשֶׁאַתֶּם שׁוֹנִין בְּבַבְלָא רַבִּי מַתִּיר וְחַכְמִים אוֹסְרִין, אֶלָּא: רַבִּי אוֹסֵר וְחַכְמִים מַתִּירִין. מֵאִי?

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<sup>N</sup> 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?

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּרַב תַּחְלִיפָא בַר אַבְדִּימִי עֵבַד עוֹבְדָא בְּתוּתִיהָ דְשִׁמוּאֵל. וְאָמַר רַב: תַּחֲלַת הוֹרָאָה דְהָאִי צוּרְבָא מְרַבְּנָן לְקוּלָא. אִי אִמְרַת בְּשִׁלְמָא לְקוּלָא קְאָמַר – הֵינֵי קְלָקוּלָא. אֶלָּא אִי אִמְרַת לְחוּמְרָא – מֵאִי קְלָקוּלָא אֵיבָא?

The Gemara attempts to cite a proof: Come and hear that Rav Tahlifa bar Avdimi<sup>P</sup> 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?

בֵּינָן דְּמַקְלָקְלִי בְּהַ רַבִּים

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 וְלֹאֲסוּר: 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 – מִתְפַּלֵּל: One must recite a prayer that includes eight blessings – שְׁמֹנֶה בְּשִׁבְעָה: 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 – תְּפִילַת שַׁבָּת וְיוֹם טוֹב: 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. אִמְרֵי רַבָּא אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: הֲלֵכָה כְּרַבִּי וְלֹאֲסוּר.

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<sup>N</sup> 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.

תְּנִי רַבְנָן: יוֹם טוֹב שְׁחָל לְהִיּוֹת בְּשַׁבָּת. בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מִתְפַּלֵּל שְׁמֹנֶה [וְאוֹמֵר] שֵׁל שַׁבָּת בְּפָנֵי עֲצֻמָּה וְשֵׁל יוֹם טוֹב בְּפָנֵי עֲצֻמָּה. וּבֵית הִלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: מִתְפַּלֵּל שְׁבַע, מִתְחִיל בְּשֵׁל שַׁבָּת וּמְסִיִּים בְּשֵׁל שַׁבָּת, וְאוֹמֵר קְדוּשַׁת הַיּוֹם בְּאִמְצַע. רַבִּי אוֹמֵר: אֶף חוֹתֵם בָּהּ "מְקַדֵּשׁ הַשַּׁבָּת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַזְּמַנִּים".

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,<sup>N</sup> 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.<sup>H</sup>

The *halakha* is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and as resolved by Ravina – הַלְכָה כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְכַדְרִיזִין רַבִּינָא: The early authorities ask: How could Rav Yosef, a third-generation *amora*, rule that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Ravina, who lived considerably later? One suggestion is that he is referring to a different Ravina from an earlier generation. Most commentaries, however, explain that the concluding words: As resolved by Ravina, are not part of Rav Yosef's original statement but are an addition of the Gemara. Rav Yosef issued a certain ruling, and at some later point the Gemara connected this ruling with the later comments of Ravina (*Shitta Mekubbetzet*; see other later authorities).

**Shabbat that occurs on a New Moon – שַׁבָּת שְׁחָל לְהִיּוֹת** – בְּרֵאשׁ חוֹדֶשׁ: This wording: A Shabbat that occurs, is imprecise, as the day of Shabbat is fixed while the New Moon and the Festivals fall on different days of the week. It seems that the *tanna* was attempting to be concise, for otherwise he would have had to repeat: And likewise an intermediate day of a Festival that occurs on Shabbat (Rav Yitzhak Abuhav).

Wherever one is required to recite seven [*lesheva*] – כָּל – מְקוֹם שֶׁהוֹזַק לְשִׁבְעַת: The *Meiri* apparently reads this as: To recite Shabbat prayers [*leShabbat*]. In any case, the meaning is the same, i.e., that this adjustment must be made, not only in the additional prayer, but in the evening, morning, and afternoon prayers as well.

The *halakha* is not in accordance with that pair of scholars – אֵין הַלְכָה כְּאוֹתוֹ הַזֶּה: Rashi hints at the reason that the Gemara uses this expression rather than the more straightforward: The *halakha* is in accordance, etc. The reason is that the *halakha* is not precisely in accordance with the first *tanna* either. Therefore, Rav Huna comes only to establish that the *halakha* does not follow that pair of scholars at all.

תַּנֵּי תַנָּא קַמֵּיה דְרַבִּינָא: "מְקַדֵּשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַשְּׁבֵת וְהַזְמִינִים". אָמַר לֵיה: אֵטוּ שַׁבָּת יִשְׂרָאֵל מְקַדְּשֵׁי לֵיה? וְהָא שַׁבָּת מְקַדְּשָׁא וְקִיּוּמָא. אֶלָּא אֵימָא: "מְקַדְּשׁ הַשְּׁבֵת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַזְמִינִים". אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: הַלְכָה כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְכַדְרִיזִין רַבִּינָא.

