

HALAKHA

Separated seven *etrogim* – הפריש שבועה אֶתְרוּגִים: If one separated seven *etrogim* with the intention of fulfilling his obligation with a different one each day, it is permitted to eat each *etrog* after the day on which he used it has passed; he may not eat it on the same day it is used. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Asi (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 665:2).

NOTES

The distinction between a *sukka* and an *etrog* – שוּנָה: Since the Torah connects the four species to the mitzva of a *sukka*, one might have thought that an *etrog* should also be prohibited for all other uses all seven days, as is a *sukka* (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

Nights are divided – מִפְּסְקוֹ לַיְלוֹת: This reasoning appears relevant only according to the opinion of Rav Asi but not according to that of Rav, who permits one to eat the *etrog* immediately. It is possible to explain that the fact that the *etrog* does not retain its sanctity the following day shows that it was sanctified only for that day. It is for this reason that its sanctity expires once one has fulfilled his obligation with it. With regard to a *sukka*, however, its mitzva continues all day and through the nights as well (Bigdei Yom Tov).

וּמֵאֵי שְׁנָא מִהָא, דְּאִתְמַר: הַפְּרִישׁ שְׁבֻעָה אֶתְרוּגִים לְשִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים, אָמַר רַב: כָּל אַחַת וְאַחַת יוֹצֵא בָּהּ וְאוֹכְלָהּ לְאַלְתֵּר, וְרַב אֲסִי אָמַר: כָּל אַחַת יוֹצֵא בָּהּ וְאוֹכְלָהּ לְמִחָר.

The Gemara asks: And in what way is it different from that which was stated with regard to a different *halakha*: In the case of one who separated seven *etrogim*^H for each of the seven Festival days, one for each day, Rav said: He fulfills his obligation through each and every one of them when he recites the blessing over the *lulav* and *etrog*, and if he so desires he may eat it immediately after the blessing. And Rav Asi said: He fulfills his obligation through each one, and he may eat it the following day, as it retains its sanctity for the duration of that entire day. In any case, all agree that the sanctity of each *etrog* does not extend to the following day. If so, why does the sanctity of the *sukka* extend through all seven days?^N

הֵתָם דְּמִפְּסְקוֹ לַיְלוֹת מִיָּמִים – כָּל חַד וְחַד יוֹמָא מִצְוָה בְּאַפִּי נִפְשִׂיהּ הוּא. הֵכָא, דְּלֵא מִפְּסְקוֹ לַיְלוֹת מִיָּמִים – כּוּלְהוּ יוֹמֵי בְּחַדָּא יוֹמָא אֲרִיכְתָא דְּמִי.

The Gemara answers: There is a difference between an *etrog* and a *sukka*. There, with regard to an *etrog*, the nights are divided^N from the days, as the mitzva of *etrog* applies only during the day and not at night. This means that each and every day is its own mitzva, and therefore an item that is sanctified for one day is not necessarily sanctified for the following day. However, here, with regard to a *sukka*, where the nights are not divided from the days, as the mitzva of *sukka* applies at night as well, all seven days are considered as one long day. Throughout the Festival, there is no moment during which the sanctity of *sukka* leaves the wood; it leaves only at the conclusion of the Festival.

Perek IV Daf 31 Amud a

HALAKHA

Bringing wood for kindling – הִבָּאת עֵצִים לְהִסְדָּה: It is prohibited to bring wood from a field, even if it had been gathered on the eve of the Festival. However, one may collect wood from that which was brought indoors as kindling, although some prohibit this (Yam Shel Shlomo). Similarly, one may take wood that is before him in a courtyard (Rema), but he may not gather it together (Yam Shel Shlomo). One may bring in wood that has been gathered and placed in a fenced *karpef*. Some even permit one to do so in a *karpef* that is not fenced and closed (Taz, citing Beit Yosef; Rashba; Rosh). This applies only if it is within the Shabbat limit, but otherwise it is prohibited, in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel and Rabbi Yosei, whose opinion is understood as a leniency (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 501:3).

