

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

12c

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud

Book III

Folios 66a-100b



SHABBOS

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH NOTES

BY RABBI DR. H. FREEDMAN, B.A., Ph.D.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

RABBI DR I. EPSTEIN B.A., Ph.D., D. Lit.

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771

www.613etc.com

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 66a

WHILE R. JOSE FORBIDS IT. AND IF IT HAS A RECEPTACLE FOR PADS,¹ IT IS UNCLEAN.² HIS SUPPORTS³ ARE UNCLEAN THROUGH MIDRAS,⁴ AND ONE MAY GO OUT THEREWITH ON THE SABBATH,⁵ AND ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WHILST WEARING THEM.⁶ HIS STOOL AND SUPPORTS⁷ ARE UNCLEAN AS MIDRAS, AND ONE MAY NOT GO OUT WITH THEM ON THE SABBATH,⁸ AND ONE MAY NOT ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WITH THEM.⁹ AN ARTIFICIAL ARM [LUKITMIN]¹⁰ IS CLEAN, BUT ONE MAY NOT GO OUT THEREWITH.¹¹

GEMARA. Raba asked R. Nahman, How do we learn [this]?¹² I do not know, replied he. What is the law? I do not know, was his answer. It was stated: Samuel said: A stump-legged person may not, [etc.]; and R. Huna said likewise: A stump-legged person may not, [etc.].¹³ R. Joseph observed: Since Samuel said: A stump-legged person may not [etc.], and R. Huna [also] said: A stump-legged person may not [etc.], then we too should learn, A stump-legged person may not. Rabbah b. Shila demurred: Did they not hear what R. Hanan b. Raba recited to Hiyya b. Rab before Rab in a little room of Rab's academy: A stump-legged person may not go out with his wooden stump: this is R. Meir's view; but R. Jose permits it; whereupon Rab signaled to them that it was the reverse? R. Nahman b. Isaac observed: And your token is samek samek.¹⁴

Now, Samuel too retracted.¹⁵ For we learnt: If she performs *halizah*¹⁶ with a shoe that is not his,¹⁷ with a wooden shoe, or with a left-footed [shoe] placed on the right foot, the *halizah* is valid. Now we observed, Which Tanna [rules thus]?¹⁸ Said Samuel, R. Meir: For we learnt: A STUMP-LEGGED PERSON MAY GO OUT WITH HIS

WOODEN STUMP: THIS IS R. MEIR'S VIEW; WHILE R. JOSE FORBIDS IT.¹⁹

Now, R. Huna too retracted. For it was taught: A lime burner's shoe²⁰ is unclean as midras, a woman may perform *halizah* therewith, and one may not go out with it on the Sabbath: this is R. Akiba's view; but they [the Sages] did not agree with him. But it was taught:²¹ They agree with him? — Said R. Huna, Who agreed with him? R. Meir.²² And who did not agree with him? R. Jose.²³ R. Joseph said: Who did not agree with him? R. Johanan b. Nuri. For we learnt: A hive of straw and a tube of canes:²⁴ R. Akiba declares it unclean; while R. Johanan b. Nuri declares it clean.²⁵

The Master said: 'A lime-burner's shoe is unclean as midras'. But it is not made for walking?²⁶ — Said R. Aha son of R. 'Ulla: That is because the lime-burner walks in it until he comes home.

AND IF IT HAS A RECEPTACLE FOR PADS, IT IS UNCLEAN. Abaye said: It has the uncleanness of a corpse, but not midras; Raba said: It is unclean even as midras.²⁷ Said Raba: Whence do I know it? For we learnt: A child's waggonette²⁸ is unclean as midras. But Abaye said: There he [the child] leans upon it, but here he [the stump-legged person] does not lean upon it. Abaye said: How do I know it? Because it was taught: A staff of old men is completely clean.²⁹ And Raba?³⁰ — There

1. Upon which the stump rests.
2. 'Unclean' and 'clean' in this and similar passages means susceptible and not susceptible to uncleanness respectively. A wooden article is unclean only when it has a receptacle for objects to be carried therein. If the *log* is merely hollowed out for the stump, it is not a receptacle in this sense.
3. Leather supports for one who is stumped in both legs.
4. If he is a *zab*, q.v. [Glos.](#) Midras, lit., 'treading' is the technical term for the uncleanness occasioned by a *zab* through bringing his weight to bear upon an object, e.g., by treading, sitting,

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

or leaning, even if he does not actually touch it with his body. The degree of defilement imposed thereby is called 'the principal degree of uncleanness' (Heb. *ab*, father), and is only one grade less than that of a corpse: cf. p. 55, n. 6.

5. They rank as ornaments.
6. Though one may not enter wearing his shoes (Ber. 54a), these are not accounted as such.
7. This refers to one who is unable to walk upon supports alone, the muscles of his foreleg being atrophied or paralyzed. A stool is made for him, and also supports for his stumps, and he propels himself along with his hands and just a little with his feet too. R. Israel Lipshitz in his commentary [H] on Mishnah seems to translate [H] here as referring to the hand supports used by the cripple in propelling himself along, and not to the foot supports, which meaning it bears in the earlier clause.
8. Rashi: as he does not actually walk upon them, they dangle in the air and may fall off, which will cause him to carry them in the street.
9. There seems no adequate reason for this, and most commentators are silent upon the matter. Tosaf. Yom Tob states that 'ONE MAY NOT ... SABBATH' refers only to the 'SUPPORTS' mentioned in the first clause, not to the 'STOOL AND ITS SUPPORTS' (he appears to agree with R. Israel Lipshitz in his interpretation), which are mentioned only to teach that they are unclean as midras.
10. Jast. s.v. [H]: for carrying burdens. Rashi: a kind of mask for frightening children. The actual meaning of the word is discussed in the Gemara.
11. Jast.: because it is intended for carrying burdens. Rashi: because it is neither useful nor ornamental.
12. The text seems to have been doubtful, and it was not clear whether R. Meir gave a lenient ruling and R. Jose a stringent one or the reverse. V. Weiss, Dor, II, 213 seqq. on doubtful and corrupt readings in the Mishnah.
13. This was their text in the Mishnah; thus it differed from ours.
14. Samek (ס) is a letter of the Hebrew alphabet. Thus R. Jose (יֹסֵי) forbids (אִסְרוּ), the samek occurring in the name and in the ruling.
15. 'Too' in the sense that he too subsequently held as Rab.
16. V. [Glos.](#)
17. Sc. her brother-in-law's.
18. That a wooden shoe comes within the term and she shall loose his shoe' (Deut. XXV, 9).
19. R. Meir regards even a hollowed-out *log* as a shoe, though it is unusual, and the same applies here, though wood is an unusual material for a shoe. Thus Samuel quotes Rab's version of the Mishnah.
20. Rashi states two views: (i) that it was of wood; (ii) that it was of straw. Rashi and Tosaf. incline to the latter view.
21. Wilna Gaon emends: but we learnt, since the citation is from a Mishnah.
22. V. n. 6; the same argument applies here.
23. Thus he accepts our version of the Mishnah.
24. Or reeds, Wilna Gaon emends: A straw mat and a tube of straw.
25. The former holds that straw is the same as wood, which is susceptible to uncleanness, while the latter regards it as a different material.
26. It was put on over the ordinary leather shoe to protect the latter from the burning action of the lime. In order to be subject to midras uncleanness an object must be used for walking, sitting, or lying upon.
27. 'The uncleanness of a corpse' is mentioned merely as an example of any ordinary defilement, where the uncleanness of the object defiled is one degree less than that of the object which defiles it, and which requires either actual contact or that the object be under the same covering as the corpse. Thus Abaye holds that it attains even a primary degree of uncleanness (*ab hatum'ah*) through a corpse, which itself possesses a *supra*-primary degree of uncleanness, but not through the midras of a *zab*. Abaye holds that the wooden stump is not made primarily for leaning upon.
28. Rashi: on which it is carried, thus a perambulator. Tosaf. with which a child learns to walk, by holding on to it.
29. I.e., it is susceptible neither to midras nor to any other form of defilement. It is not susceptible to midras because it is not made for leaning, since one walks on his feet. This shows that though one does lean on it occasionally, yet since that is not its main purpose, it is not defiled as midras, and the same applies here. — It is not susceptible to other forms of defilement because it is a wooden utensil without a cavity (p. 238, n. 6).
30. How does he rebut this proof?

Shabbath 66b

it is made to facilitate his steps;¹ whereas here it is made to lean on, and he does so.²

HIS STOOL AND SUPPORTS ARE UNCLEAN AS MIDRAS, AND ONE MAY NOT GO OUT WITH THEM ON THE SABBATH, AND ONE MAY NOT ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WITH THEM. A tanna recited before R. Johanan: One may enter the Temple court with them. Said he to

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

him, I learn, A woman can perform *halizah* therewith,³ yet you say [that] they may enter! Learn, One may not enter the Temple court with them.

AN ARTIFICIAL ARM [LUKITMIN] IS CLEAN. What is lukitmin? — Said R. Abbahu: A pulley for loads.⁴ Raba b. Papa said: Stilts. Raba son of R. Huna said: A mask.

MISHNAH. BOYS MAY GO OUT WITH GARLANDS [KESHARIM], AND ROYAL CHILDREN MAY GO OUT WITH BELLS, AND ALL PEOPLE [MAY DO LIKEWISE], BUT THAT THE SAGES SPOKE OF THE USUAL PRACTICE.

GEMARA. What is kesharim? — Said Adda Mari in the name of R. Nahman b. Baruch in the name of R. Ashi b. Abin in Rab Judah's name: Garlands of pu'ah.⁵ (Abaye said, Mother⁶ told me: Three⁷ arrest [illness], five cure [it], seven are efficacious even against witchcraft. R. Aha b. Jacob observed: Providing that neither the sun nor the moon see it, and that it does not see rain nor hear the sound of iron, or the cry of a fowl or the sound of steps. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The pu'ah has fallen into a pit!)⁸ Why [then] particularly BOYS; even girls too [may go out therewith]? And why particularly children; even adults too?⁹ — But [then] what is meant by KESHARIM? As Abin b. Huna said in the name of It. Hama b. Guria: If a son yearns for his father [the father] takes a strap from his right shoe and ties it to his left [hand].¹⁰ R. Nahman b. Isaac said: And your token is phylacteries.¹¹ But if the reverse there is danger.¹²

Abin b. Huna said in the name of R. Hama b. Guria: The placing of a [hot] cup upon the navel on Sabbath¹³ is permitted. Abin b. Huna also said in the name of R. Hama b. Guria: One may rub in oil and salt on the Sabbath.¹⁴ Like R. Huna at Rab's college, and Rab at R. Hiyya's, and R. Hiyya at Rabbi's,¹⁵ when they felt the effect of the wine they would bring oil and salt and rub into the palms of their hands and the instep

of their feet and say, 'Just as this oil is becoming clear,¹⁶ so let So-and-so's wine become clear.'¹⁷ And if [this was] not [possible], they would bring the sealing clay of a wine vessel and soak it in water and say, 'Just as this clay becomes clear, so let So-and-so's wine become clear.'¹⁸

Abin b. Huna also said in the name of R. Hama b. Guria: One may reset [a laryngeal muscle]¹⁹ on the Sabbath. Abin b. Huna also said in the name of R. Hama b. Guria: To swaddle a babe on the Sabbath is in order.²⁰ R. Papa recited [two dicta about] children, [while] R. Zebid recited [one dictum] about a child.²¹ R. Papa recited [the two dicta about] children,²² and both in the name of Abin b. Huna. While R. Zebid recited a dictum about a child [in his name]; for the first he recited in the name of Abin b. Huna, but this [latter one] he recited in the name of Rabbah b. Bar Hanah, for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: To swaddle a babe on the Sabbath is in order.

Abaye said: Mother told me, All incantations which are repeated several times must contain the name of the patient's mother, and all knots²³ must be on the left [hand?]. Abaye also said: Mother told me, of all incantations, the number of times they are to be repeated, is as stated; and where the number is not stated, it is forty-one times.

Our Rabbis taught: One may go out with a preserving stone²⁴ on the Sabbath. On the authority of R. Meir it was said: Even with the counterweight of a preserving stone.²⁵ And not only when one has miscarried,²⁶ but even [for fear] lest she miscarry; and not only when she is [already] pregnant, but even lest she become pregnant and miscarry. R. Yemar b. Shalmia said on Abaye's authority: Provided that it was found to be its natural counterweight.²⁷ Abaye asked: What about the counterweight of the counterweight? The question stands over.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, For a daily fever²⁸ one must take a white *zuz*,²⁹ go to a salt deposit,³⁰ take its weight in salt, and tie it up in the nape of the neck with a white

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

twisted cord. But if this is not [possible], let one sit at the cross-roads, and when he sees a large ant carrying something, let him take and throw it into a brass tube and close it with lead, and seal it with sixty seals.³¹ Let him shake it, lift it up and say to it, 'Thy burden be upon me and my burden be upon thee.' Said R. Aha son of R. Huna to R. Ashi: But perhaps [another] man had [previously] found it and cast [his illness] upon it?³² Rather let him say to it, 'My burden and thy burden be upon thee.' But if this is impossible, let him take a new pitcher, go to the river and say to it, 'O river, O river, lend me a pitcher of water for a journey that had chanced to me.' Let him then turn it seven times about his head, throw it behind his back, and say to it, 'O river, O river, take back the water thou gavest me, for the journey that chanced to me came in its day and departed in its day!'

R. Huna said:

1. But not that his whole body should lean upon it.
2. I.e., its purpose is to bear the weight of his whole body.
3. Which shows that they count as shoes, in which one may not enter the Temple court.
4. So Jast. Rashi: a wooden donkey's head worn by mummies.
5. A vegetable; dyer's madder; a prophylactic.
6. She was really his foster-mother, v. Kid. 31a.
7. Garlands; or, plants.
8. It is useless as a remedy to-day, as none take all these precautions — probably a sarcastic remark showing his disbelief in these remedies.
9. This is an objection to Rab Judah's explanation. If the Mishnah means garlands used as prophylactics, they are surely not confined to young boys!
10. This cures him so that he is able to bear his father's absence.
11. The right hand winds the strap on the left hand.
12. If the strap of his left is tied to the son's right.
13. To alleviate stomach ache.
14. Into the skin.
15. I.e., when they were at these colleges.
16. The heat of the flesh would clarify it.
17. Let the fumes depart!
18. This is an instance of sympathetic magic.
19. Lit., 'strangle'. An operation performed in cases of abdominal affection by squeezing the jugular veins. Rashi and 'Aruk reads: one may have the laryngeal muscle reset.
20. In order to set its limbs.

21. I.e., R. Papa recited two separate dicta about children, both in the name of Abin b. Huna, as explained below, while R. Zebid recited a single law about children in his name.
22. The one referring to the child that yearns for his father and the other relating to swaddling.
23. For magical purposes of healing.
24. As a safeguard against abortion. [The aetit (or Eagle stone). For the belief in the efficacy of this stone against abortion among the ancients v. Preuss, Medizin, p. 446].
25. Anything that was weighed against it.
26. To protect her from a repetition.
27. Without anything having been added or taken away.
28. A quotidian whose paroxysms recur every day.
29. I.e., new and clean.
30. In a cavity in which sea-water was allowed to evaporate.
31. The number is not exact, but simply means many e.g., sealing wax over the lead, then pitch above that, then clay, etc. (Rashi).
32. And the second would now take it over.

Shabbath 67a

[As a remedy] for a tertian fever one should procure seven prickles from seven palm trees, seven chips from seven beams, seven pegs from seven bridges, seven [heaps of] ashes from seven ovens, seven [mounds of] earth from under seven door-sockets, seven specimens of pitch from seven ships, seven handfuls of cummin, and seven hairs from the beard of an old dog, and tie them, in the nape of the neck with a white twisted thread.¹

R. Johanan said: For an inflammatory fever let one take an all-iron knife, go whither thorn-hedges² are to be found, and tie a white twisted thread thereto.³ On the first day he must slightly notch it, and say, 'and the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, etc.'⁴ On the following day he [again] makes a small notch and says, 'And Moses said, I will turn aside now, and see, etc.' The next day he makes [another] small notch and says, 'And when the Lord saw that he turned aside [sar] to see.'⁵ R. Aha son of Raba said to R. Ashi, Then let him say, 'Draw not nigh hither?'⁶ Rather on the first day he should say, 'And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, etc. ... And Moses said, I will, etc.'; the next day he says, 'And when, the Lord

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

saw that he turned aside to see'; on the third, 'And he said, Draw not nigh.' And when he has recited his verses he pulls it down [sc. the bush] and says thus: 'O thorn, O thorn, not because thou art higher than all other trees did the Holy One, blessed be He, cause His *Shechinah* to rest upon thee, but because thou art lower than all other trees did He cause His *Shechinah* to rest upon thee. And even as thou sawest the fire [kindled] for Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah and didst flee from before them, so look upon the fire [i.e., fever.] of So-and-so² and flee from him.'

For an abscess one should say thus: 'Let it indeed be cut down, let it indeed be healed, let it indeed be overthrown; Sharlai and Amarlai are those angels who were sent from the land of Sodom³ to heal boils and aches: bazak, bazik, bizbazik, mismasik, kamun kamik,⁹ thy color [be confined] within thee, thy color [be confined] within thee,¹⁰ thy seat be within thee,¹¹ thy seed be like a kalut¹² and like a mule that is not fruitful and does not increase; so be thou not fruitful nor increase in the body of So-and-so.'¹³ Against ulcers¹⁴ one should say thus: 'A drawn sword and a prepared sling, its name is not Joheb, sickness and pains.' Against a demon one should say thus: 'Thou wast closed up; closed up wast thou. Cursed, broken, and destroyed be Bar Tit, Bar Tame, Bar Tina¹⁵ as Shamegez, Mezigaz and Istamai.' For a demon of the privy one should say thus: 'On the head of a lion and on the snout of a lioness did we find the demon Bar Shirika Panda; with a bed of leeks I hurled him down, [and] with the jawbone of an ass I smote him.'

AND ROYAL CHILDREN MAY GO OUT WITH BELLS. Who is the authority [for this ruling]? — Said R. Oshaia: It is R. Simeon, who maintained: All Israel are royal children. Raba said: It means that it is woven [sewn] into his garment; thus it agrees with all.

MISHNAH. ONE MAY GO OUT WITH A HARGOL'S EGG,¹⁶ A FOX'S TOOTH, AND A NAIL FROM [THE GALLOWS OF] AN IMPALED CONVICT AS A PROPHYLACTIC:

THIS IS R. MEIR'S VIEW; BUT THE SAGES FORBID THIS EVEN ON WEEKDAYS ON ACCOUNT OF 'THE WAYS OF THE AMORITE.'¹⁷

GEMARA. ONE MAY GO OUT WITH A HARGOL'S EGG, which is carried for ear-ache; AND WITH A FOX'S TOOTH, which is worn on account of sleep: a living [fox's] for one who sleeps [too much], a dead [fox's] for him who cannot sleep.

AND A NAIL FROM [THE GALLOWS OF] AN IMPALED CONVICT. It is applied to an inflammation,

AS A PROPHYLACTIC: THIS IS R. MEIR'S VIEW. Abaye and Raba both maintain: Whatever is used as a remedy is not [forbidden] on account of the ways of the Amorite.¹⁸ Then if it is not an [obvious] remedy, is it forbidden on account of the ways of the Amorite? But surely it was taught: If a tree casts its fruit, one paints it with sikra¹⁹ and loads it with stones. Now, as for loading it with stones, that is in order to lessen its strength.²⁰ But when he paints it with sikra, what remedy does he effect?²¹ — That is in order that people may see and pray for it. Even as it was taught: And he [the leper] shall cry, 'Unclean, unclean':²² he must make his grief publicly known, so that the public may pray for him. Rabina observed: In accordance with whom do we suspend a cluster of dates on a [sterile] date tree? In accordance with this Tanna.

A tanna recited the chapter of Amorite practices²³ before R. Hiyya b. Abin. Said he to him: All these are forbidden as Amorite practices, save the following: If one has a bone in his throat, he may bring of that kind, place it on his head, and say thus: 'One by one go down, swallow, go down one by one': this is not considered the ways of the Amorite. For a fish bone he should say thus: 'Thou art stuck in like a pin, thou art locked up as [within] a cuirass; go down, go down.'

1. Magical properties were ascribed to the number seven, which was regarded as the most sacred number. Various factors were responsible for

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

this: it is a combination of three and four, themselves held to be sacred; there are seven days in the week; the seventh day is holy. — The Rabbis, though opposed to superstitions practices in general (v. p. 243, n. 3), were nevertheless children of their age, and recognized their efficacy.

2. Or, wild rose bushes.
3. The knife, or the thorn bush?
4. Ex. III, 2.
5. Ibid. 4. Sar also means to depart, and it is applied magically to the fever. The belief in the efficacy of sacred books or verses to effect cures, etc. was widespread in ancient times both among pagans and believers in God. V. J.E. art. Bibliomancy.
6. Ibid. 5; this may appropriately be referred to the illness.
7. Mentioning the mother's name.
8. Rashi: this is the incantation formula, but they were not actually sent thence.
9. Unintelligible words forming part of the incantation.
10. Let it not change to a deeper red.
11. Let it not spread.
12. An animal with uncloven hoofs (the sign of uncleanness) born of a clean animal. Rashi: one whose semen is locked up, so that he cannot reproduce.
13. Mentioning the mother's name.
14. Others: epilepsy.
15. Lit., 'the son of clay, son of defilement, son of filth' — names for the demon.
16. Hargal is a species of locust.
17. These are forms of heathen magic, forbidden in neither shall ye walk in their statutes, Lev. XVIII, 3.
18. I.e., where its remedial character is obvious, in contrast to magic.
19. A red paint.
20. It casts its fruit because they grow too heavy, owing to the tree's super-vitality.
21. Surely it is only magic?
22. Lev. XIII, 45.
23. Chapters seven and eight of the Tosefta on Sabbath, which deals with these.

Shabbath 67b

He who says, 'Be lucky, my luck [gad gedi] and tire not by day or night,'¹ is guilty of Amorite practices. R. Judah said: Gad is none other but an idolatrous term, for it is said, ye that prepare a table for Gad.² If husband and wife exchange their names,³ they are guilty of Amorite practices. [To say], 'Be strong, o ye Barrels!' is [forbidden] as the

ways of the Amorite. R. Judah said: Dan [Barrel] is none other but the designation of an idol, for it is said, They that swear by the sin, of Samaria, and say, As thy god Dan liveth.⁴ He who says to a raven, 'Scream,' and to a she-raven, 'Screech, and return me thy tuft for [my] good,' is guilty of Amorite practices. He who says, 'Kill this cock, because it crowed in the evening,'⁵ or, 'this fowl, because it crowed like a cock,' is guilty of Amorite practices. He who says, 'I will drink and leave over, I will drink and leave over,'⁶ is guilty of the ways of the Amorite. He who breaks eggs on a wall in front of fledglings, is guilty of Amorite practices. He who stirs [eggs?] before fledglings is guilty of Amorite practices. He who dances and counts seventy-one fledglings in order that they should not die, is guilty of Amorite practices. He who dances for kutah,⁷ or imposes silence for lentils, or cries for beans,⁸ is guilty of Amorite practices. She who urinates before her pot in order that it should be quickly cooked is guilty of Amorite practices. Yet one may place a chip of a mulberry tree and broken pieces of glass in a pot in order that it should boil quickly.⁹ But the Sages forbade broken pieces of glass [to be employed thus] on account of danger.

Our Rabbis taught: A lump of salt may be placed in a lamp in order that it should burn brightly;¹⁰ and mud and clay may be placed under a lamp in order that it should burn slowly.¹¹

R. Zutra said: He who covers an oil lamp or uncovers a naphtha [lamp] infringes the prohibition of wasteful destruction.¹² 'Wine and health to the mouth of our teachers!'¹³ is not considered the ways of the Amorite. It once happened that R. Akiba made a banquet for his son and over every glass [of liquor] that he brought he exclaimed, 'Wine and health to the mouth of our teachers; health and wine to the mouths of our teachers and their disciples!'

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

CHAPTER VII

MISHNAH. A GREAT PRINCIPLE WAS STATED IN RESPECT TO THE SABBATH: HE WHO FORGETS THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE SABBATH¹⁴ AND PERFORMS MANY LABOURS ON MANY SABBATHS, INCURS ONE SIN-OFFERING ONLY. HE WHO KNOWS THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY LABOURS ON MANY SABBATHS,¹⁵ INCURS A SIN-OFFERING ON ACCOUNT OF EACH SABBATH. HE WHO KNOWS THAT IT IS THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY LABOURS ON MANY SABBATHS, IS LIABLE FOR EVERY

1. This is the conjectured translation.
2. Isa. LXV, II. Hence this statement is an invocation to an idol.
3. Lit., 'he by her name and she by his name — probably done to ward off evil.
4. Amos. VIII, 14. This translation differs from that of the E.V. q.v.
5. Later than usual. Others: it crowed like a raven.
6. That the rest may be blessed.
7. V. [Glos.](#)
8. That they should be well prepared. — Sound (or silence in some cases) was thought to benefit certain food preparations; cf. Ker. 6b.
9. This is not enchantment.
10. The salt clarifies the oil.
11. These cool the oil and retard its flow.
12. Derived from Deut. XX, 19, q.v. Because these cause the lamp to burn with unnecessary speed.
13. A drinking toast.
14. Not knowing at all that there exists a law of the Sabbath.
15. Forgetting on each occasion that it was the Sabbath.

Shabbath 68a

PRIMARY LABOUR.¹ HE WHO PERFORMS MANY LABOURS BELONGING TO THE SAME CATEGORY OF WORK² IS LIABLE TO ONE SIN-OFFERING ONLY.

GEMARA. Why does he [the Tanna] state, A GREAT PRINCIPLE? Shall we say that because he wishes to teach 'another principle',³ he [therefore] states here, A GREAT PRINCIPLE?⁴ And in respect to shebi'ith⁵ too, because he wishes to teach

another principle, he states, This is a great principle?⁶ But what of tithes, though 'another principle' is taught, he nevertheless does not teach [elsewhere] 'a great principle'?⁷ — Said R. Jose b. Abin: As for the Sabbath and shebi'ith, since they possess both primaries and derivatives,⁸ he teaches GREAT; but in respect to tithes, since there are no primaries and derivatives, he does not teach great'. Then according to Bar Kappara, who did learn 'A great principle' in respect to tithes,⁹ what primaries and what derivatives are there? But surely this must be the reason:¹⁰ The penal scope of the Sabbath is 'greater' than that of shebi'ith, for whereas [the restriction of] the Sabbath is found in respect of both detached and growing [produce], [the prohibitions of] shebi'ith do not operate in respect of detached, but only in respect of growing [produce].¹¹ Again, the penal scope of the seventh year is 'greater' than that of tithes: for whereas [the law of] shebi'ith applies to both human food and animal fodder, [the law of] tithes operates in the case of human food, but not of animal fodder.¹² And according to Bar Kappara who learned 'a great principle' in connection with tithes, — the penal scope of tithes is greater than that of *pe'ah*:¹³ for whereas [the law of] tithes operates in figs and vegetables [too], *pe'ah* does not operate in figs and vegetables.¹⁴ For we learnt: A general principle was stated in respect to *pe'ah*: whatever is a foodstuff, is guarded, grows from the earth, is [all] gathered simultaneously,¹⁵ and is collected for storage,¹⁶ is liable to *pe'ah*. 'Foodstuff' excludes the after-growth of woad¹⁷ and madder;¹⁸ 'is guarded' excludes hefker;¹⁹ 'grows from the earth' excludes mushrooms and truffles;²⁰ 'is [all] gathered simultaneously' excludes the fig-tree;²¹ 'and is taken in to be stored' excludes vegetables.²² Whereas in respect to tithes we learnt: A general principle was stated in respect to tithes: Whatever is a foodstuff, is guarded, and grows from the earth is subject to tithes; but we did not learn, 'is gathered simultaneously and is collected for storage.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Rab and Samuel both maintain: Our Mishnah treats of a child who was taken captive among Gentiles, or a proselyte who became converted in the midst of Gentiles.²³ But if one knew and subsequently forgot, he is liable [to a sin-offering] for every Sabbath.²⁴ We learnt: **HE WHO FORGETS THE ESSENTIAL LAW OF THE SABBATH:** surely that implies that he knew [it] originally? — No: what is meant by **HE WHO FORGETS THE ESSENTIAL LAW OF THE SABBATH?** That the very existence of the Sabbath was unknown²⁵ to him. But what if he knew and subsequently forgot; he is liable for every Sabbath? Then instead of teaching, **HE WHO KNOWS THE ESSENTIAL LAW OF THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY LABOURS ON MANY SABBATHS, INCURS A SIN-OFFERING ON ACCOUNT OF EACH SABBATH:** let him teach, He who knew and subsequently forgot, and how much more so this one? — What is meant by, **HE WHO KNOWS THE ESSENTIAL LAW OF THE SABBATH?** That he who knew the essential law of the Sabbath and forgot it.

1. The general principle is this: a sin-offering in connection with the Sabbath is incurred for every unwitting transgression. The number of transgressions is determined by the number of unknown facts. Thus, when one is ignorant of the Sabbath law altogether, he is unaware of a single fact, and incurs one sin-offering only. If he forgets a number of Sabbaths, each is a separate fact; hence he is liable for each. If he knows that it is the Sabbath but forgets that certain labors are forbidden, each labor is a separate fact, and he is liable for each separately. — For primary (Heb. *ab*, lit., 'father') labors v. p. 3, n. 2.
2. I.e., all derivatives (toledoth) of the same primary labor (*ab*).
3. *Infra* 75b.
4. By contrast, this being wider in scope.
5. V. [Glos.](#) It is also the name of a Tractate dealing with the laws thereof.
6. V. Sheb. v, 5 and VII, 1.
7. V. Ma'as. I, 1, and II, 7.
8. V. *infra* 73a seq. Agricultural labor forbidden during the seventh year is likewise divided into primaries and derivatives: sowing, harvesting, reaping and fruit gathering, are primaries, other forms of labor in a field or vineyard are derivatives; v. M.K. 3a.

9. In his collection of Baraitas. These are collections of Tannaitic teachings not incorporated by R. Judah ha-Nasi in the Mishnah; there were several such collections, the most authoritative being those of R. Hiyya and R. Oshaia.
10. Why GREAT is stated in connection with Sabbath.
11. Thus: one must do no work on growing (lit., attached') produce on the Sabbath, e.g., sow, reap, etc. nor on detached produce, e.g., grind corn. But only the former is forbidden in the seventh year, not the latter.
12. Thus the scope of both the Sabbath and shebi'ith is greater than that of tithes, and for that reason 'great' is employed in connection with the first two.
13. V. [Glos.](#)
14. 'Penal scope', Heb. 'onesh, is employed here in the sense that the violation of these laws is punishable.
15. I.e., the whole of the crop ripens about the same time.
16. Lit., 'is brought in to be kept'. This applies to cereals in general, which are stored in granaries over long periods.
17. [G], *isatis tinctoria*, a plant producing a deep blue dye.
18. Both being used as dyes.
19. V. [Glos.](#)
20. Though these grow in the earth, they were held to draw their sustenance mainly from the air.
21. Whose fruits do not all ripen at the same time. The same holds good of many other trees, which are likewise excluded.
22. Which must be consumed whilst fresh.
23. So that they never knew the laws of the Sabbath.
24. He is regarded as knowing the sanctity of the Sabbath but forgetting on each occasion that it is the Sabbath.
25. Lit., 'forgotten'.

Shabbath 68b

What if he did not forget it?¹ He is liable for each labor? Then instead of teaching, **HE WHO KNOWS THAT IT IS THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY LABOURS ON MANY SABBATHS, IS LIABLE FOR EVERY LABOUR,** let him teach, He who knows the essential law of the Sabbath, and how much more so this case? Rather our Mishnah refers to one who knew but subsequently forgot, and Rab and Samuel's [ruling] too is similar to the case of one who knew but subsequently forgot, and it was thus stated: Rab and Samuel both

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

maintain: Even a child who was taken captive among Gentiles or a proselyte who became converted in the midst of Gentiles is as one who knew but subsequently forgot, and so he is liable. But R. Johanan and Resh Lakish maintain: Only one who knew but subsequently forgot [is liable], but a child who was taken captive among Gentiles, or a proselyte who became converted in the midst of Gentiles, is not culpable.

An objection is raised: A great principle is stated in respect to Sabbath: He who forgets the essential law of Sabbath and performs many labors on many Sabbaths, incurs one sin-offering only. E.g., if a child is taken captive among Gentiles or a proselyte is converted in the midst of Gentiles and performs many labors on many Sabbaths, he is liable to one sin-offering only. And he is liable to one [sin-offering] on account of blood, one on account of heleb,² and one on account of idolatry.³ But Monabaz exempts him. And thus did Monabaz argue before R. Akiba: Since a willful transgressor is designated a sinner, and an unwitting transgressor [too] is designated a sinner;⁴ then just as willful transgression implied that he had knowledge,⁵ so when unwittingly transgressing he must have had the knowledge.⁶ Said R. Akiba to him, Behold, I will add to your words. If so, just as willful transgression involves that he shall have had knowledge at the time of his deed, so in unwitting transgression he must have had knowledge at the time of his deed.⁷ Even so, he replied, and all the more so since you have added [this argument]. As you define it,⁸ such is not designated unwitting, but willful transgression, he retorted. Now after all it is stated, 'E.g., if a child' [etc.]: as for Rab and Samuel, it is well.⁹ But according to R. Johanan and Resh Lakish it presents a difficulty? — R. Johanan and Resh Lakish can answer you: Is there not Monabaz who declares him non-culpable? We rule as Monabaz.

What is Monabaz's reason?¹⁰ Because it is written, Ye shall have one law for him that

doeth unwittingly;¹¹ and in proximity thereto [it is written], And the soul that doeth aught with a high hand:¹² hence unwitting is assimilated to willful transgression:¹³ just as willful transgression involves that he shall have had knowledge, so unwitting transgression implies that he shall have had knowledge.¹⁴ And the Rabbis: how do they employ this [verse], Ye shall have one law, [etc.]? — They employ it even as R. Joshua b. Levi taught his son: Ye shall have one law for him that doeth unwittingly; and it is written,

1. Sc. the essential law of the Sabbath, but merely that that particular day was the Sabbath.
2. V. Glos.
3. I.e., for the violation of each law, which if deliberately infringed, carries with it the penalty of *kareth*, he incurs one sin-offering only, no matter how many times he actually infringes it. The consumption of blood and heleb and the worshipping of idols are given as examples.
4. For a willful transgressor v. Lev. V, 1: And if any one sin, etc. That refers to willful transgression, since Scripture does not maintain that his sin be hidden from him', i.e., committed in ignorance. For unwitting transgression v. Lev. IV, 2 et passim.
5. of the forbidden nature of his action.
6. Formerly, though at the time of sinning he had forgotten it.
7. Which is absurd!
8. Lit., 'according to your words'.
9. For they too maintain that he is liable. Now, they can argue that the same holds good even if one originally knew the law but subsequently forgot it, just as they explain the Mishnah, while the particular illustration is given because of Monabaz's dissent in this case.
10. The analogy on mere grounds of logic is insufficient, since willful and unwitting transgression are obviously dissimilar.
11. Num. XV, 29.
12. Ibid. 30; this obviously applies to deliberate transgression.
13. I.e., Scripture itself intimates by this proximity that the two are similar.
14. Before a sin-offering is incurred.

Shabbath 69a

and when ye shall err, and not observe all these commandments;¹ and it is written, And the soul that doeth aught with a high hand ... [that soul shall be cut off]: thus they are all assimilated to idolatry: just as there it is

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

something for the willful transgression of which *kareth*² is incurred, and for the unwitting transgression a sin-offering is incurred,³ so for everything the willful transgression of which involves *kareth*, its unwitting transgression involves a sin-offering.⁴

But according to Monabaz, wherein lies his non-willfulness?⁵ E.g., if he was ignorant in respect of the sacrifice.⁶ But the Rabbis hold that ignorance in respect of the sacrifice does not constitute ignorance.

Now according to the Rabbis, in respect to what is ignorance [required]? R. Johanan said: As long as one errs in respect to *kareth*, even if he willfully sins in respect of the negative command;⁷ while Resh Lakish maintained: He must offend unwittingly in respect of the negative injunction and *kareth*. Raba said, What is R. Simeon b. Lakish's reason? Scripture saith, [And if any one of the common people sin unwittingly, in doing any of the things which the Lord hath commanded] not to be done, and be guilty;⁸ hence he must err both as to the negative injunction and its attendant *kareth*.⁹ And R. Johanan: how does he employ this verse adduced by R. Simeon b. Lakish? — He utilizes it for what was taught: [And if any one] of the common people: this excludes a mumar.¹⁰ R. Simeon b. Eleazar said on the authority of R. Simeon:¹¹ [... sin unwittingly in doing any of the things which the Lord hath commanded] not to be done, and be guilty: he who would refrain¹² on account of his knowledge, brings a sacrifice for his unwitting offence; but he who would not refrain on account of his knowledge cannot bring a sacrifice for his unwitting offence.¹³

We learnt: The primary forms of labor are forty less one.¹⁴ Now we pondered thereon, Why state the number?¹⁵ And R. Johanan replied: [To teach] that if one performs all of them in a single state of unawareness,¹⁶ he is liable [to a sin-offering] for each. Now, how is this possible? [Surely only] where he is aware of the Sabbath but unconscious of [the forbidden nature of] his labours.¹⁷ As for R.

Johanan, who maintained that since he is ignorant in respect of *kareth*, though fully aware of the negative injunction, [his offence is unwitting], it is well: it is conceivable e.g., where he knew [that labor is forbidden on] the Sabbath by a negative injunction. But according to R. Simeon b. Lakish, who maintained that he must be unaware of the negative injunction and of *kareth*, wherein did he know of the Sabbath?¹⁸ — He knew of [the law of] boundaries,¹⁹ this being in accordance with R. Akiba.²⁰

Who is the authority for the following which was taught by the Rabbis: If one is unaware of both,²¹ he is the erring sinner mentioned in the Torah;²² if one willfully transgresses in respect of both, he is the presumptuous offender mentioned in the Torah. If one is unaware of the Sabbath but conscious of [the forbidden character of] his labors or the reverse, or if he declares, 'I knew that this labor is forbidden, but not whether it entails a sacrifice or not, he is culpable? With whom does this agree? With Monabaz.²³

Abaye said: All agree in respect to an 'oath of utterance'²⁴ that a sacrifice is not incurred on account thereof unless one is unaware of its interdict.²⁵ 'All agree': who is that? R. Johanan?²⁶ But that is obvious! When did R. Johanan say [otherwise], where there is [the penalty of] *kareth*; but here [in the case of an 'oath of utterance'] that there is no [penalty of] *kareth*, he did not state [his ruling]? — One might argue: Since liability to a sacrifice [here] is an anomaly,²⁷ for we do not find in the whole Torah that for a [mere] negative injunction²⁸ one must bring a sacrifice, whilst here it is brought; hence even if he is unaware of the [liability to a] sacrifice, he is culpable:²⁹

1. Ibid. 22; in Hor. 8a it is deduced that this refers to idolatry.
2. I.e., cutting off.
3. V. v. 27.
4. But where willful transgression involves a lesser penalty than *kareth*, an unwitting offence does not involve a sin-offering.
5. When the offender has knowledge at the time of his action.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

6. He knew that the willful offence involved *kareth*, but not that the unwitting transgression involved a sin-offering.
7. I.e., he knows that it is forbidden by a negative injunction but not that its penalty is *kareth*. This constitutes sinning in ignorance, and involves a sin-offering.
8. Lev. IV, 27.
9. Not to be done after 'sin unwittingly' implies that he is ignorant that it is forbidden at all.
10. One who is professedly antagonistic to Jewish law. If he sins unwittingly, he cannot offer a sacrifice, even if he desires. This is deduced from the partitive of the common people, expressed in the original by the letter mem (n), which is regarded as a limitation.
11. I.e., R. Simeon b. Yohai.
12. Lit., 'turn back'.
13. For the verse implies that he acted solely through his ignorance; only then can he atone with a sacrifice. R. Simeon too teaches the exclusion of a mumar, but deduces it differently.
14. *Infra* 73a.
15. Since they are enumerated by name.
16. Of their forbidden nature.
17. For in the reverse case he incurs only one sin-offering (v. Mishnah 67b). Now awareness of the Sabbath implies that he knows at least one of the labors forbidden, for otherwise the Sabbath is the same to him as any other day, and he cannot be said to be aware thereof. But in the present passage he appears to have known none at all: how then can we regard him as being aware of the Sabbath? This the Talmud proceeds to discuss.
18. Seeing that he was ignorant of all the forbidden labors.
19. That one may not go on the Sabbath more than a certain distance beyond the town limits. Infringement of this law does not entail a sacrifice.
20. Who maintains that the limitation of boundaries is Biblical. The Rabbis dispute this.
21. I.e., of the Sabbath and that this labor is forbidden on the Sabbath.
22. He certainly falls within this category.
23. *Supra*.
24. E.g., 'I swear that I will eat', or, 'I swear that I will not eat', and then broken, cf. Lev. V, 4.
25. I.e., the offender must have forgotten his oath at the time of breaking it, so that he is unaware that his action is interdicted by his oath. A sacrifice for a broken oath is decreed in Lev. V, 4 seq.
26. For Abaye cannot mean by 'all' that even Monabaz agrees that it is insufficient that he shall merely be ignorant that a vain oath entails a sacrifice. For how can this be maintained? On the contrary, the reverse follows *a fortiori*: if Monabaz regards unawareness of the liability to

a sin-offering elsewhere as true unawareness, though such liability is in accordance with the general principle that where *kareth* is incurred for a willful offence a sin-offering is incurred for an unwitting transgression, how much more so here, seeing that the very liability to a sacrifice is an anomaly unexpected, for the deliberate breaking of an oath does not entail *kareth*. Hence Abaye must refer to R. Johanan's view on the ruling of the Rabbis.

27. Lit., 'a new thing' — something outside the general rule.
28. Which does not entail *kareth*.
29. Even on the views of the Rabbis.

Shabbath 69b

hence he [Abaye] informs us [otherwise].

An objection is raised: What is an unwitting offence in respect of an 'oath of utterance' relating to the past?¹ Where one says, 'I know that this oath is forbidden,² but I do not know whether it entails a sacrifice or not,' he is culpable?³ — This agrees with Monabaz. (Another version: Who is the authority for this? Shall we say, Monabaz? But then it is obvious! seeing that in the whole Torah, where it [liability to a sacrifice] is not an anomaly, Monabaz rules that unawareness of the sacrifice constitutes unawareness, how much more so here that it is an anomaly!⁴ Hence it must surely be the Rabbis, and this refutation of Abaye is indeed a refutation.)⁵

Abaye also said: All agree in respect to *terumah* that one is not liable to [the addition of] a fifth unless he is unaware of its interdict.⁶ 'All agree': who is that? R. Johanan: But that is obvious: when did R. Johanan say [otherwise], where there is the penalty of *kareth*, but here that there is no penalty of *kareth*, he did not state [his ruling]? — You might argue: death stands in the place of *kareth*,⁷ and therefore if one is ignorant of [this penalty of] death, he is culpable; hence he informs us [otherwise]. Raba said: Death stands in the place of *kareth*, and the fifth stands in the place of a sacrifice.⁸

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

R. Huna said: If one is travelling on a road or² in the wilderness and does not know when it is the Sabbath, he must count six days and observe one.¹⁰ Hiyya b. Rab said: He must observe one¹¹ and count six [weekdays]. Wherein do they differ? One Master holds that it is as the world's Creation;¹² the other Master holds that it is like [the case of] Adam.¹³

An objection is raised: If one is travelling on a road and does not know when it is the Sabbath, he must observe one day for six. — Surely that means that he counts six days and observes one? No: he keeps one day and counts six. If so, [instead of] 'he must observe one day for six,' he should state, 'he must observe one day and count six'? Moreover, it was taught: If one is travelling on a road or in a wilderness and does not know when it is the Sabbath, he must count six and observe one day.' This refutation of Hiyya b. Rab is indeed a refutation.

Raba said: Every day he does sufficient for his requirements [only],¹⁴ except on that day. And on that day he is to die? — He prepared double his requirements on the previous day. But perhaps the previous day was the Sabbath? But every day he does sufficient for his requirements, and even on that day. Then wherein may that day be recognized? By kiddush and habdalah.¹⁵

Raba said: If he recognizes the relationship to the day of his departure,¹⁶ he may do work the whole of that day.¹⁷ But that is obvious? — You might say, Since he did not set out on the Sabbath, he did not set out on the eve of the Sabbath either;¹⁸ hence this man, even if he set out on Thursday, it shall be permitted him to do work on two days. Hence he informs us that sometimes one may come across a company and chance to set out [on a Friday].

HE WHO KNOWS THE ESSENTIAL LAW OF THE SABBATH. How do we know it? — Said R. Nahman in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha, Two texts are written: Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the

Sabbath;¹⁹ and it is written, and ye shall keep my Sabbaths.²⁰ How is this to be explained?²¹ 'Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath' [implies] one observance for many Sabbaths;²² [whereas] 'and ye shall keep my Sabbaths' [implies] one observance for each separate Sabbath.²³ R. Nahman b. Isaac demurred: On the contrary, the logic is the reverse: Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath [implies] one observance for each separate Sabbath; [whereas] 'and ye shall keep my Sabbaths' [implies] one observance for many Sabbaths.²⁴

HE WHO KNOWS THAT IT IS THE SABBATH.

1. I.e., where one falsely swears that he has eaten.
2. Knowing that he is swearing to an untruth.
3. This contradicts Abaye.
4. V. n. 2.
5. The passage 'Another ... refutation' is bracketed in the edd., and Rashi deletes it. For in fact the ruling is necessary according to Monabaz too. For whereas elsewhere ignorance is constituted by unawareness either of the forbidden nature of the act or of the sacrifice it entails, here the former does not constitute ignorance, and there must be unawareness of the liability to a sacrifice. This does not follow from Monabaz's other ruling and so must be stated.
6. If a non-priest eats *terumah* unwittingly, he must indemnify the priest for its value and add a fifth (Lev. XXII, 14). Abaye states that he must have been unaware of its forbidden nature, i.e., thinking it to be ordinary food.
7. If *terumah* is knowingly eaten by a non-priest, he is liable to death inflicted by Heaven.
8. Death and the addition of a fifth for the conscious and unconscious eating of *terumah* respectively are the equivalent of *kareth* and a sacrifice in the case of other transgressions. Hence according to R. Johanan on the basis of the ruling of the Rabbis one is liable to the addition of a fifth if he eats *terumah* in ignorance that the conscious offence is punishable by death at the hands of Heaven.
9. Alfasi, Asheri, Maim., Tur and J.D. omit 'on a road or'.
10. From the day that he discovers that he has forgotten when it is the Sabbath.
11. The first after his discovery.
12. Where the Sabbath followed six working days.
13. He was created on the sixth day; thus his first complete day was the Sabbath.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

14. But no unnecessary work, since each day may be the Sabbath.
15. Kiddush =sanctification; habdalah=distinction. The former is a prayer recited at the beginning of the Sabbath; the latter is recited at the end thereof, and thanks God for making a distinction between the sanctity of the Sabbath and the secular nature of the other days of the week.
16. On the day that he discovers that he has forgotten when it is the Sabbath, he nevertheless remembers how many days it is since he set out. The passage may also possibly be translated: if he recognizes a part, viz., the day on which he set out.
17. Viz., on the seventh after he set out, without any restrictions, since he certainly did not commence his journey on the Sabbath.
18. As it is unusual.
19. Ex. XXXI, 16.
20. Lev. XIX, 3.
21. Sc. the employment of the sing. in one verse and the plural in the other.
22. In the sense that if one desecrates many Sabbaths he fails in a single observance and is liable to one sin-offering only.
23. Viz., that the desecration of each Sabbath entails a separate sacrifice. It then rests with the Rabbis to decide where each shall apply.
24. R. Nahman b. Isaac agrees that the distinctions of the Mishnah follow from these texts, but he reverses their significance.