A *tanna* taught a *baraita* before Ravina with a slightly different reading: He concludes the blessing with: **Who sanctifies the Jewish people, Shabbat, and the seasons.** Ravina said to that *tanna*: **Is that to say that the Jewish people sanctify Shabbat? Isn't Shabbat already sanctified from the six days of Creation?** Every seventh day is automatically Shabbat, without the need for any declaration on the part of the Jewish people. **Rather, amend it and say as follows: Who sanctifies Shabbat, the Jewish people, and the seasons,** as the Jewish people indeed sanctify the New Moon and the Festival days. **Rav Yosef said: The *halakha* with regard to the conclusion of the blessing is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and as the difficulty was resolved by Ravina.**<sup>N</sup>

תַּנּוּ רַבְנָן: שַׁבָּת שְׁחָל לְהִיּוֹת בְּרֵאשׁ חוֹדֶשׁ אוֹ בְּחֻלוֹ שֶׁל מוֹעֵד, עֶרְבֵית וְשַׁחֲרִית וּמִנְחָה – מִתְפַּלֵּל שִׁבְעַת וְאוֹמֵר מֵעֵין הַמְּאוֹרֵעַ בְּעִבּוּדָה, וְאֵם לֹא אָמַר – מְחַזְרִין אוֹתוֹ. רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: בְּהוֹדָאָה. וּבְמוֹסָפִין מִתְחִיל בְּשֶׁל שַׁבָּת, וּמְסִיִּים בְּשֶׁל שַׁבָּת, וְאוֹמֵר קְדוּשַׁת הַיּוֹם בְּאַמְצַע.

The Sages taught the following *baraita*: In the case of Shabbat that occurs on a New Moon<sup>N</sup> or on one of the intermediate days of a Festival, for the evening, morning, and afternoon prayers, one prays in his usual manner, reciting seven blessings in the *Amida*, and recites a passage pertaining to the event of the day, i.e.: May there rise and come [*ya'aleh veyavo*], during the blessing of the Temple service, known as *retze*,<sup>H</sup> and if he did not recite it, he is required to return to the beginning of the *Amida* prayer and repeat it.<sup>H</sup> Rabbi Eliezer disagrees and says: This passage is recited during the blessing of thanksgiving, known as *modim*. And in the additional prayer one begins the fourth blessing, the special blessing for the additional service, with Shabbat, and concludes it with Shabbat, and recites a passage pertaining to the sanctity of the day of the New Moon or the Festival in the middle.<sup>H</sup>

רַבִּן שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל וְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל בְּנוֹ שֶׁל רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן בְּרוּקָא אוֹמְרִים: כָּל מְקוֹם שֶׁהוֹזַק לְשִׁבְעַת מִתְחִיל בְּשֶׁל שַׁבָּת, וּמְסִיִּים בְּשֶׁל שַׁבָּת וְאוֹמֵר קְדוּשַׁת הַיּוֹם בְּאַמְצַע. אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: אֵין הַלְכָה כְּאוֹתוֹ הַזֶּה.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yohanan ben Beroka, disagree and say: **Wherever one is required to recite seven<sup>N</sup> blessings, whether in the evening, morning, or afternoon prayers, he begins the fourth blessing with Shabbat and concludes it with Shabbat, and recites a passage referring to the sanctity of the day of the New Moon or the Festival in the middle.** Rav Huna said: The *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of that pair of scholars;<sup>N</sup> rather, it is in accordance with the opinion of the first *tanna*, that in the evening, morning, and afternoon prayers one recites the usual seven blessings and recites a passage pertaining to the event of the day during the blessing of the Temple service.

#### HALAKHA

The prayer for Shabbat and the New Moon or the intermediate day of a Festival – תְּפִילַת שַׁבָּת וְרֵאשׁ חוֹדֶשׁ וְחוֹל הַמוֹעֵד – When the New Moon or an intermediate day of a Festival occurs on Shabbat, one recites the regular seven-blessing *Amida* of Shabbat in the evening, morning, and afternoon prayers, adding: May there rise and come, during the blessing of the Temple service, in which no mention is made of Shabbat (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 425:1, 490:9).

If one forgot: May there rise and come – שִׁכַּח יַעֲלֶה וְיָבֹוא – On the intermediate days of a Festival, one recites the regular *Amida* in the evening, morning, and afternoon prayers, adding: May there rise and come, in the blessing of Temple service. If

he forgot to say it, he must repeat the entire *Amida* (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 490:2).

The additional prayer for Shabbat and the New Moon or the intermediate days of a Festival – מִיּוֹפֵף שַׁבָּת וְרֵאשׁ חוֹדֶשׁ וְחוֹל הַמוֹעֵד: When the New Moon or an intermediate day of a Festival occurs on Shabbat, one begins and concludes the middle blessing with mentions of Shabbat and in the middle recites a passage referring to the sanctity of the day. The blessing on the New Moon concludes with the formula: Who sanctifies Shabbat, the Jewish people, and New Moons, and on an intermediate day of a Festival: Who sanctifies Shabbat, the Jewish people, and the seasons (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 425:3).

On the first Festival day for the next and stipulate – **מִיּוֹם טוֹב לְחַבְרוֹ וּמִתְּנָה**: The Rambam holds that this was the *halakha* only in the early amoraic period, when the months were determined by eyewitness testimony and therefore there was real uncertainty. Nowadays, however, when the Festivals are established by a fixed calendar and the second Festival day is kept merely as a custom, one may place an *eiruv* on the second day without any stipulations. Many authorities question his ruling (Ran; commentaries on the Rambam), but later authorities suggest several resolutions for these difficulties.

