

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF KUF LAMED ALEF

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

(And Rav is going according to his rationale, because Rav said: An alley only becomes permitted to carry in it through a side-post and a beam¹ if) there are at least two houses opening into each courtyard, and at least two courtyards open into it (the alley). Because this makes it into a public place.²

And here, once the courtyards have an *eiruv* that connects them to the houses, there are houses and no courtyards, because the courtyards are nullified to the houses.

The Gemara challenges this explanation: If that is the reason, even if they did not make an *eiruv*, we should regard these houses as if they are closed off because without an *eiruv* one cannot carry from them into the courtyards.

And if so, it is as if there are only courtyards and no houses. So how can one carry in this alley if there is no *eiruv*?

The Gemara answers: It is possible that they (the residents of all the houses) all nullify their jurisdiction in the courtyard to one of the house owners, and then it is as if the courtyard belongs to that person's house alone, and he will be able to carry from his house to the courtyard (see Shulchan Aruch 380). Thus without an *eiruv* the alley will have courtyards and houses.

¹ Because an alley opens to the public domain, to carry in an alley one has to make a symbolic partition from the public domain by placing a side-post next to one side of the alley where it meets the public domain, or placing a beam over the opening.

PEREK 19 – 131B

The Gemara raises a difficulty: But **in the end, there is one house, but not two houses.** And Rav said that the alley requires two houses.

The Gemara answers: **It is possible that from morning until midday**, everyone nullifies their jurisdiction **to one person, and from midday until evening** they nullify it to another person. Thus two houses were connected to the courtyards in the course of Shabbat.

The Gemara argues that this is insufficient: But **in the end, at the time that there is this house** from where one may carry in the morning, **there is not that house** from which one may carry in the afternoon. So at no time are there two houses from which one may carry.

*

Thus the Gemara is forced to give a different explanation of Rav's statement, that if the houses and courtyards did not make an *eiruv*, one can carry in the alley:³

Rather, said Rav Ashi: What causes the courtyards to be forbidden, that one cannot carry from them to the alley, and that one cannot carry things in the alley? The **houses. And there are no houses.**

In explanation: Rav holds like Rabbi Shimon, that one is allowed to carry from a courtyard to an alley, and one is certainly allowed to carry in the alley itself. But this is

² But if it does not have houses and courtyards open to it and it is more like a private courtyard, it needs more: not just one thin pole, but two thin poles - one on each side of the entrance, or one pole that is four *tefachim* wide. Mishnah Berurah 366:102.

³ And the Gemara retracts from its attempt to say that if there is an *eiruv* it is as if there are no courtyards.

PEREK 19 – 131B

only so if there is no *eiruv* between the houses and courtyards. But if there is an *eiruv*, this is forbidden. Why?

Because in an alley (for which one did not make *shitufei mavu'ot*)⁴ one is allowed to carry only utensils that were in the courtyard or alley when Shabbat came in,⁵ but one may not carry utensils that were in a house when Shabbat came in. Therefore, if there is an *eiruv* which allows the utensils of the house to be carried into the courtyard, the Sages were concerned that one may end up carrying those utensils from the courtyard to the alley.

Therefore they decreed that when there is an *eiruv*, and utensils from the houses might end up in the courtyard, one may not carry *anything* from the courtyard to the alley, or even carry anything four *amot* in the alley itself.

Said Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said Rabbi Yochanan: Not for every case did Rabbi Eliezer say that preparations of a mitzvah supersede the Shabbat.

Proof for this is as follows: **Because the two breads** brought as an offering on Shavuot **are an obligation of the day, and Rabbi Eliezer only derived** the law that baking them supersedes Shabbat **from** a special *gezeirah shavah*.⁶ And if he held that preparations *always* supersede Shabbat, why did he need the *gezeirah shavah* in this case?

⁴ *Shitufei Mavu'ot* is when the people of the courtyards make a joint partnership of the alley and is similar to making an *eiruv*.

⁵ Because such objects do not generally belong to any one house, so the rabbinical laws restricting carrying objects from place to place apply to them to a lesser extent.

⁶ I.e. when different verses have a similar wording, they are often connected. This is *gezeirah shavah*, one of the means by which Scriptural verses are interpreted. There are many verses with similar wording, and a *gezeirah shavah* interpretation is only made when there is a tradition of the Oral Torah (as handed down from Mt. Sinai) that these two verses are indeed linked.

PEREK 19 – 131B

Because it was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Eliezer says: From where do we know that the preparatory stages (baking) of the two loaves supersede Shabbat?

Because it says **“bringing” concerning the *Omer*** barley offering, brought on the second day of Pesach. For it says, “You shall *bring* the *Omer*, the first of your harvest to the cohen. And you shall count for you from the morrow of the Shabbat, from the day that you bring the *Omer* that is waved” (*Vayikra* 23:10).