Shabbath 70a

Wherein does the first clause differ from the second? — Said R. Safra: Here he would refrain on account of the knowledge that it is the Sabbath: whilst there he would refrain through the knowledge of the [forbidden] labor[s]. Said R. Nahman to him: Does one refrain from [action on] the Sabbath [for any other reason] save that the labors [are forbidden]; and does one refrain from labors for aught save because of the Sabbath?¹ But said R. Nahman: for what does the Divine Law impose a sacrifice? For ignorance. There there is one fact of ignorance; here there are many facts of ignorance.²

HE IS LIABLE FOR EVERY SEPARATE LABOUR. Whence do we know the division of labors?³ — Said Samuel: Scripture saith, every one that profaneth it shall surely be put to death:⁴ the Torah decreed many deaths

for one desecration. But this refers to willful [desecration]? — Seeing that it is irrelevant in connection with willful transgression, for it is written, whosoever doeth any work therein shall be put to death,⁵ apply it to an unwitting offender;⁶ then what is meant by, shall be put to death? He shall be amerced⁷ in money.⁸

But let the division of labors be deduced whence R. Nathan derives it? For it was taught, R. Nathan said: Ye shall kindle 'no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath day:⁹ why is this stated?¹⁰ Because it is said, And Moses assembled all the congregation of the children of Israel, and said unto them, These are the words which the Lord hath commanded ... Six days shall work be done:¹¹ 'words' [debarim], 'the words' [ha-debarim], 'these [eleh] are the words': this indicates the thirty-nine labors taught to Moses at Sinai.¹² I might think that if one performs all of them in a single state of unawareness,¹³ he incurs only one [sin-offering]: therefore it is stated, from plowing and from harvesting thou shalt rest.¹⁴ Yet I might still argue, For plowing and for harvesting one incurs two sacrifices, but for all others [together] there is but a single liability: therefore it is stated, 'Ye shall kindle no fire' — Now kindling is included in the general law: why is it singled out? That analogy therewith may be drawn, teaching: just as kindling is a principal labor and it entails a separate liability,¹⁵ so for every principal labor a separate liability is incurred.¹⁶ — Samuel holds as R. Jose, who maintained: Kindling is singled out to teach that it is [merely the object of] a negative precept.¹⁷ For it was taught: Kindling is singled out to teach that it is [merely the object of] a negative precept: this is R. Jose's view. R. Nathan said: It is particularly specified to indicate division.¹⁸

Now, let division of labors be derived, whence it is learnt by R. Jose? For it was taught: R. Jose said: [If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any one of the commandments of the Lord, concerning

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

things which ought not to be done,] and shall do of one of them:¹⁹ sometimes one sacrifice is incurred for all of them, whilst at others one is liable for each separately. Said R. Jose son of R. Hanina, What is R. Jose's reason?²⁰ [Of one of them teaches that liability is incurred for] one [complete act]; [for one which is but part] of one; for performing labors forbidden in themselves [i.e. 'them'], and [for labors whose prohibition is derived] from others [i.e., 'of them']; [further,] 'one transgression may involve liability for a number of sacrifices [i.e., 'one'='them'], while many offences may involve but one sacrifice [i.e., 'them'='one'],²¹ [Thus:] one [complete act]: [the writing of] Simeon; [one which is but part] of one, —

1. If the matter is determined by what one would refrain from, the Sabbath and its forbidden labors are tantamount to the same thing, and there would be one law for both forms of ignorance.
2. V. notes on the Mishnah 67b.
3. That a sacrifice is incurred for every separate labor, though they are all performed in one state of unawareness.
4. Ex. XXXI, 14. 'Surely' is expressed in Hebrew by the doubling of the verb, which according to Talmudic exegesis signifies extension.
5. Ex. XXXV, 2. Here the verb is not doubled.
6. This is one of the methods of Talmudic exegesis: a text or its deduction which is irrelevant or incorrect in reference to its own case is applied to another case.
7. Lit., 'put to death'.
8. I.e., a sacrifice. Hence the verse teaches that many sacrifices may be incurred for the desecration of one Sabbath.
9. Ex. XXXV, 3.
10. It is apparently superfluous, being included in the general prohibition of labor.
11. Ibid. 1f.
12. 'Words' implies at least two; 'the' (Heb. ה) is regarded as an extension, whereby two is extended to three; 'these' (Heb. אלה) is given its numerical value, which is thirty-six, thus totaling thirty-nine in all. (Hebrew letters are also numbers.) — The existence of a large body of oral law, stated verbally to Moses or generally known, was assumed. V. Weiss, Dor, I, and *supra* p. 123, n. 7.
13. Without being informed in between that some of these labors are forbidden, but remaining in ignorance from the first labor to the last.
14. Ibid. XXXIV, 21. Since these are specified individually, it follows that each entails a separate sacrifice.
15. Since it is stated separately.
16. Hence the difficulty, why does Samuel quote different verses to learn this?
17. Whereas other labors, willfully performed, are punishable by death or *kareth*, this is punished by flagellation, like the violation of any negative precept.
18. As above.
19. Lev. IV, 2.
20. How does he deduce this from the verse?
21. 'Of one of them', Heb. [H] is a peculiar construction. Scripture should have written, 'and shall do one' (not of one) 'of them', or, 'and do of them' (one being understood), or, 'and shall do one' (of them being understood). Instead of which a partitive preposition is used before each. Hence each part of the pronoun is to be interpreted separately, teaching that he is liable for the transgression of 'one' precept, and for part of one (i.e., 'of one'); for 'them' (explained as referring to the primary labors); and for the derivatives 'of them' (toledoth — labors forbidden because they partake of the same nature as the fundamentally prohibited labors). Also, each pronoun reacts upon the other, as explained in the text.

Shabbath 70b

[the writing of] Shem as part of Simeon.¹ Labors forbidden in themselves' [i.e., 'them']-the primary labors,' [labors whose prohibition is derived] from others' [i.e., 'of them'] — derivatives; 'one transgression may involve liability for a number of sacrifices [i.e., 'one' = 'them'] — awareness of the Sabbath coupled with unawareness of [the forbidden nature of his] labours.² Many offences may involve but one sacrifice [i.e., 'them' = 'one'] — unawareness of the Sabbath coupled with awareness of [the forbidden nature of his] labours.³ — Samuel does not accept the interpretation that 'one' [transgression] may involve liability for a number of sacrifices, while many offences may involve but one sacrifice.⁴

Raba asked R. Nahman: What if one forgot both?⁵ — Said he, Surely he is unaware of the Sabbath; hence he incurs only one [sacrifice].⁶ On the contrary, he has forgotten the labors; hence he is liable for each?² But

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

said R. Ashi: We see: if he would desist [from these labors] on account of the Sabbath,⁸ his unawareness is of the Sabbath, and he incurs only one sacrifice. While if he would desist on account of the labours,⁹ his unawareness is [chiefly] of the labors, and he is liable for each. Said Rabina to R. Ashi: Would he then desist on account of the Sabbath save because of the [forbidden nature of his] labors; and would he desist on account of [the forbidden nature of his] labors save because of the Sabbath?¹⁰ Hence there is no difference.¹¹

We learnt: The primary labors are forty less one. Now we pondered thereon, Why state the number? And R. Johanan answered: [It is to teach] that if one performs all of them in one state of unawareness he is liable for each separately. Now, it is well if you say that if one is unaware of both he is liable for each separately; then it is correct.¹² But if you maintain that this is [mainly] an unawareness of the Sabbath [and] entails only one sacrifice, then how is this possible?¹³ [Presumably] by awareness of the Sabbath and ignorance of the [forbidden] labors. Now, that is well if he¹⁴ agrees with R. Johanan, who ruled: As long as one is unaware of *kareth*, even if he deliberately offends in respect of the negative command:¹⁵ then it is conceivable where he knows that the Sabbath is the object of a negative injunction. But if he agrees with R. Simeon b. Lakish, who maintained: He must offend unwittingly in respect of both the negative injunction and *kareth*, then wherein does he know that it is the Sabbath?¹⁶ — He knew of boundaries, this being in accordance with R. Akiba.¹⁷

Raba said: If one reaped and ground [corn] of the size of a dried fig¹⁸ in unawareness of the Sabbath but awareness in respect of the labours,¹⁹ and then he again reaped and ground [corn] of the size of a dried fig in awareness of the Sabbath but unawareness in respect of the labours,²⁰ and then he was apprised of the reaping and/or grinding [performed] in unawareness of the Sabbath but awareness of the labours,²¹ then he was apprised of the reaping and/or grinding

[performed] in awareness of the Sabbath but unawareness in respect of the labors:

1. A sin-offering is incurred only when a complete action is performed. The writing of a complete word — Simeon — is given as an example. Now, if one commences the word Simeon, [H] SHiMeoN in Hebrew, but writes only the first two letters thereof, viz., SHeM [H], he is also liable, though his intention is only partly fulfilled, because SHeM is a complete word in itself. This is called one labor which is part of another (i.e., 'of them'). If, however, the part he writes is not complete in itself, e.g., the first two letters of Reuben, in Hebrew, there is no liability.
2. Hence though he violates only one injunction, viz. the sacredness of the Sabbath, yet since he is ignorant of each of these acts, he is regarded as having committed a number of separate inadvertent transgressions, for each of which a sacrifice is due.
3. Since all his actions are the result of being unaware of one single fact, viz., that it is the Sabbath, only one sacrifice is due. — Hence the same difficulty, why does Samuel not learn from these verses? (The notes on this passage follow Rashi's explanation in Sanh. 62a; v. Sonc. ed., pp. 421 ff.)
4. He does not agree to their implication of the verse, holding that it is all required in respect of primary and derivative labors.
5. Lit., 'if there is the forgetfulness of both in his hand'. — I.e., he was unaware that it was the Sabbath and that his acts are forbidden on the Sabbath.
6. As in n. 2.
7. As in n. 1.
8. I.e., on being informed that it is the Sabbath.
9. When informed that these labors are forbidden on the Sabbath.
10. When he is reminded of one, he naturally understands that the other is meant too, and desists on account of both.
11. Hence the problem remains in both cases; therefore only one sacrifice is brought, since a sin-offering may not be offered unless one is definitely liable thereto (Rashi as elaborated by Maharsha).
12. For if he is ignorant of all the forbidden labors of the Sabbath, the Sabbath is exactly the same as any other day to him, and he may be regarded as unaware of both.
13. That he should be liable for every single labor.
14. R. Nahman. Rashi reads.: That is well in the view of R. Johanan, etc. v. *supra* 69a.
15. V. p. 329, n. 3.
16. Seeing that he does not know of a single forbidden labor: v. n. 1.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

17. V. *supra* 69a for notes.
18. That is the minimum for which one is culpable.
19. So that he is liable to one sacrifice only.
20. Having been apprised of the Sabbath, whilst he forgot that these are prohibited labors. In this case he is separately culpable on account of each. In the interval between his first labors and his second he did not learn of his offence.
21. Whereupon he set aside one sacrifice on account of both labors — this being before he learnt of his second series of offences.

Shabbath 71a

then [atonement for] the [first] reaping involves [atonement for] the [second] reaping and [atonement for] the [first] grinding involves [atonement for] the [second] grinding.¹ But if he was [first] apprised of his reaping [performed] in awareness of the Sabbath but unawareness in respect of labors: then [atonement for] this [second] reaping involves [atonement for] the [first] reaping and its accompanying grinding;² but the corresponding [second] grinding remains in its place.³ Abaye maintained: [Atonement for the first] grinding involves atonement for the second grinding too: the designation of grinding is the same.⁴

Now, does then Raba hold the theory of involvement?⁵ But it was stated: If one eats two olive-sized pieces of heleb⁶ in one state of unawareness,⁷ is apprised of one of them, and then eats another olive-sized piece whilst still unaware of the second — Raba said: If he offers a sacrifice for the first, the first and second are expiated,⁸ but the third is not. If he brings a sacrifice for the third, the third and second are expiated, but not the first. If he offers a sacrifice for the middle one, all are atoned for.⁹ Abaye maintained: Even if he offers a sacrifice for the first, all are expiated! — After hearing from Abaye he adopted it. If so, let grinding too be carried along with grinding?¹⁰ — He accepts the theory of [direct], but not that of indirect involvement.¹¹

The matter that is clear to Abaye and Raba¹² was a problem to R. Zera: For R. Zera asked R. Assi — others state, R. Jeremiah asked R.

Zera: What if one reaped or¹³ ground [corn] of the quantity of half a dried fig in unawareness of the Sabbath but awareness in respect of the labors, then he again reaped or ground [corn] of the quantity of half a dried fig in awareness of the Sabbath but unawareness in respect of the labors; can they be combined?¹⁴ — Said he to him: They are distinct in respect of sin-offerings,¹⁵ therefore they do not combine.¹⁶

Now, wherever [acts] are distinct in respect of sin-offerings, do they not combine? Surely we learnt: If one eats heleb and [then again] heleb in one state of unawareness, he is culpable for only one [sin-offering]. If one eats heleb, blood, nothar, and piggul¹⁷ in one state of unawareness, he is culpable for each separately: in this many kinds [of forbidden food] are more stringent than one kind. — But in the following one kind is more stringent than many kinds: viz., if one eats half the size of an olive and then eats half the size of an olive of the same kind of [commodity],¹⁸ he is culpable; of two different commodities, he is not culpable. Now we questioned this: 'of the same commodity, he is culpable': need this be stated?¹⁹ And Resh Lakish said on the authority of Bar Tutani: The reference here is to one e.g., who ate [them] from two tureens,²⁰ this being according to R. Joshua, who ruled: Tureens divide.²¹ You might say that R. Joshua rules [thus] whether it leads to leniency or to stringency: hence we are informed that he did not rule thus leniently, but only stringently.²² Thus here, though distinct in respect of sin-offerings, yet they combine? — Said he to him: You learn this in reference to the first clause: hence it presents a difficulty to you.²³ But we learn it in reference to the second clause, and it presents no difficulty to us. [Thus:] 'Of two kinds of [commodities], he is not culpable': need this be said? And Resh Lakish answered on the authority of Bar Tutani: After all, it means of the same kind of [commodity]. Yet why is it designated two kinds of [commodities]? Because he ate them out of two tureens, this agreeing with R. Joshua, who maintained:

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Tureens divide, and we are informed this: that R. Joshua ruled [thus] both leniently and stringently. Now, since the second clause refers to one kind of [commodity] and two tureens,

1. In respect to expiation. The sacrifice for his first two acts of reaping and grinding is an atonement for his second two acts, since all were performed in one state of unawareness, without any appraisal in the interval, notwithstanding that his first unawareness differed in kind from his second unawareness.
2. When he makes atonement for his second reaping he automatically makes atonement for the first too, and since his first reaping and grinding only necessitate one sacrifice, his first grinding too is atoned for thereby.
3. Unatoned for, until another sacrifice is brought.
4. I.e., all acts of grinding made in one state of unawareness are covered by this sacrifice, though it is not primarily offered on account of grinding at all.
5. That atonement for one involves atonement for the other, as above.
6. This is the minimum quantity of forbidden food the eating of which entails a sacrifice.
7. Not being apprised in between that he had eaten heleb.
8. Since they were eaten in one state of unawareness.
9. Since both the first and the third were eaten in the state of unawareness of the second. — The first two rulings show that he rejects the theory of involvement.
10. As Abaye rules above.
11. Lit., 'involvement of involvement'. Thus the first act of grinding is atoned for only because it is involved in the atonement for reaping; hence this in turn cannot involve the second act of grinding.
12. Viz., that awareness of the Sabbath and ignorance of the forbidden nature of one's labors followed by the reverse constitute a single state of unawareness, though the first differs in kind from the second, and the two states or periods are not separate in respect to sacrifice, but sacrifice for one makes atonement for the other.
13. The context shows that the *waw* is disjunctive here, and it is thus translated by Rashi.
14. Viz., the two reapings or the two acts of grinding. Is it all regarded as a single state of unawareness, so that they do combine, or as two states of unawareness, since they differ in kind and they do not combine? Thus he was doubtful of what was clear to Abaye and Raba.
15. Had each reaping been sufficient to entail a sin-offering, a sacrifice for one would not make

atonement for the other. He thus differs from Abaye and Raba.

16. Hence there is no liability.
17. V. Glos.
18. The overall time being less than is required for the eating of half an average meal. It is then regarded as one act of eating.
19. It is obvious.
20. I.e., the two pieces of heleb were differently prepared.
21. If one eats two pieces, each the size of an olive, out of different tureens, in one state of unawareness, they are treated as two separate acts, and he must make atonement on account of each.
22. Therefore the two half-olive sized pieces combine, though they are of two tureens.
23. Since it must be explained as treating of two tureen.

Shabbath 71b

it follows that the first clause treats of one kind of [commodity] and one tureen. But if it is one kind of [commodity] and one tureen, need it be stated?¹ — Said R. Huna: The circumstances here dealt with are e.g., that he was aware in between,² this agreeing with Rabban³ Gamaliel, who maintained: Knowledge of half the standard quantity is of no consequence.⁴

It was stated: If one eats two olive-sized pieces of heleb in one state of unawareness, is apprised of the first and subsequently of the second, — R. Johanan maintains: He is liable to two [sin-offerings]; while Resh Lakish rules: He is liable to one only. R. Johanan maintains: He is liable [for the second], [deducing] for his sin ... he shall bring [a sacrifice].⁵ While Resh Lakish rules, He is not liable [for the second], [interpreting,] of his sin ... and he shall be forgiven.⁶ But according to Resh Lakish too, surely it is written, 'for his sin ... he shall bring?' — That holds good after atonement.⁷ But according to R. Johanan too, surely it is written, 'of his sin ... and he shall be forgiven'? — That refers to one e.g., who ate an olive and a half [of heleb],⁸ was apprised concerning the size of an olive,⁹ and then ate again as much as half an olive in the unawareness of the second [half].¹⁰ Now you

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

might say, let these combine; therefore it¹¹ informs us [otherwise].¹²

Rabina asked R. Ashi: Do they disagree where it [the eating of the second piece] became known to him before setting apart [a sacrifice] for the first, and they differ in this: one Master holds, Appraisements divide,¹³ whilst the other Master holds, [Only] separations [of sacrifices] divide;¹⁴ but if [he learnt of the second piece] after setting apart [a sacrifice for the first], Resh Lakish concedes to R. Johanan that he is liable to two. Or perhaps they disagree where it became known to him after the act of setting apart, and they differ in this: One Master holds, Separations [of sacrifices] divide, while the other Master holds, [Only] acts of atonement divide;¹⁵ but if [he learnt of the second piece] before setting apart [a sacrifice for the first], R. Johanan concedes to Resh Lakish that he is liable only to one [sacrifice]. Or perhaps they differ in both cases? — Said he to him: It is logical that they differ in both cases. For should you think that they differ before the setting apart of a sacrifice, whereas after 'setting apart' Resh Lakish concedes to R. Johanan that he is liable to two sacrifices, — then instead of interpreting the verse as referring to after atonement, let him interpret it as referring to after 'setting apart'.¹⁶ Whilst if they differ after 'setting apart', whereas before separation R. Johanan agrees with Resh Lakish that he is liable only to one [sacrifice]; — instead of interpreting the verse as referring to [one who ate] as much as an olive and a half, let him relate it to [apprisement of the second] before 'setting apart'? But perhaps that itself is in doubt, and it is hypothetically stated.¹⁷ [Thus:] if you assume that they differ before 'setting apart', how can R. Johanan interpret the verse? As referring to [one who ate] the quantity of an olive and a half. And if you assume that they differ after separation, how can Resh Lakish interpret the verse? As referring to after atonement.

'Ulla said: On the view that a certain guilt-offering does not require previous knowledge:¹⁸

1. Surely his culpability is obvious!
2. That he had eaten heleb.
3. A higher title than 'Rabbi'.
4. I.e., it does not separate two acts of eating, when in each case only half the standard quantity to create liability is consumed.
5. Lev. IV, 28, q.v. I.e., for each sin a separate sacrifice is required.
6. Ibid. 35. 'Of' (Heb. n) is interpreted partitively: i.e., even if he offers a sacrifice for part of his sin only, he is forgiven for the whole.
7. If he offends a second time after having atoned for the first, he must make atonement again.
8. At once, though the heleb was not in one piece.
9. That that amount of the fat was heleb.
10. Which was eaten the first time.
11. The verse quoted by Resh Lakish.
12. As in n. 2.
13. I.e., the knowledge first obtained concerning one piece separates this piece from the second, and necessitates a sacrifice for each.
14. And since a sacrifice was not set apart — i.e., separated — until he learnt of the second piece, it atones for both.
15. V. n. 3.
16. Even before it was actually sacrificed.
17. Lit., 'and he says, "should you say".'
18. There are two classes of guilt-offerings (Heb. asham, pl. ashamoth): (i) A guilt-offering of doubt. This is due when one is doubtful if he has committed a sin which, when certainly committed, entails a sin-offering. (ii) A certain guilt-offering. This is due for the undoubted commission of certain offences, viz., (a) robbery (after restoration is made, v. Lev. V, 25); (b) misappropriation of sacred property to secular uses (Lev. V, 16); (c) coition with a bondmaid betrothed to another (Lev. XIX, 21); (d) a nazirite's interrupting of the days of his purity by permitting himself to be ritually defiled (Num. VI, 12); and (e) a leper's guilt-offering (Lev. XIV, 12). Now with respect to b, the Rabbis hold that no guilt-offering is incurred for doubtful misappropriation, whilst R. Akiba and R. Tarfon hold that one can bring a guilt-offering conditionally, stating: 'If I learn at some future date that I was definitely guilty, let this be accounted now as a certain guilt-offering. But if I am destined to remain in doubt, let this be a guilt-offering of doubt'. Thus on the first hypothesis a certain guilt-offering is brought, though at the time one has no knowledge whether he has actually sinned. — This follows Tosaf. Rashi holds that R. Akiba and R. Tarfon differ in this very question.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 72a

if one cohabits five times with a betrothed bondmaid,¹ he is liable to one [guilt-offering] only.² R. Hamnuna objected: If so, if one cohabits, sets aside a sacrifice, and states, 'Wait for me until I cohabit again,'³ is he then liable to only one?⁴ — Said he to him, You speak of an act after separation [of the sacrifice]: in such a case I did not state [my ruling].⁵

When R. Dimi came,⁶ he said: On the view that a certain guilt-offering requires previous knowledge: If one cohabits five times with a betrothed maiden, he is liable for each [act]. Said Abaye to him, But in the case of a sin-offering [definite] knowledge is required beforehand,⁷ yet R. Johanan and Resh Lakish differ [therein]?⁸ He remained silent. Said he to him, Perhaps you refer to an act after separation [of the sacrifice], and as R. Hamnuna?⁹ Even so, he replied.

When Rabin came,⁶ he said: All agree about a betrothed bondmaid [in one respect], and ali agree about a betrothed bondmaid [in another respect], and there is disagreement about a betrothed bondmaid [in a third respect].¹⁰ [Thus:] All agree in the case of [coition with] a betrothed bondmaid, that one is liable only to one [sacrifice], as Ulla. All agree in the case of [coition with] a betrothed bondmaid, that one is liable for each, as R. Hamnuna. And there is disagreement about a betrothed bondmaid: on the view that a certain guilt-offering requires previous knowledge, there is disagreement between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish.¹¹

It was stated:

1. Unwittingly. Between each act of coition he learnt of his previous offence.
2. Since knowledge of guilt is not required, the knowledge that he does possess is insufficient to separate his actions and necessitate a sacrifice for each. But on the view that previous knowledge is essential for a guilt-offering, this matter will be disputed by R. Johanan and Resh Lakish, as on 71b. — Though we do not find a doubtful guilt-offering for doubtful coition, and

so it would appear that here at least knowledge is essential, for otherwise how does he know that he sinned at all, a sacrifice is nevertheless conceivable without previous knowledge. Thus: when in doubt one might bring a conditional sacrifice and stipulate: 'If I have sinned, let this be a certain guilt-offering; if not, let this be a peace-offering' (Tosaf.).

3. So that this sacrifice may atone for both. — Even conscious coition with a betrothed bondmaid necessitates a sacrifice, though in all other cases only an unwitting offence entails an offering.
4. Surely not!
5. For this certainly divides the offences, and a sacrifice is required for each.
6. V. p. 12, n. 9.
7. That an offence was committed. If one brings a sin-offering before he knows that he has sinned, and then learns that he has sinned, the sacrifice is invalid for atonement.
8. And the same principle applies here. How then can you make a general statement?
9. Whereas R. Johanan and Resh Lakish differ where all his actions were committed before the separation of an animal for a sacrifice.
10. 'All' and 'there is disagreement' refer to the views of R. Johanan and Resh Lakish.
11. V. p. 343. n. 5.

Shabbath 72b

If one intended to lift up something detached, but cut off something attached [to the soil],¹ he is not culpable. [If he intended] to cut something detached, but cut something attached [instead],² Raba ruled: He is not culpable; Abaye maintained: He is culpable.³ Raba ruled, He is not culpable, since he had no intention of a prohibited cutting.⁴ Abaye maintained: He is culpable, since he had the intention of cutting in general.⁵

Raba said, How do I know it? Because it was taught: [In one respect] the Sabbath is more stringent than other precepts; [in another respect] other precepts are more stringent than the Sabbath. The Sabbath is more stringent than other precepts in that if one performs two [labors] in one state of unawareness, he is culpable on account of each separately; this is not so in the case of other precepts. Other precepts are more stringent than the Sabbath, for in their case if an injunction is unwittingly and

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

unintentionally violated, atonement must be made: this is not so with respect to the Sabbath.

The Master said: 'The Sabbath is more stringent than other precepts in that if one performs two [labors] in one state of unawareness, he is culpable on account of each separately: this is not so in the case of other precepts.' How is this meant? Shall we say, that he performed reaping and grinding? Then an analogous violation of other precepts would be the partaking of heleb and blood — then in both cases two [penalties] are incurred! But how is it possible in the case of other precepts that only one liability is incurred? If one ate heleb twice;⁶ then by analogy, with respect to the Sabbath [it means] that he performed reaping twice — then in each case only one liability is incurred? — After all, it means that he performed reaping and grinding, and what is meant by 'this is not so in the case of other precepts'? This refers to idolatry, and is in accordance with R. Ammi, who said: If one sacrificed, burnt incense, and made libations [to an idol] in one state of unawareness, he is only liable to one [sacrifice].⁷ How have you explained it: as referring to idolatry? Then consider the second clause: Other precepts are more stringent [than the Sabbath], for in their case if an injunction is unwittingly and unintentionally violated, atonement must be made: this is not so with respect to the Sabbath. Now, how is an unwitting and unintentional transgression of idolatry possible? Shall we say that one thought it [sc. an idolatrous shrine] to be a synagogue and bowed down to it — then his heart was to Heaven! But if he saw a royal statue and bowed down to it — what are the circumstances? If he accepted it as a god, he is a willful sinner; while if he did not accept it as a god, he has not committed idolatry at all!⁸ Hence it must mean [that he worshipped it idolatrously] through love or fear;⁹ now this agrees with Abaye's view that a penalty is incurred;¹⁰ but on Raba's view that there is no culpability, what can you say? Rather it must refer to one who thinks that it [sc.

idolatry] is permitted.¹¹ Then 'this is not so in the case of the Sabbath' means that there is no liability at all! Yet when Raba questioned R. Nahman,¹² it was only whether one is liable to one [sacrifice] or to two, but certainly not to exempt him completely!

1. The latter is a forbidden act on the Sabbath. Rashi: e.g., if a knife fell down amidst growing corn, and whilst intending to lift it up one cut the corn.
2. R. Tam: e.g., he thought it was a detached bundle of corn, but after cutting it he discovered that it had been attached.
3. Throughout the Talmud Abaye's view is always quoted before Raba's. Hence it is suggested that either the order should be reversed here, or Rabbah (Abaye's teacher) should be read instead of Raba, v. Marginal Gloss.
4. Whereas in order to be culpable he must have intended to do what he did, save that his offence was unintentional either because he did not know that it was the Sabbath or that that action is forbidden on the Sabbath.
5. Whereas to avoid culpability he must have had no intention of cutting at all.
6. In one state of unawareness, not being reminded in between that heleb is forbidden.
7. Though he performed a number of services.
8. Lit., 'it is nothing'.
9. And this is called unwitting and unintentional, for it was unwitting in so far as he thought this permissible.
10. V. Sanh. 61b.
11. E.g., if he was brought up among heathens. Since he has never known of any prohibition, it is regarded not only as unwitting but as unintentional too.
12. About such a case. v. *supra* 70b. Where one forgets both the Sabbath and the forbidden labors it is tantamount to ignorance of the Sabbath altogether, and is thus analogous to the belief that idolatry is permitted.

Shabbath 73a

Surely then the first clause [dealing with the greater severity of the Sabbath] refers to idolatry, whilst the second treats of other precepts; and how is unwitting and unintentional transgression possible? When one thought that it [heleb] was permitted fat, and ate it.¹ [While] 'this is not so with respect to the Sabbath,' viz., that he is not culpable, for if [by analogy] one intended cutting something detached but cut something

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

attached [instead], he is not culpable.² But Abaye [maintains:] how is an unwitting and unintentional offence meant? When one thinks that it [heleb] is spittle and swallows it.³ [While] 'which is not so in the case of the Sabbath,' where he is exempt, for if [by analogy] one intends lifting something detached but cuts something attached [to the soil], he is not culpable. But if he intends to cut something detached and cuts something attached, he is liable.

It was stated: If one intends to throw [an object] two [cubits], but throws it four,⁴ Raba said: He is not culpable; Abaye ruled: He is culpable.⁵ Raba said: He is not culpable, since he had no intention of a four [cubits'] throw. Abaye ruled, He is culpable, since he intended throwing in general. If he thinks it private ground but it is learnt to be public ground, Raba ruled: He is not culpable; Abaye said: He is culpable. Raba ruled, He is not culpable, since he had no intention of a forbidden throw. While Abaye ruled that he is culpable, since he intended throwing in general.

Now, it is necessary.⁶ For if we were informed of the first, [it might be argued] there [only] does Raba rule thus, since he did not intend [to perform] a forbidden eating, but if he intended throwing [an object] two [cubits] but throws it four, since four cannot be thrown without two,⁷ I would say that he agrees with Abaye. And if we were informed of this, [it might be argued] here [only] does Raba rule thus, since he did not intend a four [cubits'] throw; but if he thought it private ground but it was discovered to be public ground, seeing that he intended a four [cubits'] throw, I would say that he agrees with Abaye. Thus they are [all] necessary.

We learnt: The primary labours are forty less one. Now we questioned this, Why state the number? And R. Johanan answered: [To teach] that if one performs all of them in one state of unawareness, he is liable [to a sacrifice] on account of each separately. Now, as for Abaye who ruled that in such a case one is liable, this is well: for this is

conceivable where one knows the interdict of the Sabbath and the interdicts of labours, but errs in respect of the standards.⁸ But according to Raba who maintained that one is not culpable [for this], how is this conceivable? [Presumably] [only] where he was conscious of the Sabbath but unaware of [the forbidden character of his] labours. Now that is well if he agrees with R. Johanan who ruled, Since he was ignorant of *kareth*, even if he was conscious of the negative injunction, [he is liable]:⁹ then it is possible where he knew [that his labours are prohibited on] Sabbath by a negative injunction. But if he holds with R. Simeon b. Lakish, who maintained, He must offend unwittingly in respect of both the negative injunction and *kareth*, then wherein did he know of the Sabbath?¹⁰ — He knew it by the law of boundaries, this being in accordance with R. Akiba.¹¹

MISHNAH. THE PRIMARY LABOURS ARE FORTY LESS ONE, [VIZ.:] SOWING,¹² PLOWING, REAPING, BINDING SHEAVES, THRESHING, WINNOWING, SELECTING,¹³ GRINDING, SIFTING, KNEADING, BAKING, SHEARING WOOL, BLEACHING, HACKLING, DYEING, SPINNING, STRETCHING THE THREADS,¹⁴ THE MAKING OF TWO MESHES, WEAVING TWO THREADS, DIVIDING TWO THREADS,¹⁵ TYING [KNOTTING] AND UNTYING, SEWING TWO STITCHES, TEARING IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES,¹⁶ CAPTURING A DEER, SLAUGHTERING, OR FLAYING, OR SALTING IT,¹⁷ CURING ITS HIDE, SCRAPING IT [OF ITS HAIR], CUTTING IT UP, WRITING TWO LETTERS, ERASING IN ORDER TO WRITE TWO LETTERS [OVER THE ERASURE], BUILDING, PULLING DOWN, EXTINGUISHING, KINDLING, STRIKING WITH A HAMMER,¹⁸ [AND] CARRYING OUT FROM ONE DOMAIN TO ANOTHER: THESE ARE THE FORTY PRIMARY LABOURS LESS ONE.

1. Thus it was unwitting, because he thought it permitted fat, and unintentional, since he had no intention of eating heleb. On the present hypothesis it is regarded as unwitting but

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

intentional only when he knows that it is heleb and eats it as such, thinking, however, that heleb is permitted.

2. Thus on this interpretation the Baraita supports Raba.
3. It is unwitting, because he thinks it spittle, and unintentional, because he has no intention of eating at all, swallowing not being eating. But the case posited by Raba is not unintentional in Abaye's view, since he did intend to eat.
4. Four cubits in the street is the minimum distance for culpability.
5. On Raba and Abaye v. *supra* 72b, p. 345. n. 3.
6. For the three controversies — i.e., these two and that on 72b top — to be stated, though apparently two are superfluous, since the same principle underlies all.
7. I.e., in throwing it four cubits he did fulfill his intention.
8. In each case he intended performing less than the standard for which liability is incurred, but actually performed the full standard.
9. V. p. 329, n. 2.
10. V. p. 330, n. 3.
11. V. p. 330, nn. 5-6.
12. Lit., 'he who sows', and similarly with the others that follow.
13. By hand, the unfit food from the fit.
14. On the loom.
15. I.e., dividing the ends of the web.
16. Where it is inconvenient to sew unless one tears the cloth first, that tearing is a primary labor.
17. Sc. its skin.
18. I.e., giving the finishing blow with the hammer.

Shabbath 73b

GEMARA. Why state the number? — Said R. Johanan: [To teach] that if one performs them all in one state of unawareness, he is liable on account of each separately.

SOWING AND PLOWING. Let us see: plowing is done first, then let him [the Tanna] state **PLOWING** first and then **SOWING**? — The Tanna treats of¹ Palestine, where they first sow and then plow.²

A Tanna taught: Sowing, pruning, planting, bending,³ and grafting are all one labor. What does this inform us? — This: that if one performs many labors of the same nature, he is liable only to one [sacrifice]. R. Abba⁴ said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Ashi in R. Ammi's name: He who prunes is culpable on account of planting, while he who plants,

bends [the vine], or grafts is culpable on account of sowing. On account of sowing only but not on account of planting?⁵ — Say: on account of planting too.⁶

R. Kahana said: If one prunes and needs the wood [too], he is liable to two [penalties],⁷ one on account of reaping⁸ and one on account of planting.⁹ R. Joseph said: He who cuts hay is liable to two [penalties], one on account of reaping and the other on account of planting.¹⁰ Abaye said: He who trims beets [in the ground] is liable to two [penalties], one on account of reaping¹¹ and one on account of planting.¹²

PLOWING. A Tanna taught: Plowing, digging, and trenching are all one [form of] work.¹³ R. Shesheth said: If one has a mound [of earth] and removes it, in the house, he is liable on the score of building;¹⁴ if in the field, he is liable on the score of plowing. Raba said: If one has a depression and fills it up: if in the house, he is liable on account of building; if in the field, he is liable on account of plowing.¹⁵

R. Abba said: If one digs a pit on the Sabbath, needing only the earth thereof,¹⁶ he is not culpable on its account. And even according to R. Judah, who ruled: One is liable on account of a labor which is not required on its own account:¹⁷ that is only when he effects an improvement, but this man causes damage.¹⁸

REAPING: A Tanna taught: Reaping, vintaging, gathering [dates], collecting [olives], and gathering [figs] are all one [form of] labor. R. Papa said: He who throws a clod of earth at a palm tree and dislodges dates is liable to two [penalties], one on account of detaching¹⁹ and one on account of stripping.²⁰ R. Ashi said: This is not the mode of detaching, nor is it the mode of stripping.²¹

BINDING SHEAVES. Raba²² said: He who collects salt out of a salina²³ is liable on the score of binding sheaves.²⁴ Abaye said: Binding sheaves applies only to products of the soil.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

THRESHING. It was taught: Threshing, beating [flax in their stalks], and beating [cotton] are all the same form of work.

WINNOWING, SELECTING, GRINDING AND SIFTING. But winnowing, selecting, and sifting are identical?²⁵ — Abaye and Raba both said: Whatever was performed in [connection with the erection of] the Tabernacle,

1. Lit., 'stands in' — all the Tannaim, of course, were Palestinians.
2. Involving only one liability if performed at the same time.
3. Bending a vine for drawing it into the ground and making it grow as an independent plant (Jast.).
4. So text as amended.
5. Surely bending and grafting are forms of planting? — Planting and sowing are identical, the former applying to trees and the latter to cereals.
6. Hence if he grafts and sows, he is only liable to one penalty.
7. I.e., sin-offering, if done unwittingly.
8. Cutting wood from a tree for its use is a derivative of reaping.
9. Pruning is done to enable what is left to grow more freely, and thus it is a derivative of planting.
10. The hay is cut so that new grass can grow, and thus it is a derivative of planting (i.e., sowing) too.
11. Because the beets he cuts constitute a harvest.
12. As in n. 5.
13. Involving only one liability if performed at the same time.
14. For he thereby levels the floor, which is part of building.
15. For he thereby prepares the ground for sowing.
16. But not the pit itself.
17. V. *supra* 12a, 31b.
18. He spoils the ground by the pit.
19. That which is attached to the soil, the clod being taken up from the soil.
20. Rashi: the tree of a burden, sc. the dates. Ri: the dates of their outer skin. In both cases this is a derivative of threshing, which separates the grain from the chaff.
21. Hence he is not liable on either score.
22. Maim. and Asheri read: Rabbah.
23. A salt deposit, formed by causing sea water to flow into a trench; the water evaporates through the heat of the sun, leaving the salt. Raba refers to this action of directing the water into the trench.

24. It partakes of the same nature, and ranks as a derivative thereof.

25. All consist of separating fit from unfit food.

Shabbath 74a

even if there are [labors] similar thereto, is counted [separately].¹ Then let him also enumerate pounding [wheat]?² — Said Abaye: Because a poor man eats his bread without pounding.³ Raba said: This agrees with Rabbi, who said: The primary labors are forty less one; but if pounding were enumerated, there would be forty.⁴ Then let one of these be omitted and pounding be inserted? Hence it is clear [that it must be explained] as Abaye [does].

Our Rabbis taught: If various kinds of food lie before one, he may select and eat, select and put aside; but he must not select, and if he does, he incurs a sin-offering. What does this mean? — Said 'Ulla, This is its meaning: He may select to eat on the same day, and he may select and put aside for the same day; but he must not select for [use on] the morrow, and if he does, he incurs a sin-offering. R. Hisda demurred: Is it then permitted to bake for [use on] the same day, or is it permitted to cook for the same day?⁵ Rather said R. Hisda: He may select and eat less than the standard quantity, and he may select and put aside less than the standard quantity;⁶ but he must not select as much as the standard quantity, and if he does, he incurs a sin-offering. R. Joseph demurred: Is it then permitted to bake less than the standard quantity?⁷ Rather said R. Joseph: He may select by hand and eat, or select by hand and put aside; but he may not select with a reed-basket or a dish; and if he does, he is not culpable, nevertheless it is forbidden.⁸ He may not select with a sieve or a basket-sieve, and if he does he incurs a sin-offering.⁹ R. Hamnuna demurred: Are then a reed-basket and a dish mentioned? — Rather said R. Hamnuna: He may select and eat, [taking the] eatable from the non-eatable, and he may select and put aside, [taking] the eatable from the non-eatable. But he must not select the non-eatable out of the eatable,

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

and if he does, he incurs a sin-offering.¹⁰ Abaye demurred: Is it then taught, 'the eatable from the non-eatable'? Rather said Abaye: He may select and eat immediately, and he may select and put aside for immediate use;¹¹ but he may not select for [later consumption on] the same day, and if he does, it is regarded as though he were selecting for [making] a store, and he incurs a sin-offering.¹² The Rabbis reported this to Raba. Said he to them, Nahmani¹³ has said well.

If two kinds of food lie before a person, and he selects and eats or selects and puts aside,¹⁴ — R. Ashi learnt: He is not culpable: R. Jeremiah of Difti¹⁵ learnt: He is culpable, 'R. Ashi learnt: He is not culpable!' but it was taught:¹⁶ 'He is culpable'? — There is no difficulty: the one treats of a reed-basket and a plate;¹⁷ the other refers to a sieve and a basket-sieve.

When R. Dimi came,¹⁸ he related: It was R. Bibi's Sabbath,¹⁹ and R. Ammi and R. Assi chanced to be there. He cast a basket of fruit before them,²⁰ and I do not know whether it was because he held that it is forbidden to pick out the eatable from the non-eatable, or whether he wished to be generous.²¹

Hezekiah said: One who picks lupines [after boiling] out of their husks²² is culpable. Shall we say that Hezekiah holds that it is forbidden to select the eatable from the non-eatable? [No.] Lupines are different,

1. What constitutes primary labors is learnt from the Tabernacle (v. 49b). All these labors were needed for the Tabernacle in the wilderness; hence they are counted separately.
2. In a mortar, to remove the husk. Drugs were pounded in connection with the Tabernacle for dyes.
3. Hence it is omitted, for the Tanna evidently follows the general order of making bread, and bread for the poor is prepared with the husk of the wheat. But it is certainly a primary labor forbidden on the Sabbath.
4. Rabbi deduces even the number of labors from Scripture (v. *infra* 97b).
5. Surely not! And since you say that selecting for use on the next day entails a sin-offering, it is a forbidden labor in the full sense of the term, and

hence prohibited even if required for the same day.

6. For which a penalty is incurred, viz., as much as a dried fig.
7. Granted that there is no penalty, it is nevertheless forbidden, and the same applies here.
8. There is no liability, because this is not the proper mode of selecting; nevertheless it is forbidden, because it is somewhat similar to selecting by means of a sieve.
9. Because this is the usual mode of sifting, and it is therefore a primary labor, as stated in the Mishnah. For a description of the nafah v. Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 69, n. 10.
10. The former is not the ordinary mode of sifting, while the latter is.
11. I.e., immediately he finishes putting aside he will consume what is eatable.
12. But the former does not constitute sifting and is entirely permissible.
13. A familiar name of Abaye, because he was brought up in the house of Rabbah b. Nahmani. V. however, Git., Sonc. ed., p. 140, n. 6.
14. For another to eat. The two kinds were mixed up, and he selected the kind he desired.
15. v. p. 35, n. 5.
16. *Supra*.
17. When the selecting is done by these, he is not culpable.
18. V. p. 12, n. 9.
19. It was his turn that Sabbath to wait on the scholars.
20. [H] denotes to put down with some violence. He did this instead of first separating the leaves from the fruit, as they would fall away automatically through the force of his setting it down.
21. Hence placed a large quantity before them.
22. Lit., 'refuse'.

Shabbath 74b

because they are boiled seven times, and if one does not remove it [the edible portion], it goes rancid, hence it is like [picking] the non-edible out of the edible.¹

GRINDING. R. Papa said: He who cuts up beets very fine is liable on account of grinding. R. Manasseh said: He who cuts chips [for fuel] is liable on account of grinding. Said R. Ashi: If he is particular about their size, he is liable on account of cutting.²

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

KNEADING AND BAKING. R. Papa said: Our Tanna omits the boiling of ingredients [for dyes],³ which took place in [connection with] the Tabernacle, and treats of baking!⁴ — Our Tanna takes the order of [making] bread.⁵

R. Aha son of R. Awira said: He who throws a tent peg into a stove⁶ is liable on account of cooking. But that is obvious? — You might say, His intention is to strengthen [harden] the article,⁷ therefore we are informed that it [first] softens and then hardens.⁸

Rabbah son of R. Huna said: He who boils pitch is liable on account of cooking. But that is obvious? — You might argue, Since it hardens again, I might say [that he is] not [liable]. Hence he informs us [otherwise].

Raba said: He who makes an [earthenware] barrel is culpable on account of seven sin-offerings.⁹ [He who makes] an oven is liable on account of eight sin-offerings.¹⁰ Abaye said: He who makes a wicker work is liable to eleven sin-offerings,¹¹ and if he sews round the mouth thereof, he is liable to thirteen sin-offerings.¹²

SHEARING WOOL AND BLEACHING. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: He who spins wool from off the animal's back on the Sabbath incurs three sin-offerings, one on account of shearing, another on account of hackling, and the third on account of spinning.¹³ R. Kahana said: Neither shearing, hackling, nor spinning is [done] in this manner.¹⁴ But is it not so? Surely it was taught in the name of R. Nehemiah: It was washed [direct] on the goats and spun on the goats:¹⁵ which proves that spinning direct from the animal is designated spinning? — Superior skill is different.¹⁶

Our Rabbis taught: He who plucks the wing [of a bird], trims it [the feather], and plucks it [the down], is liable to three sin offerings. Said R. Simeon b. Lakish: For plucking [the wing] one is liable on account of shearing; for trimming [the feather] he is liable on the

score of cutting; and for plucking [the down] he is liable under the head of smoothing.