מִתְנִי' מְבִיאִין עֵצִים מִן הַשָּׂדֶה מִן הַמְּבוּנָס, וּמִן הַקְּרָפֵף אֲפִילוּ מִן הַמְּבוּנָס. אֵיזוֹהוּ קְרָפֵף – כָּל שְׂסֻמוֹךְ לְעִיר, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אָמַר: כָּל שְׂנִכְנָסִין לֹא בְּפוֹתְחָתָא, וְאֲפִילוּ בְּתוֹךְ תַּחֲסֵי שַׁבָּת.

MISHNA One may bring wood chopped from a tree the previous day from an unfenced field, but only from that which has been gathered into a pile before the Festival for the purpose of using it for kindling.^H However, scattered wood is *muktze* and may not be handled. And if one brings wood from a *karpef* used for storage, he may bring even from the scattered wood, as it is considered a guarded courtyard rather than a field, and one does not remove even scattered items from his mind if they are stored inside such an enclosure. The mishna explains: What is a *karpef*?^N It is any enclosure that is near a city, but if it is far from a city, it is considered a field; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: Any fenced place into which one can enter only with a key is a *karpef*, even if it is located at a distance from a city, provided that it is within the Shabbat limit.

גַּמ' אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׂמוּאֵל: אֵין מְבִיאִין עֵצִים אֶלָּא מִן הַמְּבוּנָסִין שְׂבִקְרָפֵף. וְהָא אֲנִן תַּנְן: מִן הַקְּרָפֵף וְאֲפִילוּ מִן הַמְּבוּנָסִין. מִתְנִינָן יְחִידָאָה הִיא.

GEMARA Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One may not bring wood except from the wood that was gathered in a *karpef*.^N The Gemara challenges: But didn't we learn in the mishna: And from a *karpef*, even from scattered wood? The Gemara answers: The mishna follows an individual opinion.^N

NOTES

What is a *karpef* – אֵיזוֹהוּ קְרָפֵף: This is not a general question with regard to the definition of a *karpef*, which is relevant to several *halakhot* of Shabbat and *eiruv*; rather, it is one that concerns the particular topic of this mishna: From which *karpef* did they allow one to bring wood (Meir)?

However, the Ran and other authorities maintain that the reason it is prohibited to bring wood is due to collecting, a sub-category of the primary category of prohibited labor known as binding. According to their view, collecting is fundamentally permitted for the preparation of food, but the Sages limited it by decree. They did so with regard to several other labors as well, either to prevent the performance of a serious transgression or because the action appears similar to a weekday activity. Following this explanation, Shmuel's conclusion is that one may not bring in scattered wood at all, due to binding; he may take only from gathered wood (see *Tosafot*, Rambam, and Ramban). However, some say that even the Ran must add the reason of *muktze*, as gathered wood in a field is also prohibited, and binding does not apply to such a case. On the other hand, it is

possible that the concern is that the wood might become scattered in a field, as no one is present to watch over it. Additionally, Rabbi Yosei's insistence on a key is clearly referring to the issue of *muktze* rather than that of binding.

An individual opinion – יְחִידָאָה הִיא: In the Jerusalem Talmud, it is stated likewise. There, the opinion of Rabbi Natan is cited that the Sages disagreed only in the case of scattered wood in a *karpef*, which Beit Hillel permitted. The later authorities ask why the Gemara did not challenge Shmuel's approach with the *baraita* that states that one may take wood that has been gathered together in a field. It is possible that the Gemara preferred to cite a source that presents two opinions explicitly contradicting his view.

Reed and vine leaves – **עלי קנים ופגנים**: It is prohibited to use reed leaves and vine leaves on a Festival even if they were gathered together in a *karpef*, as the wind scatters them. However, if one placed a heavy vessel on them the day before, it is permitted, as stated by Rava (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 501:4).

NOTES

Near a city – **סמוך לעיר**: The Gemara does not define what constitutes near in this instance. The Rashba explains that the definition from the *halakhot* of *eiruv* applies here as well: Near a city means within seventy cubits and a bit, which is considered the city limits.