And it says “bringing” concerning the two breads as it says: “From your dwellings, you shall *bring* bread of waving” (ibid verse 17).

Just as “bringing” that is said concerning the *Omer*, the preparations supersede the Shabbat as the Gemara learns in Tractate *Menachot*, because it says, “Six days you shall work and on the seventh day you shall rest, in plowing and reaping you shall rest” (*Shmot* 34:21). Just as plowing (spoken of here) is regular plowing (because there is no plowing which is a mitzvah), so the reaping (here) is regular reaping, to exclude the reaping of the *Omer* which is a mitzvah. Thus we derive that reaping of the *Omer* supersedes Shabbat.

So concerning the “bringing” said concerning the two breads, preparations also supersede the Shabbat.

The Gemara now explains that the *gezeirah shavah* is *mufneh*, “open”, i.e. it is based on superfluous words in both verses involved.

Because if is not *mufneh* but the words teach some other law, **one could refute** the *gezeirah shavah* by showing that there is a logical reason not to compare the two cases.

This would be the reason not to compare them: **what is special about the *Omer*** that its preparations supersede Shabbat? **That if one found already reaped** barley, but it was not reaped for the purpose of the mitzvah, **one cuts** some more, specially for the mitzvah. Because it says, “You shall cut—and bring.”

PEREK 19 – 131B

But **can you say** the same **concerning the two breads, that if one found** wheat that was **reaped** not for the mitzvah, one should reap more? Certainly not: **one may not reap** more wheat for the mitzvah, rather one uses what one found.

The Gemara declares: **In truth**, as you said, **it is indeed *mufneh***.

The Gemara explains why it is *mufneh*: Because **indeed, it is written**, “**You shall bring the Omer, the first of your harvest to the cohen**” (*Vayikra* 23:10). **Why do I need** it to also say, “**From the day that you bring** the Omer that is waved” (*ibid*)?

Rather, hear from this a proof that the superfluous phrase is to make the verse *mufneh* so that we can have an irrefutable *gezeirah shavah* from “bringing” to “bringing.”

The Gemara suggests that this is not sufficient: **But still**, it is *mufneh* **from one side** of the *gezeirah shavah* because *Omer* has an extra phrase. But the other side of the *gezeirah shavah* (the two breads) has no superfluous phrase and is not *mufneh*.

And we heard him (Rabbi Eliezer) **that he said**: If a *gezeirah shavah* is *mufneh* only **from one side, we learn from it, but** also **challenge** its logic. And we saw that there is a possible refutation to this *gezeirah shavah*.

The Gemara answers: The verse of the two breads that says, “**From your dwellings you shall bring** bread of waving” (*ibid* verse 17), which is the other side of the *gezeirah shavah*, **is also superfluous**. Because it said just before: “You shall offer a new flour offering to Hashem,” so why repeat that one must bring it? Therefore we see that the *gezeirah shavah* is *mufneh* on both sides.

Before we said: “Not for everything did Rabbi Eliezer say that preparations for a mitzvah supersede the Shabbat.”

PEREK 19 – 131B

What does this come to **exclude**?

If you say to exclude lulav, that one cannot cut it from a tree on Shabbat—

But it was taught in a Baraita: Lulav and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat according to Rabbi Eliezer.

Rather you must say that it comes **to exclude** preparations (such as cutting branches off trees to make the roofing) of a **succah**.

This too is impossible, **because it was taught in a Baraita: Succah and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

But perhaps to exclude matzah.

That is impossible because **it was taught in a Baraita: Matzah and all its preparations (cutting wheat) supersede the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

But perhaps to exclude a shofar.

That is impossible **because it was taught in a Baraita: Shofar and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

The Gemara finally answers: **Said Rav Adda bar Ahavah: To exclude making tzitzit for one's garment, and writing a mezuzah to put on one's doorway** (which are preparatory to the mitzvah of actually wearing the tzitzit, and having the mezuzah on the door). Here, Rabbi Eliezer agrees that preparations do not supersede Shabbat.

PEREK 19 – 131B

We also learnt so in a Baraita: They agree (Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages) **that if one put tzitzit on one's garment or made a mezuzah for one's doorway, that one is liable⁷** for transgressing a Torah prohibition.

What is the reason Rabbi Eliezer agrees in these cases?

Said Rav Yosef: Because there is no set time for doing them.

Abaye said to him: On the contrary, because they have no set time...

Ammud Bet

...every time of the day **is their time**. If one wears a four-cornered garment without tzitzit or has no mezuzah on the doorway, one is neglecting a positive mitzvah every moment.

