7.5.4

38a (משנה ד] השואל כלי מחבירו) → 39a (משנה ד) השואל כלי מחבירו)

- I. משנה ד : borrowed items re
 - a. If: he borrows a tool before יו"ט, follows תחום of borrower
 - i. Challenge: this is obvious
 - ii. Answer: even in case where he handed it over on יו"ט, per ruling of ר' יוחנן
 - 1. ד' יוחנן if someone borrows a יו"ט on עיו"ט, follows borrower even if given on יו"ט
 - a. But: if borrowed on יו"ט, follows תחום of lender
 - i. Justification: even if he is accustomed to borrow from him
 - b. *Reason*: lender assumes that habitual שואל has found another משאיל has found another משאיל of lender *But if*: he borrows it on עו"ע, follows תחום of lender
 - c. Similarly: if a woman borrows water, salt or spices for her dough it has both חחמין (לחומרא)
 - i. Dissent: ר' יהודה disagrees re: water, as it is insignificant (isn't reckoned towards תחום
 - 1. Observation: ר' יהודה only dissents re water but salt isn't בטל
 - 2. Challenge: ר' יהודה ברייתא dissent re: salt as well as water whether in dough or pot
 - a. Answer: doesn't dissent in case of מלח סדומית
 - b. Challenge: מים limits מים s being negated to dough, not to pot
 - i. Answer: if תבשיל is thick and dry (water unfelt) בטל; else, he agrees
- II. אבא 'r's abortive attempt to contribute a comment to our ruling
 - a. אבא 'defended the significance of the מלח ותבלין (against the question of ה' אבא)
 - i. Defense: similar to someone's στ of wheat mixing with 10 others (owned by others)
 - 1. Shall we consider: it acceptable for him to "eat and rejoice" (ignoring their ownership)?
 - ii. Block (חכמי טבריה): laughed at him, then at his attempted defense
 - 1. Reason: he didn't use barley into wheat as בטל ברוב is בטל ברוב
 - a. and: wheat into wheat is בטל according to לבי (although not לר' יהודה)
 - b. ר' ספרא basedon ruling of ר' אבא basedon ruling of ר' ספרא
 - i. 27. if someone picks out pebbles from another's granary he owes him for wheat
 - 1. In other words: since he actually caused him loss, the other isn't מוחל
 - 2. Similarly: the spices and salt are significant and if owned by another would be owed
 - ii. Challenge (אביי): we do not equate ממון שיש לו תובעין (e.g. case of granary) with ממון שאין לו תובעין
 - iii. Response (שחוטה is בטל is שחוטה, as a נבילה could become שחוטה but not the inverse
 - 2. And: that isn't true, as חפצי הפקר acquire שביתה –as if they have owner iv. Defense (אביי): can't compare ממון (where there is no איטור (where there) is in effect)
 - v. Rather (אביי): reason for איסור here is that she may come to make dough בשותפות
 - vi. Answer2 (רבא): תבלין are used to generate flavor → not בטל
 - vii. *Answer3 (בטל e*ven in 1000) בטל never בטל even in 1000)
- III. משנה הו status of coals and flames; coals follow the owners, but flames are unlimited by
 - a. Application to מעילה coals are subject to מעילה, may not get הנאה from שלהבת, but not מעילה, but not מעילה
 - b. Application to הוצאת שבת liable for carrying coals out to רה"ר, not for שלהבת
 - i. Challenge: ברייתא rules that there is liability for הוצאת שלהבת of any size
 - ii. Answer1 (רב ששת): if he took it out on a stick
 - 1. Challenge: he should be liable for the stick
 - 2. Answer: if the stick were שבת ט:ה (per מכשיעור)
 - iii. Answer2 (אב"י): if he oiled down a כלי and then lit it up
 - 1. *Challenge*: he should be liable for כלי –
 - 2. Answer: if the שבת ח:ז (per נים מכשיעור)
 - iv. Rather: the ruling of liability is a case where he threw the flame into רה"ל (independent of a כלי ה
 - c. Application to מוספתא): only coals of ע"ז are forbidden, not flame
 - d. Application to מודר הנאה from his fellow, may not benefit from coals, may benefit from flame
 - i. observation: distinction between flame re: אסור לכתחילה) & flame of (אסור לכתחילה להנות) ע"ז)
 - ii. Reason: people naturally avoid "ע"ז →no need for a מאום but people aren't מואס בהקדש