TYING AND UNTYING. Where was there tying in the Tabernacle?¹⁷ — Said Raba: The tent-pegs were tied. But that was tying with the intention of [subsequent] untying?¹⁸ But said Abaye: The weavers of the curtains, when a thread broke, tied it up. Said Raba to him: You have explained tying; but what can be said about untying? And should you answer that when two knots [in the material] chanced to come together, one untied one and left the other knotted:¹⁹ [it may be asked], seeing that one would not do thus before a king of flesh and blood, how much more so before the Supreme King of kings, the Holy One, blessed be He?²⁰ Rather said Raba — others state, R. Elai: Those who caught the hillazon²¹ tied and untied.²²

SEWING TWO STITCHES. But it cannot endure?²³ — Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name: Providing that he knots them.²⁴

TEARING IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES. Was there any tearing in the Tabernacle? — Rabbah and R. Zera both say:

1. Which is forbidden.
2. Sc. Hides to measure; v. Mishnah on erection.
3. E.g., for the hangings and curtains, v. Rashi 73a, s.v. [H].
4. Which has nothing to do with the Tabernacle (Rashi).
5. I.e., he takes bread as an example and enumerates the various principal labors connected with it.
6. To dry it.
7. Whereas cooking softens.
8. The fire heats the moisture in the wood, which softens it, and it is only after it evaporates that the wood hardens. This prior softening partakes of the nature of cooking.
9. So MS.M., deleting 'on account of' in cur. edd. (i) The clods of earth are first crushed and powdered — this constitutes grinding; (ii) the thicker balls which do not powder well are removed — selecting (iii) it is then sifted; (iv) the powder is mixed with water — kneading; (v) the resultant clay is smoothed when the cast of the vessel is made — smoothing; (vi) the fire is

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

lit in the kiln; and (vii) the vessel is hardened in the kiln — boiling.

10. The seven foregoing, which are also needed here, and an additional one. For after it is hardened in the kiln, a layer of loam or plaster is daubed on the inside, to enable it to preserve heat. This completes it, and it is stated *infra* 75b that every special act needed to complete an article falls within the term 'striking with the hammer' (v. Mishnah, 73a). But a barrel needs no special labor to complete it.
11. It entails this number of labors: (i and ii) cutting the reeds is a two-fold labor: (a) reaping, (b) planting, since it leaves more room for the others to grow (v. *supra* 73b); (iii) collecting them — binding sheaves, (iv) selecting the best; (v) smoothing them; (vi) splitting them lengthwise into thinner rods — grinding; (vii) cutting them — to measure; (viii) stretching the lengthwise rods; (ix) drawing one cane through these, threading it above and below the lengthwise rods — this is the equivalent of 'the making of two meshes'; (x) plaiting the canes — weaving; and finally (xi) cutting it round after plaiting in order to finish it off, — 'striking with a hammer' (v. n. 7).
12. The additional two are sewing and then tying up (presumably the unattached lengths of the thread or twine used for same).
13. Spinning direct from the animal embraces these three labors.
14. Hence he is not liable at all, for one is liable only when he performs a labor in the usual manner.
15. The reference is to Ex. XXXV, 26, q.v., which R. Nehemiah translates literally, without adding 'hair' as in E.V., and so he deduces that it was spun directly from the animal.
16. Scripture emphasizes there the skill that this demanded (v. 25), which shows that normal spinning is different.
17. V. p. 224, n. 4.
18. When they struck camp. Such is not Biblically forbidden and is not the tying referred to in the Mishnah.
19. The two knots together would spoil the evenness of the fabric.
20. The untying of a knot in the fabric would leave an ugly gap, particularly as the threads were six-stranded. Hence the utmost care would be taken to prevent the thread from knotting in the first place.
21. A kind of snail or purple-fish whose blood was used for dyeing the tents of the Tabernacle.
22. The nets.
23. Two stitches alone will slip out of the cloth. Thus the work is not permanent and entails no punishment.
24. After sewing, so that they will remain.

Shabbath 75a

A curtain which was attacked by a moth was torn [round the moth hole] and resewn.

R. Zutra b. Tobiah said in Rab's name: He who pulls the thread of a seam¹ on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering; and he who learns a single thing from a Magian² is worthy of death;³ and he who is able to calculate the cycles⁴ and planetary courses but does not, one may hold no conversation with him.⁵

As to magianism, Rab and Samuel [differ thereon]: one maintains that it is sorcery; the other, blasphemy. It may be proved that it is Rab who maintains that it is blasphemy. For R. Zutra b. Tobiah said in Rab's name: He who learns a single thing from a magian is worthy of death. Now should you think that it is a sorcerer, surely it is written, thou shalt not learn to do [after the abomination of those nations],⁶ [implying], but you may learn in order to understand and instruct! This proves it.

R. Simeon b. Pazzi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi on the authority of Bar Kappara: He who knows how to calculate the cycles and planetary courses, but does not, of him Scripture saith, but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither have they considered the operation of his hands.⁷ R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Johanan's name: How do we know that it is one's duty to calculate the cycles and planetary courses? Because it is written, for this is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the peoples:⁸ what wisdom and understanding is in the sight of the peoples?⁹ Say, that it is the science of cycles and planets.

CAPTURING A DEER, etc. Our Rabbis taught: He who captures a purple-fish¹⁰ and crushes it is liable to one [sin-offering];¹¹ R. Judah said: He is liable to two, for R. Judah maintained: Crushing comes under the head of threshing. Said they to him: Crushing does not come under the head of threshing. Raba observed: What is the Rabbis' reason? They

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

hold that threshing is applicable only to produce from the soil. But let him be culpable too on the score of taking life? — Said R. Johanan: This means that he crushed it when [already] dead.¹² Raba said: You may even explain that he crushed it whilst alive: in respect to the taking of life he is but incidentally occupied.¹³ But Abaye and Raba both maintain: R. Simeon admits in a case of 'cut off his head but let him not die!'¹⁴ Here it is different, because he is more pleased that it should be alive, so that the dye should be clearer.¹⁵

AND SLAUGHTERING IT. As for him who slaughters, on what score is he culpable? — Rab said: On the score of dyeing;¹⁶ while Samuel said: On the score of taking life.

1. If the seam gapes, and he pulls the thread to draw the pieces together. This constitutes sewing.
2. One of the priest-craft of Ancient Persia.
3. This is an idiom expressing strong abhorrence, cf. similar expressions in Sanh. 58b and 59a. The Magi were hostile to Jews, and caused them much suffering in various ways; cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 504, n. 6 and 98a; Yeb. 63b; Git. 17a. This evoked the present remark.
4. Sc. of the seasons.
5. The science of astronomy was necessary for the fixing of the calendar, upon which Jewish Festivals depended. In early times this was done by observation, but gradually calculation took its place. Hence Rab's indignation at one who fails to employ such knowledge.
6. Deut. XVIII, 9.
7. Isa. V, 12.
8. Deut. IV, 6.
9. I.e., which testifies to itself.
10. Hillazon, v. p. 356, n. 2
11. Crushing not being a culpable offence.
12. In order to make the blood exude.
13. I.e., the taking of life is not his main purpose, but merely follows incidentally; such does not entail culpability.
14. R. Simeon holds that a labor performed unintentionally in the course of doing something that is permitted is itself permitted, unless it follows inevitably from the latter, when it is the same as any other forbidden labor. Here too it must inevitably die when crushed.
15. Hence its death is more than unintentional, but actually contrary to his desire.
16. The blood that gushes forth from its cut throat stains and dyes the flesh.

Shabbath 75b

On the score of dyeing but not on the score of taking life!¹ Say, on the score of dyeing too. Rab said: As to this dictum of mine, I will make an observation thereon so that later generations should not come and deride me. Wherein is one pleased with the dyeing? One is pleased that the throat should be stained with blood, so that people may see it² and come and buy from him.

SALTING AND CURING IT. But salting and tanning are identical?³ — R. Johanan and Resh Lakish both said: Omit one of these and insert the tracing of lines.⁴ Rabbah son of R. Huna said: He who salts meat is liable on account of tanning [dressing]. Raba said: Curing does not apply to foodstuffs. R. Ashi observed: And even Rabbah son of R. Huna ruled thus only when he requires it for a journey;⁵ but [when he needs it] for his house, one does not turn his food into wood.

SCRAPING AND CUTTING IT UP. R. Aha b. Hanina said: He who rubs [smooths skins] between columns⁶ on the Sabbath is liable on the score of scraping. R. Hiyya b. Abba said, R. Ammi told me three things in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: He who planes the tops of beams⁷ on the Sabbath is culpable on account of cutting.⁸ He who spreads a poultice [evenly over a sore] on the Sabbath is culpable on the grounds of scraping. And he who chisels round a stone on the Sabbath⁹ is liable on the score of striking with the hammer.¹⁰ R. Simeon b. Bisna said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: He who describes a figure on a utensil, and he who blows in glassware,¹¹ is liable on the score of striking with a hammer. Rab Judah said: He who removes threads¹² from garments on the Sabbath is liable on the score of striking with the hammer;¹³ but that is only when he objects to them.¹⁴

WRITING TWO LETTERS. Our Rabbis taught: If one writes one large letter in the place of which there is room for writing two, he is not culpable. If he erases one large letter and there is room in its place for writing two,

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

he is culpable. Said R. Menahem son of R. Jose: And this is the greater stringency of erasing over writing.

BUILDING, PULLING DOWN, EXTINGUISHING, KINDLING, AND STRIKING WITH A HAMMER. Rabbah and R. Zera both say: Whatever comprises the finishing of the work imposes liability on the score of striking with a hammer.¹⁵

THESE ARE THE PRIMARY LABOURS. THESE is to reject R. Eleazar's view, who imposes liability on account of a derivative labor [when performed concurrently] with a primary labour.¹⁶

LESS ONE. This is to reject R. Judah's view. For it was taught: R. Judah adds the closing up of the web and the beating of the woof.¹⁷ Said they to him: Closing up of the web is included in stretching the threads, and beating [the woof] is included in weaving.

MISHNAH. THEY ALSO STATED ANOTHER GENERAL PRINCIPLE: WHATEVER IS FIT TO PUT AWAY¹⁸ AND SUCH IS [GENERALLY] PUT AWAY,¹⁹ AND ONE CARRIES IT OUT ON THE SABBATH, HE IS LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING ON ITS ACCOUNT. BUT WHATEVER IS NOT FIT TO PUT AWAY AND SUCH IS NOT [GENERALLY] PUT AWAY, AND ONE CARRIES IT OUT ON THE SABBATH, ONLY HE THAT PUT IT AWAY IS LIABLE.²⁰

GEMARA. 'WHATEVER IS FIT TO PUT AWAY': What does this exclude? — R. Papa said: It excludes the blood of menstruation. Mar 'Ukba said: It excludes the wood of an Asherah.²¹ He who says the blood of menstruation, certainly [excludes] the wood of an Asherah. But he who says the wood of an Asherah; the blood of menstruation, however, is put away for a cat. But the other [argues]: since she would sicken,²² one would not put it away [for that purpose].

R. Jose b. Hanina said: This does not agree with R. Simeon. For if it were as R. Simeon, surely he maintained: All these standards

were stated only in respect of those who put away.²³

AND THAT WHICH IS NOT FIT TO PUT AWAY.

1. Surely not!
2. That it is freshly killed.
3. Salting the hide being the first step in the tanning process.
4. Before cutting.
5. It is then salted very much and is thus akin to tanning.
6. Tosaf. and Jast. Rashi: he who smooths the ground between the columns.
7. To make them all of the same level.
8. To measure.
9. Giving it its final touches.
10. V. *infra*.
11. Where the blowing shapes it.
12. I.e., anything sticking out of the web, as thread, knots, splinters, etc. which was accidentally woven into the material.
13. As this completes their labor.
14. And would not wear the garments otherwise.
15. Cf. p. 354 n. 7.
16. Hence it is possible to incur more than thirty-nine sin-offerings, whereas the number stated is to exclude this possibility.
17. In order to even it.
18. For later use.
19. It is large enough to be put away for later use.
20. If he carries it out, since by putting it away he showed that he attaches a value to it. But for others it is of no account; hence if they carry it out there is no liability.
21. A tree, or perhaps a post, devoted to idolatry; V. Deut. XVI, 21. It is forbidden to benefit thereof.
22. It was thought that if an animal consumed blood drawn from any person, that person would lose strength.
23. v. *infra* Mishnah VIII, 1. Thus a wealthy man is not liable for carrying out something which he personally would not put away, though most people would. But according to our Mishnah general practice is the decisive factor for all, and the exceptions are ignored.

Shabbath 76a

R. Eleazar said: This does not agree with R. Simeon b. Eleazar. For it was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar stated a general rule: That which is not fit to put away, and such is not [generally] put away, yet it did become fit to

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

a certain person¹ and he did put it away; then another came and carried it out, the latter is rendered liable through the former's intention.

MISHNAH. HE WHO CARRIES OUT A COW'S MOUTHFUL OF STRAW, A CAMEL'S MOUTHFUL OF PEA-STALKS ['EZH], A LAMB'S MOUTHFUL OF EARS OF CORN, A GOAT'S MOUTHFUL OF HERBS, MOIST GARLIC OR ONION LEAVES TO THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG, [OR] A GOAT'S MOUTHFUL OF DRY [LEAVES], [IS CULPABLE].² AND THEY DO NOT COMBINE WITH EACH OTHER,³ BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT ALIKE IN THEIR STANDARDS.

GEMARA. What is 'EZH? — Said Rab Judah: The stalks of certain kinds of peas.

When R. Dimi came,⁴ he stated: If one carries out a cow's mouthful of straw for a camel, — R. Johanan maintained: He is culpable: R. Simeon b. Lakish said: He is not culpable. In the evening R. Johanan ruled thus, [but] in the morning he retracted. R. Joseph observed: He did well to retract, since it is not sufficient⁵ for a camel. Said Abaye to him: On the contrary, logic supports his original view, since it is sufficient for a cow.⁶ But when Rabin came,⁷ he said: If one carries out a cow's mouthful of straw for a camel, all agree that he is culpable. Where do they differ: if one carries out a cow's mouthful of pea-stalks for a cow,⁸ and the reverse was stated: R. Johanan maintained: He is not culpable; Resh Lakish maintained: He is culpable. R. Johanan maintained; He is not culpable: eating through pressing need is not designated eating. Resh Lakish maintained, He is culpable: eating through pressing need is designated eating.

A LAMB'S MOUTHFUL OF EARS OF CORN. But it was taught: As much as a dried fig? — Both standards are identical.

MOIST GARLIC OR ONION LEAVES TO THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG, [OR] A GOAT'S MOUTHFUL OF DRY LEAVES. AND THEY DO NOT COMBINE WITH

EACH OTHER, BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT ALIKE IN THEIR STANDARDS. R. Jose b. Hanina said: They do not combine for the more stringent, but they do combine for the more lenient [standard].⁹ Yet can anything combine when their standards are not alike?¹⁰ But surely we learnt: A garment¹¹ three [handbreadths] square, a sack¹² four square, a hide five square, and [reed] matting six square [are susceptible to uncleanness as midras].¹³ Now it was taught thereon: A garment, sacking, a hide, and matting combine with each other.¹⁴ And R. Simeon observed: What is the reason? Because they are liable to the uncleanness of sitting.¹⁵ Thus the reason is that they are liable to the uncleanness of sitting,¹⁶ but whatever is not liable to the uncleanness of sitting is not so? — Said Raba:

1. He found a use for it.
2. These are the respective minima to which value is assigned, and for which a penalty is incurred. Each is the minimum which will satisfy the animal whose food it is. Moist garlic or onion leaves are fit for human consumption, hence the standard of a dried fig, which is the minimum for all human food.
3. To make up the minimum.
4. V. p. 12, n. 9.
5. Lit., 'fit'.
6. And since it is cow's fodder, that is the determining factor, notwithstanding that he carries it out for a camel.
7. V. p. 12, n. 9.
8. This is not a cow's usual food, and it eats it only when nothing else is obtainable.
9. The commodity whose standard is greater does not combine with that whose standard is lesser to make up that lesser quantity, but the latter does combine with the former to make up the greater quantity. That which requires a lesser quantity is naturally more stringent.
10. Even for the more lenient?
11. I.e., a piece of cloth.
12. A rough material, as of goats hair.
13. v. p. 312, n. 9.
14. When joined to make up the requisite minimum, they are susceptible to midras.
15. I.e., the uncleanness caused by a zab's (q.v. [Glos.](#)) sitting upon them when pieced together. That is because one may employ them thus for patching up a saddle.
16. And having that in common, they can naturally combine.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 76b

Here too they are fit for patterns.¹

MISHNAH. HE WHO CARRIES OUT [HUMAN] FOODSTUFFS TO THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG IS LIABLE, AND THEY COMBINE WITH EACH OTHER, BECAUSE THEY ARE EQUAL IN THEIR STANDARDS, EXCEPT THEIR SHELLS, KERNELS, STALKS, HUSKS² AND COARSE BRAN.³ R. JUDAH SAID: EXCLUDING THE SHELLS OF LENTILS, BECAUSE THEY ARE BOILED TOGETHER WITH THEM.⁴

GEMARA. Now, do not husks and coarse bran combine [with the grain or flour]? But we learnt: Just over five quarters of flour are liable to *hallah*,⁵ [including] that itself [sc. the flour], the husks and the bran?⁶ — Said Abaye: That is because a poor man eats his bread [baked] of unsifted dough.⁷

R. JUDAH SAID: EXCLUDING THE SHELLS OF LENTILS, BECAUSE THEY ARE BOILED TOGETHER WITH THEM. Only lentils, but not beans? But it was taught, R. Judah said: Excluding the shells of beans and lentils. — There is no difficulty: The one refers to new [beans],⁸ the other to old. Why not old ones? Said R. Abbahti: Because they look like flies in the dish.⁹

CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. HE WHO CARRIES OUT [RAW] WINE, [THE STANDARD IS THAT IT BE] ENOUGH FOR THE MIXING OF A CUP;¹⁰ MILK, AS MUCH AS IS QUAFFED AT A TIME; HONEY, SUFFICIENT TO PLACE ON A SCAB;¹¹ OIL, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED TO RUB IN A SMALL LIMB; WATER, ENOUGH FOR RUBBING COLLYRIUM;¹² AND ALL OTHER LIQUIDS, [THE STANDARD IS] A REBI'ITH;¹³ AND ALL WASTE WATER,¹⁴ A REBI'ITH. R. SIMEON SAID: [THE STANDARD FOR] ALL THESE IS A REBI'ITH, ALL THESE MEASURES HAVING BEEN STATED ONLY IN RESPECT OF THOSE WHO PUT THEM AWAY.¹⁵

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: Enough for the mixing of a full-measured¹⁶ cup. And what is a full-measured cup? The cup of benediction.¹⁷ R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: The cup of benediction must contain a quarter of a rebi'ith [of raw wine], so that it may be mixed and amount to a rebi'ith. Said Raba, We too

1. These can be pieced together to serve as a commercial pattern or sample of one's ware.
2. Or, thin bran (Levy, Worterbuch).
3. These are not eaten, and consequently do not combine with the edible foodstuffs.
4. Hence they count as foodstuffs too, and are excluded from the exception.
5. v. *supra* 15a for notes.
6. Thus they do combine.
7. But with respect to the Sabbath bread of better quality is required before liability is incurred.
8. Their shells combine.
9. The peel of old beans goes black and when in the dish looks like flies.
10. Wine had to be mixed with water before it could be drunk.
11. Rashi offers two interpretations: (i) the sore spot on the backs of horses or camels, caused by the chafing of the saddle; (ii) a bruise on the hand or foot.
12. An eye-salve. Rashi: to rub it over and cause it to dissolve. — So that it can be applied to the eye in liquid form.
13. v. Glos.
14. Any dirty liquid that must be poured out.
15. v. *supra* 75b, p. 359, n. 6. Here Rashi explains: These measures are less than a rebi'ith, and only one who actually put away that quantity and then carries it out is liable to a sin-offering. Tosaf. on 75b s.v. [H] accepts Rashi's explanation a.l. and rejects the present one.
16. Lit., 'fair'.
17. Grace after meals. It is sometimes recited over a cup of wine, which must be a full-measured rebi'ith, i.e., full to the very brim.

Shabbath 77a

learnt likewise: HE WHO CARRIES OUT [RAW] WINE, [THE STANDARD IS THAT THERE BE] ENOUGH FOR THE MIXING OF A CUP, whereon it was taught, Enough for the mixing of a full-measured cup; while the subsequent clause states; AND ALL OTHER LIQUIDS, [THE STANDARD IS] A REBI'ITH.¹ Now Raba is consistent with his view [expressed elsewhere]. For Raba said:

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Wine which does not carry three parts of water to one [of itself] is not wine. Abaye observed: There are two refutations to this. Firstly, because we learnt, And as for mixed [wine], that means two parts of water and one of wine, [namely] of Sharon wine.² Secondly, the water is in the jug and it is to combine!³ Said Raba to him, As to what you quote, 'and as for mixed [wine], that means two parts of water and one of wine, [namely] of Sharon wine' — Sharon wine stands apart, being [exceptionally] weak. Alternatively, there it is on account of appearance,⁴ but for taste more [water] is required. Whilst as for your objection, The water is in the jug and it is to combine! in the matter of the Sabbath we require something that is of account, and this too is of account.⁵

A Tanna taught: As for congealed⁶ [wine], the standard is the size of an olive:⁷ this is R. Nathan's view. R. Joseph said: R. Nathan and R. Jose son of R. Judah both said the same thing. R. Nathan, as stated. R. Jose son of R. Judah, for it was taught: R. Judah said: Six things [were stated as being] of the lenient rulings of Beth Shammai and the stricter rulings of Beth Hillel.⁸ The blood of a *nebelah*,⁹ Beth Shammai declare it clean;¹⁰ while Beth Hillel rule it unclean. Said R. Jose son of R. Judah: Even when Beth Hillel declared it unclean, they did so only in respect of a rebi'ith of blood in measure, since it can congeal to the size of an olive.¹¹ Said Abaye. Perhaps that is not so. R. Nathan states that it [sc. a congealed piece the size of an olive] requires a rebi'ith [of liquid] only here in the case of wine, which is thin; but in the case of blood, which is thick, the size of an olive [when congealed] does not require a rebi'ith [in liquid form]. Alternatively. R. Jose b. R. Judah states that for the size of an olive [when congealed] a rebi'ith [in liquid form] is sufficient only there in the case of blood, which is thick; but as for wine, which is thin, the size of an olive represents more than a rebi'ith, so that if one carries out [even] less than the size of an olive, he is liable.

MILK, AS MUCH AS IS QUAFFED AT A TIME. The scholars asked: As much as GEM'IAH or GEM'IAH?¹² R. Nahman b. Isaac cited, Give me to drink [hagmi'ini], I pray thee, a little water of thy pitcher.¹³ The scholars asked:

1. This shows that the lowest standard of potable liquids is a rebi'ith; hence the first clause must mean as much as is required for mixing to produce a cup of a rebi'ith.
2. Sharon is the plain along the Mediterranean coast from Japho to Carmel. Thus a proportion of two to one is stated here.
3. If the reason of our Mishnah is because with the addition of water it amounts to a rebi'ith, which is the average drink, but that by itself it is insufficient, are we to assume the addition of water that is elsewhere, as though he had carried it all out! Surely not.
4. The reference there is to the colors of blood which are unclean. If it is of the color of a two to one mixture, it is unclean; but a three to one mixture is paler, and blood of that color is clean.
5. Though it does not contain the water yet, since it can bear the addition of so much water.
6. Lit., 'dry'.
7. Because that represents a rebi'ith of liquid wine.
8. In the many controversies between these two schools Beth Shammai generally adopt the stricter attitude. Hence particular attention is drawn to the cases where it is the reverse.
9. V. [Glos.](#)
10. It does not defile food by its contact.
11. Which is the minimum quantity of flesh of *nebelah* which defiles.
12. The question is about the spelling, whether it is with an alef or an 'ayin. The following questions are the same.
13. Gen. XXIV, 17; the word there is spelled with an alef.

Shabbath 77b

Gar'inin or gar'inin?¹ — Raba b. 'Ulla cited: and an abatement shall be made [we-nigra'] from thy estimation.² The scholars asked: Ommemoth or 'ommemoth?³ — R. Isaac b. Adbimi cited: The cedars in the garden of God could not obscure him.⁴ The scholars asked: Did we learn me'amzin or me'amzin?⁵ R. Hiyya b. Abba cited: and shutteth ['ozem] his eyes from looking upon evil.⁶

Our Rabbis taught: When one carries out cow's milk, [the standard is] as much as one

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

quaffs at a time; woman's milk or the white of an egg, as much as is required for putting in an embrocation; collyrium, as much as is dissolved in water.⁷ R. Ashi asked: [Does that mean] as much as is required for dissolving, or as much as is required for holding and dissolving?⁸ The question stands over.

HONEY, SUFFICIENT TO PLACE ON A SCAR. A Tanna taught: As much as is required for putting on the opening of a scab. R. Ashi asked: 'On a scab': [does that mean] on the whole opening of the scab,⁹ or perhaps [it means] on the top of the scab,¹⁰ thus excluding [sufficient for] going all round the sore, which is not required?¹¹ The question stands over.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Of all that the Holy One, blessed be He, created in His world, He did not create a single thing without purpose. [Thus] He created the snail as a remedy for a scab; the fly as an antidote to the hornet[*'s sting*];¹² the mosquito [crushed] for a serpent[*'s bite*]; a serpent as a remedy for an eruption. and a [crushed] spider as a remedy for a scorpion[*'s bite*]. 'A serpent as a remedy for an eruption':¹³ what is the treatment? One black and one white [serpent] are brought, boiled [to a pulp] and rubbed in.

Our Rabbis taught: There are five instances of fear [cast] by the weak over the strong: the fear of the mafgia'¹⁴ over the lion; the fear of the mosquito upon the elephant;¹⁵ the fear of the spider upon the scorpion;¹⁶ the fear of the swallow upon the eagle;¹⁷ the fear of the kilbith¹⁸ over the Leviathan.¹⁹ Rab Judah said in Rab's name: What verse [alludes to these]? That strengtheneth the despoiled [i.e., weak] over the strong.²⁰

R. Zera met Rab Judah standing by the door of his father-in-law's house and saw that he was in a cheerful mood, and if he would ask him all the secrets of the universe he would disclose [them] to him. He [accordingly] asked him: Why do goats march at the head [of the flock], and then sheep? — Said he to him: It is as the world's creation, darkness

preceding and then light.²¹ Why are the latter covered, while the former are uncovered?²² — Those with whose [material] we cover ourselves are themselves covered, whilst those wherewith we do not cover ourselves are uncovered. Why is a camel's tail short? — Because it eats thorns.²³ Why is an ox's tail long? — Because it grazes in meadows and must beat off the gnats [with its tail]. Why is the proboscis of a locust soft [flexible]? Because it dwells among willows, and if it were hard [non-flexible] it [the proboscis] would be dislocated and it [the locust] would go blind. For Samuel said: If one wishes to blind a locust, let him extract its proboscis. Why is a fowl's [lower] eyelid bent upwards?²⁴ — Because it dwells among the rafters, and if dust entered [its eyes] it would go blind.²⁵

[The word] Dashsha [entrance] [implies] Derek SHam [there is the way];²⁶ Darga [stairs, ladder]; Derek Gag [a way to the roof]; mathkulithat [a relish]; mathay thikleh da [when will this end?]²⁷ Betha [a house] [implies] Bo we-ethib [come and sit therein]; Biketha [a small house]: Be aketha [a confined narrow house].²⁸ Kuftha [an inverted vessel, a low seat]: Kof we-THab [invert it and sit down]; libne [bricks]: libene bene [unto children's children];²⁹ huza [prickly shrubbery, hedge]: haziza [barrier]. Hazba [pitcher] [is so called] because hozeb [it draws]³⁰ water from the river; kuzah [small jug]: kazeh [like this];³¹ shotitha [myrtle branch]: shetutha [folly];³² meshikla [wash basin]: mashe kulah [washing everybody]; mashkiltha: [wash-basin]³³ mashya kalatha [washing brides];³⁴ asitha [mortar]: hasirtha [missing];³⁵ bukana [a club used as a pestle]: bo we-akkenah ['come, and I will strike it']; lebusah [upper garment]: lo bushah [no shame]. Gelima [a cloak] [is so called] because one looks in it like a shapeless mass [golem].³⁶ Golitha [a long woolen cloak] [implies] Galle wethib [roll it up and sit down]; puria [bed] is so called because it leads to procreation [parin we-rabin]; Bur Zinka [a leaping well]³⁷ Bor Zeh naki [this well is empty];³⁸ sudra

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

[turban]: sod adonai lire'aw [the secret of the Lord is revealed to those that fear him];³⁹ Apadna [palace] Apithha Din [at the door is judgment].⁴⁰

Our Rabbis taught: Three wax stronger as they grow older, viz., a fish, a serpent, and a swine.

OIL, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED TO RUB IN A SMALL LIMB. The School of R. Jannai said: Oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb of an infant one day old. An objection is raised: Oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb⁴¹ and [a limb of] a day-old infant. Surely this means, a small limb of an adult, and a large limb of a day-old infant? — The School of R. Jannai can reply: No. This is its meaning: Oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb of a day-old infant.⁴²

Shall we say that this is dependent on Tannaim? Oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb and [a limb of] a day-old infant: this is the view of R. Simeon b. Eleazar. R. Nathan said: As much as is required to rub in a small limb. Now surely they differ in this, R. Simeon b. Eleazar holding a small limb of an infant, while R. Nathan holds a small limb of an adult or a large limb of an infant, but a small limb of a day-old infant [does] not [impose liability]? No. All agree that the small limb of a day-old infant is not [sufficient],

1. Kernels: with an alef or 'ayin? (The word occurs in the Mishnah *supra* 76b.)
2. Lev. XXVII, 18. We-nigra' is with an 'ayin, and Raba b. 'Ulla connects gar'inin with this, as the kernels are thrown away and so are an abatement of the edible portion.
3. Dim, i.e., dying coals.
4. Ezek. XXXI, 8; 'ammamuhu, with an 'ayin — lit., 'keep him dim'.
5. In the Mishnah *infra* 151b. Me'amzin, we close (the eyes).
6. Isa. XXXI, 15; 'ozem, with an 'ayin.
7. To paint both eyes.
8. It is dissolved by being crushed in the water. Part remains on the fingers, and R. Ashi asked whether that must be allowed for or not.
9. The entire surface being referred to as the opening.

10. Lit., 'the first projecting point'.
11. Before a penalty is incurred.
12. A crushed fly applied to the affected part is a remedy.
13. This phrase is added in the text by BaH.
14. Lit., 'plague'. The Ethiopian gnat (Lewysohn. Zool. d. Talmud, p. 316). Rashi: a small animal that terrifies the lion with its loud cry.
15. Caused by entering its trunk.
16. In whose ear it lodges.
17. Rashi: it creeps under its wings and hinders it from spreading them.
18. A small fish, supposed to be the stickleback.
19. Likewise caused by entering its ear.
20. Amos V, 9 (E.V. 'that bringeth sudden destruction upon the strong').
21. Goats are dark colored, while sheep are white!
22. Sheep have thick tails, which cover their hind parts; but goats have a thin tail.
23. A long tail would become entangled in the thorns.
24. Rashi: When its eyes are closed the lower eyelid turns upwards and lies upon the upper.
25. Hence this arrangement affords it the most protection.
26. Reading Dashsha as an abbreviation. The following words are similarly treated. These may be regarded either as examples of popular etymology or merely as jeux d'esprit, not being meant seriously.
27. Relishes being used sparingly and lasting a long time.
28. Rashi. Jast. s.v. [H] translates rather differently.
29. I.e., lasting many generations.
30. Lit., 'hews out'.
31. 'Give us a glass of this size to drink'.
32. People danced therewith at weddings, and looked fools in doing so!
33. V. next note.
34. A fancy-shaped, probably expensive basin, used by distinguished persons only.
35. I.e., carved out.
36. The cut of the arms being covered up.
37. A well which springs forth periodically only to disappear again (Jast.).
38. Lit., 'clean'.
39. The turban being worn by Rabbinical scholars; cf. Kid. 8a; Pes. 111b.
40. I.e., all come — for justice to the King's palace.
41. Eber Katan. This phrase, used both there and in the Mishnah, may mean either a small limb or a limb of a child (or, infant).
42. 'And a day-old infant' is thus taken in the explanative sense, 'even a limb of a day-old infant'.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 78a

R. Jannai's dictum being incorrect. But here they differ in this: R. Simeon b. Eleazar holds: an adult's small limb and a day-old infant's large limb are identical [in size]. While R. Nathan holds: Only an adult's small limb [creates culpability], but not the large limb of a day-old infant.¹ What is our decision thereon? — Come and hear: For it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb of a day-old infant.²

WATER, ENOUGH FOR RUBBING COLLYRIUM. Abaye said, Consider: Whatever has a common use and an uncommon use, the Rabbis followed the common use, [even] in the direction of leniency; where it has two common uses, the Rabbis followed the common use [which leads to] stringency. [Thus,] in the case of wine the drinking thereof is common, whilst its employment as a remedy is uncommon; hence the Rabbis followed its drinking use in the direction of leniency.³ In the case of milk, the drinking⁴ thereof is common, whilst its employment as a remedy⁵ is uncommon: hence the Rabbis followed its drinking use in the direction of leniency. As for honey, both the eating thereof and its use as a remedy are common, [so] the Rabbis followed its use as a remedy in the direction of stringency.⁶ But in the case of water — consider: its drinking is common, whereas its use for healing is uncommon: why then did the Rabbis follow its use for healing in the direction of stringency? — Said Abaye: They learnt this with reference to Galilee.⁷ Raba said: You may even say that this refers to other places, thus agreeing with Samuel. For Samuel said: All liquids⁸ heal [eye sickness] but dim [the eyesight], save water, which heals without dimming.⁹

AND ALL OTHER LIQUIDS, A REBI'ITH. Our Rabbis taught; As for blood, and all [other] kinds of liquids, [the standard is] a rebi'ith. R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Blood, as much as is required for painting one eye,

because a cataract [of the eye] is painted [with blood]. And which [blood] is that? The blood of a wildfowl. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Blood, as much as is required for painting one eye, because a white spot in the eye is painted [with blood]. And with what is that? with the blood of bats.¹⁰ And your token is: within for within, without for without.¹¹ Now this applies only to him who carries it out; but if one puts it away, no matter how little, he is liable.¹² R. Simeon said: This applies only to one who puts it away, but he who carries it out is culpable only when there is a rebi'ith. And the Sages agree with R. Simeon that if one carries out waste water into the street, the standard thereof is a rebi'ith.

The Master said: 'Now this applies only to him who carries it out; but if one puts it away, no matter how little, [he is liable].' And he who puts it away, does he not carry it out?¹³ Said Abaye: The reference here is to an apprentice to whom his master said, 'Go, and clear me a place for a meal.' Now, if he goes and clears out [into the street] something that is valued by all, he is guilty on its account; something that is not valued by all: if his master had put it away,¹⁴ he is guilty on its account; if not, he is not guilty.¹⁵

The Master said: 'And the Sages agree with R. Simeon that if one carries out waste water into the street, the standard thereof is a rebi'ith.' For what is waste water fit?¹⁶ Said R. Jeremiah: To knead clay therewith. But it was taught: Clay, [the standard is] as much as is required for making the hole of a smelting pot?¹⁷ There is no difficulty: in the latter case it is kneaded, but in the former it is not [already] kneaded, because no man troubles to knead clay [only] for making the hole of a smelting pot.

MISHNAH. HE WHO CARRIES OUT CORD, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING A HANDLE FOR A BASKET; A REED CORD, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING A HANGER FOR A SIEVE OR A BASKET-SIEVE. R. JUDAH SAID: AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR TAKING

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

THE MEASURE OF A CHILD'S SHOE. PAPER, LARGE ENOUGH TO WRITE A TAX-COLLECTOR'S RECEIPT ON IT.¹⁸ (AND HE WHO CARRIES OUT A TAX-COLLECTOR'S RECEIPT IS LIABLE.)

1. And the phrasing of the controversy must be interpreted accordingly.
2. Hence this must be his meaning in the controversy quoted, while R. Nathan disagrees, as suggested in the first explanation.
3. Teaching that the minimum which creates liability for carrying out is the average drink, though a lesser quantity is used for remedial purposes. — The others are explained similarly.
4. Lit., 'eating'.
5. By external application.
6. As in the Mishnah, though for consumption the size of a dried fig — a greater standard — would be required.
7. Rashi: whose inhabitants are poor. They would never use wine or milk for dissolving collyrium, but only water, and so this use for water is as common as its drinking use.
8. Used for dissolving collyrium.
9. Hence this use too is common.
10. The word denotes with large eyeballs — a species of bats.
11. The white spot is within the eye, and the bat is generally found within human settlements; whereas a cataract protrudes on the outside of the eye, and the wildfowl too dwells without human settlements.
12. This is explained below.
13. Surely this alone is his sin.
14. For use, thus showing that he did value it.
15. This is consistent with R. Simeon's view (*supra* 76a) that one is guilty through another's intention.
16. No penalty is incurred for carrying out something that is entirely useless.
17. The hole through which the bellows are inserted. This requires less clay than is made with a *rebi'ith* of water, and since the waste water is regarded as being for the purpose of making clay, the standard should be only as much as is required for kneading this smaller quantity.
18. Lit., 'knot'. Rashi: the receipt was indicated by two letters above normal size.

Shabbath 78b

ERASED PAPER,¹ AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED TO WRAP ROUND A SMALL PHIAL OF SPIKENARD OIL; SKIN, FOR MAKING AN AMULET; PARCHMENT, FOR WRITING

THEREON THE SHORTEST PASSAGE OF THE TEFILLIN, WHICH IS 'HEAR O ISRAEL,'² INK, FOR WRITING TWO LETTERS; STIBIUM,³ FOR PAINTING ONE EYE; PASTE, FOR PUTTING ON THE TOP OF A LIME BOARD [SHAFSHAF];⁴ PITCH AND SULPHUR, FOR MAKING A PERFORATION [THEREIN];⁵ WAX, FOR PUTTING OVER A SMALL HOLE;⁶ CLAY, FOR MAKING A HOLE IN A GOLD REFINER'S POT.⁷ R. JUDAH SAID: FOR MAKING A [TRIPOD'S] PEG.⁸ BRAN, FOR PUTTING ON THE MOUTH OF A GOLD REFINER'S POT; LIME,⁹ FOR SMEARING THE SMALLEST OF GIRLS.¹⁰ R. JUDAH SAID: ENOUGH TO PRODUCE A HAIR-CROWN [KALKAL].¹¹ R. NEHEMIAH SAID: ENOUGH FOR MAKING SIDE-CURLS [ONDAFE].¹²

GEMARA. For a cord too, let one be culpable on account of as much as is required to make a hanger for a sieve or a basket-sieve? — Since it chafes the utensil, people do not make it [thus].¹³

Our Rabbis taught: As for palm leaves, the standard is as much as is required for making a handle for a basket, an Egyptian basket. As for bast; Others say:¹⁴ as much as is required for putting on the opening of a small funnel for straining wine. Fat; as much as is required for greasing under a small cake. And what size is that? — As [large as] a *sela'*. But it was taught, As [large as] a dried fig? Both are the same standard. Soft rags, as much as is required for making a small ball. Anti what size is that? As [large as] a nut.

PAPER, LARGE ENOUGH TO WRITE A TAX-COLLECTOR'S RECEIPT ON IT. It was taught: How much is a tax-collector's receipt? Two letters.¹⁵ But the following contradicts this: If one carries out smooth [blank] paper, if large enough for writing two letters thereon, he is culpable; if not, he is not culpable?¹⁶ — Said R. Shesheth: What is meant by 'two letters'? Two letters of a tax-collector's receipt. Raba said: [It means] two letters of ours, together with a margin for holding which is the equivalent of a tax-collector's receipt.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

An objection is raised: If one carries out erased paper or a receipted note; if its blank portion is large enough for two letters to be written thereon, or if the whole is sufficient for wrapping round the mouth of a small phial of spikenard oil, he is culpable; but if not, he is not culpable. As for R. Shesheth, who explained, What is meant by 'two letters'? two letters of a tax-collector's receipt, it is well.¹⁷ But according to Raba, who said that it means two letters of ours together with a margin for holding, which is the equivalent of a tax-collector's receipt — surely here no margin for holding is required?¹⁸ This is a difficulty.

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out a tax-collector's receipt before having shown it to the collector, he is culpable;¹⁹ after having shown it to the collector, he is not culpable.²⁰ R. Judah said: Even after showing it to the collector, he is culpable, because he still needs it. Wherein do they differ? Abaye said: They differ in respect to collectors' runners.²¹ Raba said: They differ in respect to the higher and the lesser collectors.²² R. Ashi said: They [even] differ in respect of one tax-collector, because he needs it [the document] for showing to the second, so that he can say to him, 'See, I am a man [exempted] by the collector.'²³

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out a note of debt, if before it has been settled, he is culpable; if after it has been settled, he is not culpable. R. Judah said: Even after settlement he is culpable, because he needs it. Wherein do they differ? R. Joseph said: They differ as to whether it is forbidden to keep a settled note. The Rabbis maintain: It is forbidden to keep a settled note;²⁴ while R. Judah holds: One may keep a settled note.²⁵ Abaye said: All hold that a settled note may not be kept; but here they differ as to whether a note requires confirmation [even] when he [the debtor] admits that it was [validly] written. The first Tanna holds: Even when [the debtor] admits that a note [was validly] written, it must be confirmed.²⁶ R. Judah holds: When [the debtor] admits that

a note was [validly] written, it need not be confirmed. And what is the meaning of 'if before it has been settled' and 'if after it has been settled'?

1. Palimpsest paper from which writing has been erased, and which cannot be written upon again.
2. Deut. VI, 4-9. The Tefillin (v. [Glos.](#)) contain four Biblical passages.
3. Used for painting the eyes.
4. For catching birds; v. *infra* 80a.
5. Rashi: The phial in which mercury is kept is closed with a perforated stopper of pitch or sulphur.
6. As a plug.
7. Through which he inserts his bellows.
8. A leg of the tripod which supports the refiner's pot.
9. Used as a depilatory.
10. V. Gemara.
11. Formed by the depilation of the undergrowth of hair.
12. *Var. lec.* Andife, v. Gemara.
13. Culpability is incurred only when the article transported can be used in its normal manner.
14. 'Others' frequently refers to R. Meir, Hor. 13a.
15. 'Aruk reads: two Greek letters — which are larger than Hebrew letters.
16. 'Two letters' implies of normal size, which is smaller than tax-collector's letters; v. also preceding note.
17. The same explanation holds good here too.
18. It can be held by the erased or the written portion.
19. Since he still needs it.
20. The receipt of tax-exemption was issued by a higher authority and then shown to the actual collector. Once shown, he has no further use for it, and is therefore not liable for carrying it out.
21. The police, who stop people and demand toll. R. Judah argues that the receipt must be shown to these; while the Rabbis hold that the person stopped could refer him to the collector or superintendent.
22. Cf. n. 4. R. Judah maintains that for this reason the document is always required, while the Rabbis hold that a secret password was used as a proof of exemption.
23. E.g., if the exemption is in respect of a toll-bridge. Even if there is always one man only on duty at one end, the document may be required for the man at the other end. V. T.A. II, p. 375.
24. Therefore it is of no value either to the creditor or to the debtor; consequently no culpability is entailed in carrying it out. — The reason of the prohibition is that one may demand payment afresh.
25. Hence the paper itself is of value.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

26. By its signatories attesting their signatures (Rashi in Keth. 19a, B.M. 7a and 72b). Otherwise the debtor can plead that it has been settled. For without the confirmation of the signatories he could successfully plead that it is a forgery, hence he is also believed in his plea of repayment, since the validity of the note rests on his word. Consequently if the debtor pleads that he has repaid the loan — this is now the meaning of 'if after it has been settled' — the note is valueless.

Shabbath 79a

If the debtor pleads that it has been settled or not settled [respectively].¹ Raba said: All agree that [even] when [the debtor] admits that a note was [validly] written, it must [still] be confirmed. But here they differ as to whether we write a quittance.² The first Tanna holds: We write a quittance;³ while R. Judah holds: A quittance⁴ is not written. R. Ashi said: [R. Judah's reason is] because he [the debtor] needs it to show to a second creditor, as he can say to him, 'See, I am a man who repays.'

SKIN, FOR MAKING AN AMULET. Raba asked R. Nahman: If one carries out skin, what is the standard [to involve a penalty]. Even as we learnt, he replied: SKIN, FOR MAKING AN AMULET. If one dresses it, what is the standard? — There is no difference, he replied. When it needs dressing,⁵ what is the standard? — There is no difference, replied he. And whence do you say thus? — As we learnt: if one bleaches [wool]. hatchels, dyes, or spins it, the standard is a full double span.⁶ And if one weaves two threads together, the standard is a full span.⁷ This shows that since it stands to be spun,⁸ the standard is as though it were spun. So here too, since it [the skin] stands to be dressed, its standard is as though it were [already] dressed. And if it is not to be dressed [at all]. what is the standard? There is no difference, said he to him.

But, is there no difference between dressed and undressed [hide]? He raised an objection to him: If one carries out dissolved dyes.⁹ [the standard is] as much as is required for

dyeing a sample of wool.¹⁰ Whereas of undissolved dyes we learnt: [In the case of] nutshells,¹¹ pomegranate shells, woad, and madder,¹² [the standard is] as much as is required for dyeing the small piece of cloth at the opening [top] of a network?¹³ — Surely it was stated thereon, R. Nahman observed in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: That is because one does not trouble to steep dyes [merely] for dyeing a sample of wool. Yet what of the seeds of a vegetable garden, whereof, before they are sown, we learnt: [If one carries out] garden seeds, [the standard is] less than the size of a dried fig; R. Judah b. Bathyra ruled: 'Five', yet after they are sown we learnt: As for manure, or thin sand, [the standard is] as much as is required for fertilizing a cabbage stalk; this is R. Akiba's view. But the Sages maintain: For fertilizing one leek plant?¹⁴ Surely it was stated thereon, R. Papa said: In the one case it refers to where it is sown, in the other where it is not sown, because one does not trouble to carry out a single seed for sowing.¹⁵

Yet what of clay. whereof, before it is kneaded, it was taught: 'The Sages agree with R. Simeon, that if one carries out waste water into the street, the standard is a rebi'ith'. And we debated thereon. For what is waste water fit? And R. Jeremiah said: For kneading clay therewith. And yet after it is mixed, it was taught: As for clay, [the standard is] as much as is required for making the hole of a smelting pot?¹⁶ — There too it is as we stated, because no man troubles to knead clay [only] for making the hole of a smelting pot.