The opinions of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei – **שיטות רבי – יהודה ורבי יוסי**: There are several versions of this discussion. Rashi rejects one possible reading of the text, preferring the version that he had before him, which is the one that appears in the printed text of the Talmud. According to the reading rejected by Rashi, the question focuses mainly on Rabbi Yosei's view, since the *halakha* is ruled in accordance with his opinion when he disagrees with a single colleague (Rashba). According to this version, it is possible to suggest that Rabbi Yosei might permit using wood only from a *karpef* that has a key. Accordingly, the Gemara does not conclude by saying: Two leniencies. Rather, it says: He stated a leniency. Therefore, if the *karpef* does not have a key, using the wood stored in it is prohibited, even if it is near a city.

BACKGROUND

Saw – **מגרה**: Saws have been developed since antiquity. Many early saws, made of copper, have the general appearance of large meat-carving knives. Egyptian illustrations from approximately 1500 BC and onward show these saws being used to split boards. The modern saw began to evolve during the Bronze Age, and some of the tools looked very much like hacksaw blades.



Roman saw blades

Sickle – **מגל**: The sickle is one of the most ancient of harvesting tools. It consists of a metal blade, usually curved, attached to a short wooden handle. Harvesting with a sickle is very slow, but because of its simplicity and low cost it is still widely used around the world, especially to reap grains such as wheat and rice. It is also used as a gardening tool.



Iron sickle from ancient Greece

One may not rely on it, as is clear from a different source that the majority view is otherwise, as it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel did not disagree with regard to wood scattered in fields that one may not bring it on a Festival to one's house for kindling, nor with regard to wood gathered in a *karpef* that one may bring it. With regard to what did they disagree? It is with regard to scattered wood in a *karpef* and gathered wood in fields, as Beit Shammai say: He may not bring it, and Beit Hillel say: He may bring it. Although the lenient opinion with regard to gathered wood in a field is attributed to Beit Hillel, this is only according to the minority view of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. However, most Sages disagree and say that one may not bring wood from a field at all, even according to Beit Hillel.

Rava said: With regard to reed leaves and vine leaves,^h although they are gathered together and placed in the same spot, since if a wind comes it will scatter them, they are already considered scattered and are therefore prohibited. Given that they are likely to be scattered in the wind, one does not intend to use them. However, if one placed a vessel on them the day before to prevent their being scattered in the wind, it seems well and is permitted.

The mishna discussed the question: What is a *karpef*? Rabbi Yehuda states that it is any enclosure that is near a city, while in Rabbi Yosei's opinion it is any fenced place into which one can enter only with a key, provided that it is within the Shabbat limit of a city. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: With regard to what case is the mishna speaking? Does Rabbi Yehuda mean to say that a *karpef* is any place that is near a city,ⁿ provided that it has a key, otherwise it is not a *karpef* at all; and Rabbi Yosei comes to say: Since it has a key, even if it is not near a city, as long as it is within the Shabbat limit it is also considered a *karpef*? According to this understanding, Rabbi Yosei's view is more lenient than that of Rabbi Yehuda.

Or perhaps this is what Rabbi Yehuda is saying: Any enclosure that is near a city is a *karpef*, whether it has a key or does not have a key, and Rabbi Yosei comes to say: With regard to the distance, it is a *karpef* even if it is not near a city, provided that it is within the Shabbat limit, but specifically if it has a key. However, if it does not have a key, even if it is near a city it is also not considered a *karpef*. According to this understanding, the opinion of Rabbi Yosei is not necessarily the more lenient one; rather, for him the defining issue is whether or not there is a key, regardless of distance.

The Gemara answers: Come and hear from the fact that it is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yosei says: Any place into which one enters with a key, even within the Shabbat limit, and he does not say: If one enters, but rather: Any place into which one enters, it shows that the key is not the determining factor. One may learn from this that Rabbi Yosei stated two conditions as leniencies. In other words, he is not more stringent than Rabbi Yehuda in any situation; he is lenient in all cases. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here that this is the case. Rav Salla said that Rabbi Yirmeya said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei as a leniency; Rabbi Yosei should be understood in this manner, and one should rule accordingly.ⁿ

MISHNA One may not chop wood on a Festival neither from beams intended for construction nor from a beam that broke on a Festival, although it no longer serves any purpose. And one may not chop wood on a Festival, neither with an ax, nor with a saw,^b nor with a sickle,^b as these are clearly craftsman's tools used on weekdays. Rather, one may chop only with a cleaver. Using this tool differs greatly from the weekday manner in which wood is chopped.