Therefore the Gemara gives another reason why the mitzvah of tzitzit and mezuzah is lighter, and its preparations do not supersede Shabbat:

But said Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak, and it you want to say, Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua: Because it is in one's ability to make them (the garment or house) **ownerless**. And once they are out of one's jurisdiction, they no longer need tzitzit or a mezuzah.

⁷ I.e. obligated to bring a sin-offering.

PEREK 19 – 131B

The Gemara now explains Rabbi Eliezer's sources in Scriptural verses for saying that preparations of mitzvot supersede the Shabbat. The following few sections of Gemara are almost identical to each other.

The master (in the Baraita) **said** earlier: **Lulav and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

The Gemara inquires: **From where does Rabbi Eliezer know this?**

If he learns it through a *meh matzinu* (by plain comparison) **from the Omer and the two breads**, whose preparation suersed Shabbat, as we learned earlier—

There is no comparison: Those are different **because they are the requirements of the most High** (i.e. they are sacrifices), and that is why their preparations supersede Shabbat.

The Gemara answers that lulav too is learned from a special verse: **The verse says:** “And you shall take for you **on the first day**. Because the verse does not write “on the first,” but adds the extra word “**on the day**” (*bayom*), it teaches that one can do preparations **even on Shabbat.**

The Gemara proves that this extra word comes to specifically allow preparations: **And for what halachah** do we allow preparation on Shabbat?

If you say to allow moving the lulav, that we are not concerned that it is *muktzeh*—

PEREK 19 – 131B

That cannot be, because we **do we need a verse to allow moving** *muktzeh*, which is only forbidden Rabbinically?

Rather, the word “on the day” must come **to** include the **preparations** of the lulav. That one can cut it off a tree on Yom Tov.

And the Rabbis, who say that preparations are forbidden, say that **this** phrase “on the day” **is needed** for something else: To teach that we take the lulav **by day and not by night**.

And Rabbi Eliezer, this law of **by day and not by night**, **from where** does **he** derive it?

The Gemara answers: He learns it **from** the verse, “**And you shall rejoice before Hashem your G-d seven ‘days.’**” “**Days**” and not nights.

And the Rabbis reply that we cannot learn from the word “days” that lulav is only taken by day.

Because **you may have thought to derive** a *gezeirah shavah* from the words “**seven days**” of lulav to the words “seven days” of the **succah**. **Just as there**, the mitzvah of sukkah is seven **days and even** the **nights**, **so here** with lulav one may have thought that it is taken seven **days and even** the **nights**.

So it, the phrase “on the day”, **tells us** that this is not so. Lulav is only taken by day, and thus there is no Scriptural source to teach us that preparations are permitted.

PEREK 19 – 131B

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And** according to Rabbi Eliezer, **let the Torah** (lit. Merciful One) **write concerning lulav** that preparations supersede Shabbat, **and learn from it** (from lulav) that the preparation of *Omer* and the two breads supersede Shabbat? Why is there a separate verse for *Omer* and the two breads?

The Gemara answers: **Because one could make a refutation** of such a comparison: One could argue that **what** is special **about lulav**, that its preparations supersede Shabbat? **That it requires four species**, all of which are necessary to fulfill the mitzvah. But *Omer* and the two breads do not have that special quality, and therefore they require their own verse.

*

A Baraita said earlier: **Succah and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

The Gemara inquires: **From where does Rabbi Eliezer know this?**

If he learns it with a *meh matzinu* (by plain comparison) **from the *Omer* and the two breads** whose preparation pushes away Shabbat—

There is no comparison: Those are different **because they are the requirements of the most High** (sacrifices).

If you want to learn succah **from lulav**, that comparison too can be rejected, **because it** (lulav) **requires four species.**

PEREK 19 – 131B

The Gemara answers that succah too is learned from a special verse: **But he** (Rabbi Eliezer) **learns** a *gezeirah shavah*. He learns the words “**seven days**” written concerning succah from the words “seven days” written concerning the **lulav**. **Just as there** (with lulav) **its preparations supersede the Shabbat, so too here** in succah, **its preparations supersede the Shabbat.**⁸

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And** according to Rabbi Eliezer, **let the Torah** (lit. Merciful One) **write regarding succah** that its preparations supersede Shabbat, **and learn** that all the other things supersede Shabbat **from it** (from succah)?

The Gemara answers: **Because one can make a refutation** of such a comparison: One can argue that **what** is special **about succah** that its preparations supersede Shabbat? **That it** is a mitzvah that is done **at night as by day**.

*

A Baraita wrote earlier: **Matzah and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

The Gemara inquires: **From where does Rabbi Eliezer know this?**

If he learns it **from the Omer and the two breads** whose preparation supersedes Shabbat—

There is no comparison: Those are different **because they are the requirements of the most High** (sacrifices).