**They did not permit the acquisition of residence on a day of rest – לְמִקְנֵי שְׁבִיטָה בְּשַׁבָּת לֹא**: What kind of acquisition of residence is involved in this case? Since he makes an explicit stipulation, he does not acquire residence on the Festival at all. It is possible to say that even where he acquires residence out of uncertainty, it nevertheless appears as if he is acquiring residence, and it is therefore prohibited (Rashba).

**But with regard to baking, he may bake only – אֲבָל** – **לְאֵפוֹת אֵינוֹ אוֹפֶה אֶלָּא**: Rabbi Aharon HaLevi explains that in the first cases, although one increases the amount of food that is cooked, it is nevertheless a single item that is being cooked. With regard to baking, however, separate objects are involved (see *Yam Shel Shlomo*).

**Because bread bakes well – מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַפֶּת נֹאֶפֶת יָפֵה**: Rashi explains that when there is only a small amount of bread in the oven, the heat does not reach the loaves and the bread does not bake properly. The Rid, however, explains in the opposite manner that when there is only a small amount of bread in the oven, the loaves might burn owing to the heat; baking a large number of loaves ensures that the heat is distributed evenly among them. There is a practical difference between these two interpretations with regard to the large ovens used in modern times; later authorities discuss this issue.

**אָמַר רַב חֵיִיא בַר אֲשִׁי אָמַר רַב: מִיּוֹם**  
**אָדָם עִירוּבֵי תַחֲוּמֵי מִיּוֹם טוֹב לְחַבְרוֹ,**  
**וּמִתְּנָה.**

**אָמַר רַבָּא: מִיּוֹם אָדָם עִירוּבֵי תַבְּשִׁילִין**  
**מִיּוֹם טוֹב לְחַבְרוֹ, וּמִתְּנָה.**

**מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר עִירוּבֵי תַחֲוּמֵי – כֹּל שְׁבִין**  
**עִירוּבֵי תַבְּשִׁילִין, וּמֵאֵן דְּאָמַר עִירוּבֵי**  
**תַבְּשִׁילִין – אֲבָל עִירוּבֵי תַחֲוּמֵי לֹא.**  
**מֵאֵי טַעְמָא – דְּלְמִקְנֵי שְׁבִיטָה בְּשַׁבָּתָא**  
**לֹא.**

**תְּנוּ רַבָּנֵי: אֵין אוֹפֵין מִיּוֹם טוֹב לְחַבְרוֹ.**  
**בְּאֵמַת אָמְרוּ: מִמְּלֵאָה אִשָּׁה כֹּל**  
**הַקֶּדֶרָה בְּשֹׂר אֶף עַל פִּי שְׂאִינָה צְרִיכָה**  
**אֶלָּא לְחֻטִּיכָה אַחַת, מִמְּלֵא נַחְתוּם**  
**חֲבִית שֶׁל מִים אֶף עַל פִּי שְׂאִינוֹ צְרִיךְ**  
**אֶלָּא לְקִיתוֹן אֶחָד, אֲבָל לְאֵפוֹת אֵינוֹ**  
**אוֹפֶה אֶלָּא מֵה שְׁצָרִיךְ לוֹ.**

**רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר אוֹמֵר: מִמְּלֵאָה**  
**אִשָּׁה כֹּל הַתְּנֹור פֶּת, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַפֶּת**  
**נֹאֶפֶת יָפֵה בְּזִמְן שֶׁהַתְּנֹור מֵלֵא. אָמַר**  
**רַבָּא: הֲלִכָּה כְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר.**

**Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said:** If a person forgot to place an *eiruv* before a Festival occurring on Thursday and Friday in the Diaspora, he may act as follows: He may place an *eiruv* for the joining of Shabbat boundaries on the first Festival day for the next, i.e., on the first Festival day for the second Festival day kept in the Diaspora, based on a doubt as to which day is the real day of the Festival, and stipulate<sup>n</sup> as follows: If today is in fact the Festival, then tomorrow is a weekday, on which I may walk as far as I wish in all directions; and if today is a weekday and tomorrow is the Festival, I hereby place an *eiruv* for the joining of Shabbat boundaries for tomorrow. On the following day he makes a similar stipulation with the same *eiruv*, so that he will have an *eiruv* for Shabbat.

**Rava said:** A person may place an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods on the first Festival day for the next day and stipulate as follows: If today is a weekday and tomorrow is the Festival, this is my joining of cooked foods, so that I may rely on it to cook tomorrow for Shabbat; and if today is in fact the Festival and tomorrow is a weekday, I may cook tomorrow as on a regular weekday.

The Gemara comments: With regard to the one who said this *halakha* concerning an *eiruv* for the joining of Shabbat boundaries, all the more so would he permit one to act in this manner concerning an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods. On the other hand, the one who said this *halakha* with regard to an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods spoke only with regard to the joining of cooked foods; however, as for an *eiruv* for the joining of Shabbat boundaries, this is not permitted. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this difference? It is that they did not permit the acquisition of residence on a day of rest,<sup>n</sup> even in a case of uncertainty. However, with regard to an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods, since it is merely symbolic, it is permitted for the sake of the honor of Shabbat.

