

HALAKHA

**Sweeping a trough – גרירת איבוס**: On Shabbat, one may not sweep the bottom of a trough used by an ox that is being fattened, even if the trough is an actual vessel and not a trough formed in the ground. This is a rabbinic decree due to the concern lest one level holes in the ground when using a trough formed in the ground. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 26:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 324:15).

**An animal whose mouth is fine – בהמה שפיה יפה**: On Shabbat, one may move food that was placed before a donkey and place it before an ox, but not the opposite, because the food will be spoiled by the ox's saliva and the donkey will not eat it. Therefore, the ox's food is set-aside (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 26:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 324:14).

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: מַחְלוּקַת בְּאִיבוּס שֶׁל קֶרְקַע, אָבֵל בְּאִיבוּס שֶׁל כְּלִי – דְּבָרֵי הַכֵּל מוּתָר. וְאִיבוּס שֶׁל קֶרְקַע מִי אֵיכָא לְמַאן דְּשָׂרִי? הָא קָא מְשִׁי גּוּמְוֹת! אֱלָא, אֵי אֵיתְמַר הָכִי אֵיתְמַר: אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא מַחְלוּקַת בְּאִיבוּס שֶׁל כְּלִי, אָבֵל בְּאִיבוּס שֶׁל קֶרְקַע – דְּבָרֵי הַכֵּל אֲסוּר.

וְנוֹטְלִין מִלְפְּנֵי בְהֵמָה. תְּנָא חֲדָא: נוֹטְלִין מִלְפְּנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה יָפָה, וְנוֹתְנִין לְפָנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה רַע. וְתַנְיָא אִידְךָ: נוֹטְלִין מִלְפְּנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה רַע וְנוֹתְנִין לְפָנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה יָפָה!

אָמַר אַבְיִי: אִידֵי וְאִידֵי מִקְמֵי חֲמָרָא לְקַמֵי תוֹרָא – שְׁקֵלִינן, מִקְמֵי תוֹרָא לְקַמֵי חֲמָרָא – לֹא שְׁקֵלִינן. וְהָא דְקִתְנִי “נוֹטֵל מִלְפְּנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה יָפָה” – בְּחֲמוֹר, דְּלִית לֵיהּ רִירֵי. וְנוֹתְנִין לְפָנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה רַע” – בְּפָרָה.

Rav Hisda said: This dispute is with regard to a trough<sup>H</sup> formed in the ground; however, with regard to a trough which is a vessel, everyone agrees that it is permitted. The Gemara expresses surprise: Is there anyone who permits doing so in a trough formed in the ground? Isn't one leveling holes and thereby performing the prohibited labors of building or plowing? Rather, if it was stated, it was stated as follows: Rav Hisda said: This dispute applies only to a trough that is a vessel; however, with regard to a trough formed in the ground, everyone agrees that it is prohibited, due to the concern lest one level holes.

We also learned in the mishna: One may take hay from before this animal and place it before that animal. It was taught in one *baraita*: One may take hay from before an animal whose mouth is fine and place it before an animal whose mouth is foul. And it was taught in another *baraita*: One may take hay from before an animal whose mouth is foul and place it in front of an animal whose mouth is fine. There is an apparent contradiction between the two *baraitot*.

Abaye said: Both this *baraita* and that *baraita* hold that one may take hay from before a donkey and place it before an ox. However, one may not take hay from before an ox and place it before a donkey. The formulation of the *baraitot* can be explained as follows: That which was taught: One may take hay from before an animal whose mouth is fine,<sup>H</sup> is referring to a donkey, and the reason the *baraita* says its mouth is fine is because it has no spittle. Therefore, the donkey does not dampen the remaining hay with its saliva. And the statement: And one may place it before an animal whose mouth is foul, is referring to a cow,

Perek XX

Daf 141 Amud a

HALAKHA

**Straw that is on top of a bed – הקש שעל גבי המטה**: If there is straw on a bed, which is presumably set-aside because it might be used for kindling, it is prohibited to move it on Shabbat with one's hands. However, one may move the straw with one's body in an atypical manner. If the straw was prepared as animal food, or if one placed a pillow or a sheet on it before Shabbat, it is not set-aside and one is allowed to shake it off with one's hands (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 25:22; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 311:8).

**Laundry press – מכבש כביסה**: If one's garments were placed in a professional launderer's press after they were washed, it is prohibited to remove them on Shabbat, even for Shabbat use. The press is tightly sealed, and loosening it is similar to disassembling a building. However, if the garments are in a homeowner's press, which is more loosely sealed, it is permissible to loosen the press and remove the clothing on Shabbat (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 26:12; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 302:4).

NOTES

**אבל – one may not press clothing with it on Shabbat**: Rashi explains that pressing garments on Shabbat is prohibited because it is considered a weekday activity and it is inappropriate to perform actions of that sort on Shabbat. Other commentaries state that there is a concern that one may forcefully wedge together the components of the press, thereby performing the prohibited labor of building (Rashash).

**He may loosen it completely – מתיר את כולו**: A variant reading of the mishna states: He identifies his garments and removes them. In other words, if the launderer's press was already loosened, one who recognizes his articles of clothing may remove them from among the others (see *Meleket Shlomo*).

דאית לה רירי.