⁸ Even though this *gezeirah shavah* is not *mufneh*, because we already find that preparations push aside

PEREK 19 – 131B

If you wish to learn matzah from lulav, that comparison too can be rejected, **because it** (lulav) **requires four species.**

If you wish to learn matzah **from succah**, that comparison too can be rejected, **because it** (succah) is used **by day as by night.**

The Gemara answers that matzah too is learned from a *gezeirah shavah*: **But he** (Rabbi Eliezer) **learns** the words “**fifteenth**” written concerning matzah **from** the words “**fifteenth**” written concerning the **Yom Tov of Succot. Just as there** (with succah) **its preparations supersede the Shabbat, so here** in matzah, **its preparations supersede the Shabbat.**

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And** according to Rabbi Eliezer, **let the Torah** (lit. Merciful One) **write regarding matzah** that its preparations supersede Shabbat, **and learn from it** that all the other things supersede Shabbat?

The Gemara answers: **Because one can refute** such a comparison: One can argue that **what** is special **about matzah** that its preparations supersede Shabbat? **That it** the mitzvah of eating matzah is **kept by woman as by men.**⁹

*

A Baraita wrote earlier: **Shofar and all its preparations supersede the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

Shabbat in the *Omer* and two breads, over here the *gezeirah shavah* is merely revealing that the same applies to succah and does not have to be so powerful. Rashi.

⁹ Even though matzah is a positive, time-bound mitzvah from which women are generally exempt, the Sages learn from a certain verse that “whoever is bound by the restriction to not eat chametz, is bound by the obligation to eat matzah.”

PEREK 19 – 131B

The Gemara inquires: **From where does Rabbi Eliezer know this?**

If he learns it **from the Omer and the two breads** whose preparation supersedes Shabbat—

There is no comparison: Those are different **because they are the requirements of the most High** (sacrifices).

If you want to learn shofar **from lulav**, that comparison too can be rejected, **because it** (lulav) **requires four species**.

If you want to learn shofar **from succah**, that comparison too can be rejected, **because it** (succah) is **used at day and at night**.

If you want to learn shofar from matzah, that comparison too can be rejected, **because it** (succah) is **kept by woman as by men**.

The Gemara answers that shofar too is learned from a special verse: **But the verse says: “It shall be a ‘day’ of blowing (*teru’ah*) for you,”** and we learn from this, **on that “day”** and even if it is **on Shabbat**.

And the Gemara proves that this verse must be coming to allow preparations on Shabbat. Because **for what** do we learn that shofar supersedes Shabbat?

If you say for allowing the actual **blowing**—

PEREK 19 – 131B

That is impossible. **But it was taught by the House of Shmuel:** It is written: **“You shall do not laborious work”** (*Bamidbar* 29:1), which means work that involves effort. This **excludes the blowing of a shofar and removing bread** from an oven, **which is a skill and not** an act of **work**. Therefore we do not need a verse to permit blowing the shofar on Shabbat, since it is not a Torah prohibition.

Rather, the word “day” must be coming **to** tell us that the shofar’s **preparations** supersede Shabbat.

And the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Eliezer will tell you: **That** word “day” **is needed** to teach that the shofar is blown **by day and not by night**.

And Rabbi Eliezer, from where does he know that the shofar is blown **by day and not by night?**

The Gemara answers: Because it is written, **“On the ‘day’ of atonement** [in the *Yovel*¹⁰ year] **you shall pass** [i.e. blow] **the shofar in all your land.”** **And we learn** the shofar laws of Rosh Hashanah, and of Yom Kippur of *Yovel*, **from each other**. Because it is written concerning Yom Kippur, “in the seventh month”, and this is superfluous because the Torah writes many times that Yom Kippur is in the seventh month. Therefore it is coming to tell us that all the shofar blasts of the seventh month have the same halachot. (Rashi quoting Rosh Hashana 33b). Therefore the shofar of Rosh Hashanah, too, is only blown by day.

The Gemara asks: **And learn** all **those** other cases **from it** (from shofar)?

¹⁰ Jubilee

PEREK 19 – 131B

The Gemara answers: **We cannot learn from the shofar blowing of Rosh Hashanah because it is specially important. Because this shofar blowing brings the remembrances of Israel to their Father in Heaven.**

And **we cannot learn from the shofar blowing of Yom Kippur of *Yovel* because it is especially important: Because the master said: The Rabbinical Court blew the shofar, and then slaves departed to their homes, and fields returned to their owners.** Thus this shofar blast has additional Halachic ramifications.

*

(The master said earlier in a Baraita): ***Milah* and all its preparations** (such as making a knife) **supersedes the Shabbat, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

The Gemara inquires: **From where does Rabbi Eliezer learn that?**

If he learnt from all of them (the cases we learnt until now), one can refute the comparison **as we said** above.

And furthermore, what is special about them...