Come and hear: For R. Hiyya b. Ammi said on 'Ulla's authority: There are three [kinds of] hide: mazzah, hippa, and diftera. Mazzah¹⁷ is as its name implies, neither salted nor treated with flour or gall-nut. And what is its standard? R. Samuel b. Rab Judah recited: As much as is required for wrapping a small weight therein. And how much is that? Said Abaye: A quarter of a Pumbedithan quarter.¹⁸ Hippa is a skin that is salted but not treated with flour and gall-nut. And what is its standard? Even as we

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

learnt: SKIN, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING AN AMULET. Diftera is skin that has been dressed with salt and flour but not treated with gall-nut. And what is its standard? As much as is required for writing a divorce.¹⁹ Now incidentally it is stated, As much as is required for wrapping a weight therein, which Abaye explained [as meaning] a quarter of a Pumbedithan quarter?²⁰ — There it treats of a steaming hide.²¹ But we learnt: A garment three [handbreadths] square is susceptible to midras,²² sacking four square, a hide five square and reed matting six square²³ are susceptible to [the uncleanness of] both midras and the dead. Now it was taught thereon: As for a garment, sacking and hide, as their standard is for uncleanness, so it is for carrying out!²⁴ — That refers to a leather spread.²⁵

1. V. preceding note.
2. V. B.B. 170b.
3. Therefore the debtor does not require the original note, since he holds a receipt, and so if he carries it out he is not culpable (R. Han. Rashi explains differently, referring this to the creditor).
4. But the creditor has to return the note to the debtor, who in turn must take care not to lose it, lest it fall into the hands of the creditor, enabling him to claim payment a second time.
5. And one carries it out — at this stage it cannot be used for an amulet.
6. Of the thumb and the forefinger.
7. The text adds 'double', but it is bracketed and is absent from the Mishnah *infra* 105b.
8. Bleaching, etc. are antecedent to spinning.
9. Ready for use.
10. Jast. V. also *supra* 11b.
11. These were quite commonly used in ancient days for dyes; v. T.A. I, p. 552, n. 222.
12. All these, including the two former, used as dyes.
13. Or, hair-net. V. also T.A. I, pp. 187 and 636, n. 776. This is a larger standard than the preceding and a similar distinction should be made between undressed and dressed hides.
14. Thus here too there is a different standard after sowing.
15. V. *infra* 90b.
16. V. notes *supra* 75a.
17. Lit., 'unleavened'.
18. Of a *litra*. V.J.E. XII, p. 48b s.v. *Litra*, though it is not clear whether what is stated there applies to a Pumbedithan *litra* too — probably not.

Weights were wrapped in hide to prevent their being rubbed away; hence this standard.

19. V. Git. 22a.
20. Which is a larger standard than the others.
21. I.e., immediately after it is flayed and before it has had time to dry. It is not yet fit for tanning, and hence a different standard is applied to it (Rashi).
22. V. p. 275, n. 1.
23. V. notes *supra* 76a.
24. That size carried out on the Sabbath involves a penalty. Hence the standard for hide is five square, which is not the same as that given in the Mishnah. Presumably the difficulty must be answered by drawing a distinction between tanned and untanned hide, and this contradicts R. Nahman.
25. The hide being so treated that it can only be used as a leather cover on couches, etc. but not for writing thereon. Hence there is a different standard.

Shabbath 79b

PARCHMENT, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR WRITING THE SHORTEST PASSAGE, [etc.]. But the following contradicts this: Parchment [*kelaf*] and *duksustos*,¹ as much as is required for the writing of a *mezuzah*?² — What is meant by *mezuzah*? A parchment slip of the tefillin.³ Are then tefillin designated *mezuzah*? Yes, and it was taught [likewise]: tefillin straps, when together with the tefillin, defile the hands;⁴ when apart, they do not defile the hands. R. Simeon b. Judah said on the authority of R. Simeon,⁵ He who touches the strap is clean, unless he touches the capsule [of the tefillin]. R. Zakkai said in his name: He is clean, unless he touches the *mezuzah* itself.⁶ But since the second clause teaches, PARCHMENT, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR WRITING THE SHORTEST PASSAGE OF THE TEFILLIN, WHICH IS 'HEAR O ISRAEL,' it follows that the first clause refers to the *mezuzah* itself? — This is its meaning: Parchment and *duksustos*, what are their standards? *Duksustos*, as much as is required for writing a *mezuzah*;² parchment, for writing the shortest passage of the tefillin, which is 'Hear O Israel'.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Rab said: *Duksustos* is as parchment: just as tefillin may be written upon parchment, so may they be written upon *duksustos*. We learnt: PARCHMENT, FOR WRITING THEREON THE SHORTEST PASSAGE OF THE TEFILLIN, WHICH IS HEAR O ISRAEL. [Thus, only parchment, but not *duksustos*?]⁸ — That is for the [most preferable observance of the] precept.²

Come and hear: It is a *halachah* of Moses from Sinai¹⁰ that tefillin [should be written] upon parchment, and a *mezuzah* upon *duksustos*; parchment is [the skin] on the side¹¹ of the flesh, and *duksustos* is [that] on the side of the hair?¹² — That is for the [most preferable observance of the] precept. But it was taught: If one does otherwise, it is unfit? — That refers to the *mezuzah*. But it was taught: If one does otherwise, in either it is unfit? — Both refer to *mezuzah*, one meaning that he wrote it on parchment [*kelaf*] facing the hair; the other, on *duksustos* facing the flesh.¹³ An alternative answer is: [The ruling]. If one does otherwise in either, it is unfit, is dependent on Tannaim. For it was taught: If one does otherwise, it is unfit. R. Aha declares it fit on the authority of R. Ahi b. Hanina — others state, on the authority of R. Jacob b. R. Hanina. R. Papa said: Rab's ruling is as the teaching of the School of Manasseh. For the School of Manasseh taught: If one writes it on paper¹⁴ or on a cloth strip, it is unfit; on parchment, *gewil*,¹⁵ or *duksustos*, it is fit. 'If one writes it' — what? Shall we say, a *mezuzah*; can then a *mezuzah* be written upon *kelaf*? Hence it Surely means tefillin. Yet [even] on your reasoning, can tefillin be written upon *gewil*?¹⁶ But that was taught of a Torah Scroll.¹⁷

Shall we say that the following supports him: When tefillin or a Torah Scroll wear out, a *mezuzah* may not be made of them,¹⁸ because we may not debase [anything] from a higher¹⁹ sanctity to a lower sanctity. Thus there is the reason that we may not debase, but if we might debase, we could make [a *mezuzah*]: now, whereon is it written? Surely

it means that it is written on *duksustos*?²⁰ — No: It is written upon parchment [*kelaf*]. — But may a *mezuzah* be written upon *kelaf*? — Yes. And it was taught [likewise]: If one writes it on *kelaf*, on paper, or on a cloth strip, it is unfit. R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: R. Meir used to write it²¹ upon *kelaf*, because it keeps [better]. Now that you have arrived at this [conclusion],²² according to Rab too, do not say. *Duksustos* is as *kelaf* but say, *kelaf* is as *duksustos*: just as a *mezuzah* may be written upon *duksustos*, so may it be written upon *kelaf*.

INK, FOR WRITING [TWO LETTERS].

1. An inferior kind of parchment, v. *infra*.
2. v. [Glos.](#) This contains two passages. viz., Deut. VI, 4-9. and XI, 13-21.
3. In the head tefillin each of the four passages is written on a separate slip. Since the particular slip is unspecified, it is assumed that it is the one required for the shortest passage.
4. In respect of *terumah*; v. *supra* 14a.
5. I.e., R. Simeon b. Yohai.
6. Thus *mezuzah* is used of the parchment slip containing the writing.
7. Literally; that is because it is not fit for tefillin.
8. This passage is bracketed in the edd. It was present in Rashi's text, but absent from other versions. — But if tefillin might be written upon *duksustos*, the same standard would apply to that too.
9. *Kelaf* being superior, phylacteries are normally written thereon, and not upon *duksustos*, though it is permissible. Hence one would not keep *duksustos* for that purpose and consequently it does not involve a penalty; cf. *supra* 75b Mishnah.
10. V. p. 123. n. 7.
11. Lit., 'place'.
12. When the hide is split in two, the portion facing the flesh is called *kelaf* (parchment), whilst that toward the hair is called *duksustos*. Tosaf. s.v. [H] reverses the reading.
13. I.e., the parchment and the *duksustos* were manufactured from the wrong portions of the hide.
14. [H], papyrus.
15. A certain kind of parchment. Rashi: that which has been dressed with gall-nut. Tosaf.: the undivided skin (v. n. 3) with the hair removed. V. also T.A. II. p. 263 and notes a.l.
16. Surely not!
17. Thus it has no bearing on Rab's dictum.
18. E.g., if the margin is in good condition and fit for use.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

19. Lit., 'from a graver ... lighter'.
20. Which supports Rab.
21. R. Meir was an expert calligraphist — a much esteemed talent before the invention of printing.
22. That a *mezuzah* may be written upon *kelaf*.

Shabbath 80a

It was taught: Two letters in ink, two letters on a pen, or two letters in an inkstand [involve culpability].¹ Raba asked: What [if one carries out sufficient for] one letter [in the form of] dry ink, one letter on the pen, and one letter in an inkstand?² The question stands over.

Raba said: If one carries out [ink sufficient for writing] two letters, and writes them whilst walking, he is culpable: the writing is tantamount to depositing.³ Raba also said: If one carries out [ink sufficient for writing] one letter [only] and writes it down, and then again carries out [sufficient for] one letter, and writes it down,⁴ he is not culpable. What is the reason? By the time he carries out the second, the standard of the first is defective.⁵

Raba also said: If one carries out half a dried fig and deposits it,⁶ and then carries out another half of a dried fig and deposits it,⁷ the first is regarded as though caught by a dog or burnt, and he is not culpable. But why so: surely it is lying there! — He means this: But if one anticipates and takes up the first before the depositing of the second, the first is regarded as though caught up by a dog or burnt,⁸ and he is not culpable. Raba also said: If one carries out half of a dried fig and deposits it and then carries out another half of a dried fig over the same route as the first,⁹ he is liable. But why: surely it does not rest [in the street]? E.g., if he carries it within three [handbreadths].¹⁰ But Raba said: [An article brought] within three [handbreadths] must, according to the Rabbis, be deposited upon something of small size [at least].¹¹ — There is no difficulty. The latter reference is to throwing;¹² the former is to carrying.¹³

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out half a dried fig, and then carries out another half of

a dried fig in one state of unawareness, he is culpable; in two states of unawareness, he is not culpable. R. Jose said: In one state of unawareness [and] into the same ground he is culpable; into two [different] grounds,¹⁴ he is not culpable. Rabbah said: Providing that there lies between them a domain involving liability to a sin-offering;¹⁵ but a *karmelith*¹⁶ does not [effect a separation].¹⁷ Abaye said: Even a *karmelith* [separates them], but not a board.¹⁸ But Raba maintained: Even a board [separates them]. Now Raba is consistent with his ruling [elsewhere]; for Raba said: [The law of] domains in respect to the Sabbath is the same as domains in respect to divorces.¹⁹

STIBIUM, FOR PAINTING ONE EYE: But one eye [alone] is not painted? — Said R. Huna: Because modest women paint [only] one eye.²⁰ An objection is raised: As for stibium, if [carried out] for medicinal use, [the standard is] as much as is required for painting one eye;²¹ if for adornment, [the standard is] two eyes? — Hillel son of R. Samuel b. Nahmani explained it: That was taught in reference to small-townners.²²

PASTE, FOR PUTTING ON THE TOP OF A LIME BOARD. A Tanna taught: As much as is required for putting on the top of a lime board of a hunter's rod.²³

WAX, FOR PUTTING OVER A SMALL HOLE. It was taught: As much as is required for putting over a small wine hole.²⁴

CLAY, FOR MAKING A HOLE IN A GOLD-REFINER'S POT, etc.²⁵ Shall we say that R. Judah's standard is larger? But we know the Rabbis' standard to be larger, for we learnt: R. JUDAH SAID: AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR TAKING THE MEASURE OF A CHILD'S SHOE?²⁶ — Say, as much as is required for plastering [the splits in] the tripod leg of a small stove.²⁷

1. Ink, Heb. dyo, is the solid pigment which was dissolved before use (cf. *supra* 17b and note a.l.). The Baraita teaches that whether one carries out dry pigment in his hand or the liquid on a

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

pen or in an inkstand, in each case sufficient for writing two letters, he is culpable.

2. Do they combine to involve liability or not? The pen and inkstand do not cause culpability, since they are subsidiary to their contents, which in themselves do not separately cause liability; v. *infra* 93b.
3. Culpability for carrying from one domain to another is incurred only when the article transported is actually deposited in the second domain; v. *supra* 2a.
4. Both in the same state of unawareness, so that normally they should rank as one act.
5. The first ink has dried and is now insufficient for the writing of one letter.
6. One fig is the minimum involving liability.
7. V. n. 6.
8. Since the whole fig does not lie in the street.
9. The second actually passing above the first.
10. Of the ground. It is then regarded as actually lying thereon; cf. *supra* 5a.
11. Though not necessarily upon a place four handbreadths square; v. *infra* 100a for the general explanation of the passage.
12. Then it must actually come to rest.
13. In the hand. The article itself is then at rest, and if the hand moreover comes within three handbreadths of the ground, it is as though deposited thereon.
14. Both public, but separated from each other.
15. I.e., private ground. Transport between private and public ground imposes liability; hence the private ground here completely separates the two public grounds. and they do not rank as one.
16. V. [Glos.](#) and *supra* 6a.
17. Since by Biblical law one may carry between a *karmelith* and public (or private) ground, it is insufficient to separate the two.
18. Placed right across the street and thus dividing it.
19. And there a board is sufficient to create separate domains; v. *Git.* 77b.
20. They go veiled, leaving only one eye visible.
21. Since only one eye may need it.
22. Or, villagers. Temptation not being so great there, it is safe even for modest women to paint both eyes.
23. The paste being to entrap the birds that alight thereon.
24. I.e., a hole through which wine is poured; this is smaller than one made for oil or honey.
25. The translation of these three passages, from PASTE, etc. follows the text as emended by BaH.
26. Which is less than the standard of the Rabbis which precedes it; v. *Mishnah supra* 75a.
27. This is a smaller standard.

Shabbath 80b

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out hair, [the standard is] as much as is required for the kneading of clay;¹ [if one carries out] clay, [the standard is] for making a hole in a gold-refiner's pot.

LIME, TO SMEAR THE SMALLEST OF GIRLS. A Tanna taught: As much as is required to smear the little finger of girls.² Rab Judah said in Rab's name: When maidens of Israel attain puberty before the proper age:³ poor maidens plaster it [the unwanted hair] with lime; rich maidens plaster it with fine flour; whilst royal princesses plaster it with oil of myrrh, as it is said, six months with oil of myrrh.⁴ What is oil of myrrh? — R. Huna b. Hiyya said: Satkath.⁵ R. Jeremiah b. Abba said: Oil of olives less than a third grown.

It was taught: R. Judah said: Anpakkinon is oil of olives less than a third grown, and why does one anoint herself therewith? Because it removes the hair and smoothes the skin.

R. Bibi had a daughter. He treated her limb by limb [with a depilatory] and took four hundred *zuz* for her.⁶ Now, a certain heathen lived in the vicinity. He [too] had a daughter, and he plastered her [whole body] all at once, whereupon she died. 'R. Bibi has killed my daughter!' he exclaimed. R. Nahman observed: As for R. Bibi who drank strong liquor, his daughter required pasting over; [but] as for us, who do not drink strong liquor, our daughters do not require such treatment.⁷

R. JUDAH SAID: ENOUGH TO PLASTER⁸ A KILKUL.⁹ What is KILKUL and what is ANDIFE? Rab said: The [upper] temple and the lower temple. Shall we say that R. Judah's standard is larger? But we know the standard of the Rabbis to be larger!¹⁰ It is smaller than the Rabbis', but larger than R. Nehemiah's.

An objection is raised: Rabbi said: I approve R. Judah's view in respect of loosely dissolved

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

lime, and R. Nehemiah's view in respect of chalky lime.¹¹ But if you maintain that they mean the [upper] temple and the lower temple, — [surely] both require loose lime?¹² Rather, said R. Isaac, The School of R. Ammi recited *andifa* [in the Mishnah].¹³ R. Kahana demurred: Does one destroy [break up] his wealth?¹⁴ Rather, said R. Kahana: It means the teeth-like marks [of a vessel];¹⁵ even as we learnt: The *hin*-measure had teeth-like marks, [to indicate] so far [must it be filled with wine] for a bullock, so far for a ram, so far for a sheep.¹⁶ Alternatively, what is *andifa*? The lock on the forehead.¹⁷ Even as a certain Galilean chanced to visit Babylon and was requested to lecture on the chariot passage;¹⁸ Said he to them, 'I will lecture to you as R. Nehemiah lectured to his companions.' Thereupon a wasp came out of the wall and stung him on the *andifa* [forehead] and he died. Said they. 'This [befell] him through his own [fault].'¹⁹

MISHNAH. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] EARTH [A KIND OF CLAY], [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR A SEAL ON PACKING BAGS;²⁰ THIS IS R. AKIBA'S VIEW. BUT THE SAGES SAY; AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR THE SEAL ON LETTERS.²¹ [FOR] MANURE, OR THIN SAND, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR FERTILIZING A CABBAGE STALK; THIS IS R. AKIBA'S VIEW. BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: FOR FERTILIZING ONE LEEK PLANT. THICK SAND, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR PUTTING ON A FULL PLASTER TROWEL. A REED, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING A PEN. BUT IF IT IS THICK OR CRUSHED,²² [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR BOILING THE LIGHTEST OF EGGS BEATEN UP AND PLACED IN A STEW POT.

GEMARA. ON A FULL PLASTER TROWEL. A Tanna taught: As much as is required for putting on the top of a plasterer's trowel. Which Tanna holds that sand improves plaster? — Said R. Hisda: R. Judah. For it was taught: One must not plaster his house with lime unless he mixed it

with straw or sand.²³ R. Judah said: Straw is permitted, but sand is forbidden, because it becomes cement.²⁴ Raba said, You may say that it agrees even the Rabbis: The spoiling thereof makes it fit.²⁵

A REED, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING A PEN. It was taught: A pen which reaches one's finger joints. R. Ashi asked: The upper joint or the lower? The question stands over.

BUT IF IT IS THICK, etc. A Tanna taught: Beaten up with oil and placed in a stew pot. Mar, son of Rabina, said to his son: Have you heard what a light egg is? — He replied: An egg of a turtle dove. What is the reason? Because it is small! Then say [the egg of a zipparta?²⁶ He was silent. Have you then heard anything on this? he²⁷ asked him. Said he to him, Thus did R. Shesheth say: It is a fowl's egg, and why is it called a light egg? The Sages estimated, You have no egg quicker [lighter] to boil than a fowl's egg. And wherefore [he²⁷ asked] are all the [food-]standards of the Sabbath the size of a dried fig, whereas here it is an egg? Said he to him, Thus did R. Nahman say: [It means] as much as [is required to boil the size of] a dried fig of a light egg.

1. Sc. as much clay as is made with a quarter *log* of waste water (Tosaf.). Hair too was used in the kneading.
2. To redden it (Rashi). [H] may be rendered either the smallest of girls, or the little (finger) of girls.
3. Lit., 'and do not attain their years' — i.e., they have the hairy growth, which is the evidence of puberty, before time, and wish to remove it.
4. Esth. II, 12 q.v.
5. Jast.: oil of myrrh or cinnamon (a corruption of [G])
6. As a dowry. This would appear to be a reversion to the very ancient practice of giving a dowry for a bride. Cf. Jacob giving his labor as a dowry for Rachel, and Shechem offering a dowry for Dinah (Gen. XXIX, 18; XXXIV, 12).
7. Their skin being white and smooth in any case — a strong argument in favor of teetotalism!
8. Sic. The reading in the Mishnah is, produce, make.
9. Mishnah: KALKAL.
10. V. Mishnah 78a.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

11. I.e., thick lime.
12. Then why this distinction?
13. Instead of andife. Rashi: andifa is an earthen vessel with two spouts, one above and one below. When one wishes to fill it with wine he closes the lower spout with lime, and it is to this that R. Nehemiah refers in the Mishnah. Jast. translates quite differently.
14. By keeping wine in such a vessel. The wine will gradually dissolve the lime and then run out.
15. A vessel for measuring. Notches were made to indicate the measure, e.g., *log. hin*, etc. and these were plastered over with lime. To this R. Nehemiah refers.
16. Sacrifices were accompanied by libations wine, the measure of which depended upon the animal sacrificed, v. Num. XXVIII, 14.
17. Jast. Rashi: The forehead where hair does not grow. This was reddened with lime.
18. Ezek. ch. 1, which treats of the Heavenly Chariot.
19. Through wishing to lecture publicly on the Chariot. This was regarded as esoteric learning, and was to be confined to the initiated only; cf. Hag. 11b, 13a and 14b.
20. Large bags in which ships' cargoes were carried.
21. This is a smaller standard.
22. And unfit for a pen.
23. To darken it as a sign of mourning. This was after the destruction of the Temple. v. B.B. 60b.
24. And is an improvement.
25. Rashi: since it may not be used without darkening, this spoiling makes it fit for use, and hence is adopted as a standard. Others (with whom Rashi disagrees): the spoiling of the color is nevertheless an improvement, for the sand strengthens it.
26. Jast.: a small bird, supposed to be the humming bird.
27. The son.

Shabbath 81a

MISHNAH. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] BONE, [THE STANDARD IS AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING A SPOON;¹ R. JUDAH MAINTAINED: FOR MAKING THEREOF² A HAF; GLASS, LARGE ENOUGH FOR SCRAPING THE TOP OF THE WHORL [OF A SPINDLE]; A CHIP OR A STONE, LARGE ENOUGH TO THROW AT A BIRD; R. ELEAZAR B. JACOB SAID: LARGE ENOUGH TO THROW AT AN ANIMAL.³

GEMARA. Shall we say that R. Judah's standard is larger: but we know the standard

of the Rabbis to be larger?⁴ — Said 'Ulla: [It means] the wards of a lock.⁵

Our Rabbis taught: The wards of a lock are clean;⁶ [but] when one fits them into the lock, they are [liable to become] unclean.⁷ But if it [the lock] is of a revolving door,⁸ even when it is fixed on the door and nailed on with nails, they [the wards] are clean, because whatever is joined to the soil is as the soil.⁹

GLASS, LARGE ENOUGH FOR SCRAPING [etc.]. A Tanna taught: Glass,¹⁰ large enough to break across two threads simultaneously.

A CHIP, OR A STONE, LARGE ENOUGH TO THROW AT A BIRD: R. ELEAZAR [etc.]. R. Jacob said in R. Johanan's name: Providing that it can feel it. And what size is that? It was taught, R. Eleazar b. Jacob said: Ten *zuz* in weight.¹¹

Zonin entered the *Beth Hamidrash* [and] said to them [the students]: My masters, what is the standard of the stones of a privy?¹² Said they to him: [One] the size of an olive, [a second] the size of a nut, and [a third] the size of an egg.¹³ Shall one take [them] in a [gold] balance! he objected.¹⁴ [Thereupon] they voted and decided: A handful.¹⁵ It was taught; R. Jose said: [One] the size of an olive, [another] the size of a nut, and [a third] the size of an egg: R. Simeon b. Jose said on his father's authority: A handful.

Our Rabbis taught: One may carry three smoothly rounded stones¹⁶ into a privy. And what is their size? R. Meir said: As [large as] a nut; R. Judah maintained: As [large as] an egg. R. R. Papa observed in R. Hisda's name: Even as they differ here, so do they differ in respect to an ethrog.¹⁷ But there it is a Mishnah, whereas here it is [only] a Baraitha?¹⁸ Rather [say:] Just as they differ in respect to an ethrog, so do they differ here.

Rab Judah said: But not brittle stone [payas].¹⁹ What is payas? — Said R. Zera: Babylonian pebbles.²⁰

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Raba said: One may not use a chip on the Sabbath [as a suppository] in the same way as one uses it on weekdays. Mar Zutra demurred: Shall one then endanger [his health]? — [It may be done] in a back-handed manner.²¹

R. Jannai said: If there is a fixed place for the privy,²² [one may carry in] a handful [of stones];²³ if not, [only] the size of the leg of a small spice mortar [is permitted].²⁴ R. Shesheth said: If there is evidence upon it,²⁵ it is permitted.²⁶ An objection is raised: Ten things lead to hemorrhoids in a man, and these are they: [i] eating the leaves of reeds; [ii] the leaves of vines; [iii] sprouts of grapevine; [iv] the rough flesh²⁷ of an animal without salt; [v] the spine of a fish; [vi] a salted fish insufficiently cooked; [vii] drinking the lees of wine; [viii] wiping oneself with lime, [ix] with clay. [x] [and] with a chip which one's neighbor has [already] used thus.²⁸ And some say, Suspending oneself in a privy too.²⁹ — There is no difficulty; the one refers to a damp [stone];³⁰ the other to a dry one. Alternatively, here the reference is to the same side [of the stone];³¹ there, to the other side. Another alternative: the one refers to his own;³² the other, to his neighbor's. Abaye asked R. Joseph: What if rain fell on it and it [the stain] was washed away? If the mark thereof is perceptible, he replied, it is permitted.

Rabbah son of R. Shila asked R. Hisda:

1. Jast.: pointed on top and curved at the end.
2. This is first assumed in the Gemara to mean a lock, which gives a greater standard than that of the Rabbis, but is subsequently translated ward of a lock.
3. But one does not trouble to throw anything at a bird, which is frightened away with the voice.
4. v. *supra* 80a, p. 381. n. 7.
5. V. note on Mishnah
6. I.e., they are not susceptible to uncleanness, being unfit for use by themselves (Rashi). Rashi also maintains that the reference is to wards made of bones; Tosaf., to wards made of metal.
7. For they are now parts of utensils.
8. It is not the lock of a box or chest, but of something fixed to soil, e.g., the door of a house.
9. Which cannot become unclean.

10. Sekukith is a rarer form of the more usual zekukith.
11. One *zuz* = 3.585 grammes (J.E., 'Weights and Measures', vol. XII, p. 489 Table 1).
12. Used for cleansing.
13. These three together constitute the standard, as they are all required.
14. For weighing them accurately.
15. Of stones, no matter what their number.
16. Jast. Rashi (as emended by Rashal): sharpened stones.
17. A citron, which is one of the fruits to be taken on the Feast of Tabernacles (v. Lev. XXIII. 40). R. Meir holds that its minimum size must be that of a nut, while R. Judah holds that it must be at least as large as an egg.
18. And the Mishnah being better known, he surely should have taken that as the point of comparison.
19. This being unsuited for this purpose. it may not be handled on the Sabbath.
20. Which are cloddy and brittle.
21. V. p. 188, n. 2.
22. Their privies were in the fields. Some were permanent, others were not.
23. I.e., over a distance of less than four cubits. V., however, R. Han. For those that are left over in the evening may be used in the morning.
24. This translation follows R. Han and Tosaf.
25. I.e., a stain of excrements.
26. To handle it, even if larger than the standard size normally allowed on the Sabbath, since it has already been used for that purpose before.
27. Rashi. Jast.: the palate.
28. This contradicts R. Shesheth.
29. Instead of sitting.
30. From former use; that is unfit.
31. That is injurious.
32. I.e., a stone which he himself has used before; that is permitted.

Shabbath 81b

Is it permissible to carry them up [the stones] after one to the roof?¹ Human dignity is very important, he replied, and it supersedes a negative injunction of the Torah.² Now, Meremar sat and reported this discussion, [whereupon] Rabina raised an objection to Meremar: R. Eliezer said: One may take a chip [lying] before him to pick his teeth therewith;³ but the Sages maintain: He may take only from an animal's trough?⁴ How compare! There, one appoints a place for his meal;⁵ but here, does one appoint a place for a privy?⁶

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

R. Huna said: One may not obey the call of nature on a plowed field on the Sabbath. What is the reason? Shall we say, because of treading down?² Then the same holds good even on weekdays? Again, if it is on account of the grasses,⁸ — surely Resh Lakish said: One may cleanse himself with a pebble whereon grass has sprouted, but if one detaches [the grass] thereof on the Sabbath, he incurs a sin-offering? Rather [the reason is] lest he take [a clod] from an upper level⁹ and throw it below,¹⁰ and he is then liable on account of Rabbah's [dictum], for Rabbah said: If one has a depression and fills it up, — if in the house, he is culpable on account of building; if in the field, he is culpable on account of plowing.

[To revert to] the main text: Resh Lakish said: One may cleanse himself with a pebble whereon 'grass has sprouted; but if one detaches [the grass] thereof on the Sabbath, he incurs a sin-offering. R. Pappi said: From Resh Lakish you may infer that one may take up a parpisa.¹¹ R. Kahana demurred: If they said [that it is permitted] in case of need,¹² shall they say [thus] where there is no need!¹³

Abaye said: As for parpisa, since it has come to hand, we will state something about it. If it is lying on the ground and one places it upon pegs, he is culpable on the score of detaching; if it is lying on pegs and one places it on the ground, he is liable on the score of planting.¹⁴

R. Johanan said: One must not cleanse oneself with a shard on the Sabbath. What is the reason? Shall we say on account of danger?¹⁵ Then on weekdays too [let it be forbidden]? Again if it is on account of witchcraft:¹⁶ it may not [be done] even on weekdays too? Again, if it is on account of the tearing out of hair, — but surely that is unintentional? — Said R. Nathan b. Oshaia to them: [Since] a great man has stated this dictum, let us give a reason for it. [Thus:] it is unnecessary [to state] that it is forbidden on weekdays;¹⁷ but on the Sabbath, since it bears the rank of a utensil, [I might think that] it is permitted:¹⁸ therefore he informs us [otherwise].

Raba recited it on account of the tearing out of hair, and found R. Johanan to be self-contradictory. [Thus:] did then R. Johanan say, One must not cleanse oneself with a shard on the Sabbath, which shows that what is unintentional is forbidden? Surely R. Johanan said: The *halachah* is as [every] anonymous Mishnah, and we learnt: A nazirite may cleanse [his hair] and part it, but he must not comb it.¹⁹ But it is clear that it is as R. Nathan b. Oshaia.

What is [the reference to] witchcraft? — R. Hisda and Rabbah son of R. Huna were travelling in a boat, when a certain [non-Jewish] matron said to them, 'Seat me near you,' but they did not seat her. Thereupon she uttered something [a charm] and bound the boat;²⁰ they uttered something, and freed it. Said she to them, 'What shall I do to you,

1. Since he could have carried them up there on the eve of Sabbath, Tosaf.
2. I.e., it is permitted. v. *infra* 94b.
3. Though not designated for this purpose beforehand, it is not regarded as mukzeh (q.v. [Glos.](#)).
4. There it is regarded as standing ready for use, but otherwise it is mukzeh, and human dignity, viz., the necessity to clean one's teeth, does not negative this prohibition.
5. Beforehand, and at the same time he could have prepared his toothpicks too. Hence the prohibition retains its force.
6. Surely not! (Cf. p. 386. n. 7).
7. The loose plowed soil, thus spoiling it, the reference being to a neighbor's field.
8. Which sprout on the loose, moist earth, and in picking up a clod for cleansing one may involuntarily detach the grass.
9. E.g., a mound or any other protuberance.
10. Into a depression; he thus levels them.
11. Rashi: a perforated pot. Though the earth in it might be regarded as attached to the ground in virtue of the perforation which permits the sap or moisture to mount from the one to the other, yet just as Resh Lakish rules that the pebble is treated as detached in spite of the grass which has grown on it, which is only possible through its lying on the soil, so is this pot too regarded thus. Jast.: a lump of earth in a bag of palm-leaves (v. Rashi in name of [H]).
12. Sc. for cleansing, which is necessary.
13. Surely not!

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

14. Cf. n. 3. 'Culpable' here merely denotes that the action is forbidden, but does not imply liability to a sin-offering, as usual (Rashi and Tosaf.).
15. He may cut himself.
16. As below.
17. Since one can just as easily take a chip or a pebble, to which no suspicion of danger or witchcraft attaches.
18. Being preferable to a chip or a pebble, which are not utensils, and in general it is permitted to handle a utensil sooner than that which is not a utensil.
19. v. *supra* 50b for notes.
20. So that it could not proceed further.

Shabbath 82a

seeing that you do not cleanse yourselves with a shard,¹ nor kill vermin on your garments, and you do not pull out and eat a vegetable from a bunch which the gardener has tied together'²

R. Huna said to his son Rabbah, 'Why are you not to be found before R. Hisda, whose dicta are [so] keen?' 'What should I go to him for,' answered he, 'seeing that when I go to him he treats me to secular discourses!'³ [Thus] he tells me, when one enters a privy, he must not sit down abruptly, nor force himself overmuch, because the rectum rests on three teeth-like glands, [and] these teeth-like glands of the rectum, might become dislocated and he [his health] is endangered. 'He treats of health matters,'⁴ he exclaimed, 'and you call them secular discourses! All the more reason for going to him!'

If a pebble and a shard lie before one, — R. Huna said: He must cleanse himself with the pebble, but not with the shard;⁵ but R. Hisda ruled: He must cleanse himself with the shard, and not with the pebble.⁶ An objection is raised: If a pebble and a shard lie before one, he must cleanse himself with the shard, not with the pebble this refutes R. Huna? — Rafram b. Papa interpreted it before R. Hisda on R. Huna's view as referring to the rims of utensils.⁷

If a pebble and grass lie before one, — R. Hisda and R. Hamnuna [differ therein]: one maintains: He must cleanse himself with the

pebble, but not with the grass;⁸ whilst the other ruled: He must cleanse himself with the grass, not with the pebble.⁹ An objection is raised: If one cleanses himself with inflammable material,¹⁰ his lower teeth¹¹ will be torn away? — There is no difficulty: the one refers to wet [grass];¹² the other to dry [grass].

If one has a call of nature but does not obey it — R. Hisda and Rabina — one said: He has an attack of offensive odour;¹³ the other said: He is infected by an offensive smell.¹⁴ It was taught in accordance with the view that he is infected by an offensive smell. For it was taught: One who has a call of nature yet eats, is like an oven which is heated up on top of its ashes, and that is the beginning of perspiration odour.¹⁵

If one has a call of nature but cannot obey it, — R. Hisda said: He should repeatedly stand up and sit down; R. Hanan of Nehardea said: Let him move to [different] sides; R. Hamnuna said: Let him work about that place with a pebble; while the Rabbis advise: Let him not think: Said R. Aha son of Raba to R. Ashi: If he does not think [of it], he is all the more likely not to be moved? Let him not think of other things, replied he.¹⁶ R. Jeremiah of Difti observed: I myself saw a certain Arab repeatedly arise and sit down until he poured forth like a cruse.

Our Rabbis taught: If one enters [a house] to [partake of] a complete meal,¹⁷ he should [first] walk ten four-cubit lengths others say, four ten-cubit lengths — be moved, then enter and take his seat.

MISHNAH. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] A SHARD, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS NEEDED FOR PLACING BETWEEN ONE BOARD AND ANOTHER:¹⁸ THIS IS R. JUDAH'S VIEW. R. MEIR SAID: LARGE ENOUGH TO SCRAPE OUT THE FIRE THEREWITH; R. JOSE SAID: LARGE ENOUGH TO CONTAIN A REB'I'ITH. R. MEIR OBSERVED: THOUGH THERE IS NO PROOF OF THE MATTER, YET THERE IS A HINT: SO THAT THERE SHALL NOT BE FOUND

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

AMONG THE PIECES THEREOF A SHARD TO TAKE FIRE FROM THE HEARTH.¹⁹ SAID R. JOSE TO HIM, THENCE IS PROOF [OF MY VIEW, VIZ.]: OR TO TAKE WATER WITHAL OUT OF THE CISTERN.²⁰

GEMARA. (The Scholars asked: Is R. Meir's standard greater or R. Jose's standard greater?)²¹ Logically, R. Jose's standard is greater, whereas the verse [quoted indicates that] R. Meir's standard is greater, for should you think that R. Jose's standard is greater, does he [the prophet] [first] curse in respect to a small vessel, and then curse in respect to a large one!²² — Said Abaye: Our Mishnah too [means] to scrape out a fire from a large hearth.²³

SAID R. JOSE TO HIM, THENCE IS PROOF. But R. Jose says well to R. Meir! — R. Meir maintains that he proceeds to a climax: Not only will nothing that is of value to people be found therein, but even that which is of no value to people shall not be found therein.

CHAPTER IX

MISHNAH. R. AKIBA SAID: WHENCE DO WE KNOW THAT AN IDOL DEFILES BY CARRIAGE LIKE A *NIDDAH*?²⁴ BECAUSE IT IS SAID, THOU SHALT CAST THEM [SC. THE IDOLS] AWAY AS A MENSTRUOUS THING; THOU SHALT SAY UNTO IT, GET THEE HENCE:²⁵ JUST AS A *NIDDAH* DEFILES BY CARRIAGE, SO DOES AN IDOL DEFILE BY CARRIAGE.²⁶

GEMARA. We learnt elsewhere:²⁷ If one's house adjoins an idol,²⁸ and it collapses, he must not rebuild it.²⁹ What shall he do? He must retreat four cubits within his own [ground] and rebuild.

1. And are thus not exposed to witchcraft — this remark gives the point of the story.
2. But you first untie the bunch.
3. I.e., not on Torah.
4. Lit., 'the life (health) of the creatures.
5. Though the first is not a utensil (v. p. 389. n. 1), because the latter is dangerous.
6. Because the former is technically a utensil.

7. Which are rounded and smooth; hence they are not dangerous.
8. Because it injures the flesh (Rashi). Or the reference is to attached (growing) grass, and one must not make use on the Sabbath of that which is attached to the soil.
9. He ignores the prohibition mentioned in the last note, and holds grass to be preferable, because a pebble is not a utensil and may normally not be handled on the Sabbath.
10. Lit., 'over which the fire rules'.
11. I.e., the teeth-like glands supporting the rectum.
12. This is permissible.
13. From his mouth.
14. From the whole body.
15. Which affects the whole body.
16. But concentrate on this.
17. Lit., 'a fixed meal' as opposed to a mere snack, so that he will have to sit some time there.
18. When they are piled up. Rashi: the boards are not allowed to touch, but are separated by shards to prevent them from warping. 'Aruk: to enable the air to enter and dry them.
19. Isa. XXX. 14.
20. Ibid. The least quantity of water to be counted is a *rebi'ith*; v. first Mishnah of this chapter.
21. Rashal and BaH delete this bracketed passage.
22. This is raised as a difficulty. Generally speaking, only a very small shard is required for scraping out a fire from a stove, certainly not one large enough to contain a *rebi'ith*. On the other hand, the prophet would not curse by first observing that not even a small shard will remain, and then add that a large shard will not remain either.
23. Which requires a larger shard.
24. If one carries a *niddah* (q.v. [Glos.](#)), even without actually touching her, he becomes unclean, and R. Akiba teaches that the same applies to an idol.
25. Isa. XXX, 22.
26. Rashi: This Mishnah is quoted here because of its similarity in style to a later Mishnah concerning circumcision on the Sabbath (*infra* 86a). R. Han. and Tosaf.: Since the last Mishnah of the preceding chapter quotes a law which is supported by, though not actually deduced from, a Biblical verse, this chapter commences similarly. Both verses quoted are from Isa. XXX.
27. V. A.Z. 47b.
28. So that its wall is also the wall of the heathen temple, though actually it belongs entirely to him.
29. Since he thereby builds a wall for the temple too.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 82b

If it belongs to him and to the idol, it is judged as half and half.¹ The stones, timber and earth thereof defile like a [dead] creeping thing [sherez], for it is said, Thou shalt treat a creeping thing.² R. Akiba said: [They defile] like a *niddah*, because it is said, 'Thou shalt cast them away [tizrem] as a menstruous thing': just as a *niddah* defiles by carriage, so does an idol defile by carriage. Rabbah observed, Tizrem, mentioned in the verse, means 'thou shalt alienate them from thee as a zar [stranger].' 'Thou shalt say unto it, Get thee hence', but thou shalt not say unto it, Enter hither.³

Rabbah also observed: As for carriage, all agree that it defiles thereby, since it is assimilated to *niddah*. They differ in respect to a stone that closes a cavity:⁴ R. Akiba holds, It is like a *niddah*: just as a *niddah* defiles through a cavity-closing stone, so does an idol defile through a cavity-closing stone; while the Rabbis maintain, It is like a creeping thing [sherez]: just as a sherez does not defile through a cavity-closing stone, so does an idol not defile through a cavity-closing stone.

Now, according to R. Akiba, in respect of which law is it likened to a sherez?⁵ — In respect of its service utensils.⁶ And according to the Rabbis, in respect of which law is it likened to *niddah*? — In respect of carriage. Then let it be likened to *nebelah*?⁷ That indeed is so, but [the analogy with *niddah* teaches:] just as a *niddah* is not [a source of contamination] through her [separate] limbs,⁸ So is an idol not [a source of contamination] through its limbs. Then when R. Hama b. Guria asked: 'Does the law of an idol operate in respect of its limbs or not?'-solve it for him from this that according to the Rabbis it does not operate in respect of its limbs? — R. Hama b. Guria asked it on R. Akiba's view.

But R. Eleazar maintained: In respect of a cavity-closing stone all agree that it does not defile thereby, since it is likened to a sherez,⁹

they differ only in respect of carriage. R. Akiba holds, It is like a *niddah*: just as a *niddah* defiles through carriage, so does an idol defile through carriage. While the Rabbis argue. It is like a sherez: just as a sherez does not defile through carriage, so does an idol not defile through carriage. Now, according to R. Akiba, in respect of what law is it likened to a sherez? — In respect of its service utensils. And according to the Rabbis', in respect of what law is it likened to a *niddah*? — Just as a *niddah* is not [a source of contamination] through her [separate] limbs, so is an idol not [a source of contamination] through its limbs.

1. E.g., if the wall is two cubits thick, one cubit only is accounted as his portion, and he must retreat another three cubits.
2. Deut. VIII, 26. Shakkez teshakkezenu fr. shekez, something loathsome, which is connected with sherez (E.V.: thou shalt utterly detest it). A sherez defiles by its touch, but not when it is merely carried; but v. discussion *infra*.
3. I.e., one must absolutely reject it (Tosaf. s.v.[H]).
4. Rashi: a stone resting upon laths, and under it lie utensils. Tosaf.: a stone so heavy that when a *niddah* sits upon it her additional weight makes no difference to the utensils upon which it rests. According to both definitions, the question is whether these utensils are defiled when an idol is placed upon the stone.
5. As it is in the verse, v.p. 393, n. 8.
6. The utensils used in an idol's service do not defile through carriage or through a cavity-closing stone.
7. V. [Glos.](#) This analogy would give the exact law, whereas the analogy with *niddah* has to be qualified by a further analogy with sherez.
8. If a limb e.g., an arm, is cut off from a *niddah*, it defiles as the severed limb of a living human being in general, but not as *niddah*. The practical difference is that it does not defile through a cavity-closing stone.
9. This is the text as emended by Rashal.

Shabbath 83a

Now according to R. Akiba, in respect of what law is it likened to a *niddah*? [only] in respect of carriage! Then let it be likened to *nebelah*? — That indeed is so, but [the analogy with *niddah*, rather, teaches: just as *niddah* is not a source of contamination] through her [separate] limbs, so is an idol not

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

[a source of contamination] through its limbs. Then when R. Hama b. Guria asked: 'Does the law of an idol operate in respect of its limbs or not 'solve it for him from this, according to both the Rabbis and R. Akiba, that it does not operate in respect of its limbs? — R. Hama b. Guria learns this as Rabbah, and asked it on R. Akiba's view.

An objection is raised: An idol is like a [creeping thing] sherez and its service utensils are like a sherez; R. Akiba maintained: An idol is like a *niddah*, and its service utensils are like a sherez. Now, according to R. Eleazar, it is well; but on Rabbah's view, it is a difficulty? — Rabbah answers you: Is it stronger than the Mishnah, which states, 'The stones, timber and earth thereof defile like a sherez,' and we explained, What is meant by 'like a sherez?' That it does not defile through a cavity-closing stone: here too it means that it does not defile through a cavity-closing stone.

An objection is raised: A heathen man or woman, an idol and its service utensils, they themselves [defile] but not their motion [hesset];¹ R. Akiba maintained: They and their hesset. Now, as for R. Eleazar, it is well;² but on Rabbah's view it is a difficulty? — Rabbah answers you: And [even] on your view, [can you say of] a heathen man and woman too, they but not their motion [hesset], — surely it was taught: Speak unto the children of Israel [... when any man hath an issue out of his flesh, etc.]:³ the children of Israel defile through gonorrhoea, but heathens do not defile through gonorrhoea, but they [the Rabbis] decreed concerning them that they rank as *zabin* in all respects.⁴ But Rabbah answers [the difficulty] according to his view, [Thus:] A heathen man or woman: they themselves, their motion [hesset], and their cavity-closing stone [all defile]; an idol: it and its motion [hesset], but not its cavity-closing stone; R. Akiba maintains: An idol: it, its hesset and its cavity-closing stone [defile]. Whilst R. Eleazar interprets it in accordance with his view: A heathen man or woman: they themselves, their motion [hesset], and

their cavity-closing stone [defile]; an idol: it, but not its motion [hesset]. Whilst R. Akiba maintains: An idol: it and its motion [defile].⁵

R. Ashi objected thereto: [If so,] what is [the meaning of] they themselves'?⁶ — Rather said R. Ashi: This is the meaning: In the case of a heathen man or woman, whether they move others⁷ or others move them,⁸ [these others] are unclean.⁹ If idol moves others, they are clean;¹⁰ if others move it,¹¹ they are unclean. [As for] its service utensils, whether they move others or others move them, [these others] are clean. R. Akiba maintained: In the case of a heathen man or woman and an idol, whether they move others or others move them, [these others', are unclean; as for its service utensils, whether they move others or others move them, they are clean.

[In the case of] an idol, as for others moving it, that is well, [for] it is possible; but how is it conceivable for it to move others? Said Rami son of R. Yeba, Even as we learnt: If a *zab* is on one pan of the scales, and foodstuffs or drinks are in the other pan and the *zab* outweighs them, they are unclean,¹²

1. Hesset is the technical term for uncleanness induced by the motion or shaking caused by a gonorrhoeist (*zab*). E.g., if he moves a bench upon which a clean person is sitting, even without actually touching it, the latter becomes unclean. The Rabbis enacted that heathens defile in the same way as a *zab*. But it is now assumed that hesset is used here in the sense that the heathen, etc. are moved by the clean person, which is another expression for their being carried, and it is taught that these do not defile by carriage.
2. That the first view which is that of the Rabbis, is that they do not defile through carriage.
3. Lev. XV, 2. This introduces the laws of a *zab*.
4. Which includes defilement through carriage.
5. On both interpretations the Baraita must be emended.
6. If 'hesset' means 'carriage' (v. p. 395, n. 1), what is meant by 'they'? For it cannot mean that they are unclean in themselves, since that is obvious from the fact that we debate whether even their carriage defiles.
7. E.g., by moving or weighing down the bench upon which they are sitting.
8. Which is tantamount to carrying them.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

9. Thus he translates: 'they themselves'- i.e., when they are moved by others, and their 'hesset'- i.e., when they move others. This gives hesset its usual connotation.
10. This agrees with Rabbah in accordance with whom R. Ashi explains this Baraitha. It can be explained on similar lines according to R. Eleazar too.
11. I.e., carriage.
12. Since he thereby moves the foodstuffs or drinks, which is hesset. In this way an idol may move others, sc. by outweighing them on a pair of scales.