וְהָא דְקִתְנִי “נוֹטֵל מִלְפְּנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה רַע” – בְּחֲמוֹר דְּלֹא דִיִּיק וְאֵכִיל, וְנוֹתְנִין לְפָנֵי בְהֵמָה שְׁפִיָּה יָפָה” – בְּפָרָה דְּדִיִּיקָא וְאֵכִילָהּ.

**מתני' הקש שעל גבי המטה** – לֹא יִנְעָנְעוּ בְיָדוֹ, אֱלָא מִנְעָנְעוּ בְּגוּפוֹ. וְאִם הָיָה מְאָכֵל בְּהֵמָה, אוֹ שְׁהִיָּה עֲלָיו כֹּר אוֹ סָדִין – מִנְעָנְעוּ בְיָדוֹ.

מִכְבֵּשׁ שֶׁל בַּעֲלֵי בֵתִים – מִתְרִין, אָבֵל לֹא כּוֹבְשִׁין. וְשֶׁל כּוֹבְסִין – לֹא יָנֵעַ בוֹ. רַבֵּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמַר: אִם הָיָה מוּתָר מֵעֶרֶב שַׁבָּת – מִתְּרֵי אֶת כּוּלוֹ שׁוֹמְטוֹ.

which has spittle.

And that which was taught in the other *baraita*: One may take hay from before an animal whose mouth is foul, is referring to a donkey. Its mouth is foul because it does not discern between different foods and it eats everything. And the statement: One may place it before an animal whose mouth is fine, is referring to a cow, which discerns between different foods and only then it eats.

**MISHNA** With regard to straw that is on top of a bed,<sup>H</sup> if a person wishes to lie on it, he may not move it with his hand to smooth it, as the straw is set aside for kindling; rather, he may move it with his body. Since moving straw with one's body is not the usual manner, it is permitted. And if the straw was designated as animal food, or a pillow or sheet was on it, which would clearly indicate that the straw was placed on the bed so one could sleep on it, the straw is not considered set-aside, and one may move it even with his hand.

A press which belongs to a homeowner, one may loosen it on Shabbat. This press is used to dry and press clothing after laundering. One loosens it to remove clothing from it. However, one may not press clothing with it on Shabbat.<sup>N</sup> And in the case of a press that belongs to a launderer,<sup>H</sup> which is made specifically for pressing and requires professional expertise for its operation, one may not touch it. Rabbi Yehuda says: If the launderer's press was loosened somewhat on Shabbat eve, he may loosen it completely<sup>N</sup> on Shabbat and remove the garment.

**גמ'** אמר רב נחמן: האי פוגלא, מלמעלה למטה – שרי, מלמטה למעלה – אסיר.

**GEMARA** With regard to moving items that are set aside, the Gemara cites that which Rav Nahman said: **This radish, which was buried in the earth, if it was buried from top to bottom, with its wide end at the top and its narrow end at the bottom, it is permitted to remove it on Shabbat.** When the radish is buried in that manner, one does not move the earth when he removes the radish. However, if the radish was buried in the earth **from bottom to top, with the wide end at the bottom, it is prohibited.**

אמר רב אבא, אמרי בי רב: תנא דלא כרב נחמן "הקש שעל גבי המטה – לא ינענעו בידו, אבל מנענעו בגופו. ואם היה מאכל בהמה, או שהיה עליו בר או סדין – מנענעו בידו". שמע מינה: טלטול מן הצד – לא שמייה טלטול, שמע מינה.

Rav Adda bar Abba said: **They say in the school of Rav: We already learned in the mishna that the halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rav Nahman: With regard to straw on top of a bed, one may not move it with his hand, but he may move it with his body. And if it is animal food, or a pillow or sheet is on it, he may move it even with his hand. Conclude from here that moving an item in an atypical manner<sup>n</sup> is not considered moving.** The Gemara concludes: Indeed, **conclude from here that this is indeed the case.**

אמר רב יהודה: הני פלפלי מידק חדא חדא בקתא דסבינא – שרי, תרתי – אסיר. רבא אמר: בין דמשני – אפילו טובא נמי.

The Gemara cites a somewhat similar case.<sup>n</sup> Rav Yehuda said: **In the case of these peppers, crushing them<sup>h</sup> one by one with the handle of a knife is permitted.** However, **crushing two at a time is prohibited, because it appears to be a prohibited labor. Rava said: Since he alters the manner in which he performs this activity, even crushing many at a time is also permitted.**

אמר רב יהודה: מאן דסחי במיא – לינגיב נפשיה ברישא, והדר ליסליק, דילמא אתי לאתויי ארבע אמות בכרמלית.

Rav Yehuda also said: **One who bathes in water should first dry himself immediately upon exiting,<sup>h</sup> and then ascend to the coast, lest he come to carry the remaining drops of water on his body four cubits in a karmelit.**

אי הכי, כי קא נחית נמי, קא דחי כחו ארבע אמות, ואסיר! כחו בכרמלית לא גזרו.

The Gemara asks: **If so, if there is a concern about carrying water, there should be concern when one descends into the water as well.** In that case, **his force propels water four cubits into the river, and it should be prohibited.** The Gemara answers: With regard to movement that results from **his force in a karmelit**, the Sages did not issue a decree. Since one does not directly propel the water, but the water moves only as an extension of his motion, and since the river is a *karmelit*, and the prohibition to carry there is only a rabbinic law, the Sages did not issue a decree for one who descends into the water.

אמר אביי ואיתימא רב יהודה: טיט שעל גבי רגלו מקנחו בקרקע, ואין מקנחו בכותל.