דתנאי, אמר רבי שמעון בן אלעזר: לא נחלקו בית שמאי ובית הלל על המפוזרים שבשדות שאין מביאין, ועל המכוונסין שבקרפף שמביאין. על מה נחלקו – על המפוזרים שבקרפף ועל המכוונסין שבשדות. שביט שמאי ואמרים: לא יביא, ובית הלל אמרים: יביא.

אמר רבא: עלי קנים ועלי גפנים, אף על גב דמכנפי להו ומותבי, בין דאי מדלי זיקא מבידר להו – כמפוזרים דמו, ואסורין. ואי אתנח מנא מאתמול עליהו – שפיר דמי.

“איזהו קרפף” וכו'. אבעיא להו: היכי קאמר, כל שסמוך לעיר – והוא דאית ליה פותחת, ואתא רבי יוסי למימר: בין דאית ליה פותחת – אפילו בתוך תחום שבת נמי.

או דלמא הכי קאמר: כל שסמוך לעיר, בין דאית ליה פותחת בין דלית ליה פותחת, ואתא רבי יוסי למימר: אפילו בתוך תחום שבת, ודוקא דאית ליה פותחת, אבל לית ליה פותחת – אפילו סמוך לעיר נמי לא?

תא שמע: מדקתני רבי יוסי אומר: כל שנכנסין לו בפותחת ואפילו בתוך תחום שבת, שמע מינה רבי יוסי תרתי לקולא קאמר, שמע מינה. אמר רב סלא אמר רבי ירמיה: הלכה כרבי יוסי להקל.

מתני' אין מבקעין עצים לא מן הקורות ולא מן הקורה שנשברה ביום טוב. ואין מבקעין לא בקרדום, ולא במגרה, ולא במגל, אלא בקופיץ.

NOTES

One may not chop...yet even when one chops – אין מבקעים... The Gemara initially assumed there was a single reason for the mishna's statements, and therefore it raised a contradiction between the first case and the latter one. According to the conclusion, however, there are two reasons: The prohibition against handling an object that came into being on Shabbat or a Festival [nolad], which is part of the prohibition of *muktze*, and the limitations concerning the labor of chopping itself.

There are various opinions with regard to the basic question of whether or not it is permitted to chop on Festivals. Some authorities write that chopping large chunks of wood into smaller pieces does not constitute a prohibited labor, provided that one does not chop them into pieces the size of toothpicks, which would be similar to the labor of grinding (Rashi; Rid; Rashba). According to this approach, the Sages' prohibition against using certain implements stems from the fact that they are clearly craftsman's tools, and they give the appearance that one is going to perform a full-fledged labor (Rid; Rid the Younger). The Ra'avad, however, claims that since it is necessary to kindle wood, this labor is similar to other work performed to prepare food. Since it is possible to prepare the wood on the eve of the Festival, the Sages stipulated that should one need to do so on the Festival itself, he should do so in an unusual manner. The Rambam explains that with regard to this labor, one cannot be certain how much wood he will need. Sometimes, when one comes to add wood to the fire, he finds that he requires more or that he is not able to break up the remaining pieces and needs to chop them (see Ra'avan).

An ax and a cleaver – קופיץ וקרדום: Some explain that there is no practical difference between the Gemara's two versions of this discussion (Ran; *Shitta Mekubbetzet*). The distinction between them is that only the second version holds that there are some butcher's knives that are similar to axes in that their narrower end is permitted and their broader end prohibited. Others explain, however, that there is a halakhic difference between the two readings: According to the first version, all butcher's knives are permitted, whereas according to the second only the narrow side of a cleaver may be used (*ge'onim*; Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

BACKGROUND

Ax [kardom] – קרדום: Based on the description here and in other places, a *kardom* is the Roman dolabra, a two-sided implement. Its broader end was used for chopping, while its narrower side was used for hoeing or breaking. The narrow end was either bent, as depicted here, or straight.