Shabbath 83b

if they out weigh [him], they are clean.¹

With whom does that which was taught agree, [viz.]: [As for] all unclean things which move [others], they [the things moved] are clean, save [in the case of] moving by a *zab*, for which no analogy² is found in the whole Torah. Shall we say that this is not according to R. Akiba, for if according to R. Akiba, there is an idol too? — You may even say that it agrees with R. Akiba: He states *zab* and all that is like thereto.³

R. Hama b. Guria asked: Does the law of an idol operate in respect to its limbs or not?⁴ Now, where an unskilled person can replace it [the limb in the idol], there is no question, for it is as though [already] joined [thereto]. When does the question arise? If an unskilled person cannot replace it, what [then]? Since an unskilled person cannot replace it, it is as broken;⁵ or perhaps it is actually not defective?⁶ Some there are who put the question in the reverse direction: Where an unskilled person cannot replace it, there is no question, for it is as broken. When does the question is if an unskilled person can replace it: what [then]? Since an unskilled person can replace it, it is as though [already] joined [thereto]; or perhaps now it is nevertheless disjoined and loose [separate]? — The question stands over.

R. Ahedbuy b. Ammi asked: What of an idol less than an olive in size? R. Joseph demurred to this: In respect of what [does he ask]? Shall we say, in respect of the

interdict?⁷ — let it be no more than the fly [zebug] of Baal Ekron,⁸ for it was taught: And they made Baal-berith their God:² this refers to the fly-god of Baal Ekron. It teaches that everyone made a likeness of his idol¹⁰ and put it in his bag; whenever he thought of it he took it out of his bag and embraced and kissed it!¹¹ But [the question is] in respect of uncleanness: what [is the law]? since it is assimilated to sherez¹² then just as sherez [defiles] by the size of a lentil,¹³ so an idol too [defiles] by the size of a lentil; or perhaps it is [also] likened to a corpse:¹⁰ just as a corpse [defiles] by the size of an olive,¹⁴ so does an idol [defile] by the size of an olive? — Said R. Awia — others state, Rabbah b. 'Ulla-Come and hear: For it was taught: An idol less than an olive in size has no uncleanness at all, for it is said, And he cast the powder thereof [sc. of the idol] upon the graves of the children of the people:¹⁵ just as a corpse [defiles] by the size of an olive, so does an idol [defile] by the size of an olive.

Now, according to the Rabbis, in respect of what law is it [an idol] likened to sherez? — that it does not defile by carriage; to a *niddah*? — that it is not [a source of contamination] through its [separate] limbs; [and] to a corpse? — that it does not defile by the size of a lentil!¹⁶ [Why?] Interpret it rather stringently: In respect of what law does the Divine Law liken it to a sherez? that it defiles by the size of a lentil; to a *niddah*? that it defiles through a cavity-closing stone; [while] the Divine Law assimilates it to a corpse, [teaching] that it defiles under the law of a covering?¹⁷ The uncleanness of an idol is [only] by Rabbinical law: [consequently,] where there are lenient and stringent [analogies], we draw a lenient analogy, but do not draw a stringent analogy.¹⁸

MISHNAH. How DO WE KNOW THAT A SHIP IS CLEAN?¹⁹ BECAUSE IT IS SAID, THE WAY OF A SHIP IN THE MIDST OF THE SEA.²⁰

GEMARA. Now, it is obvious that a ship is in the midst of the sea, but we are informed this: just as the sea is clean, so is a ship clean. It was taught: Hananiah said: We learn it

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

from a sack:²¹ just as a sack can be carried both full and empty, so must everything [which is to be susceptible to defilement] be possible to be carried both full and empty, thus excluding a ship, seeing that it cannot be carried full and empty.²² Wherein do they differ? — They differ in respect to an earthen ship: he who quotes, 'a ship in the midst of the sea', [holds that] this too is in the midst of the sea. But as for him who maintains that it must be like a sack: only those [vessels] that are mentioned in conjunction with a sack²³ if they can be carried full and empty, are [susceptible to uncleanness], if not, they are not [susceptible]; but an earthen ship, even if it cannot be carried full and empty, [is still susceptible to defilement]. Alternatively, [they differ in respect to] a boat of the Jordan:²⁴ he who quotes, 'a ship in the midst of the sea', [holds that] this too is a ship in the midst of the sea;²⁵ but as for him who requires that it be carried full and empty, this too is carried full and empty, for R. Hanina b. Akiba said: Why was it ruled that a Jordan boat is unclean? Because it is loaded on dry land and [then] lowered into the water.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One should never abstain from [attendance at] the *Beth Hamidrash* even for a single hour, for lo! how many years was this Mishnah learnt in the *Beth Hamidrash* without its reason being revealed, until R. Hanina b. Akiba came and elucidated it. R. Jonathan said: One should never abstain from the *Beth Hamidrash* and from Torah, even in the hour of death, for it is said, This is the Torah, when a man dieth in a tent:²⁶ even in the hour of death one should be engaged in [the study of] the Torah.²⁷ Resh Lakish said: The words of the Torah can endure only with him who sacrifices²⁸ himself for it, as it is said, This is the Torah, when a man dieth in a tent.²⁹

Raba said:

1. For they bear the *zab*, and only articles which are fit for lying or sitting upon, or human beings, are unclean in such a case.
2. Lit., 'companion'.

3. Which includes an idol, since R. Akiba deduces an idol's power to contaminate from a *niddah*, who is akin to a *zab*.
4. V. *supra* 82b.
5. And therefore does not defile.
6. All the parts are there, even if not assembled; hence each part should defile.
7. One may not benefit in any way from an idol.
8. A Phoenician idol; cf. II Kings I, 2.
9. Judg. VIII, 34.
10. Lit., 'fear'.
11. This shows that it is the same as any other idol, and benefit thereof is certainly forbidden.
12. V. *supra* 82b.
13. Less than the size of an olive.
14. That is the least portion of a corpse which defiles.
15. II Kings XXIII, 6.
16. V. *supra* 82b.
17. Cf. p. 69, n. 7.
18. All the verses quoted above as intimating the uncleanness of an idol are only supports (*asmakta*), but not the actual source of the law. Cf. Halevy, Doroth, 1, 5, ch. 8, pp. 470 seqq.
19. I.e., it cannot become unclean.
20. Prov. XXX, 19.
21. A ship is a wooden vessel, and only those wooden vessels which are like a sack can become unclean, since they are assimilated to a sack in Lev. XI, 32.
22. By 'carried' is meant actually as one carries a sack.
23. V. Lev. XI, 32.
24. Owing to the rapid course of the Jordan the boats that plied on it were of canoe-like structure, which could be taken up and carried over the unnavigable stretches.
25. For all rivers are the same, not susceptible to defilement.
26. Num. XIX, 14.
27. In the face of the boundless love for the Torah displayed by this dictum, the criticism of Rabbinism as a dry, legalistic system is seen to be shallow and superficial. No system which does not appeal to the warm-hearted emotions could call forth such love.
28. Lit., 'kills'.
29. I.e., this Torah can live only when a man is prepared to die for it—an interpretation that has been historically justified.

Shabbath 84a

Now according to Hananiah, carrying by means of oxen is regarded as carrying.¹ For we learnt: There are three wagons: That which is built like a cathedra² is liable to uncleanness as midras;³ that which is like a

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

bed⁴ is liable to uncleanness through the defilement caused by a corpse;⁵ that of stones⁶ is completely clean. Now R. Johanan observed thereon: But if it has a receptacle for pomegranates, it is liable to uncleanness through the defilement of a corpse.⁷ There are three chests: a chest with an opening at the side is liable to uncleanness as midras;⁸ at the top, is liable to uncleanness through the defilement of a corpse;⁹ but an extremely large one¹⁰ is completely clean.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: The midras of an earthen vessel is clean;¹² R. Jose said: A ship too. What does he mean?¹³ — Said R. Zebid. He means this: The midras of an earthen vessel is clean, but contact there with renders it unclean,¹⁴ while an earthen ship is unclean, in accordance with Hananiah;¹⁵ R. Jose ruled: An [earthen] ship too is clean, in agreement with our Tanna. R. Papa demurred: [if so,] why say, A ship too?¹⁶ Rather said R. Papa, This is its meaning: The midras of an earthen vessel is clean, whilst contact therewith defiles it; but [in the case of a vessel] of wood, both its midras and its touch are unclean; while a boat of the Jordan is clean, in agreement with our Tanna; R. Jose said: A ship too is unclean, in accordance with Hananiah.

Now, how do we know that the midras of an earthen vessel is clean? — Said Hezekiah, Because Scripture saith, and whosoever toucheth his bed.¹⁷ this assimilates 'his bed' to himself [the *zab*]: just as he can be cleansed in a mikweh,¹⁸ so can 'his bed' be cleansed in a mikweh. The School of R. Ishmael taught: It shall be unto her as the bed of her impurity [*niddah*]:¹⁹ this assimilates her bed to herself: just as she can be cleansed in a mikweh, so can 'her bed' be cleansed in a mikweh, thus excluding earthen vessels, which cannot be cleansed in a mikweh.²⁰

R. Ela raised an objection: How do we know that a [reed] mat [is susceptible to defilement] through the dead?

1. For the boats of the Jordan are too large to be loaded and carried overland otherwise than by oxen.
2. Short and three sided, like an armchair.
3. Since such are made specifically for sitting; v. *supra* 59a.
4. Long, its purpose being the carriage of goods.
5. I.e., it is susceptible to every form of defilement save midras, because it ranks as a utensil, in that it can become unclean, but it is not made for sitting thereon.
6. A cart made for carrying large stones. Its bottom was perforated with large holes, and therefore could not be used to carry articles as small as a pomegranate or less, and for a vessel to be susceptible to defilement it must be able to hold pomegranates.
7. Though the same wagon cannot be moved when full except by oxen. Thus though it is a wooden vessel, and therefore must be capable of being moved full or empty (*supra* 83b), the fact that it can be moved by oxen is sufficient.
8. Because a *zab* can sit on its top without being told 'get up and let us do our work' (v. *supra* 59a). as things can be put in or taken out from the side.
9. I.e., it is susceptible to all forms of uncleanness save that of midras, because a *zab* if sitting on it would be told to get off it, v; *supra* p. 312, n. 9
10. Lit., 'one that comes in measurement'.
11. it is unfit for lying or sitting upon on account of the opening at the top, and therefore it is not susceptible to midras, while since it cannot be moved about owing to its size, it is free from other defilement (v. *supra* 83b).
12. I.e., if a *zab* sits upon it, it without actually infringing upon the air space within it.
13. A ship is not susceptible to any form of defilement.
14. Viz., if a *zab* touches it on the inside.
15. *Supra* 83 b.
16. He certainly must mean that it is clean even from defilement, it through contact; then how explain 'too', which intimates that the first Tanna has stated that a certain article cannot be defiled by contact and R. Jose adds this?
17. Lev. XV, 5. 'His bed' denotes anything upon which the *zab* has lain, and this passage teaches the law of midras.
18. V. [Glos.](#)
19. Ibid. 26, q.v.
20. This is deduced from Lev. XI, 33, q.v. Since they cannot be cleansed, they cannot become unclean in the first place through the midras of a *zab*.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 84b

This follows *a fortiori*: if small [earthen] pitchers which cannot be defiled by a *zab*¹ can be defiled through the dead,² then a mat, which is defiled by a *zab*,³ is surely defiled through the dead? But why so [it may be asked], seeing that it cannot be cleansed in a mikweh?⁴ Said R. Hanina to him: There it is different, since some of its kind [of the same material] are [capable of being cleansed in a mikweh].⁵ The All Merciful save us from this view! he exclaimed.⁶ On the contrary, he retorted, The All Merciful save us from your view! And what is the reason?⁷ Two verses are written: [i] and whosoever touches his bed; and [ii] every bed whereon he that hath the issue lieth [shall be unclean].⁸ How are these [to be reconciled]? If something of its kind [can be cleansed in a mikweh], even if that itself cannot be cleansed in a mikweh [it is susceptible to midras]; but if nothing of its kind [can be cleansed in a mikweh], his bed is assimilated to himself.

Raba said: [That] the midras of an earthen vessel is clean [is deduced] from the following: and every open vessel, which hath no covering bound upon it[, is unclean]:⁹ hence, if it has a covering bound upon it, it is clean.¹⁰ Now, does this not hold good [even] if he had appointed it [as a seat] for his wife, when a *niddah*, yet the Divine Law states that it is clean.¹¹

MISHNAH. HOW DO WE KNOW THAT IF A SEED-BED IS SIX HANDBREADTHS SQUARE, WE MAY SOW THEREIN FIVE KINDS OF SEEDS, FOUR ON THE FOUR SIDES, AND ONE IN THE MIDDLE?¹² BECAUSE IT IS SAID, FOR AS THE EARTH BRINGETH FORTH HER BUD, AND AS THE GARDEN CAUSETH ITS SEEDS TO SPRING FORTH:¹³ NOT ITS SEED, BUT ITS SEEDS IS STATED.¹⁴

GEMARA. How is this implied? — Said Rab Judah: For as the earth bringeth forth her bud: 'bringeth forth' [denotes] one, [and] 'her bud' [denotes] one, which gives two; 'her seeds' [denotes] two,¹⁵ making four; 'causeth

to spring forth' denotes one, making five [in all],

1. They are not susceptible to midras, as he cannot sit upon them. Again, an earthen vessel can be defiled only through the contaminating thing coming into contact with its inner air space, which is here impossible, as the neck of a small pitcher is too narrow to permit a *zab* to insert his finger. Furthermore, they cannot become unclean through hesset, as hesset and contact are interdependent, and only that which is susceptible to the latter is susceptible to the former.
2. They become unclean when under the same roof as a corpse, v. Num. XIX, 15.
3. With the uncleanness of midras, since it is fit for lying upon.
4. This is R. Ela's objection: how can the Baraitha state axiomatically that a mat can be defiled by a *zab*?
5. E.g., when they are provided with a receptacle.
6. That a mat should be susceptible to midras merely because something else of the same material can be cleansed in a mikweh.
7. On what grounds does R. Hanina base his thesis?
8. Lev. XV, 4. The first verse implies that the bed must be like himself, on account of the suffix 'his', but not the second, since the suffix is absent there.
9. Num. XIX, 15.
10. The contamination must, as it were, penetrate into the inner air space of the vessel, which it is unable to do on account of the covering which interposes a barrier. — This shows that the reference is to an earthen vessel, where the defilement must enter its atmosphere (cf. Ps. 402, n. 1).
11. Now in such a case it is regarded as a seat, and if it were susceptible to midras the cover would not save the vessel from becoming unclean, because whatever is itself liable to defilement cannot constitute a barrier to save something else from same. Hence it follows that an earthen vessel is not subject to midras at all.
12. Without infringing the prohibition of sowing diverse seeds (*kil'ayim*) together (Deut. XX, 9).
13. Isa. LXI, 11.
14. Rashi: almost the whole of each side is sown with one species, and one seed is sown in the middle, as in Fig. 1. The shaded part is sown. Though the corners come very near each other, and their roots certainly intermingle, that does not matter, as their very position makes it clear that each side has been sown as a separate strip. But with respect to the middle seed there is nothing to show that it was not sown indiscriminately together with the rest, and

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

therefore a substantial space (three handbreadths) between it and the sides is required. Maim. explains it as in Fig. 2.

15. The minimum number of the plural.

Shabbath 85a

and the Rabbis ascertained that five [species sown] in six [handbreadths square] do not draw [sustenance] from each other.¹ And how do we know that that which the Rabbis ascertain is of consequence?² For R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: What is meant by, Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark, which they of old have set?³ The landmark which they of old have set thou shalt not encroach upon.⁴ What landmarks did they of old set? R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Johanan's name, [Even] as it is written, These are the sons of Seir the Horite, the inhabitants of the earth:⁵ are then the whole world inhabitants of heaven? But it means that they were thoroughly versed in the cultivation of the earth. For they used to say, This complete [measuring] rod [of land is fit] for olives, this complete [measuring] rod [is fit] for vines, this complete [measuring] rod for figs.⁶ And Horite [hori] implies that they smelled [merikin] the earth. And Hivite [hiwi]? Said R. Papa: [It teaches] that they tasted the earth like a serpent [hiwya].⁷ R. Aha b. Jacob said: Horite [hori] implies that they become free [horin] from [the cares of] their property.⁸

R. Assi said: The internal area of the seed-bed must be six [handbreadths square], apart from its borders.⁹ It was taught likewise: The internal area of the seed-bed must be six [handbreadths square]. How much must its borders be?¹⁰ — As we learnt, R. Judah said: Its breadth must be the full breadth of [the sole of] a foot, R. Zera — others say, R. Hanina b. Papa — said: What is R. Judah's reason? Because it is written, and wateredst it with thy foot:¹¹ just as the [sole of] the foot is a handbreadth, so must the border too be a handbreadth.

Rab said: We learnt of a seed bed in a waste plot.¹² But there is the corner space?¹³ — The

School of Rab¹⁴ answered in Rab's name: It refers to one who fills up the corners. Yet let one sow on the outside,¹⁵ and not fill up the inside?

1. Hence the implications of the verse are referred to a plot of this size.
2. To base a law thereon.
3. Deut. XIX, 14.
4. By planting so near to your neighbor's border that the roots must draw sustenance from his land, thus impoverishing it.
5. Gen. XXXVI, 20.
6. They know how to divide up the land for cultivation, and as a corollary they must have known how much earth each species required for its sustenance. It was from them that the Rabbis acquired this knowledge, whose correctness is vouched for by this verse.
7. In both cases for agricultural purposes.
8. Being dispossessed thereof, v. Deut. II, 12.
9. Fallow borders were left around seed-beds for the convenience of threshing; the area stated in the Mishnah does not include the borders.
10. That the whole may be technically regarded as a seed-bed, and the laws appertaining thereto (v. *infra*) apply to it.
11. Ibid. XI, 10.
12. I.e., the Mishnah refers to such. But if it is surrounded by other beds sown with different seeds, there is only the two handbreadths space occupied by the borders of the two contiguous beds between them, whereas three handbreadths space is required between two rows of different plants.
13. Which can be left unsown. It is then possible to have the bed surrounded by others.
14. The term Be Rab may mean either the School founded by Rab or scholars in general; Weiss Dor, III, 158.
15. Of the seed-bed, i.e., it need not be in the middle of an unsown plot.

Shabbath 85b

— It is a preventive measure, lest he fill up the corners. Yet let it not be other than a triangular plot¹ of vegetables? Did we not learn, If a triangular plot of vegetables enters another field,² this is permitted, because it is evidently the end of a field?³ — [The permissibility of] a triangular plot does not apply to a seed-bed.⁴

But Samuel maintained: We learnt of a seed-bed in the midst of [other] seed-beds. But

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

they intermingle? — He inclines one strip in one direction and one strip in another direction,

'Ulla said: They asked in the West [Palestine]: What if a person draws one furrow across the whole?⁵ R. Shesheth maintained: The intermingling comes and annuls the strips.⁶ R. Assi said: The intermingling does not annul the strips. Rabina raised an objection to R. Ashi: If one plants two rows of cucumbers, two rows of gourds, and two rows of Egyptian beans, they are permitted;⁷ one row of cucumbers, one row of gourds and one of Egyptian beans, they are forbidden?⁸ — Here it is different, because there is entanglement.⁹

R. Kahana said in R. Johanan's name: If one desires to fill his whole garden with vegetables,¹⁰ he can divide it into¹¹ bed[s] six [handbreadths] square, describe in each a circle five [handbreadths in diameter], and fill its corners with whatever he pleases.¹² But there is the [space] between [the beds]?¹³ — Said the School of R. Jannai: He leaves the interspaces waste.¹⁴ R. Ashi said: If they [the beds] are sown in the length, he sows them [the interspaces] in the breadth, and vice versa.¹⁵ Rabina objected to R. Ashi: The planting¹⁶ of one vegetable with another [requires] six handbreadths [square],¹⁷ and they are regarded

1. Lit., 'an ox-head'.
2. Sown with other crops. Fields were generally ended off in a triangular shape.
3. Though it comes right up to the other crops, one can see that there has been no indiscriminate sowing (cf. note on our Mishnah, p. 403, n. 5); the same should apply here.
4. Because in the proposed case there is nothing to show that the different strips are distinct.
5. Rashi: From north to south, crossing the middle seeds, this furrow being either of one of the five seeds or of a sixth. Tosaf: The furrow is drawn right round the four sides of the plot but deepened (by a handbreadth) and the question is whether this deepening constitutes a distinguishing mark, so that it shall be permitted.
6. I.e., it is not a distinguishing mark, but on the contrary breaks up the separateness of the other strips, and so is forbidden.

7. Two rows constitute a field, and therefore each plant is regarded as in a separate field, though they are in proximity to each other.
8. This proves that a single row effects a prohibited intermingling.
9. Their leaves become entangled above as they grow high. On this account they are forbidden.
10. Of different kinds.
11. Lit., 'make'.
12. Thus (see drawing): planting in this way shows that there has been no indiscriminate intermingling.
13. Viz., the borders which are to be left fallow, v. *supra* a.
14. R. Johanan's phrase 'his whole garden' is not meant literally, but merely applies to the seed-beds into which it is divided.
15. in this way literally the whole garden can be filled.
16. Lit., 'working'.
17. I.e., within a bed of this area it is possible to plant a number of different kinds of vegetables, as stated in our Mishnah.

Shabbath 86a

as a square board. Thus it is only permitted as a [square] board, but otherwise it is forbidden?¹ — There [it desires to] teach another leniency in respect thereof, [viz.,] to permit a triangular wedge that issues thence [into another plot or field].²

MISHNAH. HOW DO WE KNOW THAT IF ONE [A WOMAN] DISCHARGES SEMEN ON THE THIRD DAY SHE IS UNCLEAN? BECAUSE IT IS SAID, BE READY AGAINST THE THIRD DAY.⁴ HOW DO WE KNOW THAT A CIRCUMCISED CHILD⁵ MAY BE BATHED [EVEN] ON THE THIRD DAY [AFTER CIRCUMCISION] WHICH FALLS ON THE SABBATH? BECAUSE IT IS SAID, AND IT CAME TO PASS ON THE THIRD DAY, WHEN THEY WERE SORE.⁶ HOW DO WE KNOW THAT A CRIMSON-COLOURED STRAP IS TIED TO THE HEAD OF THE GOAT THAT IS SENT [TO 'AZAZ'EL]?⁷ BECAUSE IT IS SAID, IF YOUR SINS BE AS SCARLET, THEY SHALL BE AS WHITE AS SNOW.⁸ HOW DO WE KNOW THAT ANOINTING IS THE SAME AS DRINKING ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT?⁹ THOUGH THERE IS NO PROOF OF THIS, YET THERE IS A SUGGESTION THEREOF, FOR IT IS SAID,

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

AND IT CAME INTO HIS INWARD PARTS LIKE WATER, AND LIKE OIL INTO HIS BONES.¹⁰

GEMARA. The first clause does not agree with R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, whilst the second clause does agree with R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, for if it [the first clause] were according to R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, we have heard from him that she is clean?¹¹ — He who does not [wish to] explain [a Mishnah] as [reflecting the views of two] Tannaim learns 'she is clean' in the first clause, and [thus] establishes the whole of it in accordance with R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah. Whilst he who does explain it as [the opinions of two] Tannaim¹² [holds that] the first clause agrees with the Rabbis, while the second is according to R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah.

Our Rabbis taught: if one [a woman] discharges semen on the third day, she is clean; this is the view of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah.¹³ R. Ishmael said: This [interval] sometimes comprises four periods,¹⁴ sometimes five, and sometimes six periods.¹⁵ R. Akiba maintained: It [the interval for uncleanness] is always [up to] five periods. And if part of the first period has gone,¹⁶ a part of the sixth period is given her.¹⁷ Now the Rabbis stated this [the following difficulty] before R. Papa—others say, R. Papa said to Raba: As for R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, it is well: he holds with the Rabbis, who maintain, Abstention [from intimacy] was effected on Thursday.¹⁸ Again, R. Ishmael holds with R. Jose that abstention was effected on Wednesday. But with whom does R. Akiba agree?¹⁹ — After all, R. Akiba holds as R. Jose, [but it is] as R. Adda b. Ahabah said: Moses ascended early in the morning and descended early in the morning. 'He ascended early in the morning,' for it is written, and Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto mount Sinai,²⁰ 'he descended early in the morning', for it is written, Go, get thee down; and thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee:²¹ this likens descent to the ascent: just as ascent was early in the morning, so was descent

early in the morning.²² But why did he [Moses] have to tell them [in the morning]? Surely R. Huna said: The Israelites are holy, and do not cohabit by day!²³ — But Raba said: If the house is in darkness, it is permitted. Raba also said others state, R. Papa: A scholar may cause darkness with his garment, and it is [then] permitted.

1. This excludes planting in a circle.
2. I.e., when it is planted in this shape the triangular wedge too is permitted. But the plot itself may contain a circle.
3. After cohabitation.
4. Ex. XIX, 15. Lit., 'three days'. The verse continues, 'come not near a woman'. The Tanna understands this to mean that intercourse was debarred to them for three whole days, including the first day of abstention, before the Giving of the Law, which took place on the fourth day. This proves that a discharge within this period would render her unclean for the day of the discharge, whereas all had to be clean at the Revelation.
5. Lit., 'the circumcised'.
6. Gen. XXXIV, 24. This shows that one is in danger until three days have elapsed, and therefore the Sabbath may be desecrated on its account by bathing the child.
7. V. Lev. XVI, 22-26.
8. Isa. I, 18. By a miracle this crimson colored strap turned white, thus showing the people that they were forgiven of their sins; V. Buchler, Sin and Atonement, p. 327.
9. That the former is interdicted equally with the latter?
10. Ps. CIX, 19. The former is a simile from drinking, the latter from anointing, and the two similes are treated as parallel.
11. V. *infra*.
12. V. B.M. 41a.
13. Thus, if she cohabits on Thursday and discharges on the Sabbath, she is clean, no matter at which part of the two days intimacy and discharge took place.
14. 'Onah, pl, 'onoth, is the technical term of a day or a night when these are equal.
15. He holds that she is unclean. Now, if cohabitation took place at the very beginning of Thursday evening whilst the discharge occurred at the end of the Sabbath, we have six periods; if at the end of Thursday night, five; and if at the end of Thursday, four. In all cases she is unclean.
16. When intimacy takes place.
17. A discharge up to then defiles her.
18. Whilst the giving of the Law took place on the Sabbath, at the very beginning of which they

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

performed their ritual ablutions to purify themselves, if they had discharged semen on the Friday. Now some may have cohabited at the end of Thursday, and yet they were fit for the Revelation on the Sabbath, which shows that a discharge of semen on the third day does not defile.

19. For the Torah speaks of days, which implies that whether intimacy took place at the beginning or at the end of the day, she would be clean on the third (or, the fourth, according to R. Jose) day, irrespective of the numbers of 'periods' that elapsed.
20. Ex. XXXIV, 4. Though this refers to his second ascent after the breaking of the first tables, it is held to show that he always went up early in the morning.
21. Ibid. XIX, 24.
22. Hence Moses' order to the Israelites to abstain from intimacy was given early Wednesday morning; this allows five full 'periods' until the beginning of the Sabbath, when they purified themselves. So Moses could have waited for the end of the day.

Shabbath 86b

But they were tebul yom?¹ — Abaye b. Rabin and R. Hanina b. Abin both say: The Torah was given to tebul yom. Now Meremar sat and reported this discussion. Said Rabina to him: Do you say that it was given, or that it was fitting [that it should be given]? I mean that it was fitting, he replied.² Yet they should have bathed at twilight and received the Torah at twilight?³ — R. Isaac quoted [as an answer], from the beginning I have not spoken in secret.⁴

Yet they could have bathed on the Sabbath morning and received the Torah on the Sabbath morning?⁵ — Said R. Isaac. It was unfitting that some should go to receive the Torah whilst others went to tebillah.⁶

R. Hiyya son of R. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: These are the views of R. Ishmael and R. Akiba; but the Sages maintain: We require six⁷ full periods.⁸

R. Hisda said: This controversy is [only] where it [the semen] issues from the woman; but if it issues from a man,⁹ it is unclean as long as it is moist. R. Shesheth objected: And every garment, and every skin, whereon is

the seed of copulation, [shall be washed with water and be unclean until the even]:¹⁰ this excludes semen that is foul.¹¹ Surely this refers [even] to that which issues from a man? — No: [only] to that which issues from a woman.

R. Papa asked: What of an Israelite's semen within a Cuthean woman?¹² [Do we say,] Because Israelites are anxious about [the observance of] precepts, their bodies are heated,¹³ but not so Gentiles, who are not anxious about precepts; or perhaps, as they eat creeping crawling things, their bodies [too] are heated? Now should you say, as they eat creeping crawling things their bodies are heated, what of [semen] within an animal?¹⁴ [Do we say,] A woman, who has a fore-uterus, causes it to become foul, but not so an animal, who s no fore-uterus; or perhaps there is no difference? The questions stands over.

Our Rabbis taught: On the sixth day of the month [Siwan] were the Ten Commandments given to Israel. R. Jose maintained: On the seventh thereof. Said Raba: All agree that they arrived in the Wilderness of Sinai on the first of the month. [For] here it is written, on this day they came into the wilderness of Sinai;¹⁵ whilst elsewhere it is written, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months;¹⁶ just as there the first of the month,¹⁷ so here [too] the first of the month [is meant]. Again, all agree that the Torah was given to Israel on the Sabbath. [For] here it is written, Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy;¹⁸ whilst elsewhere it is written, And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day:¹⁹ just as there, [he spoke] on that very day,²⁰ so here too it was on that very day.²¹ [Where] they differ is on the fixing of the New Moon. R. Jose holds that New Moon was fixed on the first day of the week [Sunday], and on that day he [Moses] said nothing to them on account of their exhaustion from the Journey. On Monday he said to them, and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests;²²

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

1. V. [Glos.](#) tebul yom, pl. tebul yom. If they had their ritual bath on Friday evening, they would not be thoroughly clean until the following evening, as a tebul yom does not become clean until the evening after his ablutions. Hence we must assume that they cleansed themselves at the end of Friday, in which case there is one 'period' short on all views.
2. But actually none discharged semen on the Friday, so that they were completely clean.
3. Rashi: According to R. Akiba, if God desired exactly five periods to elapse, why did he postpone Revelation until the morning, which suggests that six periods are necessary? Tosaf. maintains that the difficulty arises on all views.
4. Isa. XLVIII, 16 — i.e., the Torah had to be given in broad daylight.
5. If discharge after five 'periods' leaves the woman clean, cohabitation could have been permitted until the very end of Wednesday, and ritual ablution performed on the Sabbath morning, for a subsequent discharge would not matter.
6. V. [Glos.](#)
7. Wilna Gaon quotes a reading 'three'.
8. To elapse before discharge shall have no effect.
9. E.g., on to a garment.
10. Lev. XV, 27.
11. Being unfit then to engender, it does not defile.
12. For Cuthean v. *supra* p. 69, n. 4. Here, however, 'Cuthean' is the censor's substitute for 'gentile', which word appears in this passage in Nid. 34b, and also in the present discussion.
13. Which makes the semen foul and unfit to engender in three days.
14. This is merely a theoretical question. Bestiality was forbidden on pain of death (Ex. XXII, 18), and Jews were not suspected of this crime (Sanh. 27b).
15. Ex. XIX, 1.
16. Ibid. XII, 2.
17. V. Pes. 6b and Tosaf. *ibid.* s.v. [H].
18. Ex. XX, 8.
19. Ibid. XIII, 3.
20. Of their exodus — implied by 'this'.
21. I.e., the command to keep the Sabbath, and hence all the Ten Commandments were promulgated on the Sabbath itself.
22. Ex. XIX, 6.

Shabbath 87a

on Tuesday he informed them of the order to set boundaries,¹ and on Wednesday they separated themselves [from their wives].² But the Rabbis hold: New Moon was fixed on Monday, and on that day he said nothing to them on account of their exhaustion from the

journey. On Tuesday he said to them, and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests; on Wednesday he informed them of the order to set boundaries, and on Thursday they separated themselves. An objection is raised: And sanctify them to-day and to-morrow:³ this is difficult in the view of R. Jose?⁴ — R. Jose can answer you: Moses added one day of his own understanding.⁵ For it was taught, Three things did Moses do of his own understanding, and the Holy One, blessed be He, gave His approval:⁶ he added one day of his own understanding, he separated himself from his wife,⁷ and he broke the Tables. 'He added one day of his own understanding': what [verse] did he interpret? To-day and to-morrow: 'to-day' [must be] like 'tomorrow: just as to-morrow includes the [previous] night, so 'to-day' [must] include the [previous] night, but the night of to-day has already passed! Hence it must be two days exclusive of to-day. And how do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave his approval? — Since the *Shechinah* did not rest [upon Mount Sinal] until the morning of the Sabbath.⁸ And 'he separated himself from his wife': What did he interpret? He applied an *a minori* argument to himself, reasoning: If the Israelites, with whom the *Shechinah* spoke only on one occasion and He appointed them a time [thereof], yet the Torah said, Be ready against the third day: come not near a woman: I, with whom the *Shechinah* speaks at all times and does not appoint me a [definite] time, how much more so! And how do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave his approval? Because it is written, Go say to them, Return to your tents,⁹ which is followed by, But as for thee, stand thou here by me. Some there are who quote, with him [sc. Moses] will I speak mouth to mouth.¹⁰ 'He broke the Tables': how did he learn [this]? He argued: If the Passover sacrifice, which is but one of the six hundred and thirteen precepts, yet the Torah said, there shall no alien eat thereof:¹¹ here is the whole Torah, and the Israelites are apostates, how much more so!¹² And how do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave His approval? Because it is said, which

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

thou brakest,¹³ and Resh Lakish interpreted this: All strength to thee¹⁴ that thou brakest it.

Come and hear: And be ready against the third day: this is a difficulty according to R. Jose?¹⁵ — Surely we have said that Moses added one day of his own understanding!

Come and hear: The third, the third day of the month and the third day of the week:¹⁶ this is a difficulty according to the Rabbis?¹⁷ — The Rabbis answer you: with whom does this agree? with R. Jose.

In respect of what is [the first] 'the third' [mentioned]? — [In respect] of that which was taught: And Moses reported the words of the people unto the Lord;¹⁸ and it is written, And Moses told the words of the people unto the Lord.¹⁹ Now, what did the Holy One, Blessed be He, say unto Moses, what did Moses say unto Israel, what did Israel say to Moses, and what did Moses report before the Omnipotent?²⁰ This is the order of setting boundaries:²¹ that is the view of R. Jose son of R. Judah. Rabbi said: At first he explained the penalties [for non-observance], for it is written, 'And Moses reported [wa-yasheb]', [which implies] things which repel [meshabbebin] one's mind.²² But subsequently he explained its reward, for it is said, 'And Moses told [wa-yagged]', [which means,] words which draw one's heart like a narrative [aggadah]. Some there are who maintain, At first he explained the reward it confers, for it is written, 'And Moses reported [wa-yasheb]', [which means,] words which appease [meshibin] one's mind. Whilst subsequently he explained its penalties, for it is written, 'and Moses told [wa-yagged]', [meaning,] words as hard [unpleasant] to man as worm-wood [giddin].

Come and hear: The sixth, the sixth day of the month and the sixth day of the week [Friday]: this is a difficulty according to the Rabbis?²³ — This too agrees with R. Jose. In respect of what is [the first] 'the sixth' [mentioned]? — Raba said:

1. V. *ibid.* 12.
2. Though the reference to this precedes the command to set boundaries, it is nevertheless assumed that events were in this order; v. *infra*.
3. *Ibid.* 10.
4. For it implies Thursday and Friday, Revelation taking place on the Sabbath. The sanctification consisted in their separation from their wives (v. 14f).
5. The command 'sanctify them' was given him on Wednesday, and he interpreted it as implying three days.
6. Lit., 'agreed with him'.
7. Entirely, after the Revelation.
8. Had Moses' interpretation been incorrect, the *Shechinah* should have alighted Friday morning.
9. Deut, V, 30. This was permission to resume marital relations.
10. Num. XII, 8 — the same conclusion may be drawn from this.
11. Ex. XII, 43. 'Alien' is interpreted, one whose actions have alienated him from God, v. Targum *Onkelos* a.l.
12. They are surely unfit to receive the Torah!
13. *Ibid.* XXXIV, 1.
14. Lit., 'thy strength be well', an expression of approval. For further notes V. Yeb., Sonc. ed., pp. 412ff.
15. Cf. P. 411, n. 7.
16. The meaning of the first 'the third' is discussed *infra*.
17. Since they hold that New Moon was on Monday, the third was on Wednesday, not Tuesday.
18. *Ibid.* 8.
19. Ex. XXXIV, 9.
20. Lit., 'the strength'- one of the names of God. The difficulty is this: what conversations took place between v.v. 8 and 9, necessitating a second statement by Moses?
21. Though this is mentioned only in v. 12, it is assumed to have been given between Moses' two statements, the second of which signified the people's willingness to set boundaries.
22. Threats of punishment would naturally make the people reluctant to accept the Torah in the first place (Rashi). *jast.*: words which chasten, etc.
23. Since they held that New Moon was on Monday, Friday was not the sixth day of the month.

Shabbath 87b

[In respect] of their encamping.¹ R. Aha b. Jacob said: [In respect] of their journeying.² Now, they disagree about [the precept of] the Sabbath [as communicated to them at Marah, for it is written, [Observe the

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Sabbath day ...] as the Lord my God commanded thee,³ whereon Rab Judah commented in Rab's name: As he commanded thee at Marah.⁴ One Master holds: They were commanded concerning the Sabbath [in general], but not concerning tehumin.⁵ Whilst the other Master holds: They were commanded concerning tehumin too.⁶

Come and hear: As to the Nisan in which the Israelites departed from Egypt, on the fourteenth day they slaughtered their Passover sacrifices, on the fifteenth they went forth, and in the evening the first-borns were smitten. 'In the evening': can you think so!⁷ Rather say, The first-borns having been smitten the [previous] evening, and that day was a Thursday. Now, since the fifteenth of Nisan was on a Thursday, the first of Iyar was on the Sabbath,⁸ and the first of Siwan was on a Sunday,⁹ which is a difficulty according to the Rabbis? — The Rabbis answer you: Iyar in that year was indeed made full.¹⁰

Come and hear that they did not make it full! As to the Nisan in which the Israelites departed from Egypt, on the fourteenth they killed their Passover sacrifices, on the fifteenth they went forth, and in the evening the first-borns were smitten. 'In the evening' can you think so! Rather, say, The first-borns having been smitten since the [previous] evening, and that day was a Thursday. Nisan was a full month, so that [the first of] Iyar fell on the Sabbath. Iyar was defective, so that [the first of] Siwan fell on a Sunday. This is a difficulty according to the Rabbis? — That agrees with R. Jose.

R. Papa observed, Come and hear: And they took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came unto the wilderness of Sin ... on the fifteenth day of the second month.¹¹ Now that day was the Sabbath, for it is written, and in the morning, then ye shall see the glory of the Lord,¹² and it is written, six days ye shall gather it.¹³ Now, since the fifteenth of Iyar was on the Sabbath, the first of Siwan was on

a Sunday, which is a difficulty according to the Rabbis? — The Rabbis can answer you: Iyar of that year was made full.

R. Assi¹⁴ of Hozna'ah¹⁵ said to R. Ashi, Come and hear: And it came to pass in the first month of the second year, on the first day of the month, that the tabernacle was reared up;¹⁶ [and with reference to this] a Tanna taught: That day took ten crowns.¹⁷ It was the first of the Creation,¹⁸ the first for the princes,¹⁹ the first for the priesthood,²⁰ the first for [public] sacrifice, the first for the fall of fire [from Heaven],²¹ the first for the eating of sacred food,²² the first for the dwelling of the *Shechinah* in Israel, the first for the [priestly] blessing of Israel,²³ the first for the interdict of the high places,²⁴ [and] the first of months. Now, since the first of Nisan of that year was on a Sunday, that of the previous year must have been on a Wednesday. For it was taught: Others say, Between one 'Azereth²⁵ and another, and between one New Year[*'s* day] and another, there can be a difference of only four days,²⁶ and in a leap year, five [days].²⁷ Hence the first of Iyar must have fallen on the eve of the Sabbath [Friday], and the first of Siwan on the Sabbath, which is a difficulty according to both R. Jose and the Rabbis? — In R. Jose's view, seven months were declared defective;²⁸

1. The Baraita states that the sixth day from when they pitched their tents, which was on New Moon, was also the sixth of the month and the sixth day of the week.
2. From Rephidim (v. Ex. XIX, 2). He holds that they left Rephidim and came to the wilderness of Sinai on the same day.
3. Deut. V, 12. This occurs in the second Decalogue, which is a repetition of the first Decalogue. Hence these words, 'as ... commanded thee', must have been spoken on the first occasion at Sinai too, and they imply that the Israelites had already been commanded to keep the Sabbath.
4. V. Ex. XV, 25.
5. Tehum pl. tehumin, q.v. [Glos.](#)
6. Raba maintains that it was the sixth day from their encamping only, whilst they departed from Rephidim on the previous day, which was the Sabbath, since the law of tehumin was as yet non-existent. But R. Aha b. Jacob holds that

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

they must have set out from Rephidim on Sunday too, not on the Sabbath, this law already being in existence.

7. For this implies that the death of the first-borns took place after their departure.
8. Nisan containing thirty days.
9. Iyar containing twenty-nine days.
10. Before the calendar was fixed by calculation months might be made full (thirty days) or defective (twenty-nine days) according to the exigencies of the moment.
11. Ex. XVI, 1.
12. Ibid. 7.
13. Ibid. 26. Now, the manna first fell on the day after they arrived at Sin, for Moses says 'and in the morning', i.e., tomorrow, 'ye shall see the glory', etc. which refers to the manna. Since Moses permitted them to gather it for six days, the first must have been Sunday, and the previous day was the Sabbath.
14. So the text as emended by BaH.
15. (Be-) Hozae, Khuzistan.
16. Ex. XL, 17.
17. I.e., it was pre-eminent in ten things.
18. I.e., it was a Sunday.
19. To make their offerings for the dedication of the Tabernacle, v. Num. VII.
20. When Aaron began to officiate as a priest, v. Lev. IX; before that Divine Service was performed by first-borns.
21. V. ibid. 24.
22. I.e., flesh of sacrifices, which had henceforth to be eaten within a fixed locale, whereas hitherto it might be consumed anywhere.
23. By Aaron, v. ibid. 22.
24. Upon which sacrifices were offered before the erection of the Tabernacle.
25. Lit., 'solemn assembly' — the Feast of Weeks.
26. I.e., one falls four days later in the week than the previous year's, since the Jewish year, which is lunar, consists of three hundred and fifty-four days.
27. An extra month of twenty-nine days being intercalated.
28. So there was a difference of three days, not four, that year consisting of three hundred and fifty-three days, which makes the first of Siwan fall on a Sunday.

Shabbath 88a

in that of the Rabbis', eight months were declared defective.¹

Come and hear: For it was taught in the Seder 'Olam:² As to the Nisan in which the Israelites departed from Egypt, on the fourteenth they slaughtered their Passover

sacrifices, on the fifteenth they went out, and that day was the Sabbath eve. Now, since the first of Nisan was the Sabbath eve, the first of Iyar was on a Sunday, and [the first of] Siwan on a Monday. This is a difficulty according to R. Jose? — R. Jose answers you: This agrees with the Rabbis.

Come and hear: R. Jose said: On the second day Moses ascended and descended;³ on the third he ascended and descended;⁴ on the fourth he descended and ascended no more.⁵ But since he did not go up,⁶ whence did he descend? — Rather [say,] on the fourth he ascended and descended; on the fifth he built an altar and offered a sacrifice thereon; [but] on the sixth he had no time. Surely that was on account of [the giving of] the Torah?⁷ — No: it was on account of the preparations for⁸ the Sabbath.⁹

A certain Galilean lectured before R. Hisda:¹⁰ Blessed be the Merciful One who gave a three-fold Torah¹¹ to a three-fold people¹² through a third[-born]¹³ on the third day¹⁴ in the third month. With whom does this agree? With the Rabbis.¹⁵

And they stood under the mount:¹⁶ R. Abdimi b. Hama b. Hasa said: This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, overturned the mountain upon them like an [inverted] cask, and said to them, 'If ye accept the Torah, 'tis well; if not, there shall be your burial.' R. Aha b. Jacob observed: This furnishes a strong protest against the Torah.¹⁷ Said Raba, Yet even so, they re-accepted it in the days of Ahasuerus, for it is written, [the Jews] confirmed, and took upon them [etc.]:¹⁸ [i.e.,] they confirmed what they had accepted long before. Hezekiah said: What is meant by, Thou didst cause sentence to be heard from Heaven; The earth feared, and was tranquil:¹⁹ if it feared, why was it tranquil, and if it was tranquil, why did it fear? But at first it feared, yet subsequently it was tranquil,²⁰ And why did it fear? — Even in accordance with Resh Lakish. For Resh Lakish said: Why is it written, And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day;²¹ What is the purpose of the additional

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

'the'?²² This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, stipulated with the Works of Creation and said thereto. 'If Israel accepts the Torah, ye shall exist; but if not, I will turn you back into emptiness and formlessness.'²³

R. Simla lectured: When the Israelites gave precedence to 'we will do' over 'we will hearken,'²⁴ six hundred thousand ministering angels came and set two crowns upon each man of Israel, one as a reward for²⁵ 'we will do,' and the other as a reward for 'we will hearken'. But as soon as Israel sinned,²⁶ one million two hundred thousand destroying angels descended and removed them, as it is said, And the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments from mount Horeb.²⁷ R. Hama son of R. Hanina said: At Horeb they put them on and at Horeb they put them off. At Horeb they put them on, as we have stated. At Horeb they put them off, for it is written, And [the children of Israel] stripped themselves, etc. R. Johanan observed: And Moses was privileged and received them all, for in proximity thereto it is stated, And Moses took the tent.²⁸ Resh Lakish said: [Yet] the Holy One, blessed be He, will return them to us in the future, for it is said, and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads;²⁹ the joy from of old³⁰ shall be upon their heads.

R. Eleazar said: When the Israelites gave precedence to 'we will do' over 'we will hearken,' a Heavenly Voice went forth and exclaimed to them, Who revealed to My children this secret, which is employed by the Ministering Angels, as it is written, Bless the Lord, ye angels of his. Ye mighty in strength, that fulfill his word, That hearken unto the voice of his word:³¹ first they fulfill and then they hearken?

R. Hama son of R. Hanina said: What is meant by, As the apple tree among the trees of the wood, [So is my beloved among the sons]:³² why were the Israelites compared to an apple tree? To teach you: just as the fruit of the apple tree precedes its leaves,³³ so did

the Israelites give precedence to 'we will do' over 'we will hearken'.