In a similar decree, Abaye said, and some say that it was stated by Rav Yehuda: **If one has mud on his foot, he may wipe it<sup>h</sup> on the ground on Shabbat, but he may not wipe it on a wall.**

אמר רבא: מאי טעמא בכותל לא משום דמחזי בבונה, הא בנין תקלאה הוא!

Rava said: **What is the reason that he may not wipe it off on a wall? Is it because it appears like building, as he is adding plaster to the wall? That is the building of a field laborer, which is not an actual building.** There is no concern in that case because in adding plaster to that building, one does not perform the prohibited labor of building.

אלא אמר רבא: מקנחו בכותל, ואין מקנחו בקרקע, דילמא אתי לאשוויי גומות.

Rather, Rava said: **On the contrary, He may wipe it on a wall, but he may not wipe it on the ground.** This is due to the concern **lest one come to level holes** in the ground while wiping his foot.

איתמר, מר בריה דרבנא אמר: אחד זה ואחד זה אסור, רב פפא אמר: אחד זה ואחד זה – מותר.

It is stated that other *amora'im* disputed this issue. **Mar, son of Ravina, said: Both this, wiping the mud on a wall, and that, wiping the mud on the ground, are prohibited. Rav Pappa said: Both this and that are permitted.**

למר בריה דרבנא במאי מקנחי ליה? מקנחי ליה בקורה.

The Gemara asks: **According to the opinion of Mar, son of Ravina, with what may he wipe his foot?** The Gemara answers: Even according to his opinion, there is a permitted manner to clean his foot; **he wipes it on a beam on the ground.**

אמר רבא: לא ליתבי איניש אפומיה דליתויא, דילמא מינגדרא ליה חפץ ואתי לאתויי.

Rava said: **A person should not sit on Shabbat right at the entrance to a closed alleyway<sup>h</sup> where a side post is placed as a symbolic partition enabling one to carry inside the alleyway.** The reason for this is that **perhaps an object will roll into the public domain and one will come to get it**, as there is no conspicuous demarcation between inside and outside the alleyway.

**טלטול – מן הצד:** Objects that one is prohibited to move on Shabbat are prohibited only if they are moved in their typical manner. Moving these items in an indirect manner is permitted (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 25:14–15; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 311:8).

**דיכת פלפלים –** One is permitted to crush peppers on Shabbat if they are to be eaten on Shabbat (*Mishna Berura*) and if they are crushed in an unusual manner, even if one crushes a large amount at one time. For instance, one may crush them with the handle of a knife and in a bowl, as opposed to utilizing a mortar and pestle. This ruling is in accordance with the view of Rava (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 25:14–15; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 321:7).

**יציאה מן הנהר –** One who bathes in a river on Shabbat (see *Mishna Berura*) must dry off thoroughly when emerging from the water so that no water will remain on his body and be carried four cubits in a *karmelit*. This ruling is in accordance with Rav Yehuda (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 15:22; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 326:7).

**If one has mud on his foot, he may wipe it, etc. – טיט שעל גבי רגלו מקנחו וכו' –** One who has mud on his shoe or on his foot may wipe it off on a wall but not on the ground, due to concern that one might level holes, as stated by Rava. Some authorities prohibit wiping the mud off on a wall and permit only the use of a beam, in accordance with the opinion of Mar, son of Ravina (Rif). Other commentaries even permit the use of the ground, in accordance with Rav Pappa's opinion (Rosh). The later commentaries did not reach a consensus on this issue, although most of them agreed that only a wall should be used. This is the ruling of the *Beit Yosef*, in accordance with the decision of the majority of early commentaries. The *Bah*, however, favored the more stringent approach (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:2; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 302:6).

**ישיבה –** Although the law permits one to utilize and carry under the beam marking the entrance to an alleyway, a person should nonetheless not sit by the edge of the alleyway or by the side post (*Mishna Berura*), lest an object roll out of his hand and he come to retrieve it from the public domain, as stated by Rava (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 17:17; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 365:5).

NOTES

**מקלף –** The succession of topics in the Gemara seems to be presenting a series of unrelated *halakhot*. Nevertheless, the items share several common features. In particular, all the cases involve rabbinic decrees that prohibit actions that could lead to performance of a prohibited labor, although each action in and of itself lacks even the appearance of a prohibition. Some commentaries state that most of these decrees are in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who holds that an unintentional act is prohibited (*Tosefot Rid*).

HALAKHA

**לֹא לִיצַד אִינִישׁ כּוּבָא** – A person may not position a barrel – It is prohibited to straighten or tilt a full (*Mishna Berura*) barrel on the ground on Shabbat. Since it is heavy, one will inevitably even out holes in the ground (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 337:4*).

**מִוֶּכֶן בְּפִי כַד** – Rags in the mouth of a jug – It is prohibited to stuff wet (*Mishna Berura*) rags into the mouth of a jug on Shabbat, because one will inevitably squeeze the liquid out of them (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 22:15; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 320:16*).

**טֵיט שְׁעַל גְּבִי בְּגָדוֹ** – Mortar that is on one's garment – If one has mortar on his clothing, he may rub it off from the inside, since it does not have the appearance of laundering. He may not rub it off from the outside. It is also permitted to scrape it off with a fingernail, as that is considered atypical, as per the opinion of Rav Huna. Some authorities explain that this *halakha* applies only to wet mud. However, it is prohibited to rub off dry mud, because that constitutes the prohibited labor of grinding (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 22:17; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 302:7*).