Roman dolabras

גמ' והאמרת רישא אין מבקעין כלא! אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: חסורי מחסרה והכי קתני: אין מבקעין מן הסוואר של קורות ולא מן הקורה שנשברה ביום טוב. אבל מבקעין מן הקורה שנשברה מערב יום טוב.

וכשהו מבקעין – אין מבקעין לא בקרדום ולא במגל ולא במגרה אלא בקופיץ. תניא נמי הכי: אין מבקעין עצים לא מן הסוואר של קורות ולא מן הקורה שנשברה ביום טוב, לפי שאינו מן המוכן.

ולא בקרדום. אמר רב חנינא בר שלמיא משמיה דרב: לא שנו אלא בנקבות שלו. אבל בזכרות שלו – מותר.

פשיטא. בקופיץ תנן. מהו דתימא: הני מילי – קופיץ לחודיה, אבל קרדום וקופיץ – אימא: מגו דהאי גיסא אסור – האי גיסא נמי אסור, קא משמע לן.

ואיכא דמתני לה אסיפא: "אלא בקופיץ". אמר רב חנינא בר שלמיא משמיה דרב: לא שנו אלא בזכרות שלו, אבל בנקבות שלו – אסור. פשיטא, ולא בקרדום תנן. מהו דתימא: הני מילי – קרדום, אבל קופיץ וקרדום, אימא: מגו דהאי גיסא שרי – האי גיסא נמי שרי, קא משמע לן.

GEMARA The Gemara wonders at the wording of the mishna: **But didn't you say in the first clause of the mishna that one may not chop beams at all on a Festival, ostensibly due to the extra effort involved? Why, then, does the mishna later define how one may chop, and even permit the use of a cleaver? Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: The mishna is incomplete and is teaching the following: One may not chop wood from the pile of beams intended for construction, nor from a beam that broke on the Festival itself, as it is considered *muktze*. However, one may chop wood from a beam that broke on the eve of the Festival, since it has presumably been designated as firewood.**

Yet even when one chops^N such a beam, it must not be done in the weekday manner; an adjustment must be made. Therefore, **one may not chop it neither with an ax,^B nor with a saw, nor with a sickle, but with a cleaver.** The Gemara comments: This opinion, which is in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel, is also taught in a *baraita*: **One may not chop wood, neither from the pile of beams nor from the beam that broke on the Festival itself, as it is not considered prepared.**

It is taught in the mishna that even when it is permitted to chop wood on a Festival, one may not do so with an ax. Rav Hinnana bar Shelemya said in the name of Rav: They taught this prohibition only with regard to a case where one chops with its female side, i.e., the broad side of the ax, as was normally done. But if one chops with its male side, i.e., the narrow side, this is permitted because it is an unusual manner of chopping.

The Gemara challenges: It is obvious that one may do so in this unusual fashion, as we learned in the mishna that it is permitted to chop with a cleaver, and chopping with the narrow side of an ax is similar to chopping with a cleaver. The Gemara explains: It was necessary to teach this *halakha* lest you say: This applies only to a cleaver, as it is narrow on both sides, but with regard to a tool that is an ax on one side and like a cleaver on the other, one might say: Since this side, that which is like an ax, is prohibited, the other, side, which is like a cleaver, should also be prohibited. Rav therefore teaches us that the cleaver side is in fact permitted.

And some teach this *halakha* in relation to the latter clause of the mishna: Rather, with a cleaver. Rav Hinnana bar Shelemya said in the name of Rav: They taught that it is permitted to chop wood on a Festival from a beam that was broken the day before, as stated previously, when one does so only with its male side; but if he chops with its female side, it is prohibited. The Gemara challenges: This is obvious. Didn't we learn in the mishna that one may not use an ax? The Gemara answers: It was necessary to teach this *halakha* lest you say: This prohibition applies only to an ax, but with regard to a utensil that is both an ax and a cleaver,^N i.e., that is broad on one side and narrow on the other, one might say: Since this side, the narrower one, is permitted, the other, broader side should also be permitted. Rav therefore teaches us that they did not permit one side due to the other.^H

HALAKHA

Chopping wood – ביקוע עצים: One may not chop wood for fuel, apart from large pieces that are needed for the Festival. An ax may not be used for this purpose; rather, only the narrow side of a cleaver may be used, in accordance with the second explanation of the Gemara.