**The Sages taught in a baraita:** One may not bake bread on one Festival day for the next, i.e., on the first Festival day for the second Festival day kept in the Diaspora. Nevertheless, actually, they said the following established *halakha*: A woman may fill an entire pot with meat to cook on a Festival, although she requires only one piece for that day, and all the remainder will be for the following day. Similarly, a baker may fill an entire barrel<sup>h</sup> with water in order to heat it up although he requires only a jug of hot water. But with regard to baking, he may bake only<sup>n</sup> that which he requires for that day.

The *baraita* continues: **Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says:** A woman may fill the entire oven<sup>h</sup> with bread, although she does not intend to use it all on that day, because bread bakes well<sup>n</sup> when the oven is full. A full oven has less empty space and is therefore hotter; consequently, filling the oven with bread serves not only to provide bread for the next day but also to improve the bread to be eaten that same day. **Rava said:** The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.<sup>h</sup>

#### HALAKHA

**A baker may fill a barrel – מִמְּלֵא נַחְתוּם חֲבִית:** A baker may fill and heat an entire barrel with water, even if he requires only a jug of hot water (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 503:2*).

**A woman may fill the entire oven – מִמְּלֵאָה אִשָּׁה כֹּל הַתְּנֹור:** It is permitted to bake a large quantity of bread on a Festival day, even if one needs only a single loaf, as the bread bakes better when the oven is full. Some say that this ruling applied only in earlier times, when a full oven improved the bread, but not to modern ovens. According to others it is permitted even today if the bread is needed, but one may not employ artifice to circumvent the prohibition (*Magen Avraham*, citing Maharshah). One may rely on this leniency in pressing circumstances (*Shulḥan Arukh HaRav; Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 507:6*).

**Preparing food on a Festival day for the following day – הַכְּנָה:**

**מִיּוֹם טוֹב לְמַחֲרָת:** One may not cook, bake, or slaughter on a Festival day for the following day, even if that day is Shabbat or a Festival. This applies also to the two days of Rosh HaShana. However, it is permitted to cook an entire pot of meat even if one needs only a single piece, and one may certainly slaughter an animal if he requires an olive-bulk of meat on that day.

If he does not need the food for the Festival meal but eats of it anyway, some say that this is an artifice employed to circumvent a prohibition and is therefore prohibited (*Bah*), whereas others permit it. The custom is to be lenient, but one who is stringent is praiseworthy (*Mishna Berura*). Some maintain that if one employs artifice in order to cook for the next day, it is prohibited to partake of the food (*Peri Hadash*), whereas according to others it is permitted after the fact (*Magen Avraham; Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 503:1*).



**He must transfer** – צריך לאקנויי: The early authorities write that the one acquiring the items should execute the transfer by pulling the food items toward himself or lifting them, but not by conducting a symbolic exchange with a kerchief [*sudar*]. The reason is that symbolic exchange is the regular weekday manner of doing business, whereas when the items are merely pulled or lifted the act of acquisition is not as evident (*Beit Yosef*).

**One who did not prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods** – מי שלא הניח עירובי תבשילין: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that even one who did not prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods and cannot or will not transfer his flour to others may cook and bake the minimal amount he needs to sustain himself.

## HALAKHA

**One who did not prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods** – מי שלא הניח עירובי תבשילין: One who did not establish an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods may not cook on a Festival for Shabbat, whether for himself or for others. Likewise, others may not cook for him. His only recourse is to give his flour and his food to others as a gift, and they may then bake and cook for him, or else they may cook for themselves in a large pot and give him the remainder (*Arukh HaShulhan; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 527:20*).

**One who transgressed and baked** – עבר ואפה: If one transgresses this prohibition and bakes or cooks on a Festival not for the Festival itself, whether intentionally or unwittingly, the food is permitted, but it is proper for the court to penalize him as they see fit (*Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 527:23*).

## NOTES

**Let the *baraita* teach: One who transgressed and baked** – ליתני עבר ואפה: Given that the *baraita* addresses a different subject, why should it mention the case of one who transgressed the prohibition and baked? Several later authorities address this question. Some explain that since it is easy to remedy this situation by transferring ownership of one's flour, it would be rare for anyone to commit this transgression intentionally, and the Sages did not decree with regard to uncommon cases (*Simhat Yom Tov*).

## HALAKHA

**And if he wants to eat his *eiruv*** – ואם רצה לאכול את עירובו: After one finishes preparing all the food that he needs for Shabbat, he may eat the *eiruv* that he prepared for the joining of cooked foods, if he so desires. However, the custom is to use the bread of the *eiruv* on Shabbat as the second loaf at the evening and morning meals before eating it in the afternoon, thereby performing additional mitzvot with the same loaf (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 527:16*).

איבעיא להו: מי שלא הניח עירובי תבשילין הוא נאסר וקמחו נאסר, או דלמא הוא נאסר ואין קמחו נאסר?

§ A dilemma was raised before the Sages: In the case of one who did not prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods, is he prohibited from cooking for Shabbat and his flour is likewise prohibited, meaning that none of his food may be prepared for Shabbat? Or perhaps only he is prohibited from performing this type of labor, but his flour is not prohibited.