There was a certain Sadducee who saw Raba³⁴ engrossed in his studies while the finger[s] of his hand were under his feet, and he ground them down, so that his fingers spurted blood. 'Ye rash people,' he exclaimed, 'who gave precedence to your mouth over your ears: ye still persist in your rashness. First ye should have listened, if within your powers, accept; if not, ye should not have accepted.' Said he to him, 'We

1. Hence the year consisted of three hundred and fifty-two days, And the first of Siwan fell on a Monday.
2. The Seder 'Olam is the earliest extant post-exilic chronicle in Hebrew, and is a chronological record extending from Adam to Bar Kochba's revolt during the reign of Hadrian. Most scholars are agreed in assigning its authorship to R. Halafta, a Tanna of the first century, on the strength of a statement by R. Johanan in Yeb. 82b. V. J.E., art. Seder 'Olam Rabbah.
3. Hearing, 'and ye shall be ... a kingdom of priests' and telling it to the people.
4. Being given the order to set boundaries.
5. Until the Revelation.
6. On the fourth.
7. Which supports the Rabbis that the Torah was given on the sixth of the month.
8. Lit., 'trouble of'.
9. The sixth of the month being Friday, the eve of the Sabbath.
10. In the public lectures or sermons the scholar sat and whispered his statements to a speaker, who conveyed them to the people; this Galilean was probably R. Hisda's speaker (generally referred to as 'meturgeman').
11. I.e., the Torah (Pentateuch), Prophets and Hagiographa.
12. Israel consisting of Priests, Levites, and Israelites.
13. Sc. Moses, born third after Miriam and Aaron.
14. Of their separation from their wives.
15. For according to R. Jose it was on the fourth day of their separation, Moses having added a day (*supra* 87a).
16. Ex. XIX. 17. The translation is literal. E.V. nether part.
17. It provides an excuse for non-observance, since it was forcibly imposed in the first place.
18. Esth. IX, 27.
19. Ps. LXXVI, 9.
20. It feared lest Israel would reject the Torah, and became tranquil when Israel accepted it.
21. Gen. I, 31.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

22. In the case of the other days it is simply stated, a second day, a third day, etc. 'a' being altogether unexpressed in Hebrew.
23. He thus translates homiletically: and the continuance of morning and evening was depended on the sixth day, sc. of Siwan, when Israel was offered the Torah. The general idea is: Without law and order as exemplified by the Torah the world must lapse into chaos and anarchy.
24. V. Ex. XXIV, 7. Thus they promised to obey God's commands even before hearing them.
25. Lit., 'corresponding to'.
26. Through the Golden Calf
27. I.e., which they had received at Mount Horeb. Ibid. XXXIII, 6. E.V. from mount onwards'.
28. Ibid. 7 — The reference is not clear. V. Rashi.
29. Isa. XXXV, 10.
30. The verse may be translated thus.
31. Ps. CIII, 20.
32. Cant. II, 3. The two lovers in this poem were regarded as God and Israel.
33. Tosaf. observes this is untrue of the apple tree, which grows like all other trees; consequently refer this to the citron tree. As the citron remains on the tree from one year to the next, at which time the tree sheds its' leaves of the previous year, the fruit may be said to precede the leaves.
34. There were no Sadducees in Raba's time, and the word is probably a censor's substitute for Gentile. In J.E. X, 633 bottom it is suggested that he was probably a Manichean. [MS.M: Min (v. [Glos.](#))].

Shabbath 88b

who walked in integrity, of us it is written, The integrity of the upright shall guide them.¹ But of others, who walked in perversity, it is written, but the perverseness of the treacherous shall destroy them.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name. What is meant by, Thou hast ravished my heart, my sister, my bride: Thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes?² In the beginning with one of thine eyes; when thou fulfilllest, with both thine eyes.³

'Ulla said: Shameless is the bride that plays the harlot within her bridal canopy!⁴ Said R. Mari the son of Samuel's daughter, What verse [refers to this]? While the king sat at his table, [my spikenard gave up its fragrance].⁵ Said Rab, Yet [His] love was still

with us, for 'gave' is written, not 'made noisome'.

Our Rabbis taught: Those who are insulted but do not insult, hear themselves reviled without answering, act through love and rejoice in suffering, of them the Writ saith, But they who love Him are as the sun when he goeth forth in his might.⁶

R. Johanan said: What is meant by the verse, The Lord giveth the word: They that publish the tidings are a great host?⁷ — Every single word that went forth from the Omnipotent was split up into seventy languages.⁸ The School of R. Ishmael taught: And like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces,⁹ just as a hammer is divided into many sparks,¹⁰ so every single word that went forth from the Holy One, blessed be He, split up into seventy languages.¹¹

R. Hananel b. Papa said: What is meant by, Hear, for I will speak princely things:¹² why are the words of the Torah compared to a prince? To tell you: just as a prince has power of life and death, so have the words of the Torah [potentialities] of life and death. Thus Raba said; To those who go to the right hand thereof it is a medicine of life; to those who go to the left hand thereof¹³ it is a deadly poison. Another interpretation: princely' [denotes] that on every word which went forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, two crowns were set.¹⁴

R. Joshua b. Levi said: What is meant by, My beloved is unto me as a bundle of myrrh [zeror ha-mor], That lieth betwixt my breasts?¹⁵ The congregation of Israel spake before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Though my life be distressed [mezar] and embittered [memar], yet my love lieth betwixt my breasts.'¹⁶ My beloved is unto me as a cluster [eshkol] of henna-flowers [*kofer*] in the vineyards of [karme] En-gedi:¹⁷ He to Whom everything belongs [she-ha-kol shelo] shall make atonement [mekapper] for me for the sin of the kid¹⁸ which I stored up [karamti] for myself.¹⁹ Where is it implied that this

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

word 'karme' connotes gathering? — Said Mar Zutra the son of R. Nahman: Even as we learnt: A fuller's stool on which linen is heaped up [kormin].²⁰

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: What is meant by, His cheeks are as a bed of spices?²¹ With every single word that went forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, the whole world was filled with spices [fragrance]. But since it was filled from the first word, whither did the [fragrance of the] second word go? The Holy One, blessed be He, brought forth the wind from His store-chambers and caused each to pass on in order,²² as it is said, His lips are as lilies [shoshannim], dropping myrrh that passess on:²³ read not shoshannim but sheshonim.²⁴

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: At every word which went forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, the souls of Israel departed, for it is said, My soul went forth when he spake.²⁵ But since their souls departed at the first word, how could they receive the second word? — He brought down the dew with which He will resurrect the dead and revived them, as it is said, Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, Thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary.²⁶

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: At every single word which went forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, the Israelites retreated twelve *mil*, but the ministering angels led them back [medaddin],²⁷ as it is said, The hosts of angels²⁸ march, they march [yiddodun yiddodun]:²⁹ read not yiddodun but yedaddun [they lead].

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: When Moses ascended on high, the ministering angels spake before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! What business has one born of woman amongst us?' 'He has come to receive the Torah,' answered He to them. Said they to Him, 'That secret treasure, which has been hidden by Thee for nine hundred and seventy-four generations before the world was created.³⁰ Thou desirest to give

to flesh and blood! What is man, that thou art mindful of him, And the son of man, that thou visitest him? O Lord our God, How excellent is thy name in all the earth! Who hast set thy glory [the Torah] upon the Heavens!'³¹ 'Return them an answer,' bade the Holy One, blessed be He, to Moses. 'Sovereign of the Universe' replied he, 'I fear lest they consume me with the [fiery] breath of their mouths.' 'Hold on to the Throne of Glory,' said He to him, 'and return them an answer,' as it is said, He maketh him to hold on to the face of his throne, And spreadeth [PaRSHeZ] his cloud over him,³² whereon R. Nahman³³ observed: This teaches that the Almighty [SHaddai] spread [Pirash] the luster [Ziw] of His *Shechinah*³⁴ and cast it as a protection³⁵ over him. He [then] spake before Him: Sovereign of the Universe! The Torah which Thou givest me, what is written therein? I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt.³⁶ Said he to them [the angels], 'Did ye go down to Egypt; were ye enslaved to Pharaoh: why then should the Torah be yours? Again, What is written therein? Thou shalt have none other gods:³⁷ do ye dwell among peoples that engage in

1. Prov. XI, 3.
2. Cant. IV, 9.
3. Maharsha: A thing may be perceived spiritually and materially. When the Israelites first accepted the Torah they perceived its greatness in spirit only, i.e., in theory (one eye). Having observed it, they saw materially too, i.e., in actual practice (both eyes).
4. Thus did Israel make the Golden Calf at Mount Sinai itself.
5. Ibid. I, 12. i.e., while the King, viz., God, was at Sinai, the Israelites lost their fragrance through sin.
6. Judg. V, 31.
7. Ps. LXVIII, 12.
8. The traditional number of the languages of man, i.e., the Torah was given to all humanity. Cf. M. Joseph, *Judaism as Creed and Life*, pp. 157 seq.
9. Jer. XXIII, ag.
10. Perhaps referring to the sparks that fly off when it beats the anvil.
11. Commentators differ as to the exact point of the comparison; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 214, n. 9.
12. Prov. VIII, 6.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

13. These phrases probably mean, to those who employ it rightly ... wrongly, cf. *supra* P. 197, n. 5. which seems, however, inapplicable here.
14. The words themselves having substance: cf. the Greek doctrine of the logos.
15. Cant. I, 13.
16. I.e., God is with Israel in all his sorrows. This translation follows Maharsha; Rashi interprets differently-Zeror and ka-mor are connected here with mezar and memar.
17. Ibid. 14.
18. Gedi, kid standing for small cattle in general, and here referring to the Golden Calf.
19. For future punishment. Thus eshkol is connected with shehakol shelo, kopher with mekapper, karme with karamti, and En-gedi with gedi, a kid.
20. V. Kel. XXIII, 4.
21. Cant. V, 13.
22. The fragrance of each word was carried of to the Garden of Eden, leaving room for the next.
23. Ibid. E. V.: liquid myrrh.
24. That study, i.e.. His words spread fragrance.
25. Ibid. 6.
26. Ps. LXVIII, 10.
27. The word denotes to lead step by step, like one leads a child who can hardly walk.
28. Our texts read: Kings.
29. Ibid. 13.
30. Cf. Weber, *Judische Theologie*, p. 15 for parallels.
31. Ps. VIII, 5, 2.
32. Job XXVI, 9.
33. In Suk. 5a the reading is Tanhum.
34. Thus Parshez is treated as an abbreviation; in Hebrew the words follow the same order as these letters.
35. Lit., 'cloud'.
36. Ex. XX, 2.
37. Ibid. 3.

Shabbath 89a

idol worship? Again what is written therein? *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy:*¹ do ye then perform work, that ye need to rest? Again what is written therein? *Thou shalt not take [tissa] [the name ... in vain]:*² is there any business [*massa*] dealings among you?³ Again what is written therein, *Honor thy father and thy mother;*⁴ have ye fathers and mothers? Again what is written therein? *Thou shalt not murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal;*⁵ is there jealousy among you; is the Evil Tempter among you? Straightway they conceded

[right] to the Holy One, blessed be He, for it is said, *O Lord, our Lord, How excellent is thy name, etc.*⁶ whereas *'Who has set thy glory upon the heavens'* is not written.⁷ Immediately each one was moved to love him [Moses] and transmitted something to him, for it is said, *Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast taken spoils [the Torah]; Thou hast received gifts on account of man.*⁸ as a recompense for their calling thee man [adam]⁹ thou didst receive gifts. The Angel of Death too confided his secret to him, for it is said, *and he put on the incense, and made atonement for the people;*¹⁰ and it is said, *and he stood between the dead and the living, etc.*¹¹ Had he not told it to him, whence had he known it?

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: When Moses descended from before the Holy One, blessed be He, Satan came and asked Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Where is the Torah? 'I have given it to the earth.' answered He to him. He went to the earth and said to her, 'Where is the Torah?' 'God understandeth the way thereof, etc.'¹² she replied. He went to the sea and it told him, 'It is not with me.' He went to the deep and it said to him, 'It is not in me,' for it is said. *The deep saith, It is not in me: And the sea saith, It is not with me. Destruction and Death say, We have heard a rumor thereof with our ears.*¹³ He went back and declared before Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! I have searched throughout all the earth but have not found it!' 'Go thee to the son of Amram. answered He. [So] he went to Moses and asked him, 'Where is the Torah which the Holy One, blessed be He, gave unto thee?' 'Who am I then,' he retorted, 'that the Holy One, blessed be He, should give me the Torah?' Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to Moses, 'Moses, art thou a liar!' 'Sovereign of the Universe!' he replied, 'Thou hast a stored-up treasure in which Thou takest delight every day: shall I keep the benefit for myself?'¹⁴ 'Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to Moses, 'Moses, since thou hast [humbly] disparaged thyself, it shall be called by thy name, as it is said, *Remember ye the law of Moses my servant.*¹⁵

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: When Moses ascended on high, he found the Holy One, blessed be He, tying crowns on the letters [of the Torah].¹⁶ Said He to him, 'Moses, is there no [greeting of] Peace in thy town?'¹⁷ 'Shall a servant extend [a greeting of] Peace to his Master!' replied he: 'Yet thou shouldst have assisted Me,'¹⁸ said He. Immediately¹⁹ he cried out to Him, And now, I pray thee, let the power of the Lord be great, according as thou hast spoken.²⁰

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: Why is it written; And when the people, saw that Moses delayed [boshesh] [to come down from the mount]?²¹ 'Read not boshesh' [delayed] but ba'u shesh [the sixth hour had come]. When Moses ascended on high, he said to Israel, I will return at the end of forty days, at the beginning of the sixth hour.²² At the end of forty days Satan came and confounded the world. Said he to them: 'Where is your teacher Moses?' 'He has ascended on high,' they answered him. 'The sixth [hour] has come,' said he to them, but they disregarded him. 'He is dead' — but they disregarded him. [Thereupon] he showed them a vision of his bier, and this is what they said to Aaron, for this Moses, the man, etc.²³

One of the Rabbis asked R. Kahana: Hast thou heard what the mountain of Sinai [connotes]? The mountain whereon miracles [nissim] were performed for Israel, he replied. Then it should be called Mount Nisal? But [it means] the mountain whereon a happy augury [siman] took place for Israel. Then it should be called, Mount Simanai? Said he to him, Why dost thou not frequent [the academy of] R. Papa and R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, who make a study of *aggadah*. For R. Hisda and Rabbah the son of R. Huna both said, What is [the meaning of] Mount Sinai? The mountain whereon there descended hostility [*sin'ah*] toward idolaters.²⁴ And thus R. Jose son of R. Hanina said: It has five names: The Wilderness of Zin, [meaning] that Israel were given commandments there;²⁵ the Wilderness of Kadesh, where the Israelites were

sanctified [kadosh], the Wilderness of Kedemoth, because a priority [kedumah] was conferred there;²⁶ the Wilderness of Paran,

1. Ibid. 8.
2. Ibid. 7.
3. This connects *tissa* with *massa*. [Or, to involve you in a false oath.]
4. Ibid. 12.
5. Ibid. 13-15.
6. Ps. VIII, 10.
7. Showing that they no longer demanded that the Torah be kept in Heaven.
8. Ps. LXVIII, 19.
9. I.e., for their disparaging reference to thee as a mere mortal created from the dust (adamah); cf. Gen. II, 7, where the Hebrew for 'Man' and 'ground' are adam and adamah respectively.
10. Num. XVI, 47.
11. Ibid. 48.
12. Job. XXVIII, 23.
13. Ibid. 14, 22.
14. Surely it was not given to me alone!
15. Mal. III, 22.
16. The 'crowns' or 'Taggin', as they are generally designated, are three small strokes (*ziyyunim* = daggers) which are written on the top of the letters [H]. For a discussion of their origin and purpose v. J.E. art. Taggin.
17. Shalom (peace) is the usual greeting in Hebrew.
18. By wishing Me success in My labors.
19. At a later ascent (Rashi).
20. Num. XIV, 17.
21. Ex. XXXII, 1.
22. I.e., at midday.
23. Ibid.
24. They showed their unworthiness by rejecting the Torah.
25. Zin being connected with ziwah, 'he commanded'.
26. I.e., Israel was made pre-eminent by his acceptance of the Torah. [Or, the Torah which preceded Creation, v. Pes. 54a.]

Shabbath 89b

because Israel was fruitful [paru] and multiplied there; and the Wilderness of Sinai, because hostility toward idolaters descended thereon. Whilst what was its [real] name? Its name was Horeb. Now they disagree with R. Abbahu, For R. Abbahu said: its name was Mount Sinai, and why was it called Mount Horeb? Because desolation [hurbah] to idolaters descended thereon.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

HOW DO WE KNOW THAT A CRIMSON-COLOURED STRAP IS TIED, etc. [Instead of] ka-shanim [like scarlet threads], kashani [like a scarlet thread] is required?¹ Said R. Isaac, The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Israel: [Even] if your sins be like these years [ka-shanim] which have continued in ordered fashion from the six days of the Creation until now,² yet they shall be as white as snow.³

Raba lectured: What is meant by, Go now, and let us reason together, shall say the Lord.⁴ [Instead of] 'Go now', Come now, is required: [instead of] 'shall say the Lord', saith the Lord, is required?⁵ in the time to come the Holy One, blessed be He, shall say unto Israel, 'Go now to your forefathers, and they will reprove you.'⁶ And they shall say before Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! To whom shall we go? To Abraham, to whom Thou didst say, Know of a surety [that thy seed shall be a stranger ... and they shall afflict them ...],⁷ yet he did not entreat mercy for us? To Isaac, who blessed Esau, And it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have dominion,⁸ and yet he did not entreat mercy for us? To Jacob, to whom Thou didst say, *I will go down with thee into Egypt*,⁹ and yet he did not entreat mercy for us? To whom then shall we go now? [Rather] let the Lord state [our wrongs]!¹⁰ The Holy One, shall answer them, Since ye have made yourselves dependent upon Me, 'though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow'.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani also said in R. Jonathan's name: What is meant by, For thou art our father, though Abraham knoweth is not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us: thou, O Lord, art our father; our redeemer from everlasting is thy name?¹¹ In the future to come the Holy One, blessed be He, will say to Abraham. 'Thy children have sinned against Me.' He shall answer Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Let them be wiped out for the sanctification of Thy Name.' Then shall He say, 'I will say this to Jacob, who experienced the pain of bringing up children: peradventure he will

supplicate mercy for them. 'So He will say to him, 'Thy children have sinned.' He [too] shall answer Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Let them be wiped out for the sanctification of Thy Name.' He shall retort, 'There is no reason in old men, and no counsel in children!' Then shall he say to Isaac, 'Thy children have sinned against me.' But he shall answer Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Are they my children and not Thy children. When they gave precedence to "we will do" over "we will hearken" before Thee, Thou calledst them, Israel my son, my firstborn:¹² now they are my sons, not Thy sons! Moreover, how much have they sinned? How many are the years of man? Seventy. Subtract twenty, for which Thou dost not punish,¹³ [and] there remain fifty. Subtract twenty-five which comprise the nights,¹⁴ [and] there remain twenty-five. Subtract twelve and a half of prayer, eating, and Nature's calls, [and] there remain twelve and a half. If Thou wilt bear all, 'tis well; if not, half be upon me and half upon Thee. And shouldst Thou say, they must all be upon me, lo! I offered myself up before Thee [as a sacrifice]!' [Thereupon] they shall commence and say, 'For thou [i.e., Isaac] art our father.' Then shall Isaac say to them, 'Instead of praising me, praise the Holy One, blessed be He,' and Isaac shall show them the Holy One, blessed be He, with their own eyes. Immediately they shall lift up their eyes on high and exclaim, 'Thou, O Lord, art our father; our redeemer from everlasting is thy name.'

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: it was fitting for our father Jacob to go down into Egypt in iron chains, but that his merit saved him,¹⁵ for it is written, I drew them with the cords of a man, with bands of love; and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat before them.¹⁶

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT WOOD, [THE STANDARD FOR CULPABILITY IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR BOILING A LIGHT EGG; [SEASONING] SPICES, AS

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR SEASONING A LIGHT EGG; AND THEY COMBINE WITH EACH OTHER.¹⁷ NUTSHELLS, POMEGRANATE SHELLS, WOAD AND MADDER, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR DYEING THE SMALL PIECE OF CLOTH AT THE OPENING [TOP] OF A NETWORK. URINE, NATRON,¹⁸ LYE,¹⁹ CIMOLIAN EARTH,²⁰ AND ASHLEG,²¹ AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR WASHING THE SMALL PIECE OF CLOTH AT THE OPENING [TOP] OF A NETWORK; R. JUDAH SAID: AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR REMOVING THE STAIN.²²

GEMARA. [But] we have [already] learnt it once: A reed, (the standard is) as much as is required for making a pen. But if it is thick or crushed, as much as is required for boiling the lightest of eggs beaten up and placed in a stew pot?²³ — You might say, [That is only] there, because it is unfit for anything [else], but since wood is fit for the tooth of a key, for no matter how little involved [culpability is]; hence we are informed [otherwise].

[SEASONING] SPICES, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR SEASONING A LIGHT EGG. But the following contradicts this: Spices of two or three designations²⁴ belonging to the same species or three [different] species are forbidden,²⁵ and they combine with each other.²⁶ And Hezekiah observed;

1. Isaiah should employ the singular, parallel to 'snow' in the other half of the sentence.
2. I.e., no matter how deeply sin has eaten into you.
3. Isa. I, 18.
4. Ibid.
5. E.V. is 'come' and 'saith', but these translations are inexact.
6. Or, convince you — of your wrong-doing.
7. Gen. XV, 13.
8. Ibid. XXVII, 40.
9. Ibid. XLVI, 4.
10. Do Thou rebuke us, not they, for they did not show themselves merciful.
11. Isa. LXIII, 16.
12. Ex. IV. 22.
13. Rashi: As we find God did not punish those up to twenty years of age who accepted the report of the spies; v. Num. XIV, 29.

14. When one sleeps and does not sin.
15. Lit., 'caused it for him' — that he went down as Joseph's honored guest.
16. Hos. XI, 4.
17. To make up the standard.
18. V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 330, n. 5.
19. A sort of soap.
20. A clay used for cleansing.
21. A kind of alkali or mineral used as soap.
22. Caused by a menstruous woman, v. Sanh. 49b.
23. And obviously the same applies to wood.
24. Rashi: e.g., black pepper, white pepper, etc. Tosaf.: spices forbidden under various headings, e.g., 'orlah, kil'ayim, etc.
25. If used for seasoning food, the food is interdicted.
26. If there is not sufficient in one to impart a flavor but only in combination with each other.

Shabbath 90a

They learnt this of sweetening condiments,¹ Since they are fit for sweetening a dish. Thus it is only because they are fit for sweetening a dish, but otherwise it is not so? — Here too [in our Mishnah] they are fit for sweetening.

NUTSHELLS, POMEGRANATE SHELLS, WOAD AND MADDER, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR DYEING THE SMALL PIECE OF CLOTH, [etc.]. But this contradicts it: If one carries out dissolved dyes,² [the standard is] as much as is required for dyeing a sample color for wool?³ — Said R. Nahman in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha: That is because no man troubles to steep dyes in order to dye therewith a sample color for wool.

URINE. A Tanna taught: Urine, until forty days.⁴

NATRON. it was taught: Alexandrian natron, but not natron of Antipatris.⁵

LYE [BORITH]. Rab Judah said: That is sand. But it was taught: Borith and sand? Rather what is Borith? Sulphur. An objection is raised: To these were added halbezin⁶ and le'enn⁷ and borith and ahol.⁸ But if you maintain that it is sulphur, is then sulphur subject to shebi'ith? Surely it was taught: This is the general rule: Whatever as a root is subject to shebi'ith, but that which

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

has no root is not subject to shebi'ith? But what is borith? Ahala.² But it was taught: And borith and ahala?¹⁰ — There are two kinds of ahala.

CIMOLIAN EARTH. Rab Judah said: That is 'pull out stick in.'¹¹

ASHLEG. Samuel said: I asked all seafarers and they told me that it is called shunana; it is found in the cavity wherein the pearl lies and it is scraped out with an iron nail.

MISHNAH. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] LONG PEPPER, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY, ITRAN,¹² OF WHATEVER QUANTITY, VARIOUS KINDS OF PERFUME, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY, VARIOUS KINDS OF METAL, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY, [PIECES] OF THE ALTAR STONES OR THE ALTAR EARTH, MOTH-EATEN SCROLLS OR THEIR MOTH-EATEN MANTLES, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY, [HE IS CULPABLE]. BECAUSE THEY ARE STORED AWAY IN ORDER TO BE HIDDEN.¹³ R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO HE WHO CARRIES OUT THE SERVICE VESSELS OF IDOLS, OF WHATEVER SIZE, [IS CULPABLE], FOR IT IS SAID, AND THERE SHALL NOT CLEAVE AUGHT OF THE ACCURSED THING TO THINE HAND.¹⁴

GEMARA. Of what use is any [small] quantity of long pepper? For [dispelling] the [evil] odor of one's mouth.

ITRAN, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY. What is this good for? For megrim.

VARIOUS KINDS OF PERFUME, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY. Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out a malodorous [perfume], [the standard is] however little: good oil, however little: crimson [dye],¹⁵ however little; and a closed rose,¹⁶ [the standard is] one. **VARIOUS KINDS OF METAL, OF WHATEVER QUANTITY.** What is it fit for? — It was taught; R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Because one can make a small goad out of it.

Our Rabbis taught: If one says, 'Behold, I vow¹⁷ iron,'¹⁸ — others rule:¹⁹ He must not

give less than a square cubit [of sheet iron]. What is it fit for? — Said R. Joseph: To ward off the ravens.²⁰ Some state, Others rule: He must not give less than a raven barrier. And how much is that? — Said R. Joseph: A square cubit. [If he vows] brass, he must not give less than a silver *ma'ah* [its worth]. it was taught, R. Eleazar said: He must not give less than a small brass hook. What is it fit for?²¹ — Said Abaye, The wicks were scraped out and the branches [of the candelabrum] were cleansed therewith.

MOTH-EATEN SCROLLS AND MOTH-EATEN MANTLES. Rab Judah said: The worm [mekak] that attacks scrolls, the worm [tekak] of silk, the mite [ela] of grapes, the worm [pah] of figs, and the worm [heh] of pomegranates are all dangerous.²² A certain disciple was sitting before R. Johanan eating figs. 'My Master,' he exclaimed, there are thorns in the figs. 'The pah [worm] has killed this person,' answered he.²³

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT A PEDLAR'S BASKET, THOUGH IT CONTAINS MANY COMMODITIES, HE INCURS ONLY ONE SIN-OFFERING. [FOR] GARDEN-SEEDS, [THE STANDARD IS] LESS THAN THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG; R. JUDAH B. BATHYRA RULED: FIVE.

1. I.e., where the different kinds of spices are all for sweetening.
2. Ready for use.
3. Given to the dyer.
4. After that it loses its efficacy as a cleansing agent, and the standard of the Mishnah does not apply.
5. A city founded by Herod the Great c. 10 B.C.E. in the plain of Kefar Saba. it was the most northerly limit of Judea (Tosaf. Git. VII. 9; Yoma 69a), and about twenty-six miles south of Caesarea.
6. Jast.: bulb of ornithogalum.
7. Jast.: garden-orache.
8. Jast.: an alcalic plant used as soap. — These were added to the list of plants subject to the laws of the seventh year (shebi'ith).
9. Jast.: a mineral substance used for cleansing. Maim. Nid. IX, 6. states that it is a vegetable.
10. This is not the same Baraitha as cited before; v. Maharsha.
11. A popular nickname for Cimolian carth.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

12. A kind of resin used for lighting: cf. *supra* 24b.
13. When a sacred thing ceases to be fit for use, it must be 'hidden', i.e., buried or otherwise disposed of in accordance with the regulations stated in Meg. 26b, but not thrown away.
14. Deut. XIII, 17.
15. V. p. 218, n. 11.
16. Lit., 'the virgin of a rose'.
17. Lit., 'I (take) upon myself'.
18. To the Temple.
19. 'Others' frequently refers to R. Meir, Hor. 13b.
20. Rashi: spiked sheets of metal were placed on the Temple roof to prevent birds from alighting thereon; v. M.K. 9a.
21. In the Temple.
22. To him who eats them.
23. They are dangerous worms, not thorns.

Shabbath 90b

[FOR] CUCUMBER SEED, [THE STANDARD IS] TWO; SEED OF GOURDS, TWO; SEED OF EGYPTIAN BEANS, TWO. IF ONE CARRIES OUT A LIVE CLEAN¹ LOCUST, WHATEVER ITS SIZE; DEAD, [ITS STANDARD IS] THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG. THE BIRD OF THE VINEYARDS,² WHETHER LIVE OR DEAD, WHATEVER ITS SIZE, BECAUSE IT IS STORED AWAY FOR A MEDICINE.³ R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO HE WHO CARRIES OUT A LIVE UNCLEAR LOCUST, WHATEVER ITS SIZE, [IS CULPABLE], BECAUSE IT IS PUT AWAY FOR A CHILD TO PLAY WITH.

GEMARA. But this contradicts it: Manure, or thin sand, [the standard is] as much as is required for fertilizing a cabbage stalk: this is R. Akiba's view. But the Sages maintain: For fertilizing one leek-plant?⁴ — Said R. Papa: In the one case it is sown, and in the other it is not, because one does not trouble to carry out a single seed for sowing.

CUCUMBER SEED. Our Rabbis taught: if one carries out kernels [of dates], — If for planting, [the standard for culpability is] two; if for eating, as much as fills the mouth of a swine. And how much fills the mouth of a swine? One. If for fuel, as much as is required for boiling a light egg; if for calculating,⁵ two — others say, five.

Our Rabbis taught: if one carries out two hairs of a horse's tail or a cow's tail, he is culpable, because these are laid aside for [bird] snares. Of the stiff bristles of a swine, one [involves liability]; of palm bands,⁶ two; of palm fillets,⁷ one.

THE BIRD OF THE VINEYARDS, WHETHER LIVE OR DEAD, WHATEVER ITS SIZE. What is the bird of the vineyards? — Said Rab: Palya be'ari.⁸ Abaye observed: And it is found in a palm tree of [only] one covering, and it is prepared [as food] for [acquiring] wisdom; one eats half of its right [side] and half of its left, places it [the rest] in a brass tube and seals it with sixty [i.e., many] seals and suspends it around his left arm; and the token thereof is. A wise man's heart is at his right hand; but a fool's heart is at his left.⁹ He acquires as much wisdom as he desires, studies as much as he desires, and [then] eats the other half, for if [he does] not, his learning will vanish.¹⁰

R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO HE WHO CARRIES OUT, etc. But the first Tanna holds, Not so.¹¹ What is the reason? Lest he [the child] eat it. If so, a clean [locust] is the same, for R. Kahana was standing before Rab and passing a shoshiba¹² in front of his mouth. 'Take it away,' said he to him, 'that people should not say that you are eating it and thereby violating [the injunction], ye shall not make yourselves abominable.'¹³ Rather [the reason is] lest it dies and he [the child] eat it. But R. Judah [holds], if it dies the child will indeed weep for it.¹⁴

CHAPTER X

MISHNAH. IF ONE LAYS [AUGHT] ASIDE FOR SOWING, FOR A SAMPLE, OR FOR A MEDICINE, AND [THEN] CARRIES IT OUT ON THE SABBATH, HE IS CULPABLE WHATEVER ITS SIZE.¹⁵ BUT ALL OTHERS ARE NOT CULPABLE THEREFOR SAVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS STANDARD.¹⁶ IF HE CARRIES IT BACK AGAIN,¹⁷ HE IS LIABLE ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS STANDARD.¹⁸

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

GEMARA. Why must he teach, IF ONE LAYS ASIDE; let him teach, If one carries out [aught] for sowing, for a sample, or for a medicine, he is culpable, whatever its size?¹⁹ — Said Abaye: We discuss here a case e.g., where one laid it aside and [then] forgot why he laid it aside, and now he carries it out without specifying the purpose:

1. I.e., that may be eaten.
2. A species of locust; it is discussed in the Gemara.
3. in accordance with the general rule of the Mishnah *supra* 75b.
4. Which shows that the seed for a single plant entails culpability.
5. E.g., each to denote a certain sum.
6. I.e., made of palm bark.
7. Rashi: made of the bast of palm trees. These are finer than palm bands.
8. Perhaps, 'searcher in forests' (Jast.) — the name of a locust.
9. Eccl. X, a fool who has to acquire wisdom has to tie this on his left arm.
10. Lit., 'be eradicated'.
11. An unclean locust is not laid aside, etc.
12. A species of long-headed locust, which is eatable.
13. Lev. XI, 43. The abomination consists in eating it alive.
14. But not eat it.
15. Since by laying it aside he shows that he values it.
16. As stated in the previous chapter.
17. Having carried it out he decides not to sow it, etc. after all, and takes it back into the house.
18. For by changing his mind he removes the artificial value which he first attached to it, and it is the same as any other of its kind.
19. For a definite standard is required only when one carries it out without any specified purpose. But if he states his purpose, he ipso facto attaches a value to it.

Shabbath 91a

you might say, His intention has been cancelled;¹ hence we are informed that whenever one does anything, he does it with his original purpose.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: R. Meir maintained that one is culpable even if he carries out a single [grain of] wheat for sowing. But that is obvious, [for] we learnt, **WHATEVER ITS SIZE?** — You might say,

WHATEVER ITS SIZE is to exclude [the standard of] the quantity of a dried fig, yet even so [one is not guilty unless there is as much as an olive: hence we are informed [otherwise]. R. Isaac son of Rab Judah demurred: If so,² if one declares his intention of carrying out his whole house, is he really not culpable unless he carries out his whole house? — There his intention is null vis a vis that of all men.

BUT ALL OTHERS ARE NOT CULPABLE THEREFOR SAVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS STANDARD. Our Mishnah does not agree with R. Simeon b. Eleazar. For it was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar stated a general rule: That which is not fit to put away, and such is not [generally] put away, yet it did become fit to a certain person,³ and he did put it away, and then another came and carried it out, the latter is rendered liable through the former's intention.

Raba said in R. Nahman's name: If one carries out as much as a dried fig for food, and then decides to [use it] for sowing, or the reverse, he is liable. But that is obvious: consider it from this point of view⁴ [and] there is the standard, and consider it from that point of view, [and] there is the standard? — You might say, [Both] removal and depositing⁵ must be done with the same intention, which is absent [here]: hence he informs us [otherwise].

Raba asked: What if one carries out half as much as a dried fig for sowing, but it swells⁶ and he decides [to use it] for food? Can you argue, only there⁷ is he culpable, because consider it from this point of view [and] there is the standard, and consider it from that point of view and there is the standard: whereas here, since it did not contain the standard of food when he carried it out, he is not culpable. Or perhaps, since he would be culpable for his intention of sowing if he were silent and did not intend it [for another purpose],⁸ he is still culpable now? Now, should you rule that since he would be culpable for his intention of sowing if he were silent and did not intend it for another

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

purpose, he is still culpable now: what if one carries out as much as a dried fig for food and it shrivels up and he decides [to keep it] for sowing?² Here it is certain that if he remained silent he would not be culpable on account of his original intention; or perhaps we regard¹⁰ the present [only]; hence he is culpable? Should you rule that we regard the present, hence he is culpable: what if one carries out as much as a dried fig for food, and it shrivels and then swells up again? Does [the principle of] disqualification operate with respect to the Sabbath or not?¹¹ The question stands over.

Raba asked R. Nahman: What if one throws *terumah*¹² of the size of an olive into an unclean house? In respect of what [is the question]? If in respect of the Sabbath,¹³ we require the size of a dried fig? If in respect of defilement,¹⁴ we require food as much as an egg? — After all, it is in respect of the Sabbath, [the circumstances being] e.g., that there is food less than an egg in quantity¹⁵ and this makes it up to an egg in quantity.¹⁶ What then: since it combines in respect of defilement he is also culpable in respect to the Sabbath; or perhaps in all matters relating to the Sabbath we require the size of a dried fig? — Said he to him, We have learnt it: Abba Saul said: As for the two loaves of bread,¹⁷ and the shewbread,¹⁸ their standard is the size of a dried fig.¹⁹ But why so: let us say, since in respect of

1. Since he forgot it.
2. That according to the Mishnah culpability depends on one's intentions.
3. He found a use for it.
4. Lit., 'go here'.
5. v. p. I, n. 5.
6. To the size of a dried fig — i.e., before he deposited it, and he changes his mind likewise before depositing it.
7. In the preceding case.
8. Intention must be verbally expressed, and is not merely mental.
9. V. n. 4.
10. Lit., 'go after'.
11. The principle of disqualification (lit., 'rejection') is that once a thing or a person has been rendered unfit in respect to a certain matter, it or he remains so, even if circumstances change.

Thus here, when it shrivels, it becomes unfit to cause liability, being less than the standard: does it remain so or not? (Of course, if one carries it out thus and deposits it on another occasion, he is certainly culpable. But here it became unfit in the course of one act, and the question is whether it can become fit again for the completion of this same act.)

12. v. [Glos.](#)
13. Whether his throwing is a culpable act.
14. Whether it becomes unclean.
15. Already in the house.
16. And it alights near the first, touching it, and so both become unclean.
17. V. Lev. XXIII, 17.
18. v. Ex. XXV, 30.
19. I.e., if one carries them out on the Sabbath, this is the minimum quantity involving culpability.

Shabbath 91b

its going out,¹ [the standard is] the size of an olive, in respect of the Sabbath too it is the size of an olive?² How compare! There, immediately one takes it without the wall of the Temple Court it becomes unfit as that which has gone out, whereas there is no culpability for the [violation of the] Sabbath until he carries it into public ground. But here the Sabbath and defilement come simultaneously.³

IF HE CARRIES IT BACK AGAIN, HE IS LIABLE ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS STANDARD. But that is obvious? Said Abaye: What case do we discuss here? E.g., if he throws it on to a store, but its place is [distinctly] recognizable.⁴ You, might argue, since Its place is recognizable, it stands in its original condition;⁵ he [the Tanna] therefore teaches us that by throwing it on to a store he indeed nullifies it⁶

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT FOOD AND PLACES IT ON THE THRESHOLD, WHETHER HE [HIMSELF] SUBSEQUENTLY CARRIES IT OUT [INTO THE STREET] OR ANOTHER DOES SO, HE IS NOT CULPABLE, BECAUSE THE [WHOLE] ACT WAS NOT PERFORMED AT ONCE. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] A BASKET WHICH IS FULL OF PRODUCE AND PLACES IT ON THE OUTER THRESHOLD, THOUGH MOST OF THE

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

PRODUCE IS WITHOUT,⁷ HE IS NOT CULPABLE UNLESS HE CARRIES OUT THE WHOLE BASKET.

GEMARA. What is this threshold? Shall we say, a threshold that is public ground? [How state then] 'HE IS NOT CULPABLE'! Surely he has carried out from private into public ground? Again, if it is a threshold that is private ground, [how state then] **WHETHER HE [HIMSELF] SUBSEQUENTLY CARRIES IT OUT [INTO THE STREET] OR ANOTHER DOES SO, HE IS NOT CULPABLE'**? Surely he carries out from private into public ground? Rather the threshold is a *karmelith*,⁸ and he [the Tanna] informs us this: The reason [that he is not culpable] is because it rested in the *karmelith*; but if it did not rest in the *karmelith* he would be liable,⁹ our Mishnah not agreeing with Ben 'Azzai. For it was taught: If one carries [an article] from a shop to an open place via a colonnade, he is liable; but Ben 'Azzai holds him not liable.¹⁰

A BASKET WHICH IS FULL OF PRODUCE. Hezekiah said: They learnt this only of a basket full of cucumbers and gourds;¹¹ but if it is full of mustard, he is culpable.¹² This proves that the tie of the vessel is not regarded as a tie.¹³ But R. Johanan maintained: Even if it is full of mustard he is not culpable, which proves that he holds that the tie of the vessel is regarded as a tie. R. Zera observed: Our Mishnah implies that it is neither as Hezekiah nor as R. Johanan. 'It implies that it is not as Hezekiah', for it states: **UNLESS HE CARRIES OUT THE WHOLE BASKET.** Thus only the whole basket; but if all the produce [is without] he is not culpable, which shows that he holds that the tie of the vessel is regarded as a tie. 'It implies that it is not as R. Johanan', for it states: **THOUGH MOST OF THE PRODUCE IS WITHOUT:** thus only most of the produce, but if all the produce [is without], though the tie of the basket is within, he is liable, which shows that he holds that the tie of a vessel is not regarded as a tie. But in that case there is a

difficulty?¹⁴ — Hezekiah reconciles it in accordance with his view, while R. Johanan reconciles it in accordance with his view. Hezekiah reconciles it in accordance with his view: **UNLESS HE CARRIES OUT THE WHOLE BASKET.** When is that? in the case of a basket full of cucumbers and gourds. But if it is full of mustard, it is treated as though **HE CARRIED OUT THE WHOLE BASKET,** and he is culpable' — While R. Johanan reconciles it according to his view. **THOUGH MOST OF THE PRODUCE IS WITHOUT,** and not only most of the produce, but even if all the produce [is without] he is not culpable, **UNLESS HE CARRIES OUT THE WHOLE BASKET.**

An objection is raised: If one carries out a spice peddler's basket and places it on the outer threshold, though most of the kinds [of the spices] are without he is not culpable, unless he carries out the whole basket. Now this was assumed to refer to grains [of spices],¹⁵ which is a difficulty according to Hezekiah? Hezekiah answers you: The reference here is to prickly shrubs.¹⁶

R. Bibi b. Abaye raised an objection: If one steals a purse on the Sabbath, he is bound to make restitution, since his liability for theft arises before his desecrating of the Sabbath. But if he drags it out of the house he is exempt, since the interdict of theft and the interdict of the Sabbath come simultaneously.¹⁷ But if you think that the tie of a vessel is regarded as a tie,¹⁸ the interdict of theft precedes that of the Sabbath?¹⁹ — If he carries it out by way of its opening,²⁰ that indeed is so. Here we discuss the case where he carries it out by way of its bottom.²¹ But there is the place of its seams,

1. Beyond the walls of the Temple Court. — These must be consumed within the Temple precincts; if they are taken beyond that they become unfit for food, and the priest who eats then, violates a negative injunction.
2. And since we do not reason thus, we see that there is no connection between the standard of culpability for carrying out on the Sabbath and that required for other purposes.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

3. As it comes to rest the action of throwing is completed. and simultaneously the standard for defilement is reached.
4. He did not actually state that he had changed his mind, but let it be inferred from the fact that he threw it on to a store of other grain.
5. As being destined for separate sowing.
6. I.e., it loses its separate identity. and becomes merely part of the store.
7. In the street.
8. *Supra* 6a.
9. Though it was carried out by way of a *karmelith*.
10. V. *supra* 5b.
11. These are long, and are still partly within.
12. Since some of it is entirely in the street.
13. We do not regard all the mustard as one because it is tied together, as it were, by the basket, and treat it the same as cucumbers and gourds. [The 'tie of a vessel' in connect on with Sabbath is a technical phrase denoting that side of the vessel in the direction of the domain whence it is carried out (Rashi)].
14. The Mishnah being self-contradictory.
15. E.g., it contained ground spices, which makes it similar to a basket of mustard.
16. [G], a kind of prickly shrub used for medicinal purposes and carried in long bundles (Jast.).
17. v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 491, n. 1.
18. So that the vessel is still regarded as being within.
19. I.e., he violates the former before the latter. For as soon as part of the purse is outside, all the money within that part is regarded as stolen, since he can take it out through the mouth of the purse as it lies thus.
20. The mouth or opening preceding.
21. Through which he cannot remove the coins; hence he has not stolen them yet.

Shabbath 92a

which he can rip open¹ if he desires and extract [the coins]? — The reference is to a bar of metal.² But since it has straps,³ he [the thief] can take it out up to its opening, untie [the straps] and take out the bar,⁴ whilst the straps [still] unite it to within?⁵ — It refers to one that has no straps. Alternatively, it has straps, but they are wound round about it [the purse].⁶ And Raba said likewise: They learnt this only of a basket full of cucumbers and gourds, but if it is full of mustard he is culpable. This proves that he holds that the tie of a vessel is not regarded as a tie. Abaye ruled: Even if it is full of mustard he is not culpable, [which] proves that he holds that

the tie of a vessel is regarded as a tie. Abaye [subsequently] adopted Raba's view, while Raba adopted Abaye's view. Now Abaye is self-contradictory, and Raba likewise. For it was taught: If one carries out produce into the street, — Abaye said: If in his hand, he is culpable;⁷ if in a vessel, he is not culpable.⁸ But Raba ruled: If in his hand, he is not culpable;⁹ if in a vessel, he is culpable?¹⁰ — Reverse it. 'If in his hand, he is culpable'? But we learnt: If the master stretches his hand without and the poor man takes [an object] from it, or places [an article] therein and he carries it inside, both are exempt? — There it is above three [handbreadths],¹¹ but here it is below three.¹²

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT [AN ARTICLE], WHETHER WITH HIS RIGHT OR WITH HIS LEFT [HAND], IN HIS LAP OR ON HIS SHOULDER, HE IS CULPABLE, BECAUSE THUS WAS THE CARRYING OF THE CHILDREN OF KOHATH.¹³ IN A BACKHANDED MANNER,¹⁴ [E.G.,] WITH HIS FOOT, IN HIS MOUTH, WITH HIS ELBOW, IN HIS EAR, IN HIS HAIR, IN HIS BELT WITH ITS OPENING DOWNWARDS,¹⁵ BETWEEN HIS BELT AND HIS SHIRT, IN THE HEM OF HIS SHIRT, IN HIS SHOES OR SANDALS, HE IS NOT CULPABLE, BECAUSE HE HAS NOT CARRIED [IT] OUT AS PEOPLE [GENERALLY] CARRY OUT.

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said: If one carries out a burden above ten handbreadths [from the street level], he is culpable,¹⁶ for thus was the carrying of the children of Kohath. And how do we know that the carrying of the children of Kohath [was thus]? Because it is written, by the tabernacle, and by the altar round about:¹⁷ the altar is likened to the Tabernacle: just as the Tabernacle was ten cubits [high], so was the altar ten cubits high. And how do we know this of the Tabernacle itself? — Because it is written, Ten cubits shall be the length of a board,¹⁸ and it is [also] said, and he spread the tent over the Tabernacle,¹⁹ whereon Rab commented: Moses our Teacher spread it. Hence you may learn that the Levites were ten cubits tall.²⁰

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Now it is well known that any burden that is carried on staves, a third is above [the porter's height] and two thirds are below: thus it is found that it was very much raised.²¹ Alternatively, [it is deduced] from the Ark. For a Master said: The Ark was nine [handbreadths high], and the mercy-seat was one handbreadth; hence we have ten. And it is well known that any burden that is carried on staves, a third is above and two thirds are below: thus it is found that it was very much raised.²² But deduce it from Moses? — Perhaps Moses was different, because a Master said: The *Shechinah* rests only on a wise man, a strong man, a wealthy man and a tall man.²³

Rab said on R. Hiyya's authority: If one carries out a burden on his head²⁴ on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering, because the people of Huzal²⁵ do thus. Are then the people of Huzal the world's majority!²⁶ Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Rab said on R. Hiyya's authority: if a Huzalite carries out a burden on his head on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering, because his fellow-citizens do thus. But let his practice²⁷ be null by comparison with that of all men?²⁸ Rather if stated, it was thus stated: If one carries out a burden on his head, he is not culpable.