Some claim that since no one nowadays has the requisite expertise to identify these vessels, one should use only a knife, which certainly constitutes chopping in an unusual manner (*Tur*, citing *Tosafot*; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim* 501:1).

A house... and a hole formed – בית...ונפחת – The Ramban writes in *Milhamot Hashem* that this is referring to a house in which the hole had formed before the Festival, and the Sages permitted one to remove fruit only from the place where the hole is. It seems that the Ramban maintains that the Gemara is referring to one who was unaware of the hole before the Festival. The novel teaching here is that it is not assumed that one removed the fruit from his mind (*Bigdei Yom Tov*).

One may remove through the place of the hole – נוטל: The early authorities ask why this produce is not considered *muktze*. Rashi, the Rid, and others maintain that since this type of *muktze* is by rabbinic law, the Sages did not apply the prohibition when it might affect the joy of the Festival (see *Tosafot*). The Ramban and Rabbi Aharon HaLevi explain that whenever something is *muktze* not due to itself but due to a certain external factor, the removal of that factor leads to the cancelation of the prohibition of *muktze* as well. The Rashba explains that the case under discussion is that of an unstable house in which holes might open at any moment. One knows that it may become accessible during Shabbat, and therefore he does not set the produce aside in his mind. Some claim that the mishna is referring to a case in which one had a key to the house, and therefore *muktze* does not apply in this case at all (Rid the Younger).

Bricks placed one on top of the other – בבאורא דליבני: The early and later authorities discuss this issue at length. The Rashba explains that it is not the entire house that is constructed from uncemented bricks, but merely the doorway. It is for this reason that making an opening by removing the bricks is not considered dismantling a tent.

Unravel – מפקיע: Rabbeinu Hananel maintains that this unraveling is not referring to the rope, as explained by Rashi, but to the seal. It either breaks or is dismantled.

HALAKHA

A house...and a hole formed – בית...ונפחת: If a hole forms on a Festival in the wall or roof of a house filled with tithed produce, it is permitted to take produce through the place of the hole, in accordance with the mishna. Likewise, if one has produce and similar items hidden in a pit, and a gentile opens the pit on Shabbat or a Festival, the owner may remove the items, provided the gentile did not open the pit for the sake of the Jew (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 518:9).

Bricks remaining – ליבני דאיתור: It is permitted to handle bricks left over from a building. However, if one left them on top of one another, he has indicated that he intends to use them for construction purposes. Consequently, they may not be moved, as stated by Rav Nahman. Some claim that since nowadays it is uncommon to sit on bricks, they are always considered *muktze* (*Arukh HaShulhan; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 308:17).

Fastenings that are attached to the ground – חותמות שפקרקע: Fastenings that are tied to the ground, such as those closing the entrances of pits, may be untied, as these knots are not considered permanent knots. However, one may not unravel or cut the rope because this constitutes dismantling. If the ropes were initially made as temporary ropes, one may do so. These *halakhot* are in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 314:10).

Fastenings that are on vessels – חותמות שבפלים: It is permitted to cut, unwind, and untie fastenings on vessels, e.g., rope that holds closets shut. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel. However, one may not break a wooden beam used as a bolt because it is prohibited to completely dismantle something, even in the case of a vessel. With regard to locks of boxes and similar items, some permit dismantling them in all cases, whereas others are lenient if it is performed by a gentile and there is either a great loss or some other important need involved (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 314:7).

מתני' בית שהוא מלא פירות ונפחת, נוטל ממקום הפחת. רבי מאיר אומר: אף פוחת לכתחלה ונוטל.

MISHNA If there is a house that is filled with produce and locked on all sides, and a hole formed^{NH} in one of its walls or its roof, one may remove produce through the place of the hole.^N The produce is not considered *muktze*, even though one cannot reach it without the existence of the hole. **Rabbi Meir says: One may even make a hole *ab initio* and take produce through that opening.**

גמ' אמאי? והא קא סתר אהלא. אמר רב נחומי בר אדא אמר שמואל: באורא דליבני איני? והאמר רב נחמן: הני ליבני דאיתור מבנינא – שרי לטלטוליניהו בשבתא. הואיל וחזי למוגא עליהו. שריניהו – ודאי אקצינהו.