למאי נפקא מינה – לאקנויי קמחו לאחרים. אי אמרת הוא נאסר וקמחו נאסר – צריך לאקנויי קמחו לאחרים, ואי אמרת הוא נאסר ואין קמחו נאסר – לא צריך לאקנויי קמחו לאחרים, מאי?

The Gemara asks: What is the practical halakhic difference that emerges from this question? The Gemara explains: There is a difference with respect to whether or not he must transfer ownership of his flour to others. If you say that he is prohibited and his flour is also prohibited, he must transfer<sup>n</sup> his flour to others so that they are able to bake for him if they so desire. But if you say that only he is prohibited but his flour is not prohibited, he need not transfer his flour to others, as they may bake for him even if the flour is not theirs. The Gemara asks: What, then, is the *halakha*?

תא שמע: מי שלא הניח עירובי תבשילין, הרי זה לא יאפה ולא יבשל ולא יטמין, לא לו ולא לאחרים, ולא אחרים אופין ומבשילין לו. כיצד הוא עושה – מקנה קמחו לאחרים, ואופין לו ומבשילין לו. שמע מינה: הוא נאסר וקמחו נאסר, שמע מינה.

The Gemara answers: Come and hear a resolution from the following *baraita*: One who did not prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods<sup>NH</sup> on a Festival eve may neither bake, nor cook, nor insulate food on the Festival for Shabbat that occurs on the following day, neither for himself nor for others, and others may neither bake nor cook for him. What should he do so that he will have food to eat on Shabbat? He must transfer his flour to others, and they may then bake and cook for him. Learn from here, from the fact that the *baraita* states that he must transfer his flour to others, that he is prohibited and his flour is also prohibited. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here that this is the case.

איבעיא להו: עבר ואפה מאי? תא שמע: מי שלא הניח עירובי תבשילין, כיצד הוא עושה? מקנה קמחו לאחרים, ואחרים אופין לו ומבשילין לו.

Another dilemma was raised before the Sages: In the case of one who transgressed this prohibition and baked<sup>H</sup> on a Festival for Shabbat without having placed an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods on the eve of the Festival, what is the *halakha*? Is it permitted to partake of his bread and his cooking? The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this question from the following *baraita*: With regard to one who did not prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods, what should he do so that he will have food to eat on Shabbat? He must transfer his flour to others, and they may then bake and cook for him.

## Perek II

## Daf 17 Amud b

ואי איתא ליתני: עבר ואפה – מותר. אמר רב אדא בר מתנה: תנא, תקנתא דהיתרא – קתני, תקנתא דאסורא – לא קתני.

And if it is so that if one baked without having placed an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods, it is permitted to eat the bread, let the *baraita* simply teach: With regard to one who transgressed the prohibition and baked,<sup>N</sup> it is permitted to eat the bread. Rav Adda bar Mattana said: There is no proof from here, as the *tanna* is teaching a remedy involving acting in a permitted manner, and is not teaching a remedy involving a prohibited act. The *tanna* did not want to teach that it is also possible to solve the problem in this proscribed manner.

תא שמע: מי שהניח עירובי תבשילין – הרי זה אופה ומבשל ומטמין, ואם רצה לאכול את עירובו – הרשות בידו. אבל עד שלא אפה עד שלא הטמין – הרי זה לא יאפה ולא יבשל ולא יטמין, לא לו ולא לאחרים, ולא אחרים אופין ומבשילין לו.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution from a different *baraita*: One who prepared an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods on a Festival eve may bake and cook and insulate food on the Festival for Shabbat that occurs on the following day, and if he wants to eat his *eiruv*<sup>H</sup> on Shabbat, he has permission to do so. But if he ate it on the Festival before he baked or before he insulated, he may neither bake, nor cook, nor insulate, neither for himself nor for others, and likewise others may neither bake nor cook for him.

NOTES

And if he employed artifice it is prohibited – ואם הערים אסור – The early authorities discuss the difference between this act of artifice, which is entirely proscribed, and the permission granted to a woman to add meat to her pot if it contains something needed for the Festival (see Rashi and *Tosafot*). The Rid explains that there is no concern that people will come to prepare from a Festival to a weekday *ab initio*, as it is well-known that this entails a desecration of the honor of the Festival. In the case of preparation for Shabbat, however, one might think that no prohibition is involved at all.

It is in accordance with Hananya and in accordance with Beit Shammai – חנניה היא ואליבא דבית שמאי – The Gemara does not say that it is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai in the mishna here, as although they are stringent *ab initio*, they are not necessarily strict after the fact as well; the latter is evident only from Hananya's statement (*Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*). Some suggest that if only one *eiruv* were required, there would be no concern that one might do so *ab initio* the next time. However, since Beit Shammai require one to make several *eiruvim*, a person might make one suffice each time; therefore, it can be assumed that the Sages were stringent even after the fact in order to reinforce their enactment (*Simhat Yom Tov*).

It is possible by borrowing – אפשר בשאלה – With regard to food, however, a person generally prepares only enough food for himself and does not have extra food to give away to others (*Shitta Mekubbetzet*).