NOTES

**לֹא לִיצַד אִינִישׁ כּוּבָא** – A person may not position a barrel – Some commentaries explain that this means that one should not tip a barrel on its side to pour from it, due to the possibility that the edge of the barrel will dig a hole in the ground. Instead, one should lift the barrel off of the ground and then pour from it (*ge'onim*).

LANGUAGE

**שִׁישָׁא** – Jug [*shisha*] – From the Middle Persian *šišag*, meaning bottle or jug.

Perek XX

Daf 141 Amud b

HALAKHA

**גִּירוּד מִנְעַל** – Scraping off a shoe – It is prohibited to scrape dirt off both a new and an old shoe on Shabbat, with a knife or with a fingernail. Scraping is tantamount to the labor of smoothing the leather, in accordance with the *baraita* taught by Rabbi Hiyya. However, one may scrape the dirt off a shoe against a wall (*Magen Avraham; Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 22:18; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 302:8*).

**לֹא יִסֹךְ אֶת רִגְלוֹ** – One may not smear oil on one's foot, etc. – **לֹא יִסֹךְ אֶת רִגְלוֹ**: It is prohibited to smear oil on one's foot on Shabbat while wearing a new (*Rambam*) shoe or sandal because that approximates tanning. However, it is permitted to smear oil on one's foot and then put on a shoe or smear oil on one's entire body in order to rest on a leather carpet, as long as there is not enough oil to tan the leather and the intention is not to process the leather (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 23:10; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 327:4*).

**וְאָמַר רַבָּא: לֹא לִיצַד אִינִישׁ כּוּבָא, דִּילְמָא אָתֵי לְאִשְׁוִיֵי גּוּמּוֹת.**

**וְאָמַר רַבָּא: לֹא לִיהֲדוּק אִינִישׁ אוֹדְרָא בְּפּוּמָא דְשִׁישָׁא, דִּילְמָא אָתֵי לִידֵי סְחִיטָה.**

**אָמַר רַב כְּהֵנָּא: טֵיט שְׁעַל גְּבִי בְּגָדוֹ מִכְּסָסוֹ מִבְּפָנִים וְאִין מִכְּסָסוֹ מִבְּחוּץ.**

**מֵיִתִּיבִי: טֵיט שְׁעַל גְּבִי מִנְעַל – מְגַרְרוּ בְּגַב סָבִין, וְשְׁעַל בְּגָדוֹ – מְגַרְרוּ בְּעַפְרוֹן, וּבְלִבְדָּ שְׁלֵא יְכַסֵּם, מֵאִי לֹאוֹ – שְׁלֵא יְכַסֵּם בְּלֵל! לֹא, שְׁלֵא יְכַסֵּם מִבְּחוּץ, אֶלָּא מִבְּפָנִים.**

**אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָהוּ אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אָמַר רַבִּי יֵנְאִי: מְגַרְרִין מִנְעַל חֲדָשׁ, אֲבָל לֹא יִשְׁן.**

And Rava also said a similar decree: A person may not position a barrel<sup>HN</sup> on a dirt floor, lest he come to level holes in the ground while smoothing the surface upon which he is positioning the barrel.

And furthermore, Rava said: A person may not stuff a rag into the mouth of a jug [*shisha*]<sup>HL</sup> on Shabbat, lest he come to violate the prohibition of squeezing liquid from the cloth.

Rav Kahana said: With regard to mortar that is on one's garment<sup>H</sup> on Shabbat, one may rub it off from the inside, but one may not rub it off from the outside, because that is comparable to the prohibited labor of laundering.

The Gemara raises an objection from that which we learned: With regard to mortar that is on one's shoe, he may scrape it off with the back of a knife as a departure from the typical manner of scraping. And mortar which is on one's clothes, he may scrape off with his fingernail, as long as he does not rub it. The Gemara asks: What, is it not saying that he may not rub it at all? The Gemara rejects that premise: No, it is saying that he may not rub it from the outside, rather from the inside.

Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Yannai said: One may scrape mud off of a new shoe on Shabbat, but not off of an old shoe, because a layer of the shoe will be removed, which constitutes the prohibited labor of smoothing.

**בְּמָה מְגַרְרוּ? אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָהוּ: בְּגַב סָבִין.**

**אָמַר לֵיהּ הֵוָּא סָבָא: סָמֵי דִידָךְ מִקְמֵי הָא דַתְנִי רַבִּי חֵיִיא: אִין מְגַרְרִין לֹא מִנְעַל חֲדָשׁ וְלֹא מִנְעַל יִשְׁן, וְלֹא יִסֹךְ אֶת רִגְלוֹ שְׂמֹן וְהוּא בְּתוּךְ הַמְנַעַל אוֹ בְּתוּךְ הַסַּנְדָּל, אֲבָל סָךְ אֶת רִגְלוֹ שְׂמֹן וּמְנִיחַ בְּתוּךְ הַמְנַעַל אוֹ בְּתוּךְ הַסַּנְדָּל. וְסָךְ כֹּל גּוּפוֹ שְׂמֹן וּמְתַעֵגֵל עַל גְּבִי קַטְבְּלִיא וְאִינוּ חוֹשִׁשׁ.**

**אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא לְצַחְצָחוֹ, אֲבָל לְעִבְדוֹ – אָסוּר.**

**“לְעִבְדוֹ” פְּשִׁטָּא! וְתוֹ: לְצַחְצָחוֹ, מִי אִיכָּא מֵאֵן דְּשָׂרִי?**

**אֶלָּא, אִי אִיתְמַר הָכִי אִיתְמַר, אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שִׁיעוּר לְצַחְצָחוֹ, אֲבָל שִׁיעוּר לְעִבְדוֹ – אָסוּר.**

With what does one scrape it off? Rabbi Abahu said: With the back of a knife, which is a departure from the typical manner of doing so.