GEMARA The Gemara wonders at Rabbi Meir's statement: **Why does he permit one to make a hole in order to remove the produce *ab initio*? Isn't one who does so dismantling a tent, thereby performing a biblically prohibited labor? Rav Nahumi bar Adda said that Shmuel said:** Here, it is referring to bricks placed one on top of the other [*aveira delivni*]^{NL} but not cemented together. This is not considered a building at all. The Gemara challenges: **Is that so? But didn't Rav Nahman say: With regard to these bricks remaining^H from a building, it is permitted to handle them on Shabbat, since they are fit to sit on; however, if one arranged them in rows, one on top of the other, he has certainly set them aside from his intentions?** This indicates that even bricks placed on top of one another without being cemented together are nonetheless considered *muktze*.

אמר רבי יורא: ביום טוב אפרו. אבל לא בשבת. תניא נמי הכי, רבי מאיר אומר: אף פוחת לכתחלה ונוטל, ביום טוב אפרו אבל לא בשבת.

Rabbi Zeira said: Rabbi Meir was referring to a Festival. **On a Festival they said that one may do so, but they did not allow it on Shabbat even in such a manner, and Rav Nahman was speaking of Shabbat. This opinion was also taught explicitly in the following baraita: Rabbi Meir says: One may even make a hole on a Festival *ab initio* and remove the produce from inside; they said this with regard to a Festival, but not with regard to Shabbat.**

אמר שמואל: חותמות שפקרקע – מתיר, אבל לא מפקיע ולא חותך. שבפלים – מתיר, ומפקיע, וחותר. אחד שבת ואחד יום טוב.

Shmuel said: In the case of fastenings made of knotted ropes that are attached to the ground^H and that serve as closures for doors of cellars and caves, one may untie the knot, but one may not unravel^N the rope itself into its constituent fibers nor cut the rope. This constitutes the prohibited labor of dismantling the cellar or cave on Shabbat. With regard to fastenings that are on the doors of vessels,^H e.g., cupboards, it is permitted to untie, or unravel, or cut them if necessary, both on Shabbat and on a Festival, as the prohibition against dismantling does not apply to vessels.

מיתבי: חותמות שפקרקע, בשבת – מתיר אבל לא מפקיע ולא חותר, ביום טוב – מתיר ומפקיע וחותר.

The Gemara raises an objection to this from the following *baraita*: In a case of fastenings that are attached to the ground, which are on doors, on Shabbat one may untie the rope but not unravel or cut it. Although it is permitted to do so by Torah law, the Sages prohibited it. However, on a Festival, one may untie or unravel or cut it, as this is not prohibited even by rabbinic law. This appears to contradict the opinion of Shmuel, who does not differentiate between Shabbat and Festivals.

הא מני – רבי מאיר היא, דאמר: אף פוחת לכתחלה ונוטל. ופליגי רבנן עליה, ואנא דאמרי כרבנן. ומי פליגי רבנן עליה בחותמות שפקרקע? והתניא: מודים חכמים לרבי מאיר בחותמות שפקרקע, שבשבת מתיר אבל לא מפקיע ולא חותר, ביום טוב מתיר ומפקיע וחותר.

Shmuel could respond: In accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said: **One may even make a hole and remove produce *ab initio*, whereas the Rabbis disagree with him and prohibit it, and I spoke in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis.** The Gemara asks: **And do the Rabbis disagree with him with regard to doors sealed to the ground? But isn't it taught in a baraita: The Rabbis concede to Rabbi Meir with regard to doors sealed to the ground that one may untie them on Shabbat but not unravel or cut them, while on a Festival one may untie or unravel or cut them?**

LANGUAGE

Bricks placed one on top of the other [*aveira delivnei*] – אוריא דלבני: There are several variations of the word *aveira*. Probably the best reading is *avara*. Despite the not uncommon spelling of *avira*, the term does not appear to be related

to the word *avira*, meaning air. Rather, it is likely Akkadian in origin and related to the word *amaru*, a brick pile. In the current context, it refers to a pile of loose bricks.