HALAKHA

Employing artifice with regard to cooking – הערמה בבישול – If one employed artifice to circumvent the prohibition, cooking two pots of the same type of food (*Taz*) and saying that both are for the Festival, but leaving one over for the following day, he may not eat from the second pot. Some say this prohibition lasts only until the conclusion of Shabbat. Others hold that the food is permanently prohibited to the person who cooked it, but permitted to others immediately upon the conclusion of Shabbat (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 527:24*).

One who tithed his produce on Shabbat – המקעשר פירותיו – בישבת: If one unwittingly tithed his produce on Shabbat, he may eat of the produce that he rendered fit to eat, but if he acted intentionally, he may not partake of it until the conclusion of Shabbat (Rambam). The *Shulhan Arukh HaRav* rules likewise. Others rule that if he tithed the produce unwittingly, neither he nor others may eat it on the same day; and if it was done intentionally, he may not eat it upon the conclusion of Shabbat, but others may (*Magen Avraham; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 339:4*).

אבל מבשל הוא ליום טוב, ואם הותר – הותר לשתות, ובלבד שלא יערים. ואם הערים – אסור.

אמר רב אשי: הערמה קא אמרת, שאני הערמה דאתמירו בה רבנן טפי ממוזיד.

רב נחמן בר יצחק אמר: הא מני – חנניה היא, ואליבא דבית שמאי דתנאי, חנניה אומר: בית שמאי אומרים: אין אופין אלא אם כן ערב בפת, ואין מבשלין אלא אם כן ערב בתבשיל, ואין טומנין אלא אם כן היו חמין טמונין מערב יום טוב.

ובית הלל אומרים: מערב בתבשיל אחר ועושה בו כל צרכו.

(תנן): המקעשר פירותיו בישבת, בשוגג – יאכל, במזיד – לא יאכל. לא צריכא, דאית ליה פירי אחרוני.

תא שמע: המטביל בליו בישבת, בשוגג – ישתמש בהן, במזיד – לא ישתמש בהן.

לא צריכא, דאית ליה מאני אחרוני. אי נמי אפשר בשאלה.

However, even without an *eiruv*, one in this situation may cook for the Festival itself, and if he left over part of what he cooked, he has left it over for Shabbat, provided that he does not employ artifice to circumvent the prohibition by saying that he is cooking a large amount for guests on the Festival, when in fact he has Shabbat in mind. And if he employed artifice to circumvent the prohibition, it is prohibited<sup>n</sup> to eat the food, by decree of the Sages.<sup>h</sup> This indicates that one who cooks on a Festival for Shabbat in a prohibited manner may not eat the food.

Rav Ashi said: This is no proof, as you speak of a case of artifice, and a case of artifice is different, as the Sages were more stringent with regard to one who employs artifice than with regard to one who intentionally cooks on a Festival for Shabbat. One who purposely transgresses is aware of his sin; therefore, he might repent and desist from his prohibited behavior, thereby preventing others from learning from his actions. However, one who employs artifice to circumvent a prohibition thinks that he is acting in a permitted manner. He is therefore likely to continue his practice. Furthermore, people might emulate him, and the *halakha* of preparing an *eiruv* might be forgotten.

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said that there is another reason to reject the proof from this *baraita*: In accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is in accordance with the opinion of Hananya and in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai.<sup>n</sup> As it is taught in a *baraita* that Hananya says that Beit Shammai say: One may not bake bread on a Festival for Shabbat unless he prepared an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods on the eve of the Festival specifically with bread; and one may not cook any type of dish unless he prepared an *eiruv* with a cooked dish; and one may not insulate food unless there was hot food insulated from the eve of the Festival.

And Beit Hillel say: One may prepare an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods with one cooked dish and use it for all his needs, i.e., baking, cooking, and insulating. Since Hananya's opinion in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai is strict in this case, it may be assumed that he is stringent after the fact as well, and therefore the *baraita* provides no proof.

The Gemara offers yet another suggestion. We learned in a mishna: In the case of one who transgressed a rabbinic prohibition and tithed his produce on Shabbat,<sup>h</sup> if he did so unwittingly, he may eat of it; if he acted intentionally, he may not eat of it. This indicates that one may not derive benefit from a transgression that he committed intentionally. The Gemara rejects this argument: No, it is necessary to teach this *halakha* with regard to a case where he has other produce and therefore does not greatly suffer as a result. However, the Sages may have been more lenient with one who did not make an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked food and consequently has nothing to eat.

The Gemara poses another resolution: Come and hear a proof from a different source: In the case of one who immerses his vessels on Shabbat, an activity that the Sages prohibited because it is akin to repairing a vessel, if he did so unwittingly, he may use them; however, if he did so intentionally, he may not use them. This shows that the product of an action performed in a prohibited manner is prohibited.

The Gemara rejects this argument: No, it is necessary to teach this *halakha* with regard to a case where he has other vessels and is not forced to use these ones. Alternatively, it is possible for him to manage by borrowing<sup>n</sup> vessels from others. But if one failed to set aside an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods, perhaps the Sages allowed him to eat the food he cooked on the Festival for Shabbat since it is difficult to obtain food from others on Shabbat.

Leeks [*kaflotot*] – קפלוטות: This word derives from the Greek κεφαλωτόν, *kefaloton*, literally meaning headed or with a head, a description assigned to several plants and animals. The Sages use the term primarily in reference to leeks, which have a noticeable and prominent head.

