

7.1.8

11b (משנה 3) → 12b (הותרה נמי שלא לצורך)

Note #1: even though עמי הארץ are assumed to be טמא, in order to spare their dignity, the rabbis ruled that on the רגל they are not טמאים and their touch doesn't render טהרות impure. חכמים' position is that any of this food may not be sold as טהור after the רגל יהודה allows it to be sold as טהור.

Note #2: the תורה permits נפש אוכל נפש on מלאכה לצורך, including cooking, carrying from domain to domain etc. There is room to argue that since the תורה permitted carrying, e.g. for food, it is fully permitted, even for other purposes. This position is מתוך שהותרה לצורך [אוכל נפש] הותרה נמי שלא לצורך – and, colloquially, "מתוך"

(1) ולא תוציאו משא מבתים ביום השבת וכל מלאכה לא תעשו וקדשתם את יום השבת כאשר צוית את אבותיכם: ירמיהו ז', כב

- I. 3 משנה: shutters of food store: ב"ש forbid opening, ב"ה even allow returning
- a. עולא: in 3 cases, חכמים allow last stage (סופן) in order to encourage first stage (תחילתן) (תחילתן) (סומ"ת=סופן משום תחילתן)
 - i. Our case: allow replacing to encourage opening them, to provide food on י"ט
 1. Not: because there is no בנין/סתירה (→permitted even in homes), rather סומ"ת
 - ii. Pelt: before walkers (allow laying it out to encourage שחיטה)
 1. Not: because they could be sat upon, rather סומ"ת
 - iii. Replacing: a bandage on a wound in the מקדש on שבת (allow רפואה to encourage עבודה)
 1. Not: because אין שבות במקדש, rather סומ"ת
 - b. דחבא: adds a fourth (see note #1)
 - i. Allowing: the continued eating/drinking of טהרות after the רגל,
 1. Even though: they were in contact with עמי הארץ during the רגל (
 - a. We allow now: in order to encourage use during רגל
 2. Not: because he holds that הארץ ברגל is considered טהור, rather סומ"ת
 - ii. עולא: only listed undisputed rulings (ב"ש v. ב"ה isn't a dispute, since הלכה כב"ה)
 - c. Our משנה: at odds with רשב"א, who recorded that the dispute was only re: returning the shutters
 - i. Only: dispute if they have hinges; if no hinges, all agree permitted, even at home
 - ii. Other ברייתא: dispute only if they have no hinges; if they have hinges, all forbid
 - iii. אביי: if the hinge is on the side, all forbid; if no hinge, all permit
 1. Dispute: if hinge is in middle (dispute – מן הצד – גזרינן באמצע אטו מן הצד)
- II. 4 משנה: carrying on י"ט for other than food purposes: ב"ש forbid, ב"ה permit (see note #2)
- a. יצחק אבדימי: dispute re: מתוך (→ consequences for נדבה only according to ב"ש)
 - b. דבה: perhaps dispute is re: existence of prohibition of carrying on י"ט (ערוב והוצאה לי"ט)
 - i. As per: v. 1 - only on שבת, not on י"ט
 - ii. Challenge (רב יוסף): if so, let the dispute include even carrying rocks
 1. Examples in משנה: children, לולב, ספר תורה
 2. Explanation: if there is no איסור הוצאה at all, there is no reason to forbid מוקצה
 - iii. Rather: the dispute is about מתוך – which only extends to items which have some use on י"ט,
 1. Even if: not for food (ב"ה)
 - iv. ד' יוחנן: supports this position –
 1. He maintains: cooking בי"ט בחלב גיד הנשה is not culpable for הבערה or for בישול
 - a. Even though: the food is inedible, ... מתוך שהותרה...