

17 Tammuz 5780
July 9, 2020



Shabbos Daf 125

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Bar Hamduri said in Shmuel's name: Shreds of reeds detached from a mat may be handled on the Shabbos. What is the reason? — Said Rava, Bar Hamduri explained it to me: What is the [reed-] mat itself fit for? For covering the earth. These too are fit for covering dirt. (125a)

Rabbi Zeira said in Rav's name: Pieces of silk of aprons may not be handled on the Shabbos. Said Abaye: This refers to rags less than three [fingerbreadths] square, which are of no use to rich or poor. (125a)

Our Rabbis taught: The fragments of an old oven are like all utensils which may be handled in a courtyard; this is Rabbi Meir's view. Rabbi Yehudah said: They may not be handled. Rabbi Yosi testified in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov concerning the fragments of an old oven that they may be handled on the Shabbos, and concerning its lid [of the oven] that it does not require a handle.

Wherein do they differ? — Said Abaye: where they

¹ E.g.. they are fit for covering a barrel, but one cannot bake in them.

² The reference is to an oven. In ancient days this consisted merely of walls, without a separate bottom, and was set upon the ground and plastered to it. Now, here the oven is set over the walls of a pit, not actually on the ground, and a stone is placed between the oven and the pit as a wedge. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that if the oven is so placed, e.g., its walls almost correspond to those of the pit, that if a fire is made beneath the oven, in the pit's atmosphere, the oven itself is heated (sufficiently for its work), it is an 'oven' in the technical sense (as stated below) and is susceptible to tumah. But if the fire must be placed in the atmosphere of the oven, it is not an 'oven' and cannot be defiled.

perform something in the nature of work; but not in the nature of their own [former] work,¹ Rabbi Yehudah being consistent with his view, and Rabbi Meir with his. Rava demurred: If so, instead of disputing about the fragments of an oven, let them dispute about the fragments of utensils in general? Rather said Rava: They dispute about the fragments of the following oven. For we learnt: If he sets it [the oven] over the mouth of a pit or a cellar and places a stone there, — Rabbi Yehudah said: If one can heat it from underneath and it is [thereby] heated above, it is tamei; if not, it is tahor. But the Sages maintain: Since it can in any wise be heated, it is tamei.²

And wherein do they differ? In this verse; Whether oven, or range of pots, it shall be torn down: they are tamei, shall be tamei unto you. Rabbi Yehudah holds: Where tearing down is wanting it is tamei, while where tearing down is not wanting it is not tamei.³ Whereas the Rabbis hold: 'They shall be tamei unto you' [implies] in all cases. But the Rabbis too, surely it is written, 'it shall be torn down'? —

³ Yuttaz is generally applicable to the tearing down or demolishing of anything attached to the soil, e.g., a house. Now, since the Torah orders that if an oven becomes tamei it shall be torn down, it follows that it must be so closely joined to the soil that one can speak of tearing it down. Otherwise the Scriptural law does not apply to it, because technically it is 'torn down' from the very time that it is fixed. Hence in the present case if it is not so closely joined to the ground that one can make a fire in the pit on which it stands and thereby heat the oven, it is likewise 'torn down', and therefore is not an 'oven' which can become tamei. By 'tamei' and 'tahor' susceptibility and non-susceptibility to tumah is meant.



That is [intended] in the opposite direction: for one might argue, Since it is attached to the ground, it is like the very ground itself;⁴ therefore it informs us [otherwise]. And the other [Rabbi Yehudah] too, surely 'they shall be tamei unto you' is written? — That [is explained] as Rav Yehudah's dictum in Shmuel's name. For Rav Yehudah said in Shmuel's name: They differ only in respect of the first firing,⁵ but at the second firing,⁶ even if it is suspended to a camel's neck.

Ulla observed: And as for the first firing, according to the Rabbis, even if it is suspended from a camel's neck!⁷ Rav Ashi demurred: If so, instead of disputing about the fragments of the oven, let them dispute about the oven itself; [for] seeing that the oven itself, according to Rabbi Yehudah, is not a utensil, need the fragments [be mentioned]? Rather said Rav Ashi: In truth it is as we originally stated, and (the controversy is) where it [the fragment] can serve as a [baking] tile,⁸ while Rabbi Meir argues on Rabbi Yehudah's opinion. [Thus:] according to my view, even if they [the fragments] can perform something in the nature of [any] work; but even on your view, you must at least agree with me [here] that in such a case, it is its own work. But Rabbi Yehudah [argues]: It is dissimilar. There it is heated from within, here it is heated from without; there it stands, here it does not stand. (125a)

'Rabbi Yosi testified in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov concerning the fragments of an old oven, that they

⁴ And therefore cannot become tamei.

⁵ I.e., it had never yet been fired when it was set over the pit. The first firing hardens the clay and technically completes the manufacture of the oven, and Rabbi Yehudah holds that in this case it cannot be completed at all, for the reasons stated, and so it never becomes an oven.

⁶ I.e., it was originally set upon the ground in the usual manner, fired, and then removed to the pit.

⁷ Wherever it is, it is tamei. — It is in reference to the fragments of this oven that Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah dispute, seeing that in the first place it was not absolutely completed.