1. [The seams of their purses were loosely sewn (Tosaf.)].
2. And as long as part of it is within he has committed no theft.
3. To close it.
4. Whereby he has already committed the theft.
5. In respect of the Sabbath; hence he has not yet desecrated the Sabbath.
6. So that when he takes it out as far as its opening, the whole bag and straps are outside too.
7. Even if his body is in the house, because the tie of his body is not a tie in this respect.
8. If part of the utensil is within, as R. Johanan *supra* 91b; this contradicts Abaye's subsequent view.
9. The tie of the body is a tie.
10. [It was known to the retractors of the Talmud that this controversy took place after Abaye and Raba had retracted (Tosaf.)];
11. And the exemption is because the same person did not affect both the removal and the depositing, not because of the tie of the body.
12. So that it is technically at rest; Cf. p. 12, n. 6.

13. In connection with the Tabernacle in the wilderness, v. Num. VII, 9. The definition of forbidden labor on the Sabbath which involves culpability is learnt from the Tabernacle; v. *supra* 49b.
14. This is the idiom for anything done in an unusual way.
15. Of course, if the opening is on top such carrying would be quite usual.
16. Though the space there ranks as a place of non-culpability v. *supra* 6a.
17. Num. III, 26.
18. Ex. XXVI, 16.
19. Ibid. XL, 19.
20. It is now assumed that all Levites were as tall as Moses.
21. The Kohathites carried the altar on staves on their shoulders. Allowing for two thirds of the altar to swing below the top of their heads, the bottom of the altar would still be a third of ten cubits-i.e., three and one third cubits-from the ground, which is considerably more than ten handbreadths.
22. For allowing for Levites of the usual height, viz., three cubits eighteen handbreadths, and two thirds of the Ark, i.e., six and two thirds handbreadths swinging below the level of their heads, its bottom would still be eleven and one third handbreadths above the ground. — This alternative rejects the deduction from Moses.
23. Hence Moses' height may have been exceptional. V. Ned., Sonc. ed., p. 119 n. 4; also Gorfinkle, 'The Eight chapters of Maimonides', p. 80, for an interesting though fanciful explanation of this passage.
24. Not holding it with his hands at all.
25. V. Sanh., p. 98, n. 3.
26. To set the standard for all others
27. Lit., 'mind'.
28. For since most people do not carry it thus, it is an unusual form of carriage

Shabbath 92b

And should you object, But the people of Huzal do thus, their practice is null by comparison with that of all men.

MISHNAH. IF ONE INTENDS TO CARRY OUT [AN OBJECT] IN FRONT OF HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND¹ BEHIND HIM, HE IS NOT CULPABLE; BEHIND HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND BEFORE HIM, HE IS CULPABLE. [YET] IN TRUTH IT WAS SAID: A WOMAN, WHO WRAPS HERSELF ROUND WITH AN APRON WHETHER [THE ARTICLE IS CARRIED]

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

BEFORE OR BEHIND HER,² IS CULPABLE, BECAUSE IT IS NATURAL³ FOR IT TO REVERSE ITSELF.⁴ R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO THOSE WHO RECEIVE NOTES.⁵

GEMARA. What is the difference in [intending to carry it] BEFORE HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND BEHIND HIM, that HE IS NOT CULPABLE? [Presumably] because his intention was not fulfilled! But then [if he intended to carry it] BEHIND HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND BEFORE HIM, [there] too his intention was not fulfilled! Said R. Eleazar: There is a contradiction:⁶ he who learnt the one did not learn the other. Raba said: But what is the difficulty: Perhaps [where he intended to carry it] BEFORE HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND BEHIND HIM, this is the reason that HE IS NOT CULPABLE, because he intended a strong vigilance whereas he succeeded [in giving it only] a weak vigilance;⁷ but [if he intended to carry it] BEHIND HIM, BUT IT WORKED ROUND BEFORE HIM, this is the reason that HE IS CULPABLE, because he intended [only] a weak vigilance whereas he succeeded [in giving it] a strong vigilance.⁸ But then what is R. Eleazar's difficulty? The implications of the Mishnah are a difficulty:⁹ IF ONE INTENDS TO CARRY OUT [AN OBJECT] IN FRONT OF HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND BEFORE HIM, HE IS NOT CULPABLE: hence [if he intends to carry it] behind him and it comes behind him, he is culpable. Then consider the second clause: BEHIND HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND BEFORE HIM, only then is he CULPABLE: hence [if he intends to carry it] behind him and it comes behind him, he is not culpable?¹⁰ — Said R. Eleazar: There is a contradiction: he who learnt the one did not learn the other. R. Ashi observed: But what is the difficulty: Perhaps he leads to a climax:¹¹ it is unnecessary [to rule that if he intended to carry it] behind him and it came behind him, he is culpable, since his intention was fulfilled. But even [if he intends to carry it] BEHIND HIM, BUT IT WORKS ROUND

BEFORE HIM, it must be [stated]. [For] you might think that I will rule, since his intention was unfulfilled, he is not culpable; therefore he informs us that he intended [only] a weak vigilance whereas he succeeded [in giving it] a strong vigilance, So that he is culpable.

[Shall we say that where he intends to carry it] behind him, and it comes behind him, there is a controversy of Tannaim? For it was taught: If one intends carrying out [an object] in his belt with its opening above, but he carries [it] out in, his belt with its opening below, [or] if one intends to carry out in his belt with its opening below,¹² — R. Judah rules that he is culpable, but the Sages hold him not culpable. Said R. Judah to them: Do you not admit that [if one intends to carry out an object] behind him and it comes behind him, he is culpable?¹³ Whilst they said to him: Do you not admit that [if one carries out an object] as with the back of his hand or with his foot, he is not culpable? Said R. Judah: I stated one argument, and they stated one argument. I found no answer to their argument, and they found no answer to mine. Now, since he says to them, 'Do you not admit,' does it not surely follow that the Rabbis hold that he is not culpable?¹⁴ Then on your reasoning, when they say to him, 'Do you not admit,' does it follow that R. Judah holds him, culpable! But surely it was taught: With the back of his hand or his foot, all agree that he is not culpable! Rather [conclude thus: if one intends to carry out an object] behind him and it comes behind him, all agree that he is culpable; with the back of his hand or foot, all agree that he is not culpable. They differ when [he carries it out] in his belt with its opening below: one Master likens it to [intending to carry it out] behind him and it comes behind him, while the other Master likens it [to carrying] with the back of one's hand or foot.

IN TRUTH IT WAS SAID: A WOMAN, etc. It was taught: Every [statement of] 'In truth [etc.]' is the *halachah*.¹⁵

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO THOSE WHO RECEIVE NOTES. A Tanna taught: Because clerks of the State do thus.¹⁶

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT A LOAF INTO THE STREET, HE IS CULPABLE; IF TWO CARRY IT OUT, THEY ARE NOT CULPABLE. IF ONE COULD NOT CARRY IT OUT AND TWO CARRY IT OUT, THEY ARE CULPABLE; BUT R. SIMEON EXEMPTS [THEM].¹⁷

GEMARA. Rab Judah said in Rab's name—others state, Abaye said — others again state, it was taught in a Baraitha: If each alone is able,¹⁸ — R. Meir holds [them] culpable, while R. Judah and R. Simeon hold [them] not culpable. If each alone is unable, R. Judah and R. Meir hold [them] culpable, while R. Simeon exempts [them]. If one is able but the other is not, all agree that he is culpable.¹⁹ It was taught likewise: if one carries out a loaf into the street, he is culpable. If two carry it out: R. Meir declares him culpable; R. Judah rules: If one could not carry it out and both carry it out, they are culpable, otherwise they are not culpable; while R. Simeon exempts [them].

Whence do we know this? — For our Rabbis taught: [And if any one ... sin...] in his doing [etc.]:²⁰ [only] he who does the whole of it [is culpable], but not he who does part of it. How so? If two hold a pitchfork and sweep [corn together];²¹ [or] the shuttle, and press;²² or a quill. and write; or a cane, and carry it out into the street,²³ — I might think that they are culpable: hence it is stated, 'in his doing': [only] he who does the whole of it, but not he who does part of it.

1. Lit., 'it comes'.
2. I.e., if she hangs anything on it to carry it out, either before or behind her, but it becomes reversed.
3. Lit., 'fit'.
4. Hence she knows of this, and such must be considered her intention.
5. Tosaf.: officials who go out with documents for taking a census, inventories of the State treasury, etc. They carried these in pouches hanging from their belts, which sometimes

turned round back to front. R. Judah rules that these too are culpable in such a case.

6. Jast. R. Han: (I take) an oath! (quoted in Tosaf. Keth. 75b s.v. [H]).
7. Hence his intention is unfulfilled.
8. Hence his intention was more than fulfilled.
9. [MS.M.: Rather if there is a difficulty the following is the difficulty.]
10. Presumably because such carriage is unnatural, as one cannot exercise a proper vigilance.
11. Lit., 'he states', 'it is unnecessary'.
12. This is the reading in the Tosef. Shab. and is thus emended here by Wilna Gaon. Cur. edd.: If one carries out money in his belt with its opening above he is culpable; if its opening is below, R. Judah rules that he is culpable, etc.
13. So here too, though carrying an object in a belt with its opening below is unusual.
14. Thus it is dependent on Tannaim.
15. V. B.M. 60a.
16. 'Aruk: they carry their documents in an apron around their loins, and sometimes these are at the front and sometimes at the back.
17. From a sin-offering.
18. To carry it out alone.
19. This is discussed *infra*.
20. Lev. iv, 27.
21. Which is forbidden on the ground of binding sheaves, *supra* 73a.
22. Which is weaving.
23. All these actions can be done by one man.

Shabbath 93a

[If they hold] a round cake of pressed figs and carry it out into the street, or a beam, and carry it out into the street, — R. Judah said: If one cannot carry it out and both carry it out, they are culpable; if not, they are not culpable. R. Simeon ruled: Even if one cannot carry it out and both carry it out, they are not culpable: for this [reason] it is stated, 'in his doing', [to teach that] if a single person does it, he is liable; whereas if two do it, they are exempt.

Wherein do they differ? In this verse: And if one person of the common people shall sin unwittingly, in his doing, [etc.]. R. Simeon holds: Three limitations are written: 'a person' shall sin, 'one' shall sin, 'in his doing' he shall sin.¹ One excludes [the case where] one [person] removes an article [from one domain] and another deposits [it in the other domain]; a second is to exclude [the case of]

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

each being able [separately to perform the action]; and the third is to exclude where neither is able [alone]. R. Judah [holds]: one excludes [the case where] one [person] removes and another deposits; the second is to exclude [the case of] each being able; and the third is to exclude [the case of] an individual who acts on the ruling of *Beth din*.² But R. Simeon is consistent with his view, for he maintains: An individual who acts on the ruling of *Beth din* is liable.³ While R. Meir [argues]: Is it then written, 'a person shall sin', 'one shall sin', 'in his doing he shall sin'! [Only] two limitations are written:⁴ one excludes [the case where] one removes and another deposits, and the other excludes [the case of] an individual who acts on the ruling of *Beth din*.

The Master said. 'If one is able but the other is not, all agree that he is culpable.' Which one is culpable? — Said R. Hisda: He who is able. For if the one who is unable, — what does he do then?⁵ Said R. Hammuna to him: Surely he helps him? Helping is no concrete [act], replied he. R. Zebid said on Raba's authority: We learnt likewise: If he [a *zab*] is sitting on a bed and four cloths are under the feet of the bed,⁶ they are unclean, because it cannot stand on three;⁷ but R. Simeon declares it clean.⁸ If he is riding on an animal and four cloths are under its feet, they are clean, because it can stand on three. But why so? surely each helps the other? Hence it must be because we maintain that helping is not a concrete [act]. Said Rab Judah of Diskarta:⁹ After all I may tell you that helping is a concrete [act]; but here it is different because it [the animal] removes it [the foot] entirely [from the ground].¹⁰ But since it alternatively removes one foot and then another, let it be as a *zab* who turns about.¹¹ Did we not learn, If a *zab* is lying on five benches or five hollow belts:¹² if along their length, they are unclean,¹³ but if along their breadth, they are clean. [But] if he is sleeping, [and] there is a doubt that he may have turned [about upon them],¹⁴ they are unclean? Hence¹⁵ it must surely be because we say, helping is no concrete [act].

R. Papi said in Raba's name, We too learnt thus.

1. I.e., each of these expressions limits the law to the action of a single individual.
2. And thereby sins; he is not liable to a sin offering.
3. v. Hor. 2b.
4. v., 'one soul' and 'in his doing'.
5. He himself can effect nothing.
6. I.e., one cloth under each foot.
7. So that each one is regarded as affording complete support. since the bed cannot stand without it, and therefore the cloth under it is unclean as midras (v. p. 312, n. 9). — For a thing to become unclean as midras the greater weight of the *zab* must rest on it.
8. Consistently with his view here that where neither can do the work alone, each is regarded merely as a help.
9. Deskarah, sixteen parasangs N.E. of Bagdad, Obermeyer, p. 146.
10. Hence it is not even regarded as helping.
11. Shifting from one support to another, as in the Mishnah quoted.
12. Probably like long straps. but hollow, and can be used as money pouches.
13. Because he may have shifted from one to another, so that each received the greater part of his weight.
14. And come to be along their length.
15. In the case of the animal.

Shabbath 93b

R. Jose said: A horse defiles through its forefeet, an ass through its hindfeet, because a horse rests its weight¹ on its forefeet, while an ass rests its upon its hindfeet.² But why so, seeing that they [the feet] help each other [to bear the animal's weight]? Hence it must surely be because we say, helping is no concrete [act].

R. Ashi said, We too learnt this: R. Eliezer said: If one foot is on the utensil and the other on the pavement, one foot on the stone and the other on the pavement, we consider: wherever if the utensil or the stone be removed, he can stand on the other foot, his service is valid; if not, his service is invalid.³ Yet why so, seeing that they [the feet] help each other? Hence it must surely be because we say, helping is no concrete [act].

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Rabina said, We too learnt this: If he [the priest] catches [the blood] with his right hand, while his left helps him,⁴ his service is valid. But why so, Seeing that they [the hands] help each other? But it must surely be because we say, helping is no concrete [act]. This proves it.

The Master said: 'If each alone is able: R. Meir holds [them] culpable.' The scholars asked: Is the standard quantity required for each, or perhaps one standard [is sufficient] for all?⁵ R. Hisda and R. Hamnuna [differ therein]: one maintains, The standard [is required] for each; while the other rules: One standard [is sufficient] for all. R. Papa observed in Raba's name, We too learnt thus: If he [a *zab*] is sitting on a bed and four cloths are under the feet of the bed, they are unclean, because it cannot stand on three.⁶ But why so: let the standard of gonorrhoea be necessary for each?⁷ Hence it must surely be because we say, One standard [suffices] for all.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said, We too learnt thus: If a deer enters a house and one person locks [it] before him,⁸ he is culpable; if two lock it, they are exempt.⁹ If one could not lock it, and both lock it, they are culpable. But why so? let the standard of trapping be necessary for each?¹⁰ Hence it must surely be because we say, One standard [suffices] for all.

Rabina said, We too learnt thus: If partners steal [an ox or a sheep] and slaughter it, they are liable.¹¹ But why so? let the standard of slaughtering be necessary for each? Hence it must surely be because we say, One standard [suffices] for all.

And R. Ashi [also] said, We too learnt thus: If two carry out a weaver's cane [quill], they are culpable. But why so? let the standard of carrying out be necessary for each? Hence it must surely be because we say, One standard [suffices] for all. Said R. Aha son of Raba to R. Ashi: Perhaps that is where it contains sufficient [fuel] to boil a light egg for each?¹² — If so, he [the Tanna] should inform us about a cane in general?¹³ why

particularly a weaver's?¹⁴ Yet perhaps it is large enough for each to weave a cloth therewith?¹⁵ Hence nothing can be inferred from this.

A *tanna*¹⁶ recited before R. Nahman: If two carry out a weaver's cane, they are not culpable; but R. Simeon declares them culpable. Whither does this tend!¹⁷ — Rather say, They are culpable, while R. Simeon exempts [them].

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT LESS THAN THE STANDARD QUANTITY OF FOOD IN A UTENSIL, HE IS NOT CULPABLE EVEN IN RESPECT OF THE UTENSIL, BECAUSE THE UTENSIL IS SUBSIDIARY THERETO. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] A LIVING PERSON IN A BED, HE IS NOT CULPABLE EVEN IN RESPECT OF THE BED, BECAUSE THE BED IS SUBSIDIARY TO HIM;¹⁸ A CORPSE IN A BED, HE IS CULPABLE. AND LIKEWISE [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE OF A CORPSE, THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE OF A *NEBELAH*, OR THE SIZE OF A LENTIL OF A [DEAD] CREEPING THING [SHEREZ], HE IS CULPABLE.¹⁹ BUT R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT.²⁰

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out foodstuffs of the standard quantity, if in a utensil, he is liable in respect of the foodstuffs and exempt in respect of the utensil! but if he needs the utensil, he is liable in respect of the utensil too.²¹ Then this proves that if one eats two olive-sized pieces of heleb in one state of unawareness, he is liable to two [sacrifices]?²² Said R. Shesheth: What are we discussing here? E.g.,

1. Lit., 'the leaning of a horse'.
2. The reference is to a cloth placed under the feet of these animals when a *zab* rides upon them.
3. A priest performed the service in the Temple barefooted, and nothing might interpose between his feet and the pavement.
4. Catching the blood of a sacrifice for its subsequent sprinkling on the altar is part of the sacrificial service, and like all other parts thereof must be performed with the right hand.
5. When two people carry out an article of food which each could carry out alone, must it be as large as two dried figs, so that there is the

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

standard for each, Or is one sufficient to render them both culpable?

6. V. *supra* a for notes.
7. 'The standard of gonorrhoea' is that a whole *zab* rests on an article-then it is unclean. Then here too four *zabim* should be lying on the bed for the four cloths to be defiled.
8. So that it cannot escape. This constitutes trapping, which is a culpable labor; v. Mishnah *supra* 73a.
9. Cf. *supra* 92b.
10. Viz., two deers should be required.
11. v. Ex. XXI, 37.
12. Mishnah *supra* 89b.
13. The standard of which is boil a light egg.
14. The standard of which is different; v. next note.
15. This is the standard of a weaver's cane.
16. V. s.v. (b).
17. I.e., surely R. Simeon rules in the opposite direction, that if two perform an action, even if each is unable to do it separately, they are exempt. Jast. translates: towards the tail! i.e., reverse it.
18. Carrying a living person is not a culpable offense, v. *infra* 94a.
19. These are the respective minima which defile. Hence carrying them out of the house ranks as a labor of importance, since a source of contamination is thereby removed.
20. For carrying out a corpse, etc. For its purpose is merely negative, i.e., he does not wish to have the corpse in his house, but does not actually want it in the street; hence it is a labor unessential in itself, and which R. Simeon holds is not a culpable offence, though it is forbidden.
21. Thus he is liable to two sacrifices.
22. Surely that is not so, yet the cases are analogous.

Shabbath 94a

where he sinned unwittingly in respect of the food, but deliberately in respect of the utensil.¹ R. Ashi demurred: But it is stated, 'in respect of the utensil too'?² Rather said R. Ashi: E.g., where he sinned unwittingly in respect of both, then [one offence] became known to him, and subsequently the other became known to him, this being dependent on the controversy of R. Johanan and Resh Lakish.³

[IF ONE CARRIES OUT] A LIVING PERSON IN A BED, HE IS NOT CULPABLE EVEN IN RESPECT OF THE BED. Shall we say that our Mishnah is [according to] R. Nathan, but not the

Rabbis? For it was taught: If one carries out an animal, beast,⁴ or bird into the street, whether alive or [ritually] killed, he is liable [to a sacrifice]; R. Nathan said: For killed ones he is liable, but for live ones he is exempt, because the living [creature] carries itself! Said Raba, You may even say [that it agrees with] the Rabbis: the Rabbis differ from R. Nathan only in respect of an animal, beast, and bird, which stiffen themselves,⁵ but as for a living person, who carries himself,⁶ even the Rabbis agree. R. Adda b. Ahabah observed to Raba, But as to what we learnt: Ben Bathyra permits [it] in the case of a horse.⁷ And it was taught: Ben Bathyra permits [it] in the case of a horse, because it is employed for work which does not entail liability to a sin-offering.⁸ And R. Johanan observed, Ben Bathyra and R. Nathan said the same thing.⁹ Now if you say that the Rabbis disagree with R. Nathan only in respect of an animal, beast, or bird, because they stiffen themselves, why particularly Ben Bathyra and R. Nathan: Surely you have said that even the Rabbis agree? — When R. Johanan said [thus] it was in respect of a horse that is set apart for [carrying] birds. But are there horses set apart for birds? Yes, there are the falconers' [horses].¹⁰ R. Johanan said: Yet R. Nathan agrees in the case of a tied [living being].¹¹ R. Adda b. Mattenah said to Abaye: But these Persians are like bound [men],¹² yet R. Johanan said, Ben Bathyra and R. Nathan said the same thing?¹³ There they suffer from haughtiness,¹⁴ for a certain officer with whom the king was angry ran three parasangs on foot.

A CORPSE IN A BED, HE IS CULPABLE.¹⁵ AND LIKEWISE [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE OR A CORPSE, etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name, and R. Joseph said in the name of Resh Lakish: R. Simeon declared exempt

1. And 'liable'- means to death, for the willful desecration of the Sabbath.
2. Which implies the same liability.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

3. v. *supra* 71b. Thus according to R. Johanan he is liable to two sin-offerings if he is apprised of each in succession, and then comes to make atonement for both. But in the view of Resh Lakish he is liable to two sacrifices only if he is apprised of one, makes atonement, and is then apprised of the other (Tosaf.).
4. Behemah means a domestic animal; hayyah, a non-domestic animal.
5. Making themselves a dead weight, and thus they are a real burden.
6. He has natural buoyancy.
7. One may not sell his cattle to a Gentile, because they are used for plowing, and thereby lose the Sabbath rest to which they are entitled (v. Ex. XX, 10). Horses, however, were not used for plowing in Mishnaic times, but merely for riding.
8. Riding being only Rabbinically prohibited.
9. Sc. that it is not a labor to carry a living being, because it carries itself.
10. The falcons which they carry are free and do not stiffen themselves; yet in the view of the Rabbis, who make an exception only in respect of a human being, one would be culpable carrying out a falcon. Hence R. Johanan specified R. Nathan.
11. Whether human or animal, because these certainly do not carry themselves.
12. Rashi: they ride swathed in their garments and could not walk if they wished to.
13. I.e., Ben Bathyra permits the sale of a horse even to a Persian, showing that even a bound person is not a burden.
14. Their haughty bearing makes them look as if they cannot walk, but actually they are able to quite well.
15. [Tosaf. identifies R. Judah as the authority for this ruling, he being of the opinion that there is liability for a labor not essential in itself cf. *supra* p. 448, n. 8.]

Shabbath 94b

even him who carries out a corpse for burial.¹ Raba observed: Yet R. Simeon admits in the case of [one who carries out] a spade for digging therewith or the Scroll of the Torah to read it, that he is culpable.² That is obvious, for if this too should be regarded as a labor unrequired per se, how would a labor necessary per se be conceivably according to R. Simeon? — You might say, it must be [carried out] both for his requirements and for its own purpose, e.g., a spade in order to make it into a [metal] plate³ and for digging, a Scroll of the Law for

correcting and reading: [therefore] he informs us [that it is not so].

A dead body was lying in Darukra,⁴ which R. Nahman b. Isaac allowed to be carried out into a *karmelith*. Said R. Nahman the brother of Mar son of Rabbana to R. Nahman b. Isaac: On whose authority? R. Simeon's! But Perhaps R. Simeon merely exempts [such] from liability to a sin-offering, yet there is a Rabbinical interdict. By God! said he to him, you yourself may bring it in. For [this is permitted] even according to R. Judah:⁵ did I then say [that it may be carried out] into the street? I [merely] said, into a *karmelith*: the dignity of human beings is a great thing, for it supersedes [even] a negative injunction of the Torah.⁶

We learnt elsewhere: If one plucks out the symptoms of uncleanness⁷ or burns out the raw flesh,⁸ he transgresses a negative injunction.⁹ It was stated: [If he plucks out] one of two [hairs]. he is culpable;¹⁰ one of three: R. Nahman maintained, He is culpable; R. Shesheth said, He is not culpable. R. Nahman maintained, He is culpable: his action is effective in so far that if another is removed the uncleanness departs. R. Shesheth said, He is not culpable: now at all events the uncleanness is present. R. Shesheth observed: Whence do I know it? Because we learnt: AND LIKEWISE [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE OF A CORPSE, THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE OF A *NEBELAH*, ... HE IS CULPABLE. This implies, [for] half the size of an olive he is exempt; but it was taught: [For] half the size of an olive he is culpable? Surely [then], where it was taught that he is culpable, [it means] that he carries out half the size of an olive from [a piece as large as] an olive; while where we learnt [by implication] that he is exempt, [it means] that he carries out half the size of an olive from an olive and a half.¹¹ But R. Nahman maintains: In both these cases he is culpable;¹² but as to what we learnt that he is exempt, that is where he carries out half the size of an olive of a large corpse.¹³

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

MISHNAH. IF ONE PARES HIS NAILS WITH EACH OTHER OR WITH HIS TEETH, LIKEWISE [IF ONE PLUCKS] HIS HAIR, LIKEWISE HIS MOUSTACHE, LIKEWISE HIS BEARD; AND LIKEWISE IF [A WOMAN] PLAITS [HER HAIR], LIKEWISE IF SHE PAINTS [HER EYELIDS] LIKEWISE IF SHE ROUGES [HER FACE],¹⁴ — R. ELIEZER DECLARES [THEM] CULPABLE, WHILE THE RABBIS FORBID [THESE ACTIONS] AS A SHEBUTH.¹⁵

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said: They differ only [where it is done] by hand; but if with an implement, all agree that he is culpable. That is obvious, [for] we learnt, WITH EACH OTHER? — You might say, the Rabbis hold [him] exempt even [if he does it] with an implement, while as to what is stated, WITH EACH OTHER, that is to teach you the extent¹⁶ of R. Eliezer['s ruling]:¹⁷ [hence] he informs us [otherwise].

R. Eleazar also said: They differ only [where one does it] for himself; but [if he does it] for his neighbor, all agree that he is not culpable. That is obvious, [for] we learnt, HIS NAILS? You might say. R. Eliezer holds [him] culpable even [if he does it] for his neighbor, while as to what is stated — HIS NAILS, that is to teach you the extent of the Rabbis[' ruling]:¹⁸ [hence] he informs us [otherwise].

LIKEWISE HIS HAIR, etc. It was taught: If one plucks out a full scissors' edge [of hair], he is culpable. And how much is a full scissors' edge? Said Rab Judah: Two [hairs]. But it was taught: But in respect of baldness [the standard is] two?¹⁹ — Say, and likewise in respect of baldness, [the standard is] two. It was taught likewise: If one plucks out a full scissors' edge [of hair] on the Sabbath, he is culpable. And how much is a full scissors' edge? Two. R. Eliezer said: One. But the Sages agree with R. Eliezer in the case of one who picks out white hairs from black ones, that he is culpable even for one;²⁰ and this is interdicted even on weekdays, for it is said, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment.²¹

It was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: As for a nail the greater part of which is severed,²² and shreds [of skin] the largest portions of which are severed [from the body], — by hand it is permitted [wholly to remove them]; (if one severs them) with a utensil, he is liable to a sin-offering. Is there anything which [if done] with a utensil renders one liable to a sin-offering, yet is permitted by hand at the very outset?²³ — This is its meaning: If the greater portions thereof are severed by hand, it is permitted [to remove them wholly]; if done with a utensil one is not culpable, yet it is prohibited. If the greater portions thereof are not severed, [if wholly removed] by hand one is not culpable. yet it is prohibited: with a utensil, one is liable to a sin-offering. Rab Judah said: The *halachah* is as R. Simeon b. Eleazar. Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name: Providing they are severed towards the top.²⁴ so that they pain him.

LIKEWISE IF [A WOMAN] PLAITS, etc. She who plaits, paints or rouges, on what score is she culpable? — R. Abin said in the name of R. Jose son of R. Hanina: She who plaits on the score of weaving; she who paints on the score of writing; she who rouges on account of spinning.²⁵ Said the Rabbis before R. Abbahu: Are then weaving, writing, and spinning done in this way? Rather said R. Abbahu: R. Jose son of R. Hanina's [statement] was explained to me [thus]:

1. Though that is for the requirements of the dead, he is exempt, since it is not for the requirements of the living.
2. Since it is for his own requirements.
3. [Aliter: to fix upon it (if blunted) a plate. v. Rash.]
4. Or, Drukerith, Darkerith, a Babylonian town near Wasit on the lower Tigris; Obermeyer, p. 197.
5. Who holds a labor not required per se to be a culpable offence.
6. Hence this is permitted. [Not exactly a Biblical prohibition but an interdict of the Rabbis whose enactments have Biblical force (Rashi). V. Ber. 19b.]
7. v., the two whitened hairs which are a proof of leprosy; v. Lev. XIII, 3 (the minimum is two hairs).

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

8. Also a symptom of leprosy, *ibid.* 10.
9. Deut. XXI, 8: Take heed in the plague of leprosy this is interpreted as a command not to remove the evidences thereof.
10. Since he thereby effectively removes the symptom of leprosy, the remaining one being insufficient to prove him unclean.
11. He is culpable in the first case because his action is effective, but in the second it does not effect anything, and the same applies here.
12. His reasoning is the same as in the case of leprosy.
13. For even if another half is carried out, it makes no difference to the contaminating efficacy of the corpse.
14. One of the explanations of Rashi. V. also Krauss, T.A. I p. 692 n. 293.
15. V. [Glos.](#)
16. Lit., 'power'.
17. Viz., that even then he is culpable.
18. Viz., that he is not culpable even when he pares his own nails.
19. V. Deut. XIV, 1: the prohibition is infringed by the plucking of two hairs. The conjunction *waw* may mean, either 'and' or 'but'; it is understood in the latter sense here, and thus implies that there is a different standard for the Sabbath, since both statements are part of the same Baraita.
20. For its removal makes him look younger; hence it is regarded as a labor.
21. *Ibid.* XXII, 5. This is interpreted as a general prohibition of effeminacy. which includes the attempt to make oneself look young by such methods.
22. I.e., it is hanging and nearly torn off.
23. Surely not!
24. Near the nail.
25. The rouge was drawn out in thread-like lengths, and thus it resembled spinning; v. Tosaf. M.K. 9b s.v. [H].

Shabbath 95a

She who paints [is culpable] on the score of dyeing; she who plaits and rouges, on the score of building. Is this then the manner of building? — Even so, as R. Simeon b. Menassia expounded: And the Lord God builded the rib [... into a woman]:¹ this teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, plaited Eve['s hair] and brought her to Adam, for in the sea-towns plaiting is called 'building'.

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: If [a woman] plaits [hair], paints [the eyes], or

rouges [the face], — if [she does this] to herself, she is not culpable; [if to] her companion, she is culpable. And thus did R. Simeon b. Eleazar [say on R. Eliezer's authority: A woman must not apply paint to her face, because she dyes.

Our Rabbis taught: One who milks, sets milk [for curdling],² and makes cheese, [the standard is] the size of a dried fig. If one sweeps [the floor], lays the dust [by sprinkling water], and removes loaves of honey, if he does this unwittingly on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin offering; if he does it deliberately on a Festival, he is flagellated with forty³ [lashes]: this is R. Eliezer's view. But the Sages say: In both cases it is [forbidden] only as a shebuth.⁴

R. Nahman b. Guria visited Nehardea. He was asked. If one milks, on what score is he culpable? On the score of milking, He replied. If one sets milk, or what score is he culpable? On the score of setting milk, he replied. If one makes cheese, on what score is he liable? On account of making cheese, he replied. Your teacher must have been a reed-cutter in a marsh, they jeered at him. [So] he went and asked in the *Beth Hamidrash*. Said they to him, He who milks is liable on account of unloading.⁵ He who sets milk is liable on account of selecting.⁶ He who makes cheese is liable on account of building.⁷

'If one sweeps, lays the dust, and removes loaves of honey, if he does this unwittingly on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering; if he does it deliberately on a Festival, he is flagellated with forty [lashes]: this is R. Eliezer's view.' R. Eleazar observed, 'What is R. Eliezer's reason? Because it is written, and he dipped it in the forest of honey:⁸ now, what is the connection between a forest and honey?'⁹ But it is to teach you: just as a forest, he who detaches [aught] from it on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering, so are loaves of honey, he who removes [honey] therefrom is liable to a sin-offering.

Amemar permitted sprinkling [the floors] in Mahoza.¹⁰ He argued: What is the reason

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

that the Rabbis said [that it is forbidden]? [It is] lest one come to level up depressions [in the earthen floor]. Here there are no depressions.¹¹ Rabbah Tosfa'ah¹² found Rabina suffering discomfort on account of the heat — others state, Mar Kashisha son of Raba found R. Ashi suffering discomfort on account of the heat. Said he to him — Does not my Master agree with what was taught: If one wishes to sprinkle his house on the Sabbath, he can bring a basin full of water, wash his face in one corner, his hands in another, and his feet in another, and thus the house is sprinkled automatically? I did not think of it,¹³ he replied. It was taught: A wise woman can sprinkle her house on the Sabbath.¹⁴ But now that we hold as R. Simeon,¹⁵ it is permitted even at the very outset.¹⁶

MISHNAH. IF ONE DETACHES [AUGHT] FROM A PERFORATED POT, HE IS CULPABLE;¹⁷ IF IT IS UNPERFORATED, HE IS EXEMPT. BUT R. SIMEON DECLARES [HIM] EXEMPT IN BOTH CASES.

GEMARA. Abaye pointed out a contradiction to Raba — others state, R. Hiyya b. Rab to Rab: We learnt, R. SIMEON DECLARES [HIM] EXEMPT IN BOTH CASES, which proves that according to R. Simeon a perforated [pot] is treated the same as an unperforated [one]. But the following contradicts it. R. Simeon said: The only difference between a perforated and an unperforated [pot]

1. Gen. II, 22.
2. Rashi: Jast.: who beats milk into a pulp. Levy, Worterbuch, s.v. [H]: if one curdles milk in order to press butter out of it; v. also T.A. II, 135.
3. Strictly speaking, thirty-nine.
4. v. [Glos.](#) This being a Rabbinical interdict, there is neither a sin-offering nor flagellation.
5. It is similar thereto, the milk being unloaded from whence it is collected in the cow. As such it is a secondary form of threshing, where the chaff is separated and unloaded, as it were, from the grain.
6. For the whey is thereby selected and separated from the rest of the milk which is to curdle.

7. The solidifying of the liquid is regarded as similar to the act of putting together an edifice.
8. I Sam. XIV, 27, lit. translation. E.V.: honeycomb.
9. Surely none at all!
10. V. p. 150, n. 11.
11. All the houses had stone floors.
12. Perhaps of Thospia. Neub. Geogr. p. 332: capital of the Armenian district Thospitis.
13. Others: do not agree with it.
14. By the foregoing or a similar device.
15. That what is unintentional is permitted. When one sprinkles it is not his intention that the water should knead together bits of earth and thus smooth out the depressions.
16. Without resort to any expedient.
17. Cf. p. 388, n. 3.

Shabbath 95b

is in respect of making [its] plants fit [to become unclean]?¹ — In all respects, answered he, R. Simeon treats it as detached, but in the matter of uncleanness it is different, because the Torah extended [the scope of] cleanness in the case of plants [seeds], for it is said, [And if aught of their carcass fall] upon any sowing seed which is to be sown, [it is clean].²

A certain old man asked R. Zera: If the root is over against the hole, what is R. Simeon's ruling then?³ He was silent and answered him nought. On a [subsequent] occasion he found him sitting and teaching: Yet R. Simeon admits that if it is perforated to the extent of making it clean, [there is culpability].⁴ Said he to him, Seeing that I asked you about a root that is over against the perforation and you gave me no reply. can there be a doubt concerning [a pot that is] perforated to the extent of making it clean?⁵ Abaye observed: If this [dictum] of R. Zera was stated, it was stated thus: Yet R. Simeon agrees that if it is perforated below [the capacity of] a rebi'ith, [there is culpability].⁶

Raba said: There are five principles in the case of an earthen utensil: [i] If it has a perforation sufficient [only] for a liquid to run out, it is clean in that it cannot be defiled when already a mutilated vessel,⁷ yet it is still

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

a utensil in respect of sanctifying the water of lustration therein.⁸ [ii] If it has a perforation sufficient for a liquid to run in,⁹ it is 'clean' in respect of sanctifying the water of lustration therein,¹⁰ yet it is still a utensil to render its plants fit [to become unclean].¹¹ [iii] If it has a perforation as large as a small root, it is 'clean' in respect of making its plants fit [to become defiled], yet it is still a utensil in that it can hold olives.¹² [iv] If it has a perforation large enough to allow olives to fall out, it is clean in that it cannot hold olives, yet it is still a utensil to contain pomegranates.¹³ [v] If it has a perforation large enough to allow pomegranates to fall through, it is clean in respect of all things.¹⁴ But if it is closed with an airtight lid — [it ranks as a utensil] unless the greater portion thereof is broken.¹⁵

R. Assi said: I have heard that the standard of an earthen vessel is [a hole] large enough to allow a pomegranate to fall out.¹⁶ Said Raba to him: Perhaps you heard [this] Only of [a vessel] closed with a tight-fitting lid!¹⁷ But it was Raba himself who said: If it is closed with a tight-fitting lid, [it ranks as a utensil] unless the greater portion thereof is broken? — There is no difficulty:

1. Edibles, e.g., grain, vegetables, etc., can be defiled only if moisture has fallen upon them after they were detached from the soil. Now, a perforated pot is regarded as attached to the soil, and therefore its plants cannot become susceptible to uncleanness; whereas an unperforated pot is detached, and so if moisture falls upon its plant, when grown it is henceforth fit to become unclean — This shows that R. Simeon too recognizes this difference.
2. Lev. XI, 37, i.e., if it is in any way attached to the soil it is clean, and this includes a perforated pot.
3. If one tears out that root on the Sabbath (Rashi). Here the root draws sustenance directly from the ground.
4. If a utensil becomes unclean and then a hole is made in it large enough for an olive to fall through. It technically ceases to be a utensil and becomes clean. Thus here too, if the perforation is of that size, R. Simeon admits that the pot and its contents, even such as are not over against the perforation, are regarded as attached to the soil.

5. It is certain that such a case is doubtful and one cannot positively state R. Simeon's views thereon.
6. I.e., if the perforation is so low in the sides of the pot that the portion of the pot beneath it cannot hold a revi'ith. Then it is certainly not regarded as a utensil, and its plants are held to grow direct from the ground. Accordingly the perforations spoken of hitherto, and in the Mishnah, are high up in the sides of the pot, and certainly not in the bottom, as is the case with our pots.
7. If the vessel is sound, such a small hole does not deprive it of its character as a utensil and it is still susceptible to uncleanness. But if it was already mutilated, e.g., cracked, this added perforation renders it incapable of becoming unclean.
8. If otherwise sound, v. Num. XIX, 17: putting the water in a utensil is designated sanctification.
9. That is naturally somewhat larger than the preceding.
10. 'Clean' is employed idiomatically to imply that it is not a utensil in respect of what follows; thus one cannot sanctify, etc.
11. V. p. 456. n. 6. Even the Rabbis admit that if the perforation is not larger than the pot and its contents are treated as detached.
12. And hence susceptible to defilement. If a utensil is not designated for any particular purpose, it must be able to hold olives in order to be susceptible to defilement.
13. I.e., if it was explicitly designated for holding pomegranates, it is still a utensil and susceptible to defilement.
14. It is no longer susceptible, or, if it was defiled before it was perforated, it becomes clean. Henceforth it is susceptible to defilement only if its owner puts it aside to use as a mutilated vessel (Rashi).
15. The reference is to Num. XIX, 15, q v. If the vessel is closed with a tight-fitting lid, its contents too remain clean, unless the greater portion is broken, in which case it does not rank as a vessel and cannot protect its contents from the contamination spread by the corpse.
16. I.e. — unless it has such a large hole it ranks as a utensil.
17. I.e. — that it affords no protection if it has such a large hole.

Shabbath 96a

the one refers to large ones, the other to small ones.¹

R. Assi said, They [the Tannaim] learnt. As for an earthen vessel, its standard is [a hole]

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

large enough to admit a liquid, while [one merely] sufficient to allow a liquid to run out was mentioned only in connection with a mutilated vessel.² What is the reason? — Said Mar Zutra son of R. Nahman: Because people do not say, 'Let us bring one fragment for another.'³

'Ulla said, Two amoraim in Palestine differ on this matter, [viz.,] R. Jose son of R. Abin and R. Jose son of Zabda: One maintains: [the standard is a hole] large enough to allow a pomegranate to fall out; while the other rules: As large as a small root.⁴ And your sign is, 'whether one increases or whether one diminishes.'⁵

R. Hinena b. Kahana said in R. Eliezer's name: As for an earthen vessel, its standard is [a hole] large enough to allow olives to fall out;⁶ and Mar Kashisha son of Rabbah completes [this statement] in R. Eliezer's name: And then they rank as vessels of dung, stone, or clay,⁷ which do not contract uncleanness either by Biblical or by Rabbinical law;⁸ but in respect to [the law of] a tight, fitting lid [it ranks as a vessel] unless the greater portion thereof is broken through.⁹

CHAPTER XI

MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] FROM PRIVATE INTO PUBLIC GROUND [OR] FROM PUBLIC INTO PRIVATE GROUND, HE IS CULPABLE. FROM ONE PRIVATE DOMAIN TO ANOTHER, AND PUBLIC GROUND LIES BETWEEN, R. AKIBA HOLDS HIM LIABLE, BUT THE SAGES DECLARE HIM EXEMPT. HOW SO?¹⁰ IF THERE ARE TWO BALCONIES FACING EACH OTHER IN THE STREET, HE WHO REACHES OVER OR THROWS [AN ARTICLE] FROM ONE TO THE OTHER IS NOT CULPABLE. IF BOTH ARE ON THE SAME STOREY,¹¹ HE WHO REACHES OVER IS CULPABLE, WHILE HE WHO THROWS IS NOT, FOR THUS WAS THE SERVICE OF THE LEVITES:¹² TWO WAGGONS [STOOD] BEHIND EACH OTHER IN PUBLIC GROUND, [AND] THEY REACHED OVER THE BOARDS

FROM ONE TO ANOTHER, BUT DID NOT THROW.

1. Rashi: in the case of large ones the greater portion must be broken, but for small ones a hole large enough for a pomegranate to fall out is sufficient. Ri: In the case of large ones a hole large enough, etc. is required, but in the case of small ones, where this may be considerably more than half if the greater portion thereof is broken it is no longer a utensil.
2. v. p. 457, n. 4.
3. I.e., when a mutilated vessel springs a leak of this size, people throw it away without troubling to bring another such vessel or a shard to catch its drippings, therefore it is no longer a vessel.
4. Rashi: the question is how large the hole of a perforated pot must be in order to render its plants susceptible to defilement (v. p. 456, n. 6). R. Tam: they differ in reference to a vessel closed with a tight-fitting lid (cf. p. 458, n. 5).
5. I.e., part of a Talmudic dictum, v. Men. 110a', the two extremes (v. Raba's enumeration of the five principles, *supra* 95b) are taken, and neither of these amoraim takes one of the intermediate standards.
6. A hole of that size renders it clean.
7. I.e., neither glazed nor baked in a kiln.
8. Lit., 'the words of the Scribes'; v. Kid. p. 79, n. 7.
9. v. p. 458, n. 3.
10. This explains the view of the Rabbis.
11. I.e. on the same side of the street, which interposes lengthwise.
12. In connection with the Tabernacle in the Wilderness.

Shabbath 96b

GEMARA. Consider: throwing is a derivative of carrying out:¹ where is carrying out itself written? — Said R. Johanan, Scripture saith, And Moses gave commandment, and they caused a proclamation to pass throughout the camp, [etc.]:² now, where was Moses stationed? in the camp of the Levites, which was public ground,³ and he said to the Israelites, Do not carry out and fetch from your private dwellings into public ground. But how do you know that this was on the Sabbath: perhaps this happened⁴ during the week, the reason being that the material was complete[ly adequate], as it is written, For the stuff they had was sufficient, etc.⁵ — The meaning of 'passing through' is learnt from

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

[its employment in connection with] the Day of Atonement, Here it is written, and they caused a proclamation to pass throughout the camp; whilst there it is written, Then shalt thou cause a loud trumpet to pass through [sc. the land]:⁶ just as there the reference is to the day of the interdict, so here too the day of the interdict [is meant].⁷ We have thus found [an interdict for] carrying out: whence do we know [that] carrying in [is forbidden]? — That is common sense: consider: it is [transference] from one domain to another: what does it matter whether one carries out or carries in? Nevertheless, carrying out is a primary [labor], [whereas] carrying in is a derivative.

Yet let us consider: one is culpable for both: why is one designated a principal and the other a derivative [labor]? — The practical difference is that if one performs two principal or two derivative [labors] together he is liable to two [sacrifices], whereas if he performs a principal [labor] and its derivative he is liable only to one. But according to R. Eliezer, who imposes liability for a derivative [when performed] conjointly with⁸ the principal, why is one called a principal and the other a derivative? — That which was of account in the Tabernacle is designated a principal, whereas that which was not of account in the Tabernacle is designated a derivative.⁹ Alternatively, that which is written is designated a principal, whereas that which is not written is designated a derivative.