A certain Elder said to Rabbi Abbahu: Delete your teaching before this statement taught by Rabbi Hiyya: One may not scrape at all; neither a new shoe nor an old shoe,<sup>H</sup> and one may not smear oil on one's foot<sup>H</sup> while it is inside the shoe or inside the sandal, as the oil is absorbed by the leather of the shoe and strengthens it, which constitutes performance of the prohibited labor of tanning. However, one may smear oil on his foot in the typical manner and place it afterward in a shoe or in a sandal, and he need not be concerned that this oil will enhance the shoe leather. And he may likewise smear oil on his entire body with oil and roll on a leather carpet, and he need not be concerned.

Rav Hisda said: They only taught this in a case where he does so in order to polish the sandal or carpet. But if he does so to tan the sandal or carpet, it is prohibited.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If he does so to tan the leather, it is obvious that it is prohibited, as tanning is a labor prohibited by Torah law. And furthermore: If he does so in order to polish it, is there an opinion that permits one to perform this act intentionally on Shabbat *ab initio*?

Rather, if it was stated, it was stated as follows: Rav Hisda said: They only taught that it is permitted to do so on Shabbat in a case where one smears a measure sufficient only to polish it; however, if one smears a measure sufficient to tan it, it is prohibited, even if he did not intend to tan the leather.

A small person may not go out in a too large shoe... in a too large cloak – בחלוק גדול... לא יצא קטן במנעל גדול – It is prohibited to go out on Shabbat wearing a shoe that is too large, because it might fall off and one might come to carry it. However, it is permitted to wear a large cloak, in which case no such concern exists (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 19:15; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 301:7).

**Halitza with a torn shoe – מנעל מרופט בחליצה** – *Ab initio, Halitza* must be performed with a shoe that is whole. Nevertheless, if *halitza* is performed with a torn shoe that is not entirely shredded (*Tosafot*), the *halitza* is valid after the fact. If the shoe is so torn that it cannot be worn, the *halitza* is invalid (Rambam *Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum VaHalitza* 4:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 169:21).

And a woman may not go out in a shoe that is torn on top... wearing a new shoe – במנעל חדש... במנעל מרופט – A woman may not wear a shoe on Shabbat that is torn at the top because she might be mocked, causing her to remove the shoe and carry it. Likewise, she may not go out wearing a new shoe that she has never worn before, because if it does not fit her she might remove it. However, the *halakha* with regard to new shoes does not apply to men, since they are not as particular about those matters (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 19:15; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 303:13).

**The purity of a new shoe – טהרת מנעל חדש** – A shoe on a last, although it has never been worn, can contract ritual impurity imparted by treading because it is a completed vessel. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Kelim* 24:5).

**Removing a shoe from a last – מנעל מעל אימוס** – It is permitted to remove a new shoe or an old one (*Mishna Berura*) from a last on Shabbat, since the last is considered a utensil, albeit one whose primary function is prohibited. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. One may likewise cause the last to fall away from the shoe (*Mishna Berura*; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 26:12; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 308:14).

NOTES

**A shoe that is torn on top [meruppat] – מנעל מרופט** – Some commentaries explain that *meruppat* means that the shoe is too large, so the foot does not fit snugly in the shoe.

**Halitza with a shoe – חליצה במנעל** – The tradition observed by the Sages is that the shoe with which *halitza* is performed must be suitable to be worn by the brother-in-law. If the shoe is torn on top, the concern is that it might not be suitable for wearing. Some explain that a shoe which is completely torn is invalid for *halitza*, even after the fact (*Tosafot*).

**A shoe that remains on a last – מנעל שעל גבי אימוס** – According to the *Tosefta* in tractate *Teharot*, Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis disagree whether or not a shoe, which is a cover that protects the last, is considered a vessel.

תנו רבנן: לא יצא קטן במנעל גדול, אבל יצא הוא בחלוק גדול.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: A small person may not go out in a too large shoe, due to concern lest the shoe fall off and he will come to carry it in the public domain; but he may go out in a too large cloak.<sup>H</sup> Even if it does not fit him properly, it will certainly not fall off.

ולא תצא אשה במנעל מרופט, ולא תחלוץ בו. ואם חליצה – חליצתה בשרה.

And a woman may not go out on Shabbat in a shoe that is torn on top,<sup>N</sup> lest she be mocked, remove it, and carry it on Shabbat. And a shoe of that kind may not be used to perform *halitza*, as it is not a suitable shoe. *Halitza* is performed by a widow bound in a levirate bond with her brother-in-law. However, if she performed *halitza* with it, her *halitza* is valid, since ultimately it is a shoe.<sup>HN</sup>

ואין יוצאין במנעל חדש. באיזה מנעל אמרו – במנעל של אשה.

And one may not go out on Shabbat wearing a new shoe,<sup>H</sup> due to the concern that it will not fit properly, and then one will remove it and carry it. The Gemara comments: In what case did they say that one may not wear a new shoe? They said this with regard to a woman's shoe, as women are very particular about having their shoes fit properly.