⁸ Tiles which were heated to bake something placed upon them. Thus it can still be used in a manner akin to its original function,

may be handled on the Shabbos, and concerning its lid, that it does not require a handle.' Ravina said: In accordance with whom do we handle nowadays the oven lids of the town Mechasya which have no handle? In accordance with whom? Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov. (125a)

MISHNAH: If a stone [is placed] in a pumpkin shell,⁹ and one can draw [water] in it and it [the stone] does not fall out, one may draw [water] in it; if not, one may not draw water in it. If a [vine-]branch is tied to a pitcher, one may draw [water] with it on the Shabbos. As for the stopper of a skylight, Rabbi Eliezer said: when it is fastened and suspended,¹⁰ one may close [the skylight] with it; if not, one may not close (the skylight) with it.¹¹ But the Sages maintain: in both cases we may close [the skylight] with it. (125a – 125b)

GEMARA: We learnt elsewhere: If a stone is on the mouth of a cask (e.g., of wine), one tilts it on a side and it falls off. Rabbah said in Rabbi Ammi's name in Rabbi Yochanan's name: They learnt this only if one forgets (it there); but if he places [it there],¹² it [the barrel] becomes a stand for a forbidden article.¹³ Whereas Rav Yosef said in Rav Assi's name in Rabbi Yochanan's name: They learnt this only if one forgets [it there]; but if he places [it there], it (the stone) becomes a covering of the barrel.¹⁴

Rabbah said: An objection is raised against my teaching: If a stone [is placed] in a pumpkin shell, and one can draw water in it and it does not fall out, one may draw water in

but not altogether so, for originally one baked inside the oven, whereas now the food to be baked must be placed on top.

⁹ Used for drawing water. As the pumpkin was too light to sink, a stone was used to weigh it.

¹⁰ In the air, the cord being too short to allow it to reach the ground.

¹¹ For it looks like adding to the building.

¹² Before the Shabbos.

¹³ Sc. the stone, which may not be handled.

¹⁴ Hence the stone itself may be handled and removed, and it is unnecessary to tilt the barrel.



it?¹⁵ But it is not [analogous]: there, since it is firmly fastened, it is made as a wall [of the vessel]. Rav Yosef said: An objection is also raised against my teaching: If not, one may not draw water in it?¹⁶ But it is not [analogous]: there, since he did not fasten it firmly, he nullified its classification.¹⁷

Wherein do they differ? One Master (Rabbi Ammi) holds: An act of labor is required; while the other Master (Rabbi Assi) holds: An act of labor is not required. Now, they are consistent with their views. For when Rav Dimi came, he said in Rabbi Chanina's name-others state, Rabbi Zeira said in Rabbi Chanina's name: Rebbe once went to a certain place and found a course of stones,¹⁸ whereupon he said to his disciples, Go out and intend [them,]¹⁹ so that we can sit upon them to-morrow; but Rebbe did not require them [to perform] an act of labor. But Rabbi Yochanan said, Rebbe did require them [to perform] an act of labor. What did he say to them? — Rabbi Ammi said: He said to them, Go out and arrange them in order.²⁰ Rabbi Assi said: He said to them, 'Go out and scrape them' [free of mortar, etc.].²¹

It was stated: Rabbi Yosi ben Shaul said: It was a pile of beams; Rabbi Yochanan ben Shaul said: It was a ship's sounding pole. Now he who says [that it was] a sounding pole, all the more so a pile [of beams];²² but he who says that [it was] a pile, but one is particular about a sounding pole.²³ (125b)

If a vine-branch is tied, etc. Only if it is tied, but not

¹⁵ Which shows that the stone is now part of the vessel.

¹⁶ Which shows that it is not part of the vessel.

¹⁷ Since the pumpkin is not fit for drawing water, as the stone will fall out. But here it is enough for his purpose to place the stone upon the barrel, therefore the stone becomes part of the barrel in virtue of that act.

¹⁸ Arranged in order, and waiting to be used in building. This renders them muktzeh.

¹⁹ Express your intention of sitting on them to-morrow (the Shabbos), so that they may not be muktzeh.

²⁰ That they may be ready for sitting upon without further handling, Rabbi Ammi holding. as above, that mere disposition

otherwise? Must we say that our Mishnah does not agree with Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel? For it was taught: As for the dried branches of a palm tree which one cut down for fuel, and then he changed his mind, [intending them] for sitting [on them], he must tie them together. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: He need not tie them together. — Said Rav Sheishes, You may even say [that it agrees with] Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel: we treat here of one [a branch] that is attached to its parent stock.²⁴ If so, he makes use of what is attached to the soil?²⁵ — It is below three.²⁶ Rav Ashi said: You may even say that it refers to a detached [branch]: it is a preventive measure, lest he cut (i.e., shorten] it. (125b)

As for the stopper of a skylight, etc. Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: All agree that we may not make for the first time a temporary building on a Festival, while on the Shabbos it goes without saying. They differ only in respect of adding [to a building]: Rabbi Elozar maintaining: We may not add on a Festival, while on the Shabbos it goes without saying; whereas the Sages rule: We may add on the Shabbos, while it is superfluous to speak of a Festival. (125b)

does not make them a utensil.

²¹ But they can be arranged for sitting on the Shabbos itself. Thus these views are consistent with those expressed above.

²² They certainly could have sat upon the latter.

²³ Not to use it for anything else, lest it be bent or warped. Therefore it is muktzeh and must not be handled.

²⁴ Sc. the vine. Hence if it is not tied to the pitcher before the Shabbos, it remains part of the wine and must not be handled.

²⁵ Even if tied before the Shabbos it is still that and is forbidden.

²⁶ Handbreadths from the ground. Such may be used.