Again, as to what we learnt, 'If one throws [an article] four cubits on to a wall above ten handbreadths, it is as though he throws it into the air;¹⁰ if below ten, it is as though he throws it on to the ground;¹¹ and he who throws [an article] four cubits along the ground is culpable',¹² — how do we know that he who throws [an article] four cubits in the street is culpable? — Said R. Josiah: Because the curtain weavers threw their needles to each other.¹³ Of what use are needles to weavers? — Rather [say:] Because the sewers threw their needles to each other. But

perhaps they sat close together? — Then they would reach each other with their needles.¹⁴ Yet perhaps they sat within four [cubits] of each other? Rather said R. Hisda: Because the curtain weavers threw the clue into the curtain. But the other [worker] still has the distaff in his hand? — He refers to the last manipulation.¹⁵ But it passed through a place of non-liability?¹⁶ — Rather [say:] Because the curtain weavers threw the clue to those who would borrow it from them.¹⁷ Yet perhaps they sat near each other? Then they would touch each other on making the border. Yet perhaps they sat in irregular lines?¹⁸ Moreover, did they borrow from each other? Surely Luda¹⁹ taught: every man from his work which they wrought:²⁰ he wrought of his own work [stuff], but not of his neighbour's.²¹ Again, how do we know that if one carries [an article] four cubits in the street, he is culpable? Rather the whole [law of transporting] four cubits in the street is known by tradition.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: [The offence of] the gatherer [of sticks]²² was that he carried [them] four cubits over public ground. In a Baraitha it was taught: He cut [them] off.²³ R. Aha b. Jacob said: He tied [them] together.²⁴ In respect of what is the practical difference? — In respect of Rab's [dictum]. For Rab said, I found a secret scroll of the School of R. Hiyya, wherein It is written, Issi b. Judah said: There are thirty-nine principal labors, but one is liable only [for] one. One and no more? Surely we learnt, The principal labors are forty less one. And we pondered thereon: why state the number? And R. Johanan answered: [To teach] that if one performs all of them, in one state of unawareness, he is liable for each separately? Say: for one of these he is not culpable.²⁵ Now, Rab Judah is certain that he who carries [in the street] is culpable; the Baraitha is certain that he who cuts off is culpable; while R. Aha b. Jacob is certain that he who binds is culpable. [Thus] one Master holds, This at least is not in doubt, while the other Master holds, That at least is not in doubt.²⁶

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Our Rabbis taught: The gatherer was Zelophehad. And thus it is said, and while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man [gathering sticks, etc.];²⁷ whilst elsewhere it is said, our father died in the wilderness;²⁸ just as there Zelophehad [is meant], so here too Zelophehad [is meant]: this is R. Akiba's view. Said R. Judah b. Bathyra to him, 'Akiba! in either case you will have to give an account [for your statement]: if you are right,²⁹ the Torah shielded³⁰ him, while you reveal him; and if not, you cast a stigma upon a righteous man.'

1. On principal and derivative labors v. p. 3. n. 2. Throwing is certainly a derivative only, since it is not enumerated in the principal labors *supra* 73a: also it must be a derivative of carrying out, for it is not similar to any of the other principal labors,
2. Ex. XXXVI, 6.
3. As everyone had to pass through to gain access to Moses.
4. Lit., 'he stood'.
5. Ex. XXXVI, 7.
6. Lev. XXV, 9.
7. Sc. the Sabbath. This method of exegesis is called *gezerah shawah*, q.v. [Glos.](#)
8. Lit., 'in the place of'.
9. V. *infra* 100a.
10. And he is not liable.
11. And since it traverses four cubits, he is culpable.
12. V. *supra* 75a.
13. Through public ground.
14. When stretching their arms to thread the needles they would strike each other.
15. When the weaver throws the clue through the web for the last time.
16. V. *supra* 6a; i.e., it passed between the portions of the curtain, which is certainly not public ground.
17. 'Aruch reads: their apprentices. On both readings the reference is to people working on other curtains, and the clue had to traverse public ground.
18. Crosswise, or in zigzag rows, so that they could work close together without touching each other.
19. An amora: Yalkut reads: Levi.
20. Ex. XXXVI, 4.
21. Having sufficient material of his own.
22. V. Num. XV 32 seq.
23. He cut off twigs or branches from a tree, which is the equivalent of detaching produce from the soil.
24. They were already lying on the ground. Tying them together is the same as binding sheaves.

25. V. *supra* 6b for notes.

26. As being referred to in Issi's dictum.

27. Num. XV, 32.

28. Ibid. XXVII, 3.

29. Lit., 'if it is as your words'.

30. Lit., 'covered'.

Shabbath 97a

But surely he learns a *gezerah shawah*?¹ — He did not learn the *gezerah shawah*.² Then of which [sinners] was he?³ — Of those who 'presumed [to go up to the top of the mountain].'⁴

Similarly you read, and the anger of the Lord was kindled against them; and he departed:⁵ this teaches that Aaron too became leprous: this is R. Akiba's view. Said R. Judah b. Bathyra to him, 'Akiba! in either case you will have to give an account: if you are right, the Torah shielded him, while you disclose him; and if not, you cast a stigma upon a righteous man.' But it is written, 'against them?'⁶ That was merely with a rebuke. It was taught in accordance with the view that Aaron too became leprous. For it is written, And Aaron turned [wa-yifen] to Miriam, and behold, she was leprous:⁷ [and] it was taught: [That means] that he became free [panah] from his leprosy.⁸

Resh Lakish said: He who entertains a suspicion against innocent⁹ men is bodily afflicted, for it is written, [And Moses ... said,] But, behold, they will not believe me;¹⁰ but it was known¹¹ to the Holy One, blessed be he, that Israel would believe. Said He to him: They are believers, [and] the descendants of believers, whereas thou wilt ultimately disbelieve. They are believers, as it is written, and the people believed;¹² the descendants of believers: and he [Abraham] believed in the Lord.¹³ Thou wilt ultimately disbelieve, as it is said, [And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron,] Because ye believed not in me.¹⁴ Whence [is it learnt] that he was smitten? — Because it is written, And the Lord said furthermore unto him, Put now thine hand into thy bosom, etc.¹⁵

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Raba-others state, R. Jose b. R. Hanina-said: The dispensation of good comes more quickly than that of punishment [evil]. For in reference to the dispensation of punishment it is written, until he took it out, and behold, his hand was leprous, as white as snow;¹⁶ whereas in reference to the dispensation of good it is written, and he took it out of his bosom, and behold, it was turned again as his other flesh:¹⁷ from his very bosom,¹⁸ it had turned again as his other flesh.

But Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods:¹⁹ R. Eleazar observed, It was a double miracle.²⁰

FROM ONE PRIVATE DOMAIN TO ANOTHER, etc. Rabbah asked: Do they disagree when it is below ten, and they differ in this: R. Akiba holds, An object caught up is at rest; while the Rabbis hold that it is not as at rest; but above ten all agree that he is not liable, for we do not learn throwing from reaching across. Or perhaps they disagree when it is above ten, and they differ in this: R. Akiba holds, We learn throwing from reaching across; while the Rabbis hold, We do not learn throwing from reaching across; but below ten, all agree that he is culpable. What is the reason? An object caught up is as at rest?²¹ Said R. Joseph: This question was asked by R. Hisda, and R. Hamnuna solved it for him from this: [If one removes an object] from one private domain, to another and it passes through the street itself, R. Akiba declares [him] liable, while the Sages exempt [him]. Now, since it states, through the street itself, it is obvious that they differ where it is below ten. Now, in which [case]? Shall we say, in the case of one who carries [it] across: is he culpable only when it is below ten, but not when it is above ten? Surely R. Eleazar said: If one carries out a burden above ten [handbreadths from the street level], he is culpable, for thus was the carrying of the children of Kohath, Hence it must surely refer to throwing, and one is culpable only when it is below ten, but not when it is above ten; this proves that they differ in whether an object caught up is as at rest. This proves it.

Now, he [R. Hamnuna] differs from A. Eleazar. For R. Eleazar said: R. Akiba declared [him] culpable even when it is above ten; but as to what is stated, through the street itself,²² that is to teach you the extent²³ of the Rabbis'[' ruling].²⁴ Now he [R. Eliezer] differs from R. Hilkiyah b. Tobi, for R. Hilkiyah b. Tobi said: Within three [handbreadths from the ground], all agree that he is culpable;²⁵ above ten, all agree that he is not culpable; between three and ten, we come to the controversy of R. Akiba and the Rabbis. It was taught likewise: Within three, all agree that he is liable; above ten, It is [prohibited] only as a shebuth,²⁶ and if they are [both] his own grounds, it is permitted [at the very outset]; between three and ten, R. Akiba ruled [him] culpable, while the sages exempt him.

The Master said: 'And if they are [both] his own grounds, it is permitted.' Shall we say that this is a refutation of Rab? For it was stated: If there are two houses on the two [opposite] sides of a street, Rabbah son of R. Huna said in Rab's name: One may not throw [an object] from one to another; while Samuel ruled: It is permitted to throw from one to another!²⁷ — But did we not establish that law [as referring] e.g., to [the case] where one [house] is higher and one is lower, so that it [the object] may fall [into the street]²⁸ and he come to fetch it?

R. Hisda asked R. Hamnuna-others state, R. Hamnuna asked R. Hisda-How do we know this principle which the Rabbis stated, viz.: Whatever is [separated by] less than three [handbreadths] is as joined?²⁹ Said he to him, Because it is impossible for the street to be trimmed with a plane and shears.³⁰ If so, the same should apply to three also? Moreover, when we learnt: If one lets down walls from above to below,³¹ if they are three handbreadths high above the ground, it [the *sukkah*] is unfit,³² Hence if [they are] less than three it is fit:³³ what can be said?³⁴ — There the reason is that it is a partition through which goats can enter.³⁵ That is well [for] below; what can be said [for] above?³⁶

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

— Rather [the fact is] that whatever is [separated by] less than three [handbreadths] is regarded as joined is a law received on tradition.

Our Rabbis taught: [If one throws³⁷ an article] from public to public ground, and private ground lies between: Rabbi holds him liable, but the sages exempt him — Rab and Samuel both assert: Rabbi imposed liability only in the case of covered-in private ground, when we say that the house is as though it were full, but not if it is uncovered,³⁸ R. Hana³⁹ said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: Rabbi held him liable to two [sacrifices], one on account of carrying out and another on account of carrying in,⁴⁰ Now R. Hana sat [studying] and this presented a difficulty to him:⁴¹

1. v. **Glos.** That which is so derived is regarded as explicitly stated.
2. Rashi: R. Judah b. Bathyra did not receive this *gezerah shawah* on tradition from his teachers, and no analogy by *gezerah shawah* can be employed unless sanctioned by tradition. 'Aruch: R. Akiba did not learn it from his teachers, but inferred it himself.
3. On the view of R. Judah b. Bathyra. For it is stated, but he died in his own sin, *ibid*.
4. *Ibid.* XIV, 44.
5. *Ibid.* Xli, 9 q.v.
6. The plural definitely includes Aaron.
7. Num. XXVII. 10.
8. 'he turned' is understood to mean, he turned away from, i.e., he was freed.
9. Lit., 'worthy'.
10. Ex. IV, 1.
11. Lit., 'revealed'.
12. *Ibid.* 31.
13. Gen. XV, 6.
14. Num. XX, 12.
15. Ex. IV, 6; he was smitten with leprosy, *Ibid*.
16. It became leprous only when he took it out.
17. *Ibid.* 7.
18. I.e., before It was fully withdrawn.
19. *Ibid.* VII, 12.
20. Lit., 'a miracle within a miracle'. It first became a rod again, and as a rod it swallowed up their serpents.
21. v, *supra* 4b for notes.
22. Which implies below ten.
23. Lit., 'power'.
24. Even then they hold that he is not culpable.
25. because that is regarded as on the ground itself, and therefore at rest.

26. v. **Glos.** — The shebuth here is that he carries from his domain to his neighbor's, both being private ground.
27. Both houses must belong to the same person. for otherwise Samuel would certainly not permit it, V. 'Er., Sonc. ed.. p, 593 notes.
28. For the houses not being on the same level, more skill is required to throw from one to the other.
29. Labud, v, Glos,
30. The ground cannot be perfectly leveled, and it must contain bumps of that height. Therefore everything within three handbreadths is regarded as joined to the ground.
31. The reference is to the walls of a *sukkah* (booth, v. Lev, XXIII. 42). He takes a wall, e.g.. of boards, lowers it, but not right down to the ground, and fastens it to something on top.
32. As the walls are incomplete.
33. For they are then regarded as touching the ground.
34. The *sukkah* not being in a public ground, the reason stated is inapplicable here.
35. Lit., 'cleave'. But they cannot squeeze through a gap less than three.
36. This principle of labud operates also where the gap is above; v. e.g.. 'Er, 16b, Suk. 7a; obviously these reasons do not hold good in that case.
37. so *supra* 4b.
38. V. notes on this passage *supra* 4b and 5,
39. *Var. lec.*: R. Hisda.
40. For during its journey it passes out of private into public ground, and enters from public into private ground.
41. In connection with what he had heard from Rab Judah,

Shabbath 97b

shall we say that Rabbi holds one liable for a derivative [when performed] conjointly with its principal?¹ But surely it was taught. Rabbi said: Words [debarim], the words [haddebarim], these [eleh] are the words: this indicates the thirty-nine labors stated to Moses at Sinai.² Said R. Joseph to him: You learn it³ in reference to this, and so find Rabbi self-contradictory; We learn it in reference to R. Judah['s ruling]. and find no difficulty.⁴ For it was taught: [If one throws an article] from private to public ground, and it traverses four cubits over the public ground: R. Judah holds [him] liable, whereas the sages exempt [him]. [Whereon] Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: R. Judah holds [him] liable to two [sacrifices], one on account of transporting [from private

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

ground] and a second on account of carrying over [public ground). For if you think that he holds him liable to one [only], it follows that the Rabbis exempt [him] completely: but surely he has carried it out from private to public ground? [But] how so? Perhaps I may tell you after all that R. Judah holds him liable to one [only]. and the Rabbis exempt [him] completely: yet [as to the question] how is that possible? it is where e.g.. he declared, 'Immediately on issuing into the street, let it come to rest; and they differ in this: R. Judah holds: 'We say. An object caught up [in the air] is as at rest, and his intention is fulfilled; while the Rabbis hold, We do not say. An object caught up is as at rest, and his intention is not fulfilled;⁵ but for a derivative [performed] simultaneously with its principal R. Judah does not impose liability? You cannot think so, for it was taught: R. Judah adds the closing up of the web and the evening of the woof. Said they to him: Closing the web is included in stretching the threads, and evening [the woof] is included in weaving.⁶ Does that not mean that one performs both of them together. which proves that R. Judah imposed liability for a derivative [performed] simultaneously with its principal — Why so? perhaps it really means that each was performed separately. R. Judah not imposing liability for a derivative [performed] simultaneously with its principal, and they differ in this: R. Judah holds. These are principal labors; while the Rabbis hold, These are derivatives. The proof [of this assumption] is that it is stated, 'R. Judah adds, etc.': now. it is well if you agree that they are principal labors [on his view, for then] what does he add? he adds principals; but if you say that they are derivatives, what does he add?² It was stated likewise, Rabbah and R. Joseph both maintain: R. Judah imposed liability only for one [sacrifice].

Rabina observed to R. Ashi: But on our original assumption that R. Judah held [him] liable to two, — if he desires it [to alight] here. he does not desire it [to alight] there, and vice versa?⁸ — Said he to him, It means

that he declared, 'Wherever it pleases, let it come to rest.'⁹

It is obvious that if one intends throwing [an object] eight [cubits] but throws [it] four, it is as though he wrote SHem [as part of] SHimeon.¹⁰ [But] what if one intends throwing [an object] four [cubits] but throws [it] eight: do we say, Surely he has carried it out¹¹ or perhaps it has surely not alighted where he desired? But is this not what Rabina observed to R. Ashi, and he answered him, It means that he said, 'Wherever it pleases. let it come to rest'!¹² And as to what you say. It is the same as writing SHem [as part] of SHimeon: how compare? There, without writing SHem, SHimeon cannot be written;¹³ but here, without [intentionally] throwing [it] four, cannot one throw it eight?¹⁴

Our Rabbis taught: If one throws [an object] from public to public ground, and private ground lies between them: [if it traverses] four cubits [over public ground]. he is culpable.¹⁵

1. V. *supra* 96b.
2. V. *supra* 70a. Now the only purpose of deducing the number is to show that his is the maximum number of sacrifices to which one can be liable; but if one is liable for derivatives in addition to the principal labors there can be far more.
3. What you heard from Rab Judah.
4. For we find nowhere that R. Judah exempts for a derivative performed conjointly with the principal.
5. Hence he is not liable on its account.
6. V. *supra* 75a.
7. For only principals are enumerated there.
8. In order to be liable to two it would be necessary that he should carry it out and deposit it in the street, then lift it up and carry it four cubits. and deposit it again. Now it may be argued that an object caught up in the air is as at rest, and therefore immediately it enters the street atmosphere it is as though it alights on the ground, and when it travels further it is as though it is taken up and carried again. But the thrower's intention is that it should come to rest at one place only, either as soon as it emerges into the street or after four cubits; in either case it cannot be regarded as though he deposited it, picked it up and deposited it again. Hence he

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

can be liable for carrying it out only, but not for its passage in the street (v. Rashi and R. Han.).

9. Then it is regarded as though it rested at both places in accordance with this intention,
10. V. *infra* 103a and p. 336. n. 5. Hence here too he is liable.
11. of its original spot and it has traversed the four cubits he desired, though it has gone further too,
12. But otherwise he is not liable; so here too he should not be liable in either case unless he made such a declaration.
13. Hence when one writes S_Hem he does so intentionally, though he also intends to add to it,
14. Surely not! I.e., one need have no intention to throw it exactly four cubits in order to be able to throw it eight. (The difference is that when one writes S_Hem he has performed a labor, whereas when one throws an article, his action is incomplete until it comes to rest.)
15. I.e., over the two public grounds combined.

Shabbath 98a

less than four cubits, he is not culpable. What does this inform us? — This is what he informs us, that [similar] domains combine,¹ and we do not say, An object caught up [in the air] is as at rest.²

R. Samuel b. Judah said in R. Abba's name in R. Huna's name in the name of Rab: If one carries [an article] four cubits in covered public ground, he is liable, because it is not like the banners of the wilderness.³ But that is not so? for the wagons surely were covered,⁴ and yet Rab said in R. Hiyya's name: As for the wagons, beneath them, between them, and at their sides it was public ground?⁵ — Rab referred to the interspaces⁶ — Consider: what was the length of the wagons? Five cubits. What was the breadth of the board? A cubit and a half. Then how many [rows] could be placed: three: thus leaving half a cubit, and when you divide it among them [the spaces] they are as joined!⁷ — Do you think that the boards lay on their width? they were laid on their thickness. Yet even so, what was the thickness of the board? One cubit. How many [rows] were [then] laid? Four, thus leaving a cubit, and when you divide it among them [the spaces] they are as joined!⁸ Now, on the view that the boards were one cubit thick at

the bottom, but tapered to a fingerbreadth, it is well:⁹ but on the view that just as they were a cubit thick at the bottom, so at the top too, what can be said? — Said R. Kahana: (They were arranged] in clasped formation.¹⁰ Now, where were they placed: on the top of the wagon. But the wagon itself was covered?¹¹

1. If it travels part of the ground; this does not agree with R. Jose *supra* 80a.
2. For if we did, he would be culpable on account of carrying in from public to private ground, even if it does not travel four cubits over the latter.
3. V. *supra* 5a.
4. With the boards of the Tabernacle placed crosswise on top along their length.
5. V. *supra* 99a. The width of the wagons was five cubits, and five cubits' space was allowed between them in the breadth, whilst the boards were ten cubits in length. Hence when placed crosswise on top of the wagons they projected two and a half cubits on both sides; thus the space between them was completely covered over, and yet he states that it was public ground.
6. Between the rows of boards, which were not arranged close to each other.
7. For there was only a quarter cubit one and a half handbreadths between the rows of boards, whereas a space less than three cubits is disregarded (v. *supra* 97a).
8. For there are three spaces which give two handbreadths for each.
9. As there would be more at the ends than three handbreadths' space between each.
10. I.e., the four rows were not equidistant, but in two rows (as though clasped) at the head and at the tail of the wagon respectively, this leaving a cubit between them. This was necessary because each row contained three boards, which would give a height of four and a half cubits, and as the thickness was only one cubit they might otherwise topple over.
11. It is assumed that the floor of the wagon was completely closed, like the floor, e.g., of a cement-carrying lorry. How then did Rab state that the space underneath the wagon too was public ground? [The translation follows Rashi's reading and interpretation. R. Han and Tosaf, adopt different readings both here and *supra*. 'Rab referred to the interspaces', and explain accordingly.]

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Shabbath 98b

— Said Samuel: [The bottom consisted] of laths.

Our Rabbis taught: The boards were one cubit thick at the bottom, but tapered to a fingerbreadth at the top, for it is said, they shall be entire [thammim] unto the top thereof¹ whilst elsewhere it is said, [the waters ...] ended [tammu] and were cut off;² this is R. Judah's view. R. Nehemiah said: Just as their thickness at the bottom, was a cubit, so at the top was their thickness a cubit, for it is said, 'and in like manner [they shall be entire]'. But surely 'thammim' is written? That [teaches] that they were to come whole,³ and not divided.⁴ And the other too, surely is written 'in like manner'? — That [teaches] that they were not to erect them irregularly.⁵ Now, on the view that just as they were a cubit thick at the bottom, so were they at the top, it is well: thus it is written, And from the hinder part of the tabernacle westward thou shalt make six boards, and two boards shalt thou make for the corners of the tabernacle;⁶ thus the breadth of these comes and fills in the thickness of those.⁷ But on the view that they were a cubit thick at the bottom, while they tapered at the top to a fingerbreadth, one receded and the other protruded?⁸ They were planed mountain-fashion.⁹

And the middle bar in the midst of the boards [shall pass through from end to end].¹⁰ A Tanna taught: It lay¹¹ there by a miracle.¹²

Moreover thou shalt make the tabernacle with ten curtains. The length of each curtain shall be eight and twenty cubits.¹³ Throw their length over the breadth of the Tabernacle; how much was it? twenty-eight cubits. Subtract ten for the roof, and this leaves nine cubits on each side. According to R. Judah. the cubit of the sockets was left uncovered; according to R. Nehemiah, a cubit of the boards was uncovered [too].¹⁴ Cast their breadth over the length of the Tabernacle: how much was it? forty cubits.¹⁵

Subtract thirty for the roof,¹⁶ leaves ten. According to R. Judah the cubit of the sockets was covered; according to R. Nehemiah the cubit of the sockets was uncovered.

And thou shalt make curtains of goats' hair for a tent over the tabernacle: [eleven curtains shalt thou make them]. The length of each curtain Shall be thirty cubits. [and the breadth of each curtain four cubits].¹⁷ Cast their length over the breadth of the Tabernacle; how much was it? Thirty. Subtract ten for the roof, which leaves ten [cubits] on each side. According to R. Judah the cubit of the sockets was covered; according to R. Nehemiah the cubit of the sockets was uncovered. It was taught likewise: And the cubit on one side, and the cubit of the other side of that which remaineth [in the length of the curtains of the tent]:¹⁸ this was to cover the cubit of the sockets: that is R. Judah's view. R. Nehemiah said: It was to cover the cubit of the boards.¹⁹ Cast their breadth over the length of the Tabernacle: how much was it? Forty-four [cubits]. Subtract thirty for the roof leaves fourteen. Subtract two for the doubling over, as it is written, and thou shalt double over the sixth curtain in the forefront of the tent,²⁰ leaves twelve. Now, according to R. Judah, it is well; thus it is written, the half curtain that remaineth shall hang;²¹ but according to R. Nehemiah, what is meant by [the half curtain ...] shall hang?²² — It shall hang over its companions.²³ The School of R. Ishmael taught: What did the Tabernacle resemble? A woman who goes in the street and her skirts trail after her.²⁴

Our Rabbis taught: The boards were cut out and the sockets were grooved;²⁵

1. Ex, XXVI. 24.
2. Josh. III, 17.
3. Translating thammim as in E.V.
4. Each board was to be of one piece. not of two joined together (Rashi). Jast. translates: the boards were to be solid, not veneered.
5. Lit.. 'they were not to remove them one from another'; but they were all to stand in the same row.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

6. Ex, XXVI, 22f.
7. Since the Tabernacle was ten cubits in breadth, and these six boards accounted for nine only, the additional two boards, one at each side made up the deficiency, whilst the extra cubit left in each fitted exactly over the thickness of the board ranged along the length of the Tabernacle,
8. Obviously these two side boards protruded at the top beyond the attenuated thickness of the boards ranged lengthwise. — 'one receded' refers to the latter.
9. These two boards were wider at the bottom and narrower at the top so that their outward line resembled a mountain slope. 'Aruch reads: like a gusset (ki tariz).
10. Ex. XXVI, 28.
11. Lit.. 'stood'.
12. It was one long straight bar which passed along the three walls; the necessary bending between the angles of the walls was miraculously done by itself.
13. Ibid. If.
14. The boards were fitted into sockets (v. 19) one cubit in height. Consequently if the thickness of the top was only one fingerbreadth, practically the whole length of the boards up to the socket was covered by the curtain; (the fingerbreadth and the slightly larger length of the hypotenuse being disregarded). But if the top too was one cubit in thickness. only eight cubits of the boards were covered.
15. I.e., ten curtains each of four cubits in breadth. Ibid. 2.
16. Which was the length of the Tabernacle, twenty boards each one and a half cubits broad,
17. Ibid. 7f.
18. Ibid. 13.
19. Left uncovered by the first covering. v. *supra*.
20. Ex. XXVI, 9.
21. Since R. Judah requires only a fingerbreadth for the top thickness of the board, practically two cubits-i.e., half a curtain hung, i.e., trailed on the floor.
22. only one cubit was left over, the other being required for the thickness.
23. Sc. the lower covering, beyond which the upper fell two cubits.
24. On the ground. So did the Tabernacle's covering trail too.
25. So that the former fitted into the latter.

Shabbath 99a

also, the clasps in the loops¹ looked like stars [set] in the sky.

Our Rabbis taught: The lower curtains [were made] of blue [wool], purple [wool]. crimson

thread and fine linen,² whilst the upper ones were of goats' [hair] manufacture; and greater wisdom [skill] is mentioned in connection with the upper than in connection with the lower. For whereas of the lower ones it is written, And all the women that were wise-hearted did spin with their hands;³ in reference to the upper ones it is written, And all the women whose heart stirred them up in wisdom spun the goats;⁴ and it was taught in R. Nehemiah's name: It was washed [direct] on the goats and spun on the goats.⁵

IF THERE ARE TWO BALCONIES, etc. Rab said in R. Hiyya's name: As for the wagons, beneath them, between them, and at their sides it was public ground. Abaye said: Between one wagon and another [as its side] there was [the space of] a full wagon. length. And how much was a wagon-length? five cubits. Why was it [this length] necessary: four and a half would have sufficed?⁶ — So that the boards should not press [against each other].⁷

Raba said: The sides of the waggon⁸ equaled the fit [internal] breadth of the wagon, and how much was the [internal] breadth of the wagon? Two cubits and a half.⁹ Why was this necessary: a cubit and a half would have sufficed?¹⁰ — In order that the boards should not jump about.¹¹ Then as to what we have as an established fact that the path [width] of public ground must be sixteen cubits: since we learn it from the Tabernacle,¹² surely [the public ground] of the Tabernacle was [only] fifteen?¹³ — There was an additional cubit where a Levite stood, so that if the boards slipped he would support them.

MISHNAH. AS FOR THE BANK OF A CISTERN,¹⁴ AND A ROCK, WHICH ARE TEN [HANDBREADTHS] HIGH AND FOUR IN BREATH,¹⁵ IF ONE REMOVES [AUGHT] FROM THEM OR PLACES [AUGHT] UPON THEM, HIS IS CULPABLE;¹⁶ IF LESS THAN THIS, HE IS NOT CULPABLE.

GEMARA. Why state, THE BANK OF A CISTERN, AND A ROCK: let him [the Tanna] state, 'A cistern and a rock'?¹⁷

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

[Hence] this supports R. Johanan, who said: A cistern together with the bank thereof combine to [give a height of] ten [handbreadths].¹⁸ It was taught likewise: As for a cistern In public ground ten [handbreadths] deep and four broad [square]. We may not draw [water] from it on the Sabbath.¹⁹

1. V. ibid. 10f,
2. V. ibid. 1.
3. Ibid. XXXV. 25.
4. Ibid. 26.
5. V. p. 355, n. 4.
6. Either for three rows of boards lying on their breadth, which gives exactly four and a half cubits, or for four rows lying on their thickness, thus allowing an additional half cubit to cover the extra space needed for the bars.
7. Rashi: if laid on their breadth. Tosaf: if laid on their thickness, the half cubit being insufficient both for the bars and for freedom of movement of the boards.
8. Which includes the thickness of the sides, the wheels which reached up alongside of them, and the space between the wheels and the sides.
9. So that the sides, as defined in n. 3, were one and a quarter each.
10. To permit the boards to be placed on their thickness inside the wagon down its length if necessary.
11. When placed on top, more than one and a quarter cubits should be necessary to support their length firmly.
12. All definitions in connection with work on the Sabbath are learnt thence.
13. Two wagons side by side, each five cubits in width and five cubits' space between them, the whole constituting a public pathway.
14. Formed by the earth dug of it.
15. I.e., four square on top.
16. Because the bank or stone is private ground (v. *supra* 6a), whilst the remover stands in public ground.
17. This would teach that anything either ten high or ten deep and four square is a private domain.
18. So that the cistern is counted as private ground.
19. Because the well is private ground whilst the drawer stands in the street.

Shabbath 99b

unless a wall ten handbreadths high is made around it;¹ and one may not drink from it on the Sabbath unless he brings his head and the

greater part of his body into it,² and a cistern and its bank combine to [give a height of] ten.

R. Mordecai asked Rabbah: What of a pillar in the street, ten high and four broad, and one throws [an article] and it alights upon it? Do We say, Surely the removal is [effected] in transgression and the depositing is [effected] in transgression;³ or perhaps since it comes from a place of non-liability⁴ it is not [a culpable action]? — Said he to him, This is [treated in] our Mishnah. He [then] went and asked it of R. Joseph: Said he to him, This is [treated in] our Mishnah. He went and asked it of Abaye, Said he to him, This is [treated in] our Mishnah. 'You all spit with each other's spittle,'⁵ cried he to them: Do you not hold thus, they replied. Surely we learnt, **IF ONE REMOVES [AUGHT] FROM THEM OR PLACES [AUGHT] UPON THEM, HE IS CULPABLE.**⁶ But perhaps our Mishnah treats of a needle? he suggested to them! — It is impossible even for a needle not to be slightly raised. — It [the rock] may have a projecting point,⁷ or it [the needle] may lie in a cleft.⁸

R. Misha said, R. Johanan propounded: What of a wall in a street, ten high but not four broad, surrounding a *karmelith*² and converting it [thereby] into private ground,¹⁰ and one throws [an article] and it alights on the top of it? Do we say, Since it is not four broad it is a place of non-liability; or perhaps, since it converts it into private ground it is as though it were [all] filled up?¹¹ Said 'Ulla, [This may be solved] *a fortiori*: if it [the wall] serves as a partition for something else,¹² how much more so for itself!¹³ This was stated too: R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name, and thus said R. Isaac in R. Johanan's name: In the case of a wall in the street ten high and not four broad, surrounding a *karmelith* and converting it into private ground, he who throws [an article] which alights thereon is culpable: if it serves as a partition for something- else, how much more so for itself.

R. Johanan propounded: What of a pit nine [handbreadths deep] and one removes one

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

segment from it and makes it up to ten;¹⁴ [do we say] the taking up of the object and the making of the partition come simultaneously, hence he is culpable; or is he not culpable? Now should you say, since the partition was not ten originally he is not liable: what of a pit ten [deep] and one lays the segment therein and [thus] diminishes it[’s depth]? [Here] the depositing of the article and the removal of the partition come simultaneously: is he culpable or not? — You may solve it for him by his own [dictum]. For we learnt: if one throws [an article] four cubits on to a wall, — if above ten handbreadths, it is as though he throws it into the air; if below, it is as though he throws it on to the ground; and he who throws [an article] four cubits along the ground is culpable. Now we discussed this: surely it does not stay there? And R. Johanan answered: This refers to a juicy cake of figs.¹⁵ Yet why so? Surely it diminishes the four cubits?¹⁶ — There he does not render it as nought;¹⁷ here he does render it as nought.¹⁸

Raba propounded: What if one throws a board and it alights upon poles?¹⁹ What does he ask? [The law where] the depositing of the article and the constituting of the partition come simultaneously? [but] that is R. Johanan’s [problem]!-When does Raba ask? e.g., if he throws a board with an article on top of it: what [then]? [Do we say], Since they come simultaneously, it is like the depositing of the article and the making of a partition [at the same time];²⁰ or perhaps, since it is impossible for it [the article] not to be slightly raised and then alight,²¹ it is like the making of a partition and the [subsequent] depositing of an article?²² The question stands over.

Raba said: I am certain, water [lying] upon water, that is its [natural] rest; a nut upon water,

1. For the drawer to stand in private ground.
2. Cf. *supra* 11a bottom.
3. I.e., the article is removed from public and deposited in private ground.
4. *V. supra* 6a. The object must sail through the air above ten handbreadths in order for it to alight on the top of column of that height.

5. Your opinions are all traceable to the same source.
6. And in so doing he must lift the object to a height above ten.
7. Part of the top may slope downward and thence project upward, and there the needle lies. In that case it is below ten, and even when picked up does not go above ten.
8. Or groove, likewise below ten. — Thus in R. Mordecai’s view the Mishnah does not solve his problem.
9. *V. Glos.*
10. *V. infra* 7a,
11. Reaching to the top of the wall, so that the wall and the *karmelith* are one, the whole, including the wall, being private ground.
12. Converting the *karmelith* into private ground.
13. It is certainly private ground, just as the *karmelith* which it converts.
14. [The segment was one handbreadth in thickness and by removing it the pit reaches the depth of ten handbreadths, which constitutes the legal height for the partition of a private domain.]
15. *V. supra* 7b.
16. For the thickness of the figs must be deducted. Nevertheless he is culpable, and the same reasoning applies to R. Johanan’s second problem.
17. When he throws the cake of figs on the wall, he does not mean it to become part thereof and cease to exist separately, as it were.
18. For it becomes part of the wall. Hence the two cases are dissimilar.
19. The poles are ten handbreadths high, but not four square, whilst the board is; thus as it rests on these poles it constitutes a private domain.
20. Hence he is not liable, assuming this to be the solution of R. Johanan’s problem.
21. For it does not stick to the board; hence the board alights first and then this article.
22. Therefore he is culpable.

Shabbath 100a

that is not its [natural] rest. Raba propounded: If a nut [lies] in a vessel, and the vessel floats on water, what [is the law]? Do we regard the nut, and behold it is at rest; or do we regard the vessel, and behold it is not at rest? The question stands over. [In respect to] oil [floating] upon wine, R. Johanan b. Nuri and the Rabbis differ. For we learnt: If oil is floating upon wine, and a tebul yom touches the oil, he disqualifies the oil only. R. Johanan b. Nuri said: Both are attached to each other.¹

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

Abaye said: If a pit in the street [is] ten deep and eight broad, and² one throws a mat into it, he is culpable; but if he divides it with the mat,³ he is not culpable.⁴ Now according to Abaye, who is certain that the mat annuls the partition,⁵ a segment certainly annuls the partition;⁶ but according to R. Johanan to whom a segment is a problem, a mat certainly does not annul the partition.⁷

Abaye also said: If a pit in the street, ten deep and four broad, [is] full of water and one throws [an object] therein, he is culpable; [but if it is] full of produce and one throws [an object] therein, he is not culpable. What is the reason? Water does not annul the partition,⁸ [whereas] produce does annul the partition. It was taught likewise: If one throws [an object] from the sea into a street, or from a street into the sea, he is not liable,⁹ R. Simeon said: If there is in the place where he throws [it a separate cavity] ten deep and four broad, he is liable.¹⁰

MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] FOUR CUBITS ON TO A WALL ABOVE TEN HANDBREADTHS, IT IS AS THOUGH HE THROWS IT INTO THE AIR; IF BELOW, IT IS AS THOUGH IT THROWS IT ON TO THE GROUND, AND HE WHO THROWS [AN ARTICLE] FOUR CUBITS ALONG THE GROUND¹¹ IS CULPABLE.

GEMARA. But it does not stay there? — Said R. Johanan: We learnt of a juicy cake of figs.¹²

Rab Judah said in Rab's name in the name of R. Hiyya: If one throws [an article] above ten [handbreadths] and it goes and alights in a cavity of any size, we come to a controversy of R. Meir and the Rabbis. According to R. Meir, who holds: We [imaginarily] hollow out to complete it, he is liable; according to the Rabbis who 'maintain, We do not hollow out to complete it, he is not liable.¹³ It was taught likewise: If one throws [an article] above ten and it goes and alights in a cavity of any size, R. Meir declares [him] culpable, whereas the Rabbis exempt [him].

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If a [sloping] mound attains [a height of] ten [handbreadths] within [a distance of] four,¹⁴ and one throws [an object] and it alights on top of it, he is culpable. It was taught likewise: If an alley¹⁵ is level with within but becomes a slope towards the [main] street,¹⁶ or is level with the [main] street, but becomes a slope within,¹⁷ that alley requires neither a lath nor a beam.¹⁸ R. Hanina b. Gamaliel said: If a [sloping] mound attains [a height of] ten [handbreadths] within [a distance of] four, and one throws [an object] and it alights on top of it, he is culpable.

MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT] WITHIN FOUR CUBITS BUT IT ROLLS BEYOND FOUR CUBITS, HE IS NOT CULPABLE; BEYOND FOUR CUBITS BUT IT ROLLS WITHIN FOUR CUBITS, HE IS CULPABLE.¹⁹

GEMARA. But it did not rest [beyond four cubits]?²⁰ — Said R. Johanan: Providing it rests [beyond four cubits] on something, whatever its size.²¹ It was taught likewise: If one throws [an article] beyond four cubits, but the wind drives it within, even if it carries it out again, he is not liable; if the wind holds it for a moment,²² even if it carries it in again, he is liable.

Raba said: [An article brought] within three [handbreadths] must, according to the Rabbis, rest upon something, however small.²³ Meremar sat and reported this statement. Said Rabina to Meremar:

1. V. *supra* 5b for notes on the whole passage.
2. I.e., eight by four—the pit of course is private ground.
3. E.g., a stiff cane mat, which stands up vertically across the middle of the pit.
4. The thickness of the mat leaves less than four square handbreadths on either side, so that neither is now private ground.
5. As in the previous note.
6. V. question asked by R. Johanan, *supra* 99b.
7. For the mat does not become part of the pit; v. p. 477. n. 3.
8. Hence the pit is private ground in spite of the water.
9. The sea is a *karmelith*, *supra* 6a.

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

10. Since it stands apart from the rest of the sea. This cavity too is naturally filled with water; hence we see that water does not annul the partition.
11. Or, over the ground, within the height of ten handbreadths.
12. V. *supra* 7b for notes on this and the Mishnah.
13. v. *supra* 7b for notes.
14. This renders it too steep to be negotiated in one's ordinary stride, and the top is therefore counted as private ground.
15. This ranks as a *karmelith*, *supra* 6a.
16. Into which it debouches.
17. The ground on the inner side of the entrance is of the same level as the main street for a short distance, but then falls away.
18. To convert it into private ground (v. *supra* 9a), the slope itself being an effective partition.
19. In both cases it did not properly rest before the wind drove it back or forward.
20. Why is he culpable in the latter case?
21. Even not on the ground itself, and stays there momentarily. Rashi: The same holds good if the wind keeps it stationary for a moment within three handbreadths of the ground 'in the principle of labud (v. [Glos.](#)). [Wilna Gaon reads: Provided it rests for a little while.]
22. Beyond the four cubits.
23. The reference is to the Rabbis' view that an object caught up in the air is not regarded as at rest, in contrast to R. Akiba's ruling that it is as at rest (*supra* 97a). Raba states that the Rabbis hold thus even if the object comes within three handbreadths of the ground: it must actually alight upon something, otherwise it is not regarded as having been deposited.

Shabbath 100b

Is this not [to be deduced from] our Mishnah, whereon R. Johanan commented. Providing it rests on something, whatever its size?¹ You speak of [a] rolling [object]. replied he; [a] rolling [object] is not destined to rest; but this, since it is destined to rest,² [I might argue that] though it did not come to rest, it is as though it had rested:³ therefore he informs us [that it is not so].

MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT OVER A DISTANCE OF] FOUR CUBITS IN THE SEA, HE IS NOT LIABLE. IF THERE IS A WATER POOL. AND A PUBLIC ROAD TRAVERSES IT, AND ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT] FOUR CUBITS THEREIN. HE IS LIABLE. AND WHAT DEPTH CONSTITUTES

A POOL? LESS THAN TEN HANDBREADTH.³ IF THERE IS A POOL OF WATER AND A PUBLIC ROAD TRAVERSES IT, AND ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT] FOUR CUBITS THEREIN,⁴ HE IS LIABLE.

GEMARA. One of the Rabbis said to Raba, As for 'traversing [mentioned] twice, that is well, [as] it informs us this: [i] traversing with difficulty is designated traversing;⁵ [ii] use with difficulty is not designated use.⁶ But why [state] POOL twice? — One refers to summer, and the other to winter, and both are necessary. For if only one were stated, I would say: That is only in summer, when it is the practice of people to walk therein to cool themselves; but in winter [it is] not [so]. And if we were informed [this] of winter, [I would say that] because they are mud-stained they do not object;⁷ but in summer [it is] not [so]. Abaye said, They are necessary: I might argue, That is only where it [the pool] is not four cubits [across]; but where it is four cubits [across], one goes round it.⁸ R. Ashi said; They are necessary: I might argue, That is only where it [the pool] is four [across];⁹ but where it is not four, one steps over it.¹⁰ Now, R. Ashi is consistent with his opinion. For R. Ashi said: If one throws [an object] and it alights on the junction of a landing bridge.¹¹ he is culpable, since many pass across it.¹²

MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT] FROM THE SEA TO DRY LAND,¹³ OR FROM DRY LAND TO THE SEA, FROM THE SEA TO A SHIP¹⁴ OR FROM A SHIP TO THE SEA OR FROM ONE SHIP TO ANOTHER, HE IS NOT CULPABLE. IF SHIPS ARE TIED TOGETHER, ONE MAY CARRY FROM ONE TO ANOTHER. IF THEY ARE NOT TIED TOGETHER, THOUGH LYING CLOSE [TO EACH OTHER], ONE MAY NOT CARRY FROM ONE TO ANOTHER.

GEMARA. It was stated: As for a ship. R. Huna said, A projection, whatever its size, is stuck out [over the side of the ship]. and [water] may then be drawn [from the sea]; R. Hisda and Rabbah son of R. Huna both maintain: One rigs up an enclosure¹⁵ four

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

[handbreadths square] and draws [water].¹⁶ [Now], R. Huna said: A projection, whatever its size, is stuck out, and [water] may then be drawn; he holds that the *karmelith* is measured from the [sea-]bed. so that the air space is a place of non-liability'.¹⁷ Hence logically not even a projection is required.¹⁸ but [it is placed there] to serve as a distinguishing mark.¹⁹ R. Hisda and Rabbah son of R. Huna both maintain: One rigs up an enclosure four square and draws [water]': they hold that the *karmelith* is measured from the surface of the water, the water being [as] solid ground.²⁰ [Hence] if a place of four [square] is not set up. one transports [the water] from a *karmelith* to private ground.²¹

R. Nahman said to Rabbah b. Abbuha: But according to R. Huna, who said, 'A projection, whatever its size, is stuck out and [water] may then be drawn', — but sometimes these are not ten,²² and so one carries from a *karmelith* to private ground? — Said he to him: It is well known that a ship cannot travel in less than ten [handbreadths of water].²³ But it has a projecting point?²⁴ — Said R. Safra: Sounders precede it.²⁵

R. Nahman b. Isaac said to R. Hiyya b. Abin: But according to R. Hisda and Rabbah son of R. Huna, who maintain, 'One rigs up an enclosure four [square] and draws [water]'. — how could he throw out his waste water?²⁶ And should you answer that he throws it [likewise] through that same enclosure, — it is [surely] repulsive to him!²⁷ — He throws it against the sides of the ship.²⁸ But there is his force [behind it]?²⁹ They [the Sages] did not prohibit one's force in connection with a *karmelith*. And whence do you say this? Because it was taught: As for a ship. one may not carry [e.g.. water] from it into the sea or from the sea into it.

1. Since he does not explain that the object came within three, it follows that even then it must alight on something.
2. It is actually falling when intercepted within three handbreadths from the ground.
3. Hence the thrower is culpable.
4. I.e., it travels four cubits before it rests. That is also the meaning in the previous case.

5. Hence the public road that passes through a pool counts as public ground, though one can only traverse it with difficulty.
6. E.g., a pit in the street nine handbreadths deep. Though one can put objects therein, it is inconvenient, and therefore is not the same as a pillar of that height in the street upon which people temporarily place their burdens whilst pausing to rest, and which ranks as public ground (*supra* 8a). The deduction that such use is not designated use follows from the repetition of traversing, which intimates that only traversing with difficulty is regarded as such, but nothing else.
7. To wade through a pool.
8. Instead of wading through it; hence it is not public ground. Therefore it is stated twice, to show that this case too is included.
9. Rashi adds cubits; but the masc. form [H] must refer to handbreadths. This reading is also more likely, as otherwise he would not say that if less than four one might step across it. — S. Strashun.
10. And thus avoids it.
11. Perhaps where the bridge joins the quay.
12. Though many, on the other hand, step over it, it does not on that account cease to be ground publicly used, and the same applies above.
13. Which is from a *karmelith* to public ground.
14. I.e., from a *karmelith* to private ground.
15. Lit., 'place'.
16. I.e., an enclosure above the water is made, which renders the water immediately below technically private ground. and through this the water is drawn.
17. Only ten handbreadths above the ground rank as a *karmelith*, whilst the space above that is a place of non-liability (*supra* 7a). Hence everything above the surface of the sea, and even the sea itself above ten handbreadths from its bed, fall within the latter category.
18. For one may certainly carry from a place of non-liability.
19. That one may not carry from a real *karmelith*.
20. The sea-bed and the sea count as one, as though the ground of the *karmelith* rose very high.
21. Viz., the ship.
22. Handbreadths from the sea-bed to its surface, so that the whole of the sea is a *karmelith*.
23. By *sefina* a large ship is meant, not a small boat.
24. Rashi: the ship has a projecting point (sc. a helm), and as that rises out of the water it is possible for it to sail into a draught of even less than ten handbreadths, and should water be drawn at this point one transports from a *karmelith* to private ground. Tosaf. and R. Han. (on the reading preserved in MS.M.): perhaps it (the sea-bed) has a projecting eminence just where the water is drawn, from the top of which

SHABBOS – 66a-100b

there are less than ten handbreadths to the sea surface?

25. Men who sound the depth of the water with long poles, and they take care to avoid such shallows.
26. For it is forbidden to throw from a private ground (the ship) to a *karmelith* (the sea).
27. To draw water subsequently through the same place.
28. Whence it descends into the sea.
29. Even if he does not throw it directly into the sea, he does so indirectly through the exercise of his force.