## BACKGROUND

Leeks [*kaflotot*] – קפלוטות: Most commentaries identify *kaflotot* with leeks, *Allium porrum* L., a plant botanically related to onions and garlic. A cultivated plant, the leek can grow almost anywhere. Its bright green leaves are distinguished from those of the onion both by their color and their flat, broad shape. Leeks are generally eaten in sauces or soups, often together with meat; in certain regions, they are eaten raw. Some hold that *kaflotot* are not leeks but a type of onion.



Leek

תא שמע: המבשל בשבת, בשוגג – לאכיל, במיוד – לא יאכל. אסורא דשבת שאני.

The Gemara suggests another proof: **Come and hear that which was taught in the following *baraita***: In the case of **one who cooks on Shabbat**,<sup>h</sup> if he did so **unwittingly, he may eat** the food that he cooked; but if he cooked it **intentionally, he may not eat** it. This demonstrates that one who purposely violated a prohibition may not benefit from his prohibited action. The Gemara rejects this argument: There is no proof from here; the **prohibition of Shabbat desecration is different**,<sup>n</sup> since it entails *karet* and execution by a court. The same stringency might not necessarily apply to cooking on a Festival for the sake of the next day, and therefore the question raised above remains unresolved.

”בית שמאי אומרים שני תבשילין.” מתניתין דלא כי האי תנא. דתניא, אמר רבי שמעון בן אלעזר: מודים בית שמאי ובית הלל על שני תבשילין שצריך, על מה נחלקו – על דג וביצה שעליו, שבית שמאי אומרים: שני תבשילין, ובית הלל אומרים: תבשיל אחד. ושני, שאם פרפר ביצה ונתן לתוך הדג, או שרסק קפלוטות ונתן לתוך הדג – שהן שני תבשילין.

It is stated in the mishna: **Beit Shammai say** that for the purpose of the joining of cooked foods one must prepare **two cooked dishes**, whereas Beit Hillel say that one dish suffices. The Gemara comments: **The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of this *tanna***, who taught in the *Tosefta* that **Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel agree that two dishes are necessary. With regard to what do they disagree?** They disagree with regard to a **fried fish and the egg on it**, as **Beit Shammai say: Two proper dishes are required**, and this fish is considered only a single dish; and **Beit Hillel say: One dish of this kind is viewed as two dishes** and is therefore suitable for an *eiruv* for the joining of cooked foods. **And they both agree that if one sliced a cooked egg and placed it inside the fish, or if he mashed leeks [*kaflotot*]<sup>LB</sup> and placed them inside the fish, they are considered two dishes.**

אמר רבא: הלכתא כותנא דידן, ואליאבא דבית הלל.

**Rava said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of the *tanna* of our mishna and in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel<sup>N</sup> that one dish suffices.**

”אכלו או שאבד הרי זה לא יבשל עליו” וכו’. אמר אביו: נקטינן, התחיל בעיסתו ונאכל עירובו – גומר.

The mishna states that if **one ate** the food prepared before the Festival as an *eiruv* or if it was **lost, he may not rely on it and cook** with the initial intent to cook for Shabbat. **Abaye said: We have a tradition that if one prepared a proper *eiruv* and began kneading his dough<sup>N</sup> on a Festival for Shabbat, and in the meantime his *eiruv* was eaten,<sup>h</sup> he may finish** baking the bread. Since he had begun in a permitted manner, he is allowed to complete the process and bake the bread.

## HALAKHA

**One who cooks on Shabbat – המבשל בשבת**: If one cooks intentionally on Shabbat, he and the members of his household may never eat the food, while others may do so immediately upon the conclusion of Shabbat. If he acted unwittingly, no one may eat it on the same day, but after Shabbat has ended even he may eat it. Some hold that if he cooked intentionally, it is prohibited both for him and for others to eat the food until the conclusion of Shabbat, whereas if he acted unwittingly, it is permitted for anyone to partake of it at once (Vilna Gaon). One may rely on this opinion in a case of need, if the food was cooked unwittingly (*Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 318:1).

**If one began kneading his dough and his *eiruv* was eaten – התחיל בעיסתו ונאכל עירובו**: If one begins to knead his dough or starts to cook, and in the meantime his *eiruv* is eaten, he may finish preparing that dough or dish. Some hold that once he has begun any of his preparations for Shabbat, he may continue with all his preparations as though his *eiruv* were still extant (Radbaz; others). One may rely on this opinion in a case of exigent circumstances (*Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 527:17).

## NOTES

**The prohibition of Shabbat is different – אסורא דשבת שאני**: This answer also resolves the previous questions: Due to the stringencies of Shabbat prohibitions, the Sages were strict with regard to them even after the fact (Rashash).

to conclude that all agree with Beit Shammai in this regard (*Hatam Sofer*).

**The *halakha* is in accordance with the *tanna* of our mishna and in accordance with Beit Hillel – הלכתא כותנא דידן ואליאבא דבית הלל**: Even though it seems to be obvious that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, the mishna here may be explained in a manner that does not differentiate between cooking and baking at all, which might lead one

**Began kneading his dough – התחיל בעיסתו**: Some explain that this applies only if one had actually started preparing his dough, because the food will be wasted if he does not finish. According to this view, he may not perform any task that he had not actually begun to do, e.g., he may not begin to prepare a new batch of dough. However, the halakhic authorities differ on this matter, as the Rosh and others hold that one who has already begun his Shabbat preparations may complete all of them, even those he had not yet begun.



