One may chop wood neither from beams set aside for building nor from a beam that broke on the Festival. Apparently, this unattributed mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yohanan answered: That mishna is actually in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda, which is an individual opinion. Come and hear: One may start a fire on a Festival with a pile of straw but not with wood that is from the wood storage behind one’s house, because that wood is set aside for other uses. Apparently, this is an unattributed mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara answers: There, the mishna is referring to wood from cedar and fir trees that are set aside due to monetary loss. Even Rabbi Shimon concedes that the prohibition of set-aside is in effect in that case.

The Gemara asks: And did Rabbi Yohanan really say that? Didn’t Rabbi Yehuda say: The halakha is in accordance with an unattributed mishna, and we learned in a mishna:

One may chop wood neither from beams set aside for building nor from a beam that broke on a Festival. Apparently, this unattributed mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who holds that the prohibition of set-aside does not apply on Shabbat. And Ze’erit also holds that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as we learned in a mishna: With regard to an animal that died on Shabbat, one may not move it from its place on Shabbat. And Ze’erit explained: This prohibition only applies to a consecrated animal, as consecrated items may not be fed to dogs in deference to their sanctity; therefore, it is set-aside and may not be moved on Shabbat. However, in the case of a non-sacred animal, one may well move it and use it because it does not have set-aside status. And Rabbi Yohanan also said that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon. The Gemara asks: And did Rabbi Yohanan really say that? Didn’t Rabbi Shimon say: The halakha is in accordance with an unattributed mishna, and we learned in a mishna:

One may start a fire with a pile of straw – but not with wood that is from the wood storage behind one’s house, because that wood is set aside for other uses. Apparently, this is an unattributed mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara answers: There, the mishna is referring to wood from cedar and fir trees that are set aside due to monetary loss. Even Rabbi Shimon concedes that the prohibition of set-aside is in effect in that case.
nullification of vows and dissolution of vows — מִשְׁרַקְתָּנוּ וּמְדַלְּדוֹת

HALAKHA

A husband may nullify his wife’s vows on Shabbat even if it has no impact on Shabbat itself; as if he fails to do so, he will not have another chance. However, he may not say to her: It is nullified. He nullifies it in his heart and says to her: Take it away, as we learned in the mishna that it is permitted to nullify vows, but when it is prohibited.
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The Gemara cites another version of the dilemma that was raised before the Sages. Was the phrase: When they are for the purpose of Shabbat, taught about both of them, and nullification is only permitted for the purpose of Shabbat, but when it is not for the purpose of Shabbat, it is protected? If so, apparently, nullification of vows may be performed for an entire twenty-four hour period after hearing the vow, and the father or husband can wait until after Shabbat to nullify the vow if he does not need to do so for the purpose of Shabbat. Or perhaps when the mishna taught that it is permitted when the nullification is for the purpose of Shabbat, that was taught only with regard to the request to dissolve that which was prohibited by the vow, but nullification of vows may be performed on Shabbat even when it is not for the purpose of Shabbat. If so, apparently nullification of vows may be performed only for the entire twenty-four hour period that the husband or father heard the vow. Once Shabbat concludes, the vow may longer be nullified. Therefore, even vows whose nullification is not for the purpose of Shabbat may be nullified on Shabbat.

Come and hear a resolution to the dilemma from that which the Sage, Zutei, of the school of Rav Pappa taught: One may nullify vows on Shabbat for the purpose of Shabbat. Apparently, when the nullification is for the purpose of Shabbat, yes, it is permitted to nullify vows, but when it is not for the purpose of Shabbat, no, it is prohibited. If so, apparently nullification of vows may be performed for the entire twenty-four hour period after hearing the vow.

Rav Ashi said: Didn’t we learn in a mishna that one may nullify vows for the entire day, and there is both a leniency and a stricture in this matter to extend or curtail the period during which the vow may be nullified. How so? If the woman vowed on Shabbat evening, her father or husband may nullify the vow on Shabbat evening and on Shabbat day until dark. However, if she vowed before Shabbat at nightfall, her father or husband may only nullify the vow until nightfall, as if he did not nullify the vow before nightfall, he can no longer nullify it because the day ended. The Gemara answers that this issue is subject to a tannaitic dispute, as it was taught in a baraita: One may nullify vows for the entire day. Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda and Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, said: For a twenty-four hour period.

We learned in the mishna: And one may request from a Sage to dissolve vows on Shabbat. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Is this only permitted when one did not have time to request to have the vow dissolved before Shabbat, or perhaps it is permitted even if one had time before Shabbat to request to have his vow dissolved? Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from the fact that the Sages attended to Rav Zutra, the son of Rav Zeira, and dissolved his vow even though he had time to request its dissolution before Shabbat.

The mishna related: They sealed a window using an earthenware vessel and tied an earthenware shard with a long reed-grass. Rav Yehuda said that Rav said in explanation: There was a small alleyway [helketei] between two houses, and there was ritual impurity imparted by a corpse there in the alleyway.
Some explained that the earthenware shard was not permanently fixed to the opening, and therefore it is not considered to have sealed it (Me’iri). Others explain that they measured the roofing that remained surrounding the opening. If its area was a handbreadth, then it would assume the legal status of a tent and would transmit ritual impurity directly over the corpse, rendering everything in the alleyway, and, through the windows, in the houses, ritually impure. However, since the roofing was cracked and the corpse was directly beneath the opening, if the opening was the size of a handbreadth or more, the entire alleyway and the houses would not become impure. Only the area directly over the corpse extending through the opening is impure. And that is the reason that they sealed the window of the house with an earthenware vessel, so that the ritual impurity would not enter the houses, and they tied an earthenware shard with a long reed-grass inserted into the opening in the roofing in order to ascertain whether or not there is an opening there in the roofing the size of a handbreadth.

The Sages ruled that one who had no intention whatsoever to perform a given action is liable only for violations involving forbidden animal fats or forbidden sexual relations, due to the pleasure derived from them. However, with regard to the fulfillment of mitzvot (Rambam, Hilkhot Shabbat 14:5; Shulchan Arukh, Oraĥ Hayyim 306:7). Whether or not there is an opening there in the roofing the size of a handbreadth – whether or not there is an opening there in the roofing the size of a handbreadth – it is permitted to think about, speak about, or measure things that pertain to religious matters for the sake of a mitzva, such as taking measurements that are required by the Torah, it is permitted to tie a non-permanent knot on Shabbat, even one that requires professional skill (Magen Avraham; Rambam, Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 10:6; Shulchan Arukh, Oraĥ Hayyim 317:1).

Measurement for a mitzva – avna: It is permitted to think about, speak about, or measure things that pertain to religious matters, due to the pleasure derived from them. However, with regard to the fulfillment of mitzvot (Rambam, Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 14:5; Shulchan Arukh, Oraĥ Hayyim 306:7).

The mishna concludes: And from their statements and their actions, we derived that one may seal a window, and measure, and tie a knot on Shabbat. The Gemara relates: Ulla happened to come to the house of the Exilarch. He saw Rabba bar Rav Huna sitting in a tub [avna] of water and measuring it. He said to Rabba bar Rav Huna: Say that the Sages said that it is permitted to measure on Shabbat only a measurement for a mitzva. However, with regard to a measurement like this one, which is not for a mitzva, did they say that it is permitted? Rabba bar Rav Huna said to him: I am merely acting unawares and am not at all interested in the measurements. Therefore, it is not prohibited.