תני בר קפרא: לא שנו אלא שלא יצאה בו שעה אחת מבעוד יום, אבל יצאה בו מערב שבת – מותר.

Bar Kappara taught: They only taught that she may not go out wearing a new shoe on Shabbat if she did not yet go out wearing it for any length of time while it was still day. However, if she went out wearing it on Shabbat eve, at which point she would have ascertained if it fits her, she is permitted to go out wearing it on Shabbat.

תני חדא: שומטין מנעל מעל גבי אימוס, ותניא אידך: אין שומטין! לא תשיא: הא – רבי אליעזר, הא – רבנן.

One *baraita* taught: One may remove a shoe from the shoe-maker's last, the frame on which a shoe is shaped, on Shabbat. And another *baraita* taught the opposite: One may not remove it. The Gemara explains that this is not difficult: This *baraita*, which prohibits doing so, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, and that *baraita*, which permits doing so, is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis dispute the applicability of the *halakhot* of ritual purity and impurity in a similar case.

דתנן: מנעל שעל גבי אימוס, רבי אליעזר מטהר, וחכמים מטמאים.

As we learned in a mishna: A shoe that remains on a last,<sup>N</sup> Rabbi Eliezer deems it pure, i.e., unable to become impure, as in his opinion the shoe is not yet complete, and therefore it is not yet a vessel and cannot become impure. And the Rabbis deem it capable of becoming impure, as in their opinion, the shoe is completed, and any vessel whose work is complete can become ritually impure.<sup>H</sup> Correspondingly, the Rabbis, who hold that a shoe on a last is a completed vessel, hold that it may be moved on Shabbat.<sup>H</sup> Rabbi Eliezer, who holds that it is an incomplete vessel, holds that it may not be moved.

הניחא לרבא, דאמר: דבר שמלאכתו לאיסור, בין לצורך גופו בין לצורך מקומו – מותר, שפיר.

The Gemara poses a question: It works out well according to the opinion of Rava, who said: Moving an object whose primary function is for a prohibited use, whether for the purpose of utilizing the object itself to perform a permitted action or for the purpose of utilizing its place, is permitted. It is well understood that one may move the last slightly while removing the shoe, since removing the shoe is considered utilizing the last's place.

אלא לאבוי, דאמר: לצורך גופו – מותר, לצורך מקומו – אסור, מאי איכא למימר?

However, according to Abaye, who said that for the purpose of utilizing the object itself to perform a permitted action, it is permitted; however, for the purpose of utilizing its place, it is prohibited, what can be said? It is prohibited to move the last, which is clearly a utensil whose primary function is for a prohibited use. How is it possible to remove the shoe without moving the last?

הכא במאי עסקינן – ברפוי, דתניא, רבי יהודה אומר: אם היה רפוי – מותר.

The Gemara answers: With what are we dealing here? It is with a shoe placed loosely on the last, so the shoe can be removed without moving the last. As it was taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yehuda says: If it was loose, it is permitted.

טעמא - דרפוי, הא לא רפוי - לא.  
המחא לאבי, דאמר: דבר שמלאכתו  
לאיסור, לצורך גופו - מותר, לצורך  
מקומו - אסור, שפיר.

The Gemara infers: **The reason** it is permitted is only **because it is loose**; however, if it is **not loose, no**, it is prohibited. **It works out well according to the opinion of Abaye**, who said that moving an object whose primary function is for a prohibited use for the purpose of utilizing the object itself to perform a permitted action it is permitted; however, for the purpose of utilizing its place, it is prohibited to move it. **It is well understood** that it is prohibited to move the last if the shoe is tightly attached to it.

אלא לרבא, דאמר: בין לצורך גופו  
בין לצורך מקומו - מותר, מאי  
איריא רפוי? אפילו לא רפוי נמי!

However, according to Rava, who said that moving an object whose primary function is for a prohibited use, whether for the purpose of utilizing the object itself to perform a permitted action or for the purpose of utilizing its place, is permitted, why discuss specifically a case where it is loose? **Even if it were not loose**, it should also be permitted to move it.

דרבי יהודה משום דרבי אליעזר  
הוא; דתנא, רבי יהודה אומר משום  
רבי אליעזר: אם היה רפוי - מותר.

The Gemara answers: **That baraita** is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in the name of Rabbi Eliezer, and it is not a clarification of the opinion of the Rabbis. Although Rabbi Eliezer holds that the shoe is not yet completed, nevertheless, Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer that it is permitted to carry it. **As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: If it was already loose** and no longer requires a last, **it is permitted** to move it, since it is a completed vessel and no longer needs the last to shape it.

הדרן עלך תולין

**מתני'** נוטל אדם את בנו והאבן בידו, וכלכלה והאבן בתוכה. ומטלטלין תרומה טמאה עם השטהרה ועם החולין.

רבי יהודה אומר: אף מעלין את המדומע באחד ומאה.

**גמ'** אמר רבא: הוציא תינוק חי וכיס תלוי בצוארו – חייב משום כיס. תינוק מת וכיס תלוי לו בצוארו – פטור.

"תינוק חי וכיס תלוי לו בצוארו – חייב משום כיס" וליחייב נמי משום תינוק!

רבא פרבי נתן סבירא ליה, דאמר: חי נושא את עצמו.

וליביטל כיס לגבי תינוק, מי לא תנן: את החי במטה פטור אף על המטה, שהמטה טמילה לו!

מטה לגבי חי – מבטלי ליה, כיון לגבי תינוק – לא מבטלי ליה.

"תינוק מת וכיס תלוי לו בצוארו – פטור" וליחייב משום תינוק! רבא פרבי שמעון סבירא ליה, דאמר: כל מלאכה שאין צריך לגופה – פטור עליה.

**MISHNA** A person may take his son in his hands on Shabbat, and even though there is a stone, which is a set-aside item, in the child's hand,<sup>h</sup> it is not prohibited to pick up the child. And it is permissible to take a basket with a stone inside it on Shabbat. And one may move ritually impure *teruma*, which may not be eaten and is set-aside, with ritually pure *teruma*, as well as with non-sacred produce.

Rabbi Yehuda says: One may even lift a measure of *teruma* that was nullified from a mixture<sup>n</sup> of one hundred measures of non-sacred produce and one measure of *teruma*. When a measure of *teruma* is mixed with non-sacred produce, if the non-sacred produce is one hundred times the measure of *teruma*, the *teruma* is nullified. However, the Sages instituted that one must remove an amount equivalent to that measure of *teruma* and give it to a priest. The remainder is considered non-sacred produce. Rabbi Yehuda permits removing that measure on Shabbat to render the mixture permitted to eat.

**GEMARA** Rava said: If one carried out a living baby to the public domain on Shabbat, and the baby had a purse that was hanging around his neck,<sup>h</sup> he is liable for carrying out the purse. However, one who carried out a dead baby, with a purse hanging around his neck, is exempt.

Rava said: If one carried out a living baby to the public domain on Shabbat, and a purse was hanging around the baby's neck, he is liable for carrying out the purse. The Gemara asks: And let him be liable for carrying out the baby as well.

The Gemara responds: Rava holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan,<sup>n</sup> who said: A living being carries itself. Therefore, one who carries a living being from one domain to another is not liable.

The Gemara asks: And let the purse be negated relative to the baby; and he should be exempt for carrying out the purse as well. Didn't we learn in a *mishna*: One who carries out a living person on a bed is exempt even for carrying out the bed, because the bed is secondary to the person? The same should be said with regard to the purse, relative to the baby.

The Gemara answers: In a case where a bed is relative to a living being, the living being negates it, as the bed is needed to carry the person and is secondary to him. However, in a case where a purse is relative to a baby, the baby does not negate it, since it is independently significant.

And Rava said: One who carried out a dead baby with a purse hanging around the baby's neck is exempt. The Gemara asks: And let him be liable for carrying out the baby. The Gemara answers: Rava holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who said: With regard to any labor that is not needed for its own sake, one is exempt for performing it on Shabbat. One who carries out a corpse does not do so because he needs it; rather, he does so for the sake of the corpse, i.e., to bury it or to move it from a degrading place. Therefore, he has not performed a labor prohibited by Torah law. Similarly, he is also exempt for carrying out the purse because due to his distress and mourning he negates the purse, as it is insignificant relative to the baby.

#### NOTES

One may lift from a mixture – מעלין את המדומע: Nullification is an important concept in the *halakhot* governing mixtures of prohibited and permitted foods. In principle, when a portion of prohibited food is mixed together with a larger amount of permitted food, the prohibited food is nullified by the permitted food. The proportion of permitted food to prohibited food necessary for nullification varies based on the nature of the mixture and the prohibition.

For example, one hundred units of permitted grain are required to nullify one unit of *teruma*. If the ratio in the mixture is less than that, the entire mixture assumes the legal status of *teruma* and may be eaten only by a priest. In either case, the Sages require that one unit be removed from the mixture and given to a priest as *teruma*.

That is done in order to prevent the priests from incurring financial loss; otherwise, they would lose the rights to the *teruma* in the mixture.

Rava holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan – רבא רבא: רבא פרבי נתן סבירא ליה: Rava himself is of the opinion that everyone agrees with Rabbi Natan that a living being carries itself. However, since this is not explicitly stated, the Gemara presents Rava's opinion simply as being in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan (Rabbeinu Aharon HaLevi). Alternatively, the Rabbis only concede to Rabbi Natan with regard to a baby able to walk. Here, the Gemara is also referring to an infant who cannot yet walk (Rashba).

#### HALAKHA

A child holding a set-aside item in his hand – תינוק המחזיק מוקצה בידו – On Shabbat, if a child longs for his father to lift him, it is permitted for the father to lift the child even if he is holding a stone in his hand (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 25:16; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 309:1).

A baby with a purse hanging around his neck – תינוק וכיס תלוי בצוארו – One who carries a living baby with a purse hanging around his neck on Shabbat is liable for carrying the purse, since the purse is not secondary to the baby (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 18:17).

NOTES

Who has longings – שיש לו גיגועין: Some commentaries explain that the baby longs for the stone and would cry if his father would take it from him. Therefore, the Sages permit the father to carry both of them (Tosefot Rid).

תנן: נוטל אדם את בנו והאבן בידו. אמרי דבי רבי ינאי: בתינוק שיש לו גיגועין על אביו.