**טבילת – The immersion of a person and vessels on Shabbat – אדם וכלים בשבת:** One may not immerse vessels on Shabbat or a Festival, but a ritually impure person may immerse himself, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. In the case of one who transgressed this prohibition and immersed vessels on Shabbat, if he did so unwittingly, he may use them; however, if it was done intentionally, he may not use them until the conclusion of Shabbat (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:8).

**Purifying impure water by bringing it into contact with pure water – טיהור מים בהשקה:** It is permitted to bring ritually impure water into contact with ritually pure water on Shabbat in order to purify the water (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:8).

**One may immerse from one principle to another – מטבילין מגב לגב:** It is permitted to immerse for a second time a vessel that had been purified for use with *teruma*, in order to purify it for use with consecrated objects, in accordance with the Rambam's understanding of this clause of the mishna (*Maggid Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Yom Tov* 4:17).

**מתני' – הל להיות אחר השבת, בית שמאי אומרים: מטבילין את הכל מלפני השבת, ובית הלל אומרים: כלים מלפני השבת, ואדם בשבת.**

**ושוין שמשקין את המים בכלי אבן לטהרן, אבל לא מטבילין ומטבילין מגב לגב ומתבורה לחבורה.**

**גמ' דכולי עלמא מיהת כלי בשבת לא, מאי טעמא? אמר רבה: גזרה**

**MISHNA** If a Festival occurs directly after Shabbat, i.e., on a Sunday, and one wishes to be have in a proper manner and purify himself and his vessels in honor of the Festival, **Beit Shammai say: One must immerse everything before Shabbat, and Beit Hillel say: Vessels must be immersed before Shabbat, but a person may immerse himself even on Shabbat.**<sup>NH</sup>

And Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel both agree that one may bring ritually impure water into contact with ritually pure water in stone vessels<sup>N</sup> on Shabbat in order to purify the water.<sup>H</sup> Impure water can be purified if it is placed into a vessel that does not contract ritual impurity, such as a stone vessel, and then lowered with the vessel into a ritual bath. The water becomes purified when it comes into contact with the water of the ritual bath. Although this is not considered proper immersion, water may nevertheless be purified in this manner. **However, one may not immerse<sup>N</sup>** the impure water in a ritually impure vessel in order to purify the vessel at the same time. Likewise, **one may immerse on a Festival from one principle to another,<sup>H</sup> and from one group to another,** as will be explained in the Gemara.

**GEMARA** In any event, everyone agrees, i.e., both Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel agree, that one may not immerse a vessel on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: **What is the reason<sup>N</sup>** that one may not do so? Which type of prohibited labor does it involve? **Rabba said:** It is a decree issued by the Sages as a preventive measure,

NOTES

**But a person on Shabbat – ואדם בשבת:** Rashi understands that a person may immerse himself even on Shabbat. The Maharshal, however, explains that a person should immerse specifically on Shabbat; since he is permitted to do so, this is the proper way of purifying himself for the Festival (*Yam Shel Shlomo*).

**One may bring water into contact [mashkin] in stone vessels – משיקין את המים בכלי אבן:** The *halakha* of bringing into contact [*hashaka*] applies uniquely to water. Some read this word as *mashki'in*, dip; i.e., *hashaka* is a shortened form of *hashka'a*, dipping (*ge'onim*). In general, ritually impure foods or liquids cannot be purified by means of immersion, and indeed, water that has undergone *hashaka* is not considered to have been purified via immersion. Rather, the reason this is effective is that the water is considered entirely nullified in the water of the ritual bath. Consequently, the water that is then removed after the *hashaka* is pure, as is the rest of the water in the ritual bath. From a halakhic perspective, this is similar to sowing impure seeds in the ground, an act that purifies them by nullifying them in the ground.

**However, one may not immerse – אבל לא מטבילין:** The early authorities discuss the significance of these words, which appear redundant. Some ask why one may not use a wooden vessel for this purpose, as although such vessels are gener-

ally susceptible to impurity and would consequently become impure by the impure water poured into them, it is merely a derivative level of impurity, which may be removed by immersion. One answer is that one is not permitted to cause vessels to become impure and then immerse them, *ab initio* (Rabbeinu Peretz; Rashba). A simple explanation of the phrase: However, one may not immerse, is that it serves to limit the previous statement regarding the agreement between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel; that is to say, that while Beit Shammai agree with Beit Hillel about *hashaka*, they disagree with them about immersion.

**One may not immerse a vessel on Shabbat, what is the reason – מאי טעמא לא כלי בשבת לא:** This *halakha*, that one may not immerse a vessel on Shabbat, is stated explicitly in a mishna in tractate *Shabbat* (34a); why doesn't the Gemara discuss this issue there? Some suggest that in that mishna it seems obvious that the reason is that immersion is akin to repairing. Here, however, since according to Beit Hillel it is permitted for a person to immerse himself, it is not immediately evident why it should be prohibited to immerse vessels (*Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*). Alternatively, in that mishna it appears as though one is doing so for the purpose of a weekday, whereas here it is possible to say that he is acting for the sake of the sacred day itself (*Hatam Sofar*).