We learned in the mishna: A person may take his son in his hands on Shabbat; and this is permitted even though there is a stone in the child's hand. As it can be inferred from this mishna that the stone is negated relative to the child, why, then, is he liable in the case of a purse hanging around a live baby's neck? Let the purse be negated relative to the baby. The Sages of the school of Rabbi Yannai say: You cannot infer from this mishna that the stone is negated and therefore it is permitted to move it. Rather, the mishna is referring to a baby who has longings<sup>N</sup> for his father. It is permitted for the father to move the stone because if the father does not lift him, the baby might take ill.

אי הכי, The Gemara asks: If so,

Perek XXI Daf 142 Amud a

NOTES

Even a dinar as well – אפילו דינר נמי: Rashi ruled stringently that one may not even hold the hand of a baby who is carrying money. The Ramban explains that the Sages issued a decree prohibiting only lifting the baby, lest he come to lift the dinar with his own hands.

The basket should be a base for a prohibited object – תיהיו בלבלה בסיס ללבר האסור: Some commentaries explained that this halakha is not based on the halakhot of a base for a prohibited object because those do not apply in a case where one forgets and misplaces the prohibited object on the base. Therefore, it is a misnomer to use the term: A base for a prohibited object. Rather, the Gemara asks why one needs to move the stone at all (Tosefot Rid). Others explained that the Gemara is referring to all cases involving baskets, including one where a stone is purposely placed in the basket. Furthermore, even in a case where one forgot the stone in the basket, the Sages only permitted carrying the basket in an unusual manner (Me'ir).

HALAKHA

A basket of fruit with a stone inside it – בלבלת פירות – ואבן בה: On Shabbat, if a basket full of fruit has a stone inside it, and the fruit will be ruined if spilled on the ground, as is the case with figs or grapes, one may lift and carry the basket with the fruit and the stone in it. However, if the fruit will not be ruined if spilled on the ground, one spills the fruit and the stone out of the basket, replaces the fruit and carries the basket (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 25:16; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 309:3).

And let him... take the fruits in his hands – ונגקטינהו: On Shabbat, when fruits lie scattered in a courtyard, one may not gather them into a basket as one would do during the week. Rather, one should lift a few at a time and eat them (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 335:5).

A broken basket – בלבלת פחותה: A basket with a hole sealed by a stone may be carried on Shabbat, because the stone is part of the side of the basket (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 25:16; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 335:2).

מאי איריא אבן, אפילו דינר נמי! אלמה אמר רבא: לא שנו אלא אבן, אבל דינר – אסור! אבן, אי נפלה לה – לא אתי אבואה לאיתויי דינר, אי נפיל – אתי אבואה לאתויי.

why does the mishna refer specifically to moving a stone? The same should hold true even for a dinar, as well.<sup>N</sup> Why, then, did Rava say: They only taught this in a case where the child has a stone in his hand; however, if the child has a dinar in his hand, it is prohibited to lift the child? The Gemara answers: Actually, lifting the child with a dinar should also be permitted. However, the Sages issued a decree prohibiting lifting the child with a dinar because with regard to a stone, if it falls, his father will not come to bring it. However, with regard to a dinar, if it falls, his father will come to bring it.

תניא כוותיה דרבא: המוציא בליו מקופלים ומונחים על כתפו, וסנדליו וטבעותיו בידו – חייב. ואם היה מלובש בהן פטור.

It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rava: On Shabbat, one who carries out his clothes to the public domain while they are folded and placed on his shoulder, and his sandals on his feet and his rings in his hand, not on his fingers, is liable. And if he was wearing them, he is exempt for all of them, as they are negated relative to him.

המוציא אדם וכליו עליו, וסנדליו ברגליו, וטבעותיו בידיו – פטור. ואילו הוציאן כמות שהן – חייב.

One who carries out a person with his garments on him, and his sandals on his feet, and his rings on the fingers of his hands, i.e., wearing all of his clothes and jewelry in the typical manner, is exempt, whereas if he carried them out as they are, i.e., the person was holding his clothes in his hands, he is liable for carrying out the clothes, just as Rava said.

”בלבלת והאבן בתוכה”. ואמאי? תיהיו בלבלת בסיס לדבר האסור! אמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: הכא בלבלת מלאה פירות עסקינן. ולישדינהו לפירי, ונישדי לאבן, ונגקטינהו בידים! בדרבי אלעי אמר רב: בפירות המיטנפין, הכא נמי – בפירות המיטנפין –

We learned in the mishna: And it is permissible to take a basket with a stone inside it on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: And why may he do so? The basket should be a base for a prohibited object,<sup>N</sup> and a base for a prohibited object is set-aside and may not be moved on Shabbat. Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said: Here, we are dealing with a basket full of fruit.<sup>H</sup> The basket is a base for permitted items as well, not only a base for the stone. The Gemara asks: Why may he move the basket and the stone? There is an alternative. And let him throw the fruit and throw the stone out of the basket, and take the fruit in his hands,<sup>H</sup> and there will be no need to move the stone. The Gemara answers: As Rabbi Elai said that Rav said in a different context: It is referring to fruits that become soiled and ruined. Here, too, it is referring to fruits that become soiled and ruined if he throws them down.

ולניערינהו נעורי! אמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר רבא: הכא בלבלת פחותה עסקינן, דאבן גופה נעשית דופן לבלבלת.

The Gemara asks a question: And let him shake them until the stone is on one side of the basket, enabling him to throw the stone out of the basket. Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rava said: Here, we are dealing with a broken basket<sup>H</sup> with a hole, in which the stone serves as a side of the basket by sealing the hole. Therefore, he cannot throw